

Introduction

The primary purpose of the *IPC Papers* is to circulate the results of research conducted or assisted by the Institute of Philippine Culture. Since the Institute does nothing but research — it conducts no courses, awards no academic units — publication is its pipeline to both the academic community and the educated layman. That there are more than a few people at the other end of that line we judge from the reception given earlier numbers of the *Papers*. And it is our awareness of this relatively large and interested audience that motivates us to make these reports easily available, not only to our colleagues in the Philippines and abroad, but to the general public as well.

In this volume, the fourth in the series, we have brought together five essays derived from the two major enterprises in which IPC personnel were involved in the period July 1964 to December 1966. Those undertakings, and the IPC's involvement in them, need some explanation.

The Philippines Peace Corps Survey

The first was the Philippines Peace Corps Survey, begun in July 1964 and completed in May 1966. Most narrowly defined, the purpose of the Survey was to discover if Peace Corps' first three years of operations here (1961-1964) had had any appreciable effect on the Philippines. However, since Peace Corps/Washington, the initial and major sponsor of the study, allowed considerable latitude to the social scientists designing it, the Survey transcended the narcissistic exercise to which company-financed research is often reduced.¹

The place of the Ateneo de Manila in the project was something like *primus inter pares* among the many Philippine

¹ I hope elsewhere to develop at some length this proposition; namely, that American (and other nations') agencies planning to do evaluative research on their operations in developing countries should under certain conditions seek the participation (at least consultative) of local academic personnel in the planning and staffing of the study; among the conditions I would list are (a) the availability of such personnel, (b) a survey plan involving interviews at length with (c) a large number of host nationals. The administrators of the Philippines Peace Corps Survey accepted and followed the terms of this proposition.

Introduction

university participants. The headquarters of the project was a rented private home in Quezon City, conveniently near both the University of the Philippines at Diliman and the Loyola Heights campus of the Ateneo. However, since the on-scene person responsible for project operations ("chief coordinator") was concurrently director of the IPC, the greatest Philippine institutional and logistic support came inevitably from Peace Corps/Manila and the Ateneo. It is worth noting, nonetheless, that during the ten months the project was located in the Philippines (the last 13 were at the University of Hawaii, which had the research contract from Peace Corps/Washington), seven other Philippine colleges and universities played important roles in the project: Ateneo de Naga, Mindanao State University, Notre Dame of Cotabato College, Notre Dame of Jolo College, University of the Philippines, University of San Carlos, and Xavier University.

The reader will get some notion of the magnitude of the operation by looking at the list of staff members employed in the project (see the Appendix to the Introduction). In the Philippines alone there were, besides myself, two affiliated investigators and six consultants participating on a part-time basis; on the full-time staff we had 74 people in the administrative, data-processing, and field divisions of the organization. More important than sheer numbers, however, was the opportunity the project offered for the training of data-processing and field personnel (four Americans, 64 Filipinos), many of whom at the end of the project either continued on in research, returned to schools or government agencies, or went on for further studies in the social sciences.

Included in this volume are two articles based on the Survey. The first, by David P. Roy, Thomas W. Maretzki, and myself, is a summary of the official final report.² The first draft of the summary was by Roy, of the Division of Research, Peace Corps/Washington. He sent it to Maretzki and myself

² Frank Lynch, Thomas W. Maretzki, Alfred B. Bennett, Jr., Susan M. Bennett, and Linda D. Nelson, *The Philippines Peace Corps Survey: Final Report* (Honolulu: International Programs and the Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii, 1966). The report is being reprinted by the University of Hawaii; for information write Dr. Thomas W. Maretzki, Chairman, Department of Anthropology, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822.

for comment and reworking, and had the resulting joint production issued as a "Research Note" primarily for Peace Corps eyes.³ The version printed here corrects some errors that crept into the first few pages of that article.

The second Survey-derived essay printed in the present volume summarizes the results of a conference which was held when the Peace Corps fieldwork had been finished. In attendance, besides a number of senior social scientists invited for the occasion, were 30 interviewers who had just completed as many as six months in the barrios and poblaciones of the Philippines, interviewing at great length a total of 2,248 respondents. The conference gave them the opportunity to say what they thought should be said about this kind of work.

Perla Makil, an experienced interviewer and now field supervisor of the IPC, prepared the basic manuscript by transcribing and editing hours of taped proceedings. With the help of Mary R. Hollnsteiner and Martha M. Woodhams, I did the final draft. Research people should find the document useful, if not exhaustive or definitive.

The Ateneo-Penn State Basic Research Program

The second long-term enterprise reflected in this volume is the Ateneo-Penn State Basic Research Program. Planned as a three-year undertaking and begun July 1, 1966, the Program addresses itself to the general question of the impact of modernization in (and on) the Philippines. It was designed as a way to bring together and support for a limited time—generally 15 months—the interests, talents, and energies of a number of American and Filipino social scientists who were already committed to seeking an understanding of the changes presently underway in the Philippines and other nations of southeast Asia.

