

Introduction

Among Filipinos, and among social scientists who specialize in Philippine society, the family has long been a subject of special interest. For the influence of this institution is all-pervasive. Some claim, in fact, that the Philippines survives and prospers largely by virtue of traditional values associated with just three institutions, namely, family, social class, and religion. This is an overstatement of the case, but there can be no doubt that the Filipino family plays a critical role in the nation's life — a role many say is not likely to be greatly altered in the near future.

The influence of the local community on the lives of those who live there is also great. But the evidence suggests that this formative power is to be found less in the official leadership than in the informal network of friends, neighbors, and kinsmen with whom the individual allies himself or is willy-nilly allied. For while the average Filipino citizen today may think of and name some government person or agency (as if by conditioned reflex) when he is asked the solution for any number of basic problems, the fact is that for most people the effective answer to these difficulties is their own alliance networks — those who are close to them, and somehow bound to help them.

It is clear, at any rate, that relatively few local leaders on the Philippine scene today have the ability to unify their communities as did the *datus* (we are told) of pre-Spanish times.¹ In those days, the local *datu* was the focal point and recipient of attention, service, crop shares, and loyalty; but he was, as well, the redistributor of those goods which wealth and power had brought him, and the assurance of his people's peaceful existence. To the extent that he follows this ancient model (and some approximate it closely), today's mayor or *barangay* captain may be a genuine social force in the community. But we fear that such charism and clout are in limited

supply today. For most people, getting on is above all a question of getting along — with their social allies.²

When we think of the Philippine *nation*, we are well aware of the present problems it faces in the South. Armed secessionist groups have in the past few years taken a toll in lives and property that the people and the Armed Forces of the Philippines can ill afford to pay. Yet despite this we know how relatively well-off the Philippines is, precisely as one nation. As an American political-scientist friend observed on returning to the Philippines after a swing through south-east Asia: "I never saw it so clearly before: when it comes to national unity, the Philippines is monolithic." This was several years before the current "troubles" in the South, and before Martial Law, but we dare say that for the great majority of Filipinos, at least, the statement is more true now than ever before.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Family, community, and nation: these are the major subjects to which a recent national survey addressed itself. Because of the many topics included in the inquiry (a circumstance to be explained below), the study was called a survey on national development. But the majority of questions dealt with the family, the respondent's local community, and the nation. What was learned from that study will be the subject of this report.

The survey on national development reported on here was made possible by the Philippine Social Science Council. This group, a private association of Philippine social-science organizations incorporated in 1968, has as one of its main objectives the decentralization of quality research activity in the Philippines. To this end, the PSSC assists in the formation of social research units in institutions outside Metro Manila. Moreover, it also helps these newly formed centers to gain experience, confidence, and consequent public credibility. This it does by using their staffs in the fielding of annual PSSC national surveys, the first of which was conducted in the 1972-73 school year (see Bulatao 1973). This report concerns the second survey, held the following year.

As originally conceived, the PSSC's national survey program had as one of its purposes the gathering of selected national data which social scientists thought important for their purposes, but would ordinarily not be able to collect, simply because the information was

too limited in scope to justify the expense involved in a countrywide survey. From the beginning, in other words, the PSSC survey was viewed as a service to social scientists, as well as to the research centers which would participate in the data gathering and analysis.

In the first survey, which centered on ethnic attitudes and employed the staffs of only eight PSSC research centers (no more than this number had been formed at the time), various considerations made it advisable not to solicit the contributed questions of social scientists that time around. Hence the survey, ably supervised by Rodolfo A. Bulatao and his associates of the Social Research Laboratory (Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines), was a relatively straightforward operation, with a minimum of theoretical or practical complications — or at least so the expertise of the supervisors made it seem.

For the present survey, supervised first by Gloria A. Fernandez of the Institute of Philippine Culture, and later by the senior author of this report (Ms. Porio), 15 research centers were involved, and the interview schedule ultimately used contained blocks and questions derived from the varied contributions of many cooperators. These numerous, and quite disparate, ideas resulted from the request of the PSSC research committee, sent July 1973 to social scientists throughout the country, for the suggestion of research topics "to generate new data on significant national development problems."

