# Social Acceptance Reconsidered

## Frank Lynch

My earlier essay on social acceptance, written and first published in 1961, has long needed clarification and updating. To satisfy this two-fold requirement I offer the present article, in which the original statement, now preceded by an explanatory introduction, is preserved as a kind of baseline and starting point. Following it are new sections on what we have learned about the subject since 1961, and what remains to be found out.

### BACKGROUND OF THE 1961 STATEMENT

*History of the essay*

Sometime in the third quarter of 1960, Mary Hollnsteiner and I were invited to give papers at the Fourth Annual Baguio Religious Acculturation Conference (BRAC), to be held at Baguio City in late December of that year. Specifically, we were asked to present our ideas on the value systems of the average lowland Filipino. Since I had been gathering and processing information and opinions on the question for about 10 years, and since Mary was just completing a study she had undertaken on the various kinds of reciprocity

FRANK LYNCH, S.J., is presently Program Coordinator of the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC), Ateneo de Manila, and professor of anthropology at the same university. He has an M.A. in anthropology from the University of the Philippines and a doctorate in the same subject from the University of Chicago. Since 1949, Fr. Lynch's major academic interest has been the study of Philippine values, religion, and social organization.

known and practiced in Obando, Bulacan, and its vicinity, we agreed to come to Baguio for the BRAC meetings.

Present at the meetings, in addition to BRAC's founder, the late Laurence Lee Wilson, were about 80 men and women, of whom three-fifths were American missionaries. They were in Baguio to mix a year-end respite with serious reflections on the cultural problems they had met and were meeting in their lives and work in the Philippines. At the close of three very active days Mary and I returned to Manila determined, not only to write the promised publishable versions of the talks we had given, but also to organize a summer course that would answer in some fashion the need for better intercultural understanding so often felt and expressed by good-willed Filipinos and Americans such as our newly made Baguio friends.

In the months that followed (January—April 1961), most of my energies were spent on the latter goal. With the dedicated cooperation of a full-time staff assembled for the purpose, assisted generously by faculty members who participated part time in the project, we managed to arrive at the summer months of May and June with a new course designed to fill the need we had sensed and spoken about at Baguio. Entitled "Understanding the Philippines and America," this offering attracted over 100 students that first summer, many of whom had been at the BRAC meetings the previous December.

Meanwhile Mary had completed her write-up of the talk she had given on reciprocity. It was published in the July 1961 issue of *Philippine Studies*, but by arrangement with that journal's editor, Horacio de la Costa, we were allowed to use the plates later to run off a separately bound edition of the same article as "IPC Papers, No. 1."[1] We got additional mileage from the same plates by holding them for use in setting up the proceedings of the Fourth Annual BRAC, for the publication of which I had accepted responsibility. For my article on social acceptance, as well as for three other papers that appeared in the 1960 *BRAC Proceedings*, the procedure was reversed. *Philippine Studies* generously paid for the setting up of the articles, but allowed the BRAC *prior* use of the plates to produce the published proceedings.[2]

I have gone into such detail because the history of the article on social acceptance introduces and explains the audience and purpose for which I wrote it. To some extent, it also helps explain the sources and methodology.

*Audience and purpose*

My audience both at Baguio in December 1960 and at the Ateneo de Manila the following summer was composed mostly of American missionaries. This fact influenced the writing of the article in two ways: first, though the article reports primarily and essentially on an exercise in social observation (Brown 1963:35), and on the results of an exploratory or formulative study

(Selltiz et al. 1967:51—65), comparative illustrative material was introduced from American culture to help the American listeners (and readers) appreciate better the phenomena being described; second, because most members of the audience were clerics or religious, and not social scientists, I was not at pains to spell out for them the nitty-gritty details of method and sources.[3]

In addressing this audience, my purpose was primarily "to present an opinion regarding a wellspring of certain frequently observed patterns of Filipino behavior" (Lynch 1970c:8, below). Further, this "wellspring" (social acceptance) was set in the context of a tentative scheme entitled "*An* outline (not "*The* outline" or simply "Outline") of lowland Philippine values" (Lynch 1970c:17—20). The essay was therefore *exploratory* in nature, reporting observations, insights, and formulations regarding behavioral *norms*. It was hoped that this preliminary statement would lead to descriptive and explanatory research—as indeed it did.

## Methodology

As in many exploratory studies, the investigation that produced the social acceptance article made use of three methods: (a) a review of the pertinent literature; (b) conversations with Filipinos and others who had practical experience with, and reflective ideas about, Filipino behavior; and (c) the analysis of "insight-stimulating" cases, or examples, drawn from my own experience and that of others (Selltiz et al. 1967:53).

In these readings, interviews, and analyses the goal was to identify values operative in Philippine culture, describe how they seemed to interact with one another, and what relative importance and position each apparently had in the total value system. All this, of course, led at most to a tentative formulation suitable for more accurate description and testing. Of use in constructing our outline of Philippine values, and in assigning social acceptance to its appropriate place within it, was the fourfold test that Robin Williams employed (1960:409—410) to judge the importance of a value in a culture. His questions about the extensiveness, duration, and intensity of the value, and the prestige of its carriers, were in fact included in the social acceptance article in partial explanation of the study's methodology.

## Sources of the essay

In the concrete, on what literature, conversations, and case analyses did I base the statement first published in 1961? To begin with, my interest in the questions dated back to 1949, when the study of concrete manifestations of Philippine and American values became the subject of monthly meetings by some 15 Filipinos and Americans whom I had known in the Philippines (1946—49) and with whom I then lived in the United States. This formal and systematic inquiry involved the group's preparation of file sheets

(generalizations and anecdotes) on many aspects of both cultures, and their discussion. This cooperative effort continued with more or less regularity till 1953, when I prepared a paper entitled "The Psychology of the Christian Filipino," my first attempt to sum up our joint impressions. I used it as part of my contribution to a Philippine area course offered at Fordham University in the summer of that year.

During my years at the University of Chicago (1954—56, 1958—60), particularly as an associate of the Philippine Studies Program and as co-director of research for the *Area Handbook on the Philippines* (1956), I continued this dialog with Filipinos and Americans on the subject of Philippine values, and it became one focus of my Bikol research in the years 1956—58. This preoccupation had, in fact, never been far from my mind in the years 1949—60, so that I found the invitation of the BRAC program committee quite compatible with my own research interests.

The resulting social acceptance article was based on other data as well. Available literature, old and new, about the Philippines and Filipinos, about Americans and the United States, had been consulted (see footnotes to the essay's text, below). Moreover, the analysis done in January—April 1961 of some 60 Tagalog dialogs, judged by a panel of Filipinos to be typical lowland Filipino exchanges, supported the preliminary conclusions we had reached. If these were not enough to convince us that social acceptance should be proposed as an extremely important value for most Filipinos, we had also had the satisfaction of that most comforting of all reassurances, namely, a high score in the prediction of Filipino reactions in a variety of situations in which social acceptance was either threatened or enhanced.

To summarize, then, the proposition that social acceptance is of paramount importance in the lowland Philippines grew out of over 10 years of explicit probing of the question in study sessions and interviews, in literary analyses, and in studies of the content of typical Tagalog dialogs. With all that, however, I must repeat that the resulting statement should not be mistaken for the firm conclusion of a descriptive or explanatory study. It is rather to be read as the initial report of one returned from a leisurely, wide-ranging scouting trip through the fascinating, at times bewildering, territory of Philippine values. It proposed as important a number of landmarks, repeatedly observed and noted, that helped orient at least one traveler, reducing to tolerable limits the confusion he had first felt in that vast and colorful land. For those who had never made the trip—and most members of the original audience had not—it offered the advice of a returned traveler, to be taken as a starting point. For those more experienced in the ups and downs, ins and outs, of values research, it presented some tentative ideas to inaugurate the dialog which has happily developed from it.

## TEXT OF THE 1961 STATEMENT*

In our saner moments, we humans accept the fact that we are different from one another. And in our leisure moments many of us enjoy getting a closer look at these differences, either first hand through travel, or second hand through reading and conversation. Yet for all that, and with all the good will in the world, we remain incipient Professor Higginses, for whom all the world is Eliza Doolittle: unconsciously perhaps but nonetheless intently, we are out to remake the world to our image, and if tolerance keeps our creative urge in check today and tomorrow, we know that come next week we may be more critical and exacting than ever.

### Evaluation and Values

What is this urge that lies within us, this tendency to censure and correct, to rate and score, to prune, crop, trim, and transplant? It is the expression of a basic and essentially human faculty, that of *evaluation*. It is a sign that we are human, for only humans make this critical response to their environment (Smith 1958:8). This intelligent reaction involves the recognition of a fundamental contrast between good and evil, truth and falsity. It involves as well the presence and operation of standards or criteria of judgment. Finally, if the judgment is to be relevant, it supposes a knowledge of the peculiar circumstances in which the evaluation must be made.