To understand the final composition of the panel of project directors in the Program, it will help to realize that the time between the Program's overall design and the deadline for its funding was unfortunately short. This meant that the time available for the recruitment of project directors was limited to

³ It appeared as No. 14 (January 1967) of a series called *Research Notes*, circulated by the Division of Research, Peace Corps/Washington.

several months. In the kind refusals we received both here and abroad from Filipino professionals invited to participate as project directors, there was a lesson to be learned (the hard way, to be sure): top-rate Filipino social scientists tend to be committed to many inescapable duties long into the future — and they find it very difficult to locate replacements for themselves. Not one of the people we approached could find a substitute that would free him for the 15 months of full-time participation required of the Program's project directors. The most we could do was engage several Filipinos on a part-time basis as project research associates (the names of those who worked with us in the first six months are included in the Appendix to this Introduction).

Ultimately seven social scientists, all from the United States except myself, agreed to join the Program as project directors. Each was invited to submit a design for his own project, the only requirement being that it should promise to shed some light on the forces and pressures of social and cultural change presently at work in the Philippines and southeast Asia.

More particularly, the research was to be such as would describe some aspect of the Philippines undergoing change, develop and test hypotheses to account for what was happening, and devise and evaluate methods and techniques of research suitable for the study of change not only in the Philippines but in its neighbor nations as well. While assuring their colleagues freedom to follow their own paths within these general prescriptions, the Program co-directors took responsibility for such integrative summaries or suggestions as might be called for.

In briefest form, the projects submitted and approved were the following: Cognitive mapping in the Tagalog area (Lynch, anthropologist, Ateneo de Manila); Legal concepts, folk and official (Stone, anthropologist, University of Hawaii); Iloilo town in transition (Szanton, anthropologist, University of Chicago); Changing values and motives (Guthrie, psychologist, The Pennsylvania State University); Changes in group structures and decision-making (Hare, sociologist, Haverford College); Iloko barrio in transition (Nydegger, anthropologist, The Pennsylvania

State University); Changes in the aiding response (Sechrest, psychologist, Northwestern University).⁴

The projects appear to represent only three fields; namely, anthropology, sociology, and psychology. As a matter of fact, however, the cognitive mapping study is of its very nature heavily linguistic in content; Stone moves into the realm of political anthropology; and Szanton's study of Estancia is a good example of economic anthropology. We would wish, nonetheless, to have all the social sciences more formally and centrally represented, and expect to make further attempts to have colleagues in these fields join the Program.

Aside from national and disciplinary representation in it, another feature of the Program deserves mentioning, even in this brief introduction. This is the manner in which control of the Program, supported though it is largely by United States funds, rests in Philippine hands.

Both the research activities and public behavior of all project directors (Americans and, when we have them, Filipinos) are subject to review by the IPC's Policy Committee, the majority of whom are Filipinos. If the Committee judges that a project director clearly irritates, or is very likely soon to irritate, Philippine-American relations by his conduct, it may, should he refuse to heed its timely admonitions, withdraw the Program's sponsorship of his project. For while everyone who takes part in the Program has all the usual assurances that accompany and support any ethical basic research—freedom to announce the source of his funds, freedom to investigate what he wants, and freedom to publish whatever he finds—he cannot expect that two responsible universities will use their own and United States government funds to assist him in a breach of international courtesy.

If this concession of power to the IPC Policy Committee seems somewhat greater than that ordinarily made to the instrument of a research subcontractor, it is nonetheless no greater than contemporary circumstances advise. Especially when the representative of one participant nation foots most of the bills,

⁴ See the Appendix below, for the directors' full names, and for the staff of Projects One to Three. Projects Four to Seven are not yet staffed.

while the other is the host, one does well to grant the man of the house that measure of ultimate control that befits him. To do otherwise at this point in history would seem anachronistic.

In this volume only the first three projects of the Program, called Projects One, Two, and Three, are reported on, for only these were underway when we went to press (May 1967). Their directors differ considerably in what they try to say here. For Project One director Lynch and deputy director Himes give an account of what they and their staff accomplished in the first six months or so, with ample illustrations of what they found. They state how their research is related to the problem of effective communication between national sectors that are modernizing at different speeds. After stating their project goals in this light, they then give a brief, inevitably unsatisfactory, explanation of ethno-science, in which their project is rooted. Finally, they tell what they have done and discovered in the cognitive domains of disease and kinship.

Reporting on Project Two, Stone takes quite a different tack. While he uses material from his research to support the main message of his paper, his contribution is less a report than a display of first fruits. For this reason, perhaps, Stone's essay makes solidly interesting reading indeed. It is clear that, even at this early stage of his study, Stone is at grips with a basic issue bound to embarrass the progress of any developing nation; namely, the conflict between traditional, often subconscious, postulates and assumptions, and what the nation's new legal code says about the same thing.