The data requested ranged from information on family and social class to religion, business, politics, and language. The PSSC research committee asked three of its members (Virgilio Enriquez, Gloria Feliciano, and Josefina Pineda) to sort out the collection, which they did, the result being 92 suggested schedule blocks. At this point the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC), which had been commissioned to do the study, was asked to review the topics and pare them down to manageable size. The criteria to be used, wherever possible, were nonduplication of existing research and feasibility within the sample-survey mode of data gathering.

The end result was a list of selected topics that focused on family life, community conditions, and perceptions and priorities relative to national development goals. Specifically, family-life subjects included (1) patterns of decision-making in the Filipino family, (2) patterns of extrahousehold activities shared by family members, (3) priorities among child-rearing values, and (4) attitudes toward the working mother. Perceptions to be investigated were the respondent's

view of his own personal situation, and that of his community and the nation, now and in the past and future. As well, provision was made for an inquiry into the respondent's awareness of, and reaction to, certain key government programs. Appropriate background data were also to be gathered to identify and distinguish the various kinds of respondents.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study were necessarily shaped, and admittedly limited, by the PSSC's decision to do the research in those places where its centers happened to be located. For while the PSSC had tried to set up research units in all regions of the Philippines, it necessarily concentrated its efforts on the larger urban areas, where institutions able to sustain such research were more likely to be found. Thus of the 13 PSSC centers involved in the survey, 10 are found in chartered cities. To those were added two more sites, also cities, with the result that the sample respondents reside in or near the nation's largest urban concentrations (see Table 1). Hence while we distinguish urban and rural subsamples in the study, the rural component is hardly a spatially remote one.

Again, since the topics included in the study came from many sources, and enjoyed only an extrinsic, ex-post-facto unity, the tightness and coherence of the research design necessarily suffered. We are here examining, not one or two carefully selected problems to be probed in depth, but a series of subjects about which several meaningful questions are answered — the data so derived to become in turn the starting points for more detailed problem-oriented studies.

Briefly, then, aside from the practical purposes of the survey — to provide field experience for PSSC centers and a data-gathering service for the nation's social scientists — the goals of the study were these:

1. To interview a sample of urban, suburban, and rural household heads;
2. To learn from this sample their opinions on a variety of important topics, with emphasis on the family, community, and nation; and
3. To draw conclusions regarding the present state of affairs in these matters and likely future trends.

PROCEDURES

The content of the interview schedule, the total sample size, and (with two exceptions) the location of research sites were taken as given. The IPC's role was to work out a suitable sampling plan, prepare and pretest appropriate research instruments, arrange for their translation into local languages, oversee the training and field phases of the survey, analyze and interpret the collected data, and submit a suitable report.

At the time the survey was being planned, the PSSC had trained the research personnel for 13 centers. Because there were as yet no such staffs for Central Luzon or the Ilocos region, it was decided to include respondents from Cabanatuan City and Laoag City, the interviewers to be sent there and managed from the Institute of Philippine Culture, Quezon City. The 15 places ultimately studied are listed in Table 1.

As planned, there were to be 3500 respondents, distributed as follows: 400 for Metro Manila; 300 each for Bacolod, Cebu, and Davao; and 200 each for the remaining 11 research sites. Outside the Metro Manila area, where all respondents would by definition be urban residents, half of the sample was to be rural. To identify the sample respondents a seven-step procedure was devised, and indeed, followed quite closely (see Appendix C, however).

Table 1. Research sites and corresponding centers which participated in the IPC/PSSC national survey (1973-74)

Research site	Research center
1. Metropolitan Manila	Research Center Philippine Christian College (PChC)
2. Tuguegarao (Cagayan)	SPCT Office for Research St. Paul College of Tuguegarao
3. Ilagan (Isabela)	SFC Research Center St. Ferdinand College
4. Laoag City	(IPC)
5. Cabanatuan City	(IPC)

(Table 1 continued)