Thus if I see a man strike a child with some vehemence, it is likely that as a human being I will pass some judgment, however kind and charitable, on the action. For I am convinced that actions such as these may be good or bad, and that there is a great difference between the two; further, I believe that there are some conditions under which it is good and others under which it is bad for a man to strike a child so; finally—not knowing the circumstances of the particular case—I may presume that the man has some good reason for this violence (because he is the father, perhaps, and the child is being corrected for an action which might possibly endanger its life, or—if I am a

---

*See footnote on Page 1. This section is the article previously entitled "Social Acceptance" which appeared in two editions of *Four Readings on Philippine Values* ("IPC Papers," No. 2). It is reproduced here in its entirety, with minor alterations in style—*not* content. Thus the one explanatory footnote of the article is retained while all the other notes (footnotes for purposes of documentation) have been written in brief form into the main text, and the full reference transferred to the appropriate section at the end of the entire article. Sequence of paragraphs was also altered as were the opening lines of some paragraphs. Section headings were supplied for greater clarity. Finally, the numerical superscripts which appear here are new explanatory notes prepared by the author in 1970. These numbers follow the sequence of those of the larger article, and the corresponding notes are included in the section on notes at the end of the entire article.

stranger to their culture—for some reason I do not yet understand). But in any event as a human I am instinctively concerned, critical, and responsive. And the measure of my response will be the system of values which I hold dear, values which are a part of my culture, part and parcel of the way of life that I have learned.

The various meanings given to the term "value" can be illustrated in a specific instance in which they are at work. The working student who is a houseboy by day and a collegian by night is motivated by any number of values, implicit or explicit, among them college education, social mobility, the possibility of self-improvement through education, the desirability of certain statuses and roles and the undesirability of others. All of these are values in the sense of *standards used in the making of a decision*—in this case, to work his way through college as a houseboy—but they are influences of different sorts. College education and social mobility are *aims* or goals toward which the young man strives. The possibility of improving one's lot through education is for him a belief, or *conviction*. The rating that he gives to his probable future status without a college degree, his temporary status as a houseboy, and the status he is likely to enjoy when he has won his degree, proceeds from a *structural principle* by which statuses are distinct and un-equal in prestige, and a *conviction* that the status of a college-degree holder is higher than that of one without such a diploma, and that the status of a houseboy is lower than either. Somehow these various principles, aims, and convictions are played off against one another, and the young man decides that the temporary status drop he suffers as a part-time houseboy will be more than compensated by the goal he is convinced he will attain. His total value system is his standard for decision, and his decision is to work his way through college.

## *No values uniquely Filipino*[4]

Our concern here is with the value system found in the lowland Philippines, with the principles, aims, and convictions that seem to be at work in the behavior one observes in this society. One should not expect every value to be uniquely Filipino, because notable differences in value systems are caused not so much by differences in the individual values as by the differences in ranking and emphasis. The compounds $H_2O$ and $H_2O_2$ contain the same elements, but water and hydrogen peroxide have quite different qualities, as many blondes can testify. To cite the analogy of Kluckhohn and Kelly (1945:102), the musical notes A, B, and G are the same notes regardless of how they are played, but the total effect is quite modified by any change of order. In similar fashion two value systems can have markedly different total casts, or slants, because of the peculiar way in which the individual values are weighted and combined in each system.

It follows, then, that when we speak of certain values as being characteristic of Philippine society, we do not mean that these conceptions of the desirable are found *only* in the Philippines. On the contrary, it will be seen that almost all the values explained in the pages that follow constitute elements in the value systems of other nations, including the United States. But the emphasis placed on pleasant interaction, for example, and the means taken to assure it, are quite noticeably different in the two cultures. Thus, the American considers clear understanding of differences a desirable prelude to discussion, and he is at pains to identify the point at which cleavage begins between himself and his discussant. He achieves peace frequently by agreement to disagree. The Filipino is likely to seek the same interpersonal harmony by a blurring of the differences, and by agreement *not* to disagree—at least openly. The American rates integrity (defined as "let your speech express your mind exactly") higher than interpersonal tranquility, whereas the Filipino sees no reason why conflict should be courted when silence or evasive speech will preserve the peace.[5]

### Identifying values and themes

How do we arrive at these values, what basis have we for saying that this or that is a value in a culture? The process involved is one of arguing back from what we observe, and what we observe will include what people do and say or do *not* do and say, the choices they make or refuse, and the things they punish and reward.[6] To identify the more important values in a culture we can employ the fourfold test of Robin Williams, namely:

(1) *Extensiveness* of the value in the total activity of the system. What proportion of a population and its activities manifest the value?

(2) *Duration* of the value. Has it been persistently important over a considerable period of time?

(3) *Intensity* with which the value is sought or maintained, as shown by: effort, crucial choices, verbal affirmation, and by reactions to threats to the value—for example, promptness, certainty, and severity of sanctions.

(4) *Prestige of value carriers*—that is, of persons, objects, or organizations considered to be bearers of the value. Culture heroes, for example, are significant indexes of values of high generality and esteem (Williams 1960:109–110).

Sometimes at the overt, and always at least at the covert, level—down underneath as it were—there are values of an *extremely* basic nature.[7] Such a value (which may be an aim, a principle, or a conviction) can be expressed as a proposition. Framed in this manner, it is "a postulate or position, declared or implied, and usually controlling behavior or stimulating activity, which is tacitly approved or openly promoted in a society." Propositions of this sort,

which Opler (1948:120) calls *themes*, conform to the definition of values given earlier, for they are norms or standards for decision and choice. Their influence may operate, however, below the level of awareness.

It is with a theme, a very basic and wide-ranging value, that we are concerned in this essay. Not with *all* themes, be it noted, but with one lowland Philippine theme that is more easily discovered and described.

At this point I am constrained to remind the reader that this essay develops one theme in a set of basic values held by *most* inhabitants of the lowland Philippines. The modal portrait should then, represent as faithfully as possible the 80 per cent who live in rural settlements of 1,000 or less, and not necessarily the minority living in large urban centers. For there is, as might be expected, a difference in values between those lowland Filipinos who are urban, well-educated, and economically secure, and the bulk of the population which is our primary consideration.* It is unfortunate that those most likely to be reading this paper are those least likely to be accurately portrayed. My apologies.

### Purpose and Context

Our purpose is *not* to pass judgment on this theme or its supporting values. It is rather less ambitious than that: first, to present an opinion regarding a wellspring of certain frequently observed patterns of Filipino behavior ; second, and more important perhaps, to demonstrate a way of thinking about observed patterns of behavior which, though it may not give us *many* answers, will at least stop us from thinking we have *all* the answers.

At the outset it may help to place this basic value in context. It is one of the themes that express conditions of human existence considered not only attainable but highly desirable—the principal constituents of the Good Life here on earth. These aims, arranged in the order of descending importance (as I see it) are the following: (1) to be accepted by one's fellows for what one is, thinks oneself to be, or would like to be, and be given the treatment due to one's station; (2) to be economically secure, at least to the extent of ordinarily being free of debt; (3) to move higher on the socio-economic scale. Social acceptance, economic security, and social mobility—these are in my opinion, three basic aims that motivate and control an immense amount of Filipino behavior. I shall here consider only the first and most important of these themes.

---

*This rural-urban difference is often leveled, however, by an urban institution which is deserving of more than casual study: the placing of early child care almost completely in the hands of poorly educated maids reared in, or recently arrived from, the provinces. Beliefs in witches, ghosts, and the like may persist in the most externally sophisticated households, if each new arrival is indoctrinated by relatively ignorant and credulous household help.[8]

## The Theme of Social Acceptance

I have already suggested that social acceptance is enjoyed when one is taken by one's fellows for what he is, or believes he is, and is treated in accordance with his status. Put negatively—and this is perhaps the best way to express what I feel is the bare minimum of social acceptance for the Filipino—social acceptance is had when one is not rejected or improperly criticized by others. At the risk of undue and perhaps incorrect refinement of the concept, I distinguish social *acceptance* from social *approval* by the fact that the latter includes a positive expression of *liking* which does not seem essential to social acceptance among Filipinos. This is a point I would not argue, however, for I am fully aware that my distinction may be based less on the Filipino's failure to express this liking than my failure to observe it. It can be said without fear of contradiction, nonetheless, that a Filipino is satisfied with much more subtle expressions of acceptance than is the average American.[9] A Tagalog proverb states, *Hindi baleng huwág mo akóng mahalín; huwág mo lang akóng hiyain;* that is, "It doesn't matter if you don't love me; just don't shame me."

The Filipino does enjoy overt signs of approval and liking, of course. Acceptance is especially sweet when it includes an outward manifestation of approval that makes clear to the individual that he is liked by those with whom he deals or—more important—by those to whom he is subject in one way or another. It is a great source of satisfaction for anyone to be given a pat on the back by his employer or teacher, and this seems clearly to be the case for Filipinos. Anyone who has stood before a class of Filipino students will easily recall the whoop of joy and relief that greets his smile of open approval, particularly if he has first feigned disappointment in class or individual performance. And as a matter of fact, in a society where (as many psychologist friends tell me) so much of one's happiness depends on the nods received from any number of authority figures, it is not surprising that assurance of social acceptance or approval should be sought after so avidly and appreciated so keenly.

To digress for a moment, is it possible that the pronounced tendency to seek and expect signs from God and the saints, as well as from environmental spirits, is sprung in part at least from the same other-directedness, the same authoritarian orientation? If one believes in the existence of an invisible world that is less than one step beyond the visible, and peopled principally by spirits who are normally neither for nor against one, but dangerously able to do no end of harm if aroused, it seems eminently logical to take all means possible to discover what these spirits want one to do. Moreover, that God and the saints *and* these other spirits should make their feelings known is not something extraordinary, since the ideal authority figure should do no less.

Reports of apparitions, miracles, and signs are accepted by most Filipinos with a casual equanimity that amazes the individual (Filipino or non-Filipino) who was brought up in a more drab and less authoritarian manner.