Szanton's report on Project Three falls somewhere between the other two essays. Largely introductory, partly programmatic and partly substantive, his contribution acquaints us with the site of his research, the town of Estancia, Iloilo. The significance of understanding Estancia will not be lost on those who see in burgeoning centers such as this both a laboratory and a pilot plant. In Estancia one can almost see the forces of social, cultural, and economic change at work; one also has hopes of learning enough about the process to be able to stimulate or encourage similar change elsewhere.

FRANK LYNCH

Appendix

Staff Members of Projects Reported in This
Number of the IPC Papers

I. The Philippines Peace Corps Survey

A. In Hawaii

Thomas W. Marezki, principal investigator; David Zundel, assistant to the principal investigator; Eugene L. Hartley, chief consultant; Doris C. Crowell, research associate; Keith Elliott, statistician; and ten research assistants.

B. In the Philippines

Frank Lynch, chief coordinator; Jaime C. Bulatao, Mary R. Hollnsteiner, affiliated investigators; Theresa Boucher, Mercedes B. Concepcion, Robert J. Meyer, Phyllis L. Meyer, Salvador A. Parco, Mario D. Zamora, consultants.

Alfred B. Bennett, Jr., executive officer; Marilou Gustilo, Nereida Mangosing, administrative assistants; Maria Fe Venida, materiel officer; Jose Rocamora assistant materiel officer; Eleno Balaba, bookkeeper.

Susan M. Bennett, chief of data-processing; Celina Hernaez, Laurie L. Labbitt, Linda D. Nelson, Adoracion Reyes, chief coders; Virginia Alvarez, Gloria Asuncion, Josefino Escoto, Bella Fernandez, Carlos Fernandez, Mariano Reynaldo, Carmelita Miranda, Severina Montemayor, Patricia Tanco, Evelyn Valido, Mary Fe Velasco, coder-analysts; Wenceslao Gajitos, Roberto Jurisprudencia, research assistants.

Prudencia Bautista, Amabel Briones, Remedios Camacho, Eric Casiño, Jovita Chapman, Flordelis Dumlaog, Nena Es-lao, Corazon Ilustre, Norma Japitana, Carlita Miguel, Camilo Mollaneda, Rosario Muhlfeld, Augusto Plopinio, Primo Poloyapoy, Gemma Sanchez, Milagros Tolentino, senior field researchers; Farida Abubakar, Sofia Abubakar, Nene Aliliran, Adam Bandila, Josefina Belamide, Mosanip Cadon, Dominador Calaguian, Wilfredo Chica, Tennie Cortez, Julia Dolalas, Baibenal Gulam, Elizabeth Hermosisima, Jose Izquierdo, Salem La, Valeriano Lagmay, Consorcio Lanas, Sylvia Lianko, Montilla Limbo, Gullas Macabangon, Nagasura Madale, Mangigin Magomrang, Perla Makil, Thomas Mallillin, Helen Manampan, Miraluna Montecillo, Vivien Ordoña, Salipongan Paglala, Milagros Ragos, Rebecca Rama, Maria Paz Ramos, Maria Clara Roldan, Samuel Simangan, Maria Luisa Tobes, Lourdes Tolentino, junior field researchers.

II. The Ateneo-Penn State Basic Research Program (as of December 31, 1966)

- A. Central Staff (Program level)
George M. Guthrie, director; Frank Lynch, co-director; Milagros C. Montemayor, administrative assistant; Rosalita M. Jesswani, secretary; Fermina T. Dumaul, typist; Martha M. Woodhams, publications editor; Ethel W. Lapitan, assistant editor; Eleno M. Balaba, bookkeeper; Edgardo C. Diaz, clerk-stenographer; Teofilo M. Catubig, driver-mechanic.
- B. Project One (Cognitive mapping study)
Frank Lynch, director; Ronald S. Himes, deputy director; Maria A. Gonzales, Rosalinda Garcia, research associates; Federico P. Montenegro, Violeta Peralta, Luzbella C. Ramirez, research assistants.
- C. Project Two (Legal concepts study)
Richard L. Stone, director; Jorge Juco, Raul Cabrera, research associates; Jose Nadonga, research assistant; Felicisima Mallillin, clerk-typist.
- D. Project Three (Iloilo transition study)
David L. Szanton, director; Cristina B. Szanton, research associate.
- E. Project Four (Values and motives study)
George M. Guthrie, director (project not yet staffed).
- F. Project Five (Group structures and decision-making study)
A. Paul Hare, director (project not yet staffed).
- G. Project Six (Iloko transition study)
William F. Nydegger, director (project not yet staffed).
- H. Project Seven (Aiding response study)
Lee Sechrest, director (project not yet staffed).