

## Introduction

This issue of the "IPC Papers" is the third in a series reporting research conducted under the auspices of the Ateneo-Penn State Basic Research Program. This volume contains a report by George Guthrie and Fortunata Azores on Filipino interpersonal relations; a description of a squatter community by Richard Stone and Joy Marsella; two papers on autonomy, the first by A. Paul and Rachel Hare, the second by A. Paul Hare and Dean Peabody; an analysis of group judgments and attitudes by Dean Peabody; and a report on nutrition in a Filipino fishing village by Helen Guthrie.

Guthrie and Azores utilized a brief sentence-completion questionnaire, which had been developed in Thailand, to study the nature of interpersonal relations among Filipinos. This was administered to a large number of Filipino subjects at differing educational and status levels and in both urban and rural settings. Their introduction includes a consideration of problems involved in translating English materials into Tagalog, a discussion that may prove useful to others who will attempt this task. They then proceed to discuss their findings with respect to the general problems or topics of status, dependency, affiliation, emotional expression, anxieties, anger, and aspirations. Their data-collecting efforts enable Guthrie and Azores to compare differences in responses obtained when the response language is English as opposed to Tagalog, as well as differences between respondents associated with varying socio-economic levels and differences between male and female respondents. In addition, since aside from the language in it was administered, the instrument they used was the same as that used in Thailand, they are able to make some comparisons between Thai responses and Filipino responses.

The findings of Guthrie and Azores support those of previous investigators, who have emphasized the importance of interpersonal skills in the Philippines. Their findings also suggest that power and its use is an important aspect of Philippine interpersonal relations and point to some interesting areas of difference between Thai and Filipino cultures.

There have been far too few serious efforts to understand the problems of squatters from the point of view of squatters themselves. Stone and Marsella's

paper in this volume is an attempt to depart from the usual by showing what life is really like for those who are squatters. They point to the forces in the nation which make squatting an understandable response and way of life, and make it clear that it has to be viewed in more than moral terms, in fact, in more than any single dimension or perspective, if it is to be dealt with effectively in the process of national development.

A. Paul and Rachel Hare study the social correlates of autonomy for Filipino, American, and African university students. Reporting on such factors as socio-economic level, sex, ethnic group, religion, age, and birth order, they suggest some interesting hypotheses about the development and importance of personal autonomy in differing cultures and in nations at different levels of development.

Hare and Peabody present the results of a comparison of the responses of Filipino, American, and African students on an autonomy scale so constructed as to make possible a separate analysis of items worded in different directions. They explore the relationship between subscales consisting of positively and negatively worded items, the tendency of subjects to agree with all items, and various background variables. A finding of considerable interest concerns the relationship between autonomy scores and the levels of economic development of the various countries from which responses were obtained.

Peabody has produced a paper of theoretical importance for the understanding of judgments made by groups about each other. He points out that judgments involve both descriptive and evaluative aspects, and these may or may not be congruent. Much previous work has been based on the premise that judgments are determined largely by considerations of consistency in an evaluative dimension, so that favorable traits are assumed to be clustered. Peabody, however, suggests that descriptive aspects are also important and may be overriding. Thus, groups making judgments about each other may differ very little in the behaviors which they attribute to one another, but they may differ very greatly in the evaluation which they make of these behaviors. Peabody shows, in a study of group judgments made by Filipino and Chinese students about each other's group, that within a cluster of related traits, descriptive consistency is stronger than evaluative consistency. The latter assumes importance across traits which are not cognitively similar.

These papers reinforce the conclusion, previously stated by Frank Lynch and George Guthrie, that modernization is an exceedingly complex process and that a variety of disciplines can contribute to the understanding of this process. They also begin to suggest some of the factors which may provide a focus for critical efforts in the attempt to facilitate that process.

*Lee Sechrest*

## **Philippine Interpersonal**

George M. Guthrie and For

Some of the most striking differences in the ways individuals behave toward one another are not only gestures and manners of behavior but also the way one person may deal with others in the social structure, and family organization. Looking at individual differences in the domain of personality organization, in this paper we will examine some of the differences of Filipinos in an attempt to identify the ways and the ways which Filipinos use to relate to one another and society, on the one hand, and to the other. We will direct our attention to dependency, affiliation, rejection, and how to identify the ways Filipinos cope with stress. We will also be concerned with the differences between Filipinos and Thais.

In the study of the personality organization of a group, the theory of personality and the study of personality emphasizes the role of interpersonal relationships and the importance of self-attitudes. It does not deny the role of unconscious factors as determinants of behavior; it is simply that the study of an individual's relationships with others shows more variance in behavior than is the study of the individual. This is particularly appropriate in the study of different cultures since it emphasizes the differences in behavior which are directed attention to differences in behavior with social organization and kind.

• The research on which this paper is based is part of the Research Program, sponsored by the Office of International Affairs, Pennsylvania State University as part of the