Returning to the discussion of the prime theme—the goal of social acceptance—let me clarify the fact that this happy state is not often conceived of in explicit terms and deliberately pursued as such. The average Filipino does not say to himself, "Above all else, I want to be socially acceptable to the co-members of my groups." The desirability of social acceptance is for the modal Filipino an *implied* postulate, but a cultural theme nonetheless. Clearly recognized as important and satisfying goals, however, are two intermediate values which assist in the attainment of acceptance: smoothness of interpersonal relations, on the one hand, and sensitivity to personal affront (often called *amor propio*), on the other.[10]

### *Intermediate value 1: smooth interpersonal relations (SIR)*

For the American newly arrived in the Philippines, the most striking quality manifested by Filipinos is their pleasantness, and among Filipinos getting their first full taste of American ways, a recurrent complaint is that Americans are often "brutally frank." These reactions are traceable to a clear intercultural difference, for smoothness of interpersonal relations (or SIR), while valued in both societies, is considered relatively more important by Filipinos than by Americans.[11] After expanding somewhat on the meaning of SIR, and common ways of achieving it, I will propose an explanation for this difference.

SIR may be defined as a facility at getting along with others in such a way as to avoid outward signs of conflict: glum or sour looks, harsh words, open disagreement, or physical violence. It connotes the smile, the friendly lift of the eyebrow, the pat on the back, the squeeze of the arm, the word of praise or friendly concern. It means being agreeable, even under difficult circumstances, and of keeping quiet or out of sight when discretion passes the word. It means a sensitivity to what other people feel at any given moment, and a willingness and ability to change tack (if not direction) to catch the lightest favoring breeze.

SIR is acquired and preserved principally by three means: namely, *pakikisama*, euphemism, and the use of a go-between. I will consider each in turn.

*Pakikisama.* This is a Tagalog word derived from the root *sama*, "accompany, go along with." At times the word pakikisama is used as synonymous with what I understand by SIR; when so employed, the word is very frequently (almost predictably) translated as "good public relations." But I believe the term pakikisama is more commonly used with a meaning narrower than SIR. In this more restricted sense it means "giving in," "following the lead or suggestion of another"; in a word, *concession*. It refers especially to

the lauded practice of yielding to the will of the leader or majority so as to make the group decision unanimous. No one likes a hold-out.

This quality of pakikisama plays hob with public-opinion surveys in the Philippines, and makes the experienced observer apt to ask many probing questions about the survey methods used. Certainly a public-opinion poll in this society is unlikely to be the voice of the people that Lundberg (1960:6–12) thinks it might be elsewhere. Too often the survey reflects what the poll-takers think or, to put it more accurately, what the respondents thought the pollsters were thinking.[12]

A large local manufacturing company recently made a poll of their outlets to discover from the retailers what the customers thought of their products. The results were most gratifying—but they did not tally with what the boys in sales had to say. A little investigation showed that most retailers had not answered the pollsters without first knowing what company they were working for. A second survey, in which the pollsters identified themselves as from a rival company, brought the same overwhelming results—in favor of the *rival*.[13]

In April 1961, to impress a class of Filipino and American students with the operation of pakikisama in the interview, I asked each of them to interview a number of Americans and Filipinos, clearly expressing an opinion contrary to the culturally expected position of the interviewee. They were then to ask the respondent what *he* thought about the question, namely, the advisability of using a go-between to adjust interpersonal hard feeling. The results of the 326 interviews indicate a highly significant association between being a Filipino and going along with the opinion of the interviewer, even where that opinion is contrary to the position one would expect the Filipino to take—in this case, that a go-between is advisable. Americans, on the other hand, *resist* the suggestion of the interviewer that a go-between is advisable. Granted that the design of this student exercise is not a tight one, still I know of no one familiar with American and Filipino ways who would question the existence of the intercultural difference illustrated by the interview results.

*Euphemism.* Aside from going along with the other fellow, there are several additional common ways of achieving smooth interpersonal relations. One of these is euphemism, which is the stating of an unpleasant truth, opinion, or request as pleasantly as possible. It is an art that has long been highly prized in Philippine society, and is no less highly regarded today. Harsh and insulting speech is correspondingly devalued.

In 1604 Chirino noted of the Filipinos: "They are punctiliously courteous and affectionate in social intercourse and are fond of writing to one another with the utmost propriety and most delicate refinement"(Chirino 1969:279). Loarca tells us as early as 1582 that taking vengeance for an insult received was a very common practice, and further adds that there was a law that "anyone who spoke disrespectfully of a chief, or uttered abusive language to

him, was liable to death" (Loarca 1582:127, 181). Plasencia, writing in 1589, says that insulting words caused great anger among the Kapampangan, and if two such quarreling parties refused to pay the fines levied for this kind of behavior, they were expected to try to outdo each other in giving a public feast, the one who spent most to be considered "the more powerful and honorable" (Plasencia 1589:326–27). Juan Delgado wrote in 1754 that the Filipino would rather suffer 100 lashes than a single harsh word, an opinion echoed in Jose Rizal's footnote to Morga: "The Filipino today prefers a beating to scolding or insults" (Morga 1609:128–29).

Dr. Encarnacion Alzona expresses this commonly held value when she writes (1956:263–65):

The use of courteous language is an ancient attribute of our people. Bluntness or brusqueness of speech is frowned upon, being regarded as a sign of ill-breeding. Thus, we give the erroneous impression to foreigners, who do not understand our concept of good manners, of being prolix or circumlocutory. As a matter of fact, it is the respectful and polite way of introducing a serious subject which is the real object of the call or conversation. A low voice and gentle manner must accompany the courteous speech, following the saying in Tagalog that

| | |
|---|---|
| *Ang marahang pangungusap* <br> *Sa puso'y makalulunas.* | (A gentle manner of speaking <br> soothes the heart.) |
| *Ang salitang matatamis* <br> *Sa puso'y nakaaakit,* <br> *Nagpapalubog ng galit.* | (Sweet words win the heart <br> and dispel anger.) |

Speaking in a harsh tone has been the cause of altercations, as the sensitive Filipino interprets it as an expression of ill-feeling. Even menial workers resent it, and the wise employer guards the tone of his voice in speaking to them, if he wants to preserve harmony and good feeling between management and labor.

The use of euphemism is notable in a public or semipublic gathering where there is need to express an opinion on the topic under discussion. Except where the group is one whose members have learned to see the occasion (an academic conference, or seminar, for instance, or a meeting of openly opposed factions) as one in which straightforwardness is acceptable and desirable, the participants may appear never to dispute the point at issue, or to find an issue to dispute. So it will appear to the average American, at least. The preference for social process (SIR) over social product (conference results and conclusions) is understandable in a system where the highest value is placed on the pleasant word except when the exchange is between good friends or sworn enemies. Under these circumstances, however, one may hear forthright speech that is exceedingly direct, even by American standards.[14]

In the analysis of natural Tagalog dialogs, my colleagues at the Institute of Philippine Culture joined me in identifying certain very common euphemistic devices at both the lexical and rhetorical levels. We found, for instance, that *siguro ngâ* ("I guess so" or "could be) was a common refuge taken

when one could not really agree with his conversation partner: weak agreement in lieu of disagreement. Self-depreciation was another frequently occuring way of smoothing a situation in which envy and hard feeling might arise.

On the more complex level of the sequence of the whole dialog, we noted that there was a pattern discernible where a request, correction, or complaint was involved. The conversation opened with a "feeler," to discover whether or not the other party were busy or, more important, receptive. There followed an introduction of the matter at hand, then the request or correction was given. Especially if a correction had been given, there would follow an integration—a friendly inquiry for the health of the family, or about some personal concern of the individual just corrected. The blow of the correction was softened by the assurance that the basic relation of alliance and loyalty had not been disturbed by the correction (which, more often than not, was blamed on pressure from "higher up").

*Go-between.* Use of go-betweens is another common means of preserving or restoring smooth interpersonal relations. This also has a long history in the Philippines and even today enters into many facets of daily living. Here it is not agreement, oblique speech, or remedial friendliness, but a third party who is used to assuage a bruise, heal a wound, or prevent injury.

The go-between is used *preventively* in a number of common situations: the embarrassing request, complaint, or decision is often communicated through a middleman, to avoid the shame (*hiyâ*) of a face-to-face encounter. For the American who feels bad that a Filipino acquaintance, for instance, has shown so little trust in his kindness as to send a third party with a request, I should add that this behavior is not necessarily prompted by a lack of confidence in the person so approached. It is often done as much for the one approached as for the one who sends the middleman. It is so much easier to explain matters to one not directly involved, especially when you know that the go-between will do a much better job than yourself in breaking the news—should it be disappointing.

The traditional marriage negotiations are conducted through go-betweens and spokesmen for the two parties, the parties being not so much the prospective bride and groom as their families and kinsmen. This custom is reported by the earliest writers on the Philippines, and is in evidence today in all but the most nontraditional centers (Lynch 1956:653—58).

Go-betweens are utilized not only to avoid possible embarrassment or bad feeling, but also to *remedy* an existing state of conflict or tension. We are familiar with extended negotiations that have been carried on through various third parties in an effort to reconcile major political figures in the Philippines. The same sort of activity is going on more quietly and less spectacularly in almost every town in the nation, the object in view being reconciliation for

political, social, or personal reasons. And it has been going on that way for all of Philippine history. Loarca, for example, stated in 1582 that the people of Panay had no judges "although there are mediators who go from one party to another to bring about a reconciliation" (Loarca 1582:141).

In family disputes, the same pattern obtains. Frequently, a relative who is not involved in the difficulty becomes the middleman for two fellow-kinsmen who are not on speaking terms with each other. This is considered his duty, provided he has the other qualities that make him desirable as a go-between: smooth speech and wit above all.

From what has been presented so far, it will be clear, I trust, that smoothness of interpersonal relations, attained through concession, euphemism, the use of a mediator, and other means, is highly and traditionally valued in Philippine society, and found at work in almost all human encounters. That this harmony of interaction should be relatively more important in the Philippines than in the United States is traceable, I believe, to the differential emphasis on individual responsibility and group solidarity in the two societies.

Traditionally, the American adult attains security through independence—standing on his own feet, fighting his own battles, making his own way in the world. In actual fact, this Horatio Alger character is often quite dependent on the assistance of others, but the ideal, inculcated in early child training, is that of the independent, achievement-oriented striver.[15] So effective is the childhood training that in later life, when hard reality has made appeal to kinsmen a necessity at least occasionally, there remains the feeling that it is not a good thing. Illustrative of this ambivalence is the report of Cumming and Schneider (1961:501) on intensive interviews with 15 American adults between the ages of 50 and 80.

> We found some reluctance among our respondents to discuss instrumental activities or mutual aid and an eagerness to discuss socio-emotional and ritual activities. In all 15 cases, initial questioning about aid among kinsmen elicited the belief that borrowing and lending among kindred was a mistake. Further questioning, however, revealed that such mutual aid had, in fact, taken place recently among 6 of the 15. Even exchange of service is discussed reluctantly. Kinship appears to include friendliness, rites of passage, family reunions, and sociability, but ideally it does not include service or financial help, although this may, through bad fortune, be necessary.

This fighting shy of dependence on kinsmen for assistance is expressed in other ways, among them the reluctance to seek the support of relatives in personal disputes with third parties. It is not expected that relatives should immediately take sides and rally around a kinsman who has had a disagreement or a fight with some outsider; settling the matter is *his* business. In effect, this means that among Americans a serious argument between two private citizens ordinarily involves only the principal pair.[16] It also means that, since these flare-ups are contained by a cultural code of nonintervention, there is ordinarily relatively little danger of tension and conflict spreading

beyond the two individuals with whom it started. Consequently, there need not be any particular emphasis on behavior that would make the likelihood of these disputes a remote one.

The situation is quite different in Philippine society, for the average Filipino considers it good, right, and just that he should go to his relatives in material need, and that he should seek them out as allies in his disagreements with outsiders. Security is sought not by *in*dependence so much as by *inter*dependence.

Correlated with this interdependence is the group's acceptance of responsibility for the actions of the individual member. Although relatives may regret very much that matters have come to such a pass, and may reserve to a later date their own punishment of a troublemaking kinsman, they will ordinarily back him up in a dispute. The opposing principal will bring his own group into the fray, the resulting conflict being one which—especially in a small community—can cause considerable and possibly long-lasting damage to the social, political, and economic life of the residents. In other words, when two Filipinos have a serious fight, there is much more at stake than when two Americans break off relations. This fact is, in my opinion, one reason why smooth interpersonal relations are more highly cultivated in the Philippines than in the United States.

## Intermediate value 2: sensitivity to personal affront (amor propio)

I should like to restate the relation between smooth interpersonal relations (SIR), which is an intermediate goal, and social acceptance, which is a thematic, or ultimate, goal. By being agreeable with others, even under trying circumstances, the Filipino grants a measure of social acceptance to those he deals with, and in the very display of courtesy himself gains or enhances his acceptance as a good member of society. Hence the reward of social acceptance is itself held out to encourage the granting of it to others.

Contrary behavior is sanctioned in two ways. First, there is the general and universal social sanction of shame, or hiyâ. The second is amor propio, which is more restricted in scope and functions to protect the individual against loss of social acceptance or to rouse him to regain it once it has been lost or diminished. This sensitivity to interpersonal discourtesy or insult is a value related particularly to the theme of social acceptance.[17]

*Hiyâ.* The meaning of this term can be illustrated by a series of connected examples taken from the office scene. The employe who would like to borrow some money from his employer may hesitate to approach him because "I am ashamed" (*nahihiyâ akó*). Again, he may view the action as socially acceptable but, on making his request, be refused in a discourteous manner. In this event he might later say of himself, "I was ashamed" (*nahiyâ akó*), and of his

employer, "He shamed me," or "He put me to shame" (*hiniyá niyá akó*). If, while he was asking for the loan, a fellow employe innocently entered the office and joined them, the worker might break off his request and leave at the first opportunity, explaining later that he did so because "I felt ashamed," or "I was made to feel ashamed" (*napahiyá akó*). A study of these episodes indicates that the generic meaning of hiyâ is the *uncomfortable feeling that accompanies awareness of being in a socially unacceptable position, or performing a socially unacceptable action.* Hiyâ is *shame,* but the feeling is aroused in various ways.

In the first episode, the employe has the feeling by *anticipation*: projecting himself into the position of asking his employer for a loan, he is aware of being in a socially undesirable role. The concomitant uncomfortable reaction inhibits further action. One who has flagrantly violated socially approved norms of conduct, yet is known or presumed to have had this antecedent awareness, merits condemnation as "shameless," or *waláng hiyâ*: he did not possess that restraining feeling of shame that should have accompanied his social awareness.

In the second instance described above, the employe judged it socially safe to approach his employer, but was rebuffed. Here it was someone else who deliberately made the employe feel out of place, generating in him an awareness of his socially unacceptable position or action and the feeling of shame that accompanies this awareness. In the final case, the element of voluntariness is missing, for it was the situation created by the unexpected entrance of a co-worker, rather than anyone's deliberate intent, that made the employee feel out of place and withdraw from the scene.

*Amor propio.* Hiyâ is a universal social sanction in lowland Philippine society, for it enforces conformity with all aspects of the social code, whether the end in view is acceptance by society in general or by the individual with whom one is dealing at the moment. There is, however, a second sanction, more limited in scope, a special defense against severe interpersonal unpleasantness. I refer to amor propio, or self-esteem, which is sensitivity to personal affront.

This sensitivity is not, like smooth interpersonal relations, for the attainment and enhancement of social acceptance; it serves rather to *retain* the acceptance one already has. It is an emotional high-tension wire that girds the individual's dearest self, protecting from disparagement or question the qualities he most jealously guards as his own best claim to others' respect and esteem.

Amor propio, in other words, is not aroused by *every* insult, slighting remark, or offensive gesture. The stimuli that set it off are only those that strike at the individual's most highly valued attributes. Some examples may clarify this distinction.

To judge from the failure of the joint BPS-PACD functional literacy project, the average Filipino farmer is not greatly concerned over his ability or inability to read and write. Chided for his illiteracy, his reaction is apathetic; he is, at most, shamed or humiliated by the disparaging comment. His reaction lacks the high emotional charge generated by injured self-esteem.

But if he is accused of being an improvident father, or the husband of a faithless spouse, core values and attributes have been questioned and the reaction is liable to be violent.

The Tagalog scholar who is quite willing to accept corrections for his lapses into poor English may be incensed by any questioning (even legitimate and justified) of his analysis of Tagalog. It has been my observation that participants in round-table discussions and seminars are extremely alert to indications of emotional involvement and will deliberately avoid pressing a question if the respondent seems too committed to his position. Where there is emotional involvement, there is amor propio, and to prick amor propio is to ask for trouble.

Social acceptance is gained and enhanced by smooth interpersonal relations; its loss is guarded against by two sanctions discouraging behavior disruptive of these relations. The first and general sanction is hiyâ, or shame; the second and specific safeguard is amor propio, or self-esteem, which is a sensitivity to personal insult or affront. By these positive and negative means the lowland Filipino strives to have his fellows take him for a good man, an acceptable member of the community.

### An Outline of Lowland Philippine Values

I. Aims and Goals

    A. *Social acceptance*–being taken by one's fellows for what one is, or believes he is, and being treated in accordance with his status. (This theme is discussed above.)

    B. *Economic security*–the ability to meet ordinary material needs without borrowing; that is, through one's own resources or those of his own segment.

    C. *Social mobility*–advancement up the social class, to another class, perhaps, or to a higher position within the class of which one is a member.

II. Beliefs and Convictions

    A. *Personalistic view of the universe*–the universe is directly controlled by personal beings other than, and different from, oneself (an outlook opposed to the mechanistic view that the universe is governed by

impersonal laws discoverable and manipulable by men—oneself and others like oneself).

B. *Good is limited*—one individual or segment cannot advance except at the expense of another, since there is only one source of good common to all.

This belief, found in many societies, is the basis of the common human failing of envy.

C. *Success is undeserved*—to claim success as a personal achievement, to take pride in it, or to refuse to share it with others is to make oneself not only undeserving of good luck (which everyone is) but positively deserving of failure.

Sharing of success, and ascribing it to luck or fate, serve to avert the envy of those who have been "deprived" by the success of the lucky person. This behavior is also an assurance that the good luck will not be withdrawn from the recipient of the windfall because of the latter's having attributed his success to personal effort or merit.

III. Principles

A. Structural

1. *Segmentation*—the social world is divided by various criteria into sets of mutually exclusive segments.

Some of these segments are defined absolutely; others are defined in relation to an individual. Examples are the following:

a. Kinship system
   i. Kinsmen distinguished from non-kinsmen
   ii. Nuclear family distinguished from other kinsmen
   iii. Blood relatives distinguished from affinal kinsmen
b. Age-grading and generation system
   i. Biologically older and younger distinguished
   ii. Older and younger generations distinguished
c. Social-class system—upper class distinguished from lower class
d. Political system
   i. Hierarchy of power recognized
   ii. Distinctions by political party
e. Locality system— distinctions by territorial units of origin and residence
f. Language—distinctions by mother tongue and by second-language ability
g. Religion—distinctions by church affiliation
h. Time—the immediate (near past, present, near future) distinguished from the remote (distant past and distant future)

2. *Ranking*—the segments in a single set are not equally valued.

   a. In the vertical alignment of segments, the superordinate segment is ordinarily more highly esteemed.

     i. Upper-class individual over lower-class individual

     ii. More powerful person over less powerful person

     iii. Older relative over younger relative

   b. Where the vertical dimension is not present, preference and loyalty are given to one's own segment.

     i. Nuclear family over other kinsmen

     ii. Close relatives over other kinsmen

     iii. Kinsmen over non-kinsmen

     iv. Neighbors over other townmates

     v. Townmates over outsiders

     vi. Those with same mother tongue over those with different mother tongue

     vii. Those with same religion over those with different religion

     viii. The immediate (near past, present, near future) more important than the remote (distant past and distant future)

B. Operational

   1. *Equivalence*—Viewed from *outside* the segment, individual segment members represent (are equivalent to) the total membership.

   Recognized kinds of equivalence are these:

   a. Person a = Group A (individual stands for his segment)

   b. Person $a^1$ = Person $a^2$ (one member of segment stands for another)

   c. Person a = Person b (spouses)

   2. *Solidarity*—Viewed from *inside* the segment, co-members are united against other segments of the same set.

   a. An injury against a segment member is an injury against the whole segment. Therefore, segment retaliation is justified.

   b. Who disgraces himself, disgraces his whole segment; on the other hand, one's success is his segment's success as well.

   3. *Reciprocity*—every service received, solicited or not, demands a return—the nature and proportion of the return determined by the relative statuses of the parties involved, and the kind of exchange at issue. (This principle is developed in the paper by M. R. Hollnsteiner.)

   Recognized kinds of reciprocity are the following:

   a. Contractual

   b. Quasi contractual

   c. *Utang na loób* (debt of gratitude)

    i. Superordinate-subordinate

    ii. Coordinate

4. *Compassion (awà) -any* individual who has suffered a grievous blow at the hand of Fate or human injustice or who is (even through his own fault) in a helpless condition, deserves sympathy, pity, mercy, and, should he ask for it, assistance. (In this statement the word "any" is stressed because the principle cuts across segment boundaries.)[18]

### FINDINGS ON SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SINCE 1961

At the time I wrote the original statement on social acceptance, there was little information available on the subject, except in those writings, anecdotes, personal experiences, and unpublished recollections mentioned above. But matters have changed considerably in the past nine years: although there are undoubtedly more, I am currently aware of no fewer than 31 new studies that shed additional light on the question. Included among them, and to be reviewed more or less briefly in the pages that follow, are three national surveys, four regional or provincial studies, six community studies, and 18 reports on special groups such as students or the parents of grade-school children.

Before we consider the results of these investigations, let me insert a reminder. It was, and is, my position that social acceptance is for most lowland Filipinos a *thematic* value; that is, an implied postulate which *need not be consciously held*, but is in fact frequently influential in the choices made by those who have it. At the conscious level, we hypothesize two intermediate and supportive values, namely, smooth interpersonal relations, or pakikisama, and sensitivity to personal affront. It is with expressions of the latter two values, and less immediately with social acceptance, that most of the following studies are concerned.

### *National Surveys*

I know of three nation-wide surveys that tell us something about the relative importance of social acceptance and SIR in the Philippines: the Philippines Peace Corps Survey, conducted 1964–65; the BRAC 1967 Filipino Family Survey; and the PAASCU/IPC Study of Schools and Influentials, begun in 1969 and still underway.

### *Philippines Peace Corps Survey*

The Peace Corps survey was designed to evaluate the first three years' operations (1961–64) of the United States Peace Corps Volunteers in the Philippines (Lynch, Maretzki, et al. 1966). Of those municipalities where

Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs) had served as teachers, 48 were randomly selected for appraisal; for 27 of these places (also chosen at random) matching non-PCV, or control, municipalities were designated for study. The resulting 75 rural municipalities were scattered literally from Aparri to Jolo, and in every one of them 30 respondents were to be interviewed. About half of the interviewees were purposively selected to represent the national-level, municipal, and barrio officials, principals and teachers, religious leaders, and special friends or enemies of the PCVs; the other half was a randomly chosen sample of household heads, male and female, from the community at large.

It is relevant to note that these sampling groups differed significantly in educational attainment, the median categories being these: religious leaders (mostly priests), postgraduate; principals and teachers, college graduate; national-level and·municipal officials, high-school graduate; barrio officials and PCV-linked respondents, elementary-school graduate; residual community sample, incomplete elementary schooling (Lynch, Maretzki, et al. 1966:153).

Among the items in the Peace Corps survey interview was an open-ended inquiry asking for the respondent's description of, first, the best possible PCV and, second, the worst. Replies to the first question added up to 1,366, or about 60 per cent of the total number of respondents: the other 40 per cent were either not asked the question (these were the 30 per cent who had never heard of the Peace Corps program nor of any PCVs) or were asked it but gave no answer (10 per cent). Replies to the second question were fewer still (1,165) because of the greater number of respondents who gave no answer.

An analysis of the replies indicates that the ability to get along well with people, often called pakikisama, is considered of paramount importance for "the best possible PCV": it is demanded by about 85 per cent of the respondents, and in most cases those who mention this interpersonal trait add no other characteristics. Again, when respondents describe the "worst possible PCV," 92 per cent of them speak of the *absence* of pakikisama.[19] Of great importance is the additional fact that there is no significant variation among sampling groups in their replies to these questions, despite the great differences in median educational attainment that distinguish them from one another (Lynch, Maretzki, et al. 1966:199–202).

*BRAC 1967 Filipino Family Survey*

In September 1967 a survey was made in 100 randomly selected municipalities located in 37 provinces of the lowland Philippines (Lynch and Makil 1968). Called the "BRAC 1967 Filipino Family Survey," it was designed to give us selected information about Filipino families living in ordinary municipalities (neither cities nor provincial capitals) in those areas of the nation where one of the eight major Philippine languages was dominant.[20]

Respondents within the randomly selected municipalities were a nonprobability sample chosen by the quota technique. Sixteen poblacion, or town, respondents and eight from a barrio in each of the 100 municipalities should have given us a sample of 2,400 in all. However, 18 interviews were not completed, leaving us with a respondent total of 2,382.

Among the topics investigated in the BRAC survey were the ideals people had for various family roles. How would they describe the best possible father, for instance, or mother? What would the ideal son or daughter be like? What traits should be found in a good husband, or a good wife? The questions were put open-endedly, as they were in the Peace Corps survey, and each respondent could mention as many as three qualities (most gave only one or two). However, no respondent was asked about all three role-pairs: to prevent an already lengthy interview from becoming intolerably long, half the respondents were asked only about the husband-wife set, one fourth about father and mother, and one fourth about son and daughter.

For all roles the desirable qualities most frequently mentioned are those likely to assure pleasant interpersonal relations. Although they are expressed in a variety of ways, these traits fit into two categories which we defined in the process of coding the respondents' open-ended replies: "Consideration and effectiveness in dealing with people," and "Deference, calm, humility."[21] The percentage of responses that fell into these SIR categories were as follows: for the ideal father, 31 per cent; ideal mother, 40 per cent; ideal son, 49 per cent; ideal daughter, 54 per cent; for both husband and wife, 45 per cent (Table 1). One can safely conclude that among BRAC respondents and the rural population they represent, smooth interpersonal relations occupy a very important position in the hierarchy of qualities desirable for family members. In particular, two statements seem justified: (a) the ideal family member, regardless of sex or role, is above all one whose relationship with others is harmonious and pleasant; (b) sons and daughters, notably the latter, are expected to attain this desirable relationship toward their elders especially by deference and obedience.

### PAASCU/IPC study of schools and influentials

Whereas the Peace Corps survey and the BRAC family survey were directed exclusively to the rural Philippines, a nationwide study of influentials, still underway, taps the opinions of respondents in Greater Manila and nine other cities of the Philippines. Reference is to the study of schools and influentials sponsored by the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU) and undertaken by the Institute of Philippine Culture (Makil 1970).

The sample was chosen by a panel of 196 for the national level and 20 to

*Table 1*

*Responses of BRAC family survey respondents classified by qualities mentioned in describing ideal family members, crossclassified by family member being described.*

| Quality | Fa[1] | Mo | So | Da | Hu | Wi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consideration and effectiveness in dealing with people[2] | 27% | 33% | 21% | 18% | 39% | 35% |
| Deference, calm, humility[3] | 4 | 7 | 28 | 36 | 6 | 10 |
| Religious piety | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| Morality | 17 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 13 | 9 |
| Industry, thrift | 18 | 25 | 11 | 18 | 20 | 24 |
| Dependability, honesty | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Modernity | 6 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Devotion to children | 19 | 19 | — | — | 5 | 7 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | 723 | 724 | 722 | 735 | 2,997 | 2,985 |
| Total no. of respondents | 436 | 436 | 430 | 430 | 1,143 | 1,143 |

[1]Abbreviations: Fa, father; Mo, mother; So, son; Da, daughter; Hu, husband; Wi, wife.

[2]The most frequently mentioned words and phrases coded under this category are these: understanding, sympathetic, loving, kind, thoughtful, considerate, sociable, friendly, polite, hospitable.

[3]The most frequently mentioned words and phrases under this category are these: (For sons and daughters) obedient, patient, calm, quiet, peaceful, self-controlled; (for others) calm, quiet, peaceful, self-controlled.

*Source*: Lynch and Makil 1968:322–24 (Tables 7–9).

32 for each of the nine provincial cities. This survey differs from the first two mentioned above, not only because the respondents are from big cities, but also because they are leaders at the national or regional level.

As of this writing (August 1970) about 160 of the national influentials and 280 of the locals have been interviewed, and it is clear from the data processed to date that the average Filipino influential is very well educated indeed: among nationals not one respondent reports less than four years of college; among locals only 8 per cent have not finished a bachelors degree (Lynch 1970a: Tables 34 and 35). In contrast to the rural respondents of humble station who figured in the two surveys reported earlier, these urban leaders seem notably less concerned about smooth interpersonal relations. More accurately, when national-level leaders are asked to describe the kind of person they think the ideal high school and college should produce, they give very little thought to traits we would code under SIR. Qualities of this category total to only three per cent of all answers (Table 2).

## Regional and Provincial Studies

In addition to the nation-wide surveys mentioned above, there have been four studies of intermediate scope. In one case, Guthrie's study of four municipalities south of Manila, the research was regional in nature. In the other three cases, all the municipalities investigated were located in a single province.

### Southern Luzon regional study

In a project undertaken as part of the Ateneo—Penn State Basic Research Program (1966–69), Guthrie (1970) studied urbanization and values in four municipalities located at various distances from Manila, all within the Tagalog-speaking area of Southern Luzon and Mindoro. In each of the four municipalities, a nonprobability sample of 108 residents 20 to 55 years old was selected in such a way as to represent distinctions of sex, social class, and community of residence, as follows: from the poblacion, 72 respondents (36 upper class and 36 lower class, each grouping equally divided into men and women); from the barrio, 36 lower class respondents, men and women in equal numbers (Guthrie 1970:65).

*Interpersonal behavior patterns.* For a subproject on interpersonal behavior patterns among the people of these four places, Guthrie and his staff interviewed only 30 out of the 108 respondents in each municipality—10 from the barrio and 20 from the poblacion (Guthrie and Azores 1968:11). To these 120 respondents he added another 290 drawn from students at four Manila institutions: a teachers college (53 men, 72 women), two private Catholic colleges (53 men, 73 women), and a college of arts and trades (39 men).

To elicit the behavior patterns of the two samples, Guthrie used a Sentence Completion Test (SCT) developed by Phillips (1966) in Thailand. This instrument was chosen "because the SCT is an efficient technique for collecting information on reactions to typical situations which many people face."

*Table 2*

*Responses of national influentials interviewed in the PAASCU/IPC study*
*of influentials, classified by category or quality mentioned in*
*describing ideal college and high-school graduate, cross-*
*classified by academic level of ideal graduate.*

| Quality category | College | High school | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledge | 37.9% | 49.5% | 43.9% |
| Behavior, except SIR-<br>related qualities | 33.1 | 21.0 | 26.9 |
| SIR-related qualities* | 2.4 | 4.2 | 3.3 |
| Values | 26.5 | 25.2 | 25.8 |
| Total | 353 | 685 | 1,038 |
| Total no. of<br>respondents | 143 | 143 | 143 |

*Includes these qualities: knows how to deal with people, can get along with fellowmen, wins friends, cooperative, good manners, respectful, gentleman.

*Source*: Makil 1970

These characteristic reaction patterns "constitute, in turn, a major component of one's personality" (Guthrie and Azores 1968:10). Originally in English, the SCT was translated into Tagalog, and this version was administered orally to all rural respondents. Half the Manila students were given the English form of the SCT, while the other half used the Tagalog equivalent, but all students completed the sentences using pencil and paper.

The entire Guthrie-Azores article can be studied with profit, for it is a mine of information and insights. However, we here restrict ourselves to those findings and conclusions that are most relative to social acceptance and pakikisama. These findings are based in large part on responses to the nine sentence stems that appear in Table 3, which I constructed by rearranging slightly the abundant data presented by the authors.

There is near-unanimity among respondents that the ideal superior is one who deals in kindly, soft-spoken fashion with his subordinates (Table 4, stems 6 and 7).[22] Regardless of residence or social class, respondents also show a strong tendency to react quietly, controlling and hiding their hurt when they feel disliked, avoided, annoyed by people who are not close to themselves

(stems 12, 13, and 24). However, when a friend has spoken against them, or someone has insulted them, respondents react both more strongly and less uniformly. All of them give more scope to anger and outright confrontation with the wrongdoer than they do when mere dislike, annoyance, or avoidance is at issue, but the relative importance given to this aggression varies by respondent group. In these two situations (stems 11 and 25), provincial residents clearly differ among themselves: lower-class respondents solve both problems principally by speaking out in anger or retaliation, while the town-dwelling big people opt mainly for a strategy of withdrawal. Manila students, on the other hand, emphasize the silent approach in dealing with a disloyal friend, but believe in an angry rejoinder for anyone who insults them.

In the context of interpersonal relations, pakikisama is the most important consideration for the great majority (72 to 93 per cent) of respondents, especially for rural residents (stem 18), but it is the most important thing in life for only a minority (13 to 25 per cent; stem 28).

*Impact of modernization.* So much for the subproject on interpersonal behavior patterns. As materials for his major study, which concerned the impact of modernization on Filipinos, Guthrie (1970:63) had a variety of sources. Most important among them perhaps were discussions with key informants and the replies recorded in a 118-item interview with 108 respondents in each of the four municipalities studied.

On the question of pakikisama, three major statements seem justified by data derived from the latter source. First, though the majority of these respondents believe that pakikisama is now more important than it was five to 10 years ago (item 40) and that its importance will increase with time (item 60), this attitude is less pronounced among those nearer Manila, those from higher social groups, and women. Second, factor analysis indicates that respondents' attitudes about interpersonal relations vary with relative independence from their feelings about jobs and money, political influence and help, and contentment (Guthrie 1970:90). Finally, lower-class barrio residents react more aggressively to insult than do town-dwellers (item 91).

### Provincial surveys

*Bulacan.* Surveys conducted in the province of Bulacan, Negros Oriental, and Negros Occidental also tell us something about social acceptance and pakikisama. The first is one done 1963–65 by Feliciano and her associates in five barrios located in four municipalities of Bulacan.[23] A total of 476 respondents were interviewed to discover factors related to the acceptance of planned change, especially to the implementation of the Land Reform Code. Under the subheading of personalism, Feliciano (1966:260) reports that farmers "attribute their acceptance of farming practices, among other things, to

*Table 3*

*Guthrie-Azores respondents to Sentence Completion Test,*
*classified by responses given to selected sentence stems,*
*crossclassified by residence and social class.*

| Response | Province upper class (N = 40) | Province lower class (N = 80) | Manila students (N = 290) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **6. *The best way to treat a subordinate is . . .*** | | | |
| Agreeable words | 90% | 89% | 92% |
| Other | 10 | 11 | 8 |
| **7. *The worst way to treat a subordinate is . . .*** | | | |
| Disagreeable words | 88% | 89% | 90% |
| Other | 13 | 11 | 10 |
| **11. *When he found out his best friend spoke against him he . . .*** | | | |
| Suffered in silence | 58% | 43% | 52% |
| Spoke out in anger | 25 | 51 | 41 |
| **12. *When he saw that they did not like him he . . .*** | | | |
| Suffered in silence | 63% | 76% | 65% |
| Spoke out in anger | 8 | 10 | 3 |
| Reformed his ways | 15 | 4 | 23 |
| Other | 15 | 10 | 9 |
| **13. *When he saw that others avoided him he . . .*** | | | |
| Suffered in silence | 55% | 65% | 42% |
| Spoke out in anger | 10 | 11 | 10 |
| Reformed his ways | 20 | 5 | 15 |
| Other | 15 | 19 | 33 |
| **18. *In his relations with people, the thing he is most careful of is . . .*** | | | |
| Pakikisama | 93% | 81% | 72% |
| Good image (reputation) | 5 | 9 | 14 |
| Other | 3 | 10 | 13 |
| **24. *When people annoy me . . .*** | | | |
| I suffer in silence | 63% | 65% | 62% |
| I speak out in anger | 20 | 19 | 23 |
| Other | 18 | 16 | 15 |
| **25. *When he insulted me I . . .*** | | | |
| Suffered in silence | 40% | 39% | 40% |
| Spoke out in anger | 33 | 46 | 44 |
| Other | 28 | 15 | 16 |
| **28. *The most important thing in life is . . .*** | | | |
| Money, success | 23% | 61% | 12% |
| Knowledge | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Pakikisama | 25 | 13 | 17 |
| Happiness, peace | 33 | 18 | 25 |
| Honor, dignity, respect | 5 | 0 | 19 |
| Other | 15 | 9 | 18 |

*Source:* Guthrie and Azores 1968.

the influence of the change agent as well as of their neighbors and friends and other barrio influentials." This influence is traced to the desire to please: "Although they might not be convinced of the new practice, still they adopt it so as not to disappoint the change agent, their neighbor or their friend." "They had to cooperate, they said, because the change agent had such a fine personality they could not displease him." Feliciano further reports that the portrait of the change agent, as revealed by depth interviewing of farmers, was that of "one who could get along with everyone in the barrio, young or old alike." She finds, in other words, that in dealing with the friendly, well-intentioned stranger, or with neighbors and friends who give well-meaning advice, these rural respondents bend over backwards to please.