Research site	Research center
6. Naga City	Research and Service Center Ateneo de Naga
7. Cebu City	Office for Social Research University of San Carlos (USC)
8. Tacloban City	Leyte-Samar Research Center Divine Word University (DWU)
9. Dumaguete City	Social Science Research Center Silliman University (SU)
10. Bacolod City	Negros Occidental Research Bureau (Noreb) ^a LSC Social Research Center La Salle College Research Center University of Negros Occidental- Recoletos (UNO-R)
11. Iloilo City	Social Science Research Unit Central Philippine University (CPU)
12. Ozamiz City	ICC Research Center Immaculate Conception College
13. Cotabato City	NDU Socioeconomic Research Center Notre Dame University
14. Davao City	Research Office Ateneo de Davao
15. Jolo (Sulu)	Coordinated Investigation of Sulu Culture (Ciscul) Notre Dame of Jolo College

^aNoreb is a research consortium between the LSC and UNO-R social-science research staffs. By mutual agreement all off-campus research is undertaken jointly.

The interview schedule used in the survey was prepared by Pilar Ramos-Jimenez, who was at that time director of the Ateneo de Davao's Research Office, but was invited to the IPC in October 1973 to participate in the PSSC national survey.³ Ms. Jimenez also supervised the translation of the schedule into Tagalog and its pretesting before copies were distributed to the participating centers. Supervisors were trained in the use of the schedule and its accompanying manual at 10 places throughout the Philippines; Ms. Jimenez met with PSSC-trained staffs at Quezon City, Cebu, Bacolod, Iloilo, Jolo, and Davao; Mila Tolentino, the IPC's field supervisor, traveled to Tuguegarao, Ilagan, Tacloban and Dumaguete.

Each center assumed responsibility for translating the schedule into the necessary local language(s), pretesting it, and running off the required copies of the 27-page document. As well, the 30 PSSC-trained supervisors were to recruit local interviewers and instruct them in its use.⁴ These research assistants numbered 232 in all, ranging from six each in Ilagan and Cabanatuan to 34 in Bacolod. Most were undergraduate social-science students of the PSSC-trained faculty members.

On the average, interviews lasted one hour, as planned. However, for a variety of reasons connected with school schedules and similar contingencies, the field period extended for a full three months (December 1973 to March 1974), and in Metro Manila, for an additional two months (November to April). This introduces a limitation which certainly must be borne in mind in weighing the survey results.

Editing of the completed interview schedules took place first in the field, where it was the responsibility of the PSSC-trained supervisors, and again at the main office of the IPC in Quezon City. Coding instructions for the non-precoded replies were based on a tally of the responses given by 20 percent of the total sample. The data were recorded in standard 80-column IPC coding sheets and then punched into 80-column IBM cards. Before transferring their contents to tape, the punched and verified cards were cleaned, that is, checked to be sure that data had been recorded in proper sequence and with logical consistency.

The data to be analyzed ultimately occupied a total of 10,461 cards, or three per respondent. Programs found in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used for the computer runs which processed these data. Simple frequencies (marginals) were made, the most consistently used being the urban-rural dichotomy.

Education, income, and sex were also run against selected dependent variables, however. Tests of significance and strength of association and correlation were applied where appropriate.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are several facts which must be kept in mind when determining what meaning to attach to the survey findings. Among the more important limiting considerations are the following:

1. *The sample is not truly representative of the general Philippine population.* By reason of the way in which the research sites were selected, the sample represents rather those *Filipinos living in and near the nation's largest urban concentrations.* Further, because we eliminated from the sample the relatively very wealthy and very poor, these extremes are not represented. Hence we are reporting on the *middle range of Filipino households.*
2. *The study is exploratory and descriptive;* it is not explanatory in purpose. This qualification follows from the way in which the many contributed suggestions of social scientists were assembled for inclusion in the interview schedule.
3. Because the research was conducted over a period of three to five months, depending on the research site, there is the *possibility* that differences among respondent groups from the various research sites may be due, not so much to differences among the various places, as to differences in the more widespread state of affairs at various points in time during the lengthy research period.

In view of the above considerations, our emphasis will be on the discovery of relatively obvious differences between various kinds, or categories, of respondents, particularly by residence, income, and education. Differences by site will be presented, but subject to caution. Further, no attempt will be made to assess with any accuracy the incidence of these differences in the general Philippine population. The latter task must be the subject of additional studies using samples of another design.