*Negros Occidental.* In 1969 the Institute of Philippine Culture did a province-wide exploratory study of sugarcane farms located in 21 municipalities of Negros Occidental (Lynch 1970b).[24] Farms were chosen randomly—eight in each of the eight milling districts we studied – to represent differences in size, productivity, and tenure. On the individual farms, respondents were also chosen randomly whenever they exceeded in number the quota we had set for a particular role category, namely: one hacendero (planter), one encargado (overseer), one cabo (foreman-timekeeper), three permanent workers (residing permanently on the farm in free housing), three temporary workers (residing off the hacienda property, usually in a nearby barrio).[25] Besides these farm-based respondents, we also interviewed an additional 57 off-farm respondents, some chosen purposively and others randomly, to represent officials of the government, of labor, of the sugar industry, and the clergy.

All respondents were asked open-endedly to describe the best possible hacendero, cabo, permanent worker, *sacada* (migrant worker), *contratista* (labor contractor), and priest. They were also asked to give the most common failings of each of these six kinds of people. Although their replies were broader in scope, we record here the responses of hacenderos, cabos, permanent workers, and off-farm respondents only insofar as they shed light on the importance of SIR as a norm.

For both cabo- and worker-respondents, smooth interpersonal relations is the most commonly mentioned desirable quality for five out of the six roles (all except the priest); its violation is the most frequently mentioned failing in four out of the six roles (Table 4). Planters however, give SIR first place in only two out of six desirable-quality cases; and in none of the common-failing lists (Lynch 1970b: 19–25).[26]

For the off-farm respondents the only pertinent information available to us at this writing is an unpublished table which shows their views of the best and worst possible priest. For the best possible priest, off-farm respondents rank SIR among other desirable qualities as follows: sugar officials (N = 27), 1.5;

*Table 4*

*Average rank given to SIR by IPC/NFSP exploratory-survey respondents describing qualities of best and worst possible incumbents of selected roles, classified by role described, crossclassified by respondent's own role.*

| Role described | Best/ Worst | Hacendero (N =63) | Cabo (N = 50) | Permanent worker (N = 171) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hacendero | Best | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Worst | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Cabo | Best | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Worst | 2.5 | 1 | 1 |
| Permanent worker | Best | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Worst | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Sacada | Best | 4 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Worst | 8.5 | 1.5 | 1 |
| Contratista | Best | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Worst | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Priest | Best | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Worst | 3.5 | 1 | 2 |

*Source:* Lynch 1970b:19–25, and unpublished tables available at the Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila.

government officials (N = 10), 8.5; labor officials (N = 8), 4.5; clergy (N = 12), 2. The lack of SIR is mentioned as a common failing of priests only by the sugar officials, with whom it ranks 5.5 among other qualities mentioned.

Smooth interpersonal relations is, then, of greater importance to workers than it is to planters and off-farm respondents. In the latter group, sugar officials (many of whom are also planters) approximate the hacenderos most closely in this regard.

*Negros Oriental.* Another ideal-quality study is that of Hottle (1970), who in 1969 interviewed 84 respondents from four poblaciones in northern Negros Oriental. Among his interests was their view, respectively, of the best and worst possible priest. Representing almost a third of all replies to the first question (Table 5) were responses tabulated under "Identification with/understanding of people," a category which "was understood to embrace qualities which appeared to be those contributing primarily to what F. Lynch has

*Table 5*

*Responses of Hottle-study respondents classified by qualities mentioned in describing the best and worst possible priest, crossclassified by kind of priest being described.*

| Quality | Best priest (N = 84) | Worst priest (N = 84) |
|---|---|---|
| Identification with/ understanding of people[1] | 31.4% | 41.0% |
| Generosity and zeal[2] | 20.4 | 13.9 |
| Leadership skills | 14.7 | — |
| Sanctity | 14.1 | 35.8 |
| Giving help | 11.0 | — |
| Fairness[3] | 4.2 | 5.3 |
| Other | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| Total N | 191 | 151 |

[1] Responses coded in this category are the following: (for best priest): sociable, approachable, adjustable and flexible, "having a good PR [public relations]," deals well with people, not proud, not aloof, not unfriendly, like us; (for worst priest): not sympathetic, no mercy for the people, aristocratic ways, hot temper, insulting way of dealing with people, unsociable, proud, strict, cruel.

[2] In the "worst possible priest" column the percentage is that which Hottle (1970:85) coded under "Selfishness."

[3] In the "worst possible priest" column the percentage is that which Hottle (1970:85) coded under "Favoritism."

*Source*: Hottle 1970:81, 85.

described as 'smooth interpersonal relations' " (Hottle 1970:80). The study found, however (Hottle 1970:82), that residents of the relatively more urban poblacion of Canlaon City mentioned SIR-related qualities less often—20.5 per cent—than people from the more rural centers of Jimalalud, Guihulngan, and Vallehermoso—31.4 per cent; further, that in describing the worst possible priest, upper-class respondents mentioned the lack of SIR less often—29.4 per cent—than lower-class respondents—56.1 per cent (Hottle 1970:86). When asked in what way Filipino priests were better than American priests, and vice versa, 90 per cent of respondents said Filipinos excelled in their understanding of and identification with the people, only 9 per cent thinking the Americans had the advantage in this regard (Hottle 1970:126, 129).

In summary, then, Hottle finds that kind, understanding, and harmonious interpersonal behavior is the most commonly mentioned attribute of the good priest, while its absence is the most often-cited sign of an undesirable priest.

Lower-class and rural respondents are especially concerned about this quality, and Filipino priests are recognized as endowed with it more liberally than are Americans.

### Community Studies

Since 1960 a number of studies have appeared which are based on research conducted in a single municipality. Among those that I have seen, I find those of Nurge (1965), the Nydeggers (1966), Abasolo-Domingo (1961), Kaut (1961), and Jocano (1966b, 1969a, 1969b, 1969c) most relevant to our present interests. The first three studies concentrate on child-rearing and personality development, while those of Kaut and Jocano are more general in scope, with special emphasis, however, on social organization and structure.

### Child-rearing studies

*Nurge in Leyte.* Nurge spent about eight months (December 1955 to July 1956) in barrio Guinhangdan, northeast Leyte. Her major interest was child-rearing practices there, about which she has this to say:

Dominant and aggressive behavior is discouraged and suppressed in the village and training for suppression begins very early for both sexes. Quarrels among children are deplored; physical violence is inveighed against; and any attempt at self-assertiveness is discouraged or punished. Mothers are unanimous in deploring the quarrelsome child in the play group and in praising the peaceful one. They are, in fact, monotonous in their repetition that an active, assertive child is a troublemaker and a quiet, quiescent, submissive, noncompetitive child is a good one (Nurge 1965:84).

*The Nydeggers in Ilocos Sur.* Reporting on a barrio in the Ilocos region where they stayed 1954–55, the Nydeggers first tell us (1966:173) of the traditional system in these terms: "The view of life presented to the child is easy to grasp; one should be a good neighbor, in time establish a proper family and, with luck, improve one's condition." Later they speak of the changes that barrio Tarong, as they call it, has undergone.

The factor that has produced the severest shifts in traditional patterns of living has been the acceptance of the traditionally tertiary goal, improvement of socio-economic position, as a primary goal. This has created a necessary declining interest in the older primary goal of neighborly solidarity (Nydegger and Nydegger 1966:176).

The Nydeggers observe, in other words, that modernization has brought about a lowering of pakikisama's place in the barrio's value hierarchy.

*Abasolo-Domingo in Rizal.* We learn from this study (1961) of child-rearing in Barrio Cruz na Ligas near the Diliman campus of the University of the Philippines that getting along well with playmates, rather than leading them, is the average mother's emphasis. For these mothers it is of little concern or interest who takes the lead in their children's play. All of them express the idea that the important thing is that children get along well without too much quarreling.

Avoiding aggression and promoting sociability is emphasized, rather than dominance over peers (Abasolo-Domingo 1961:179). The same norm is applied to adults as well, the main test for a successful leader being how well he gets along with his followers or constituents. For the people in this community believe that common goals will be achieved only in an atmosphere of friendly cooperation (Abasolo-Domingo 1961:171).

## General community studies

*Kaut and utang na loób in Bulacan.* Kaut spent some 20 months (1956–58) doing research in several communities in the Tagalog-speaking area of Luzon. In one of his reports (1961), based principally on observations in Kapitangan, a barrio of Paombong, Bulacan, he presents an analysis of the way in which culturally defined indebtedness (utang na loób) regulates and conditions behavior between two people. At one point, Kaut states (1961:269) that refusal to comply with an utang-na-loób obligation is "rare on an overt level" because to refuse is to insult and insults are serious matters." He continues:

Rather, a verbal commitment is made which the promiser has no intention of honoring as he feels that the person (usually a stranger or foreigner) has no real right to ask for any such thing. In this way he effectively refuses, but since he does not want to precipitate conflict or cause shame, he softens or postpones the effects of the refusal by placing it on delayed behavioral level while seeming not to refuse on a verbal level—he makes a contract he does not intend to honor. In such an instance, social cleavage results or is reinforced—just as surely as if a vocal face-to-face refusal had been uttered—but not in a violent abrupt manner. The petitioner will soon know that he has been refused—that the other person does not feel any sense of obligation toward him—that his request was based upon a faulty analysis of the situation (Kaut 1961:269).

It is Kaut's observation, in other words, that the ordinary barrio folk with whom he lived placed great importance on the avoidance of overt interpersonal conflict.

*Jocano and interpersonal relations in Capiz.* Jocano has studied several communities in rural central Panay and a neighborhood in the Santa Ana district of Manila. Especially relevant to our inquiry are his detailed descriptions of Malitbog (1969a, 1969b), a barrio of Tapaz, Capiz, and his references in passing to both Malitbog and Santa Ana (1966a, 1966b, 1969c).

The Malitbog study was done especially in 1964–65, though Jocano had visited and stayed in Malitbog on several previous occasions (1966b:xi) at the time of his most intensive research the barrio numbered 733 people, of whom a little over half were Catholics and the rest Protestants (1969a:31).

Jocano's published reports affirm the high value accorded considerate interpersonal dealings. Thus he cites with approval Ealdama's description of *patugsiling* (Jocano 1969a:285; see Ealdama 1948:81–82), calling it, after Ealdama, one of the "cardinal virtues" of the people of Malitbog (Jocano 1969b:101). Ealdama's description of this quality contains the following familiar ideas:

It embraces the meanings of love, kindness, justice, and consideration. It also means broadmindedness, and sympathetic understanding. In its broadest concept, it reflects a norm of conduct which goes farther than the golden rule to the point of subordinating complacently one's opinions, likes and dislikes to those of another; it inclines one to weigh his words and acts, so that what is said or done will not in any way injure another. It enjoins one to view with just consideration the feelings, conditions and circumstances of his fellowmen.

It is appropriate to introduce at this point several broader statements made by Jocano, apparently meant to describe lowland Filipinos in general. He says, for instance (1966a:19), that in his values training

it is impressed on him [the Filipino] by his parents that these people are his relatives – (at least those who are described as good relatives) – they are the people he can count on for help in time of need. Thus, their good-will has to be cultivated. This implies avoiding conflicts; getting along with them. Getting along is, in many instances, more desired than "courting conflicts" because getting along with one's kinsmen is a psychological investment for possible future economic, religious, social, and political gain. This involves *pakikisama* and *galang* (respect). Both relational principles require courteous language and complimentary behavior. Conformity to these codes of interaction is rewarded with cooperation and assistance and non-conformity is punished by withdrawal of kin support.[27]

Elsewhere Jocano (1966a:20) says that "Respect is often expressed in courteous language and action. Harsh or blunt speech is a sign of disrespect and therefore frowned upon." Further, in developing the importance of amor propio, he explains:

A harsh speech or a discourteous comment is enough to trigger a violent reaction from a Filipino. As a Tagalog, again, would say, "*Ang sugat ng itak ay mas mahanay kaysa sugat ng masamang pangungusap*" ("The wound from a knife is more bearable than the wound from an offensive word"). This value notion is often noted in the manner in which a Filipino avoids straightforward, interpersonal verbal encounters or in the manner in which he seeks "interpersonal harmony by blurring of the differences and by agreement not to disagree at least openly" (Jocano 1966a:23).

He closes the article with his ideas on "the psychology of the Filipino *yes*," giving seven circumstances in which the average Filipino will say "yes" when he really means "no."[28] This is of course one of the more striking euphemistic practices noted by visitors to the Philippines.

To summarize, in his Malitbog study and in at least one of his more general statements, Jocano affirms that a traditionally high value is placed on social acceptance (or at least on smooth interpersonal relations) as a cultural *norm*. However, he does not stop here. As we shall see, he reports that in both Malitbog and Santa Ana the *behavior* of people often falls short of this ideal (Jocano 1966b:286–87). I shall return to this latter point after a brief summary of the pertinent findings of Jocano's Manila study.

*Jocano and aggressiveness in Santa Ana, Manila.* For his study of a slum area, Jocano drew in part on his own observations as a resident, off and on, in the years 1964–67, and in part on the results of interviews with 300 gang members. Of the latter, three out of four came from one-parent households,

their fathers having deserted the family or been sent to jail. Given such circumstances it is easy to believe that the "importance of the gang to the individual often transcends that of the home" (Jocano 1969c:56–57).

"Violence," we are told, "is a normal expectation among the gang. In fact, it can be safely inferred that it is the core of gang subculture." One boy is quoted as follows:

If you show you are a coward, all the boys will make fun of you; no one will respect you as a person. You have to be aggressive. The whole world is expecting you to be that way. The police are after you, the people outside of the slum community look down on you, your fellow slum-dwellers are mean to you—what else can you do? Be what they expect you to be. That way, you are accepted and you are happy (Jocano 1969c:58).

Jocano believes that gangs are formed to answer the young slum-dweller's need for acceptance and group identity; further, that aggressiveness is the vehicle for this acceptance, as well as for the expression of personal frustrations, and for the refutation of charges, real or imagined, that one is less manful than he says he is, or ought to be. Fellow gang members are, then, substitute parents and siblings, and loyalty to the gang (going along with one's *kabarkada* and their norms—come hell, high water, police threats, beatings, or prison terms) makes and keeps one a member of his ersatz family.

Jocano further reports (1966b:287) that, despite the rough language many slum-dwellers use, SIR does have a place in "dealing with strangers or with persons suspected of having certain government connections." He refers to this as a "front," suggesting that among themselves slum-dwellers are characteristically given to "threats, expletives, and obscene expressions."

When Jocano publishes the monograph he has promised us on the slum as a way of life, we will all have a better understanding of the complexities of Santa Ana. Meanwhile, I conclude from what he has already published that (a) social acceptance is highly valued among gang members there, (b) sensitivity to personal affront (amor propio) protects against the loss or diminution of that acceptance, (c) courtesy and euphemism are characteristically employed in dealing with friendly strangers, (d) pakikisama, in the sense of conformity to group norms, is highly valued among gang members, and (e) aggressiveness toward enemies, actual or potential, is also highly valued.

*Stress and conflict in Malitbog and Santa Ana.* The studies of Nurge, the Nydeggers, Abasolo-Domingo, Kaut, and Jocano are all based in part on the authors' observations of ongoing behavior in the communities where they lived. In this they differ from the national surveys and regional or provincial studies described earlier. However, among the observational studies, those of Jocano are unique in that, while confirming, like the others, the traditional value placed on social acceptance, SIR, and amor propio, they also attest to an alternative norm of aggressiveness (among the Santa Ana gang members). What is more, whereas other authors make only indirect and passing reference to

violations of the traditional norm of interpersonal harmony, Jocano emphasizes that quarrels and conflicts are common occurrences in both Malitbog and Santa Ana. He reports (1966b:286), in fact, that family and neighborhood quarrels occur almost daily in Santa Ana, and that in a six-month period in Malitbog he recorded 87 quarrels and 150 misunderstandings. We shall return to these findings toward the end of the essay.

## Special-group Studies

Aside from national, regional, provincial, and community studies, there are 18 other investigations available for review, conveniently distinguished by the main occupation of the subjects they concern. Seven are about college or high school students, and another three each report on the mothers of grade-school children, government-related people, and urban workers. A final two concern institutional inmates. With the few exceptions to be noted in passing, all subjects are residents of Greater Manila.

### Studies of college and high-school students

*Personal preferences.* Bulatao (1963) administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) to a sample of Filipino college students divided as follows: 100 men from a middle-class men's school in Manila, 130 women from the same kind of women's school in Manila, 180 college men and the same number of women from a provincial town 300 kilometers north of Manila.[29] Since the scores for a standard American sample (760 college men, 747 college women) were available, he also compared his Filipino students with the Americans.

When Filipino college women are compared with their male counterparts in the same residential category (Manila or the provinces), they are found to score higher on the EPPS needs of endurance, abasement, nurturance, and succorance, and to score lower on autonomy, dominance, heterosexuality, and exhibition. Among Manila students (but not among those from the province) women also score higher than men on deference, order, and affiliation, but lower on achievement and aggression.

Provincianos, male and female, score higher than Manila students on order, lower on autonomy. Additionally, Manila girls have higher change and exhibition scores than provincial girls. Manila men score higher than provincial men on autonomy, dominance, aggression, and heterosexuality; but lower on endurance, affiliation, deference, abasement, and succorance.

Compared to their Manila counterparts, American men and women are higher on autonomy, affiliation, exhibition, change, and heterosexuality; they are lower on deference, order, abasement, nurturance, endurance, and aggression. Manila men score higher than Americans on dominance; Manila women,

higher than American women on achievement and succorance, but lower on intraception.

Although I shall make additional comments on these findings after reviewing the doctoral dissertation of Juan (1967), let me here quote two pertinent paragraphs from Bulatao's discussion of his findings (1963:177):

2. When contrasted with the American, the Filipino is less autonomous, more dependent. He prefers a stable way of life where things are "structured" and do not demand a continual risk-taking. He will thus be more traditional, oriented to authoritarian ways of thinking rather than to innovation and entrepreneurship. He finds it easier to submit than to assert his own individuality. He likes to take care of others and be taken care of. In brief, he values *small-group belongingness*. The hold of his primary group on him is very strong . . . .

3. Almost in proportion to the intensity of his loyalty to the primary group is his distance from others not belonging to this circle of intimates. This trait is manifest in the continually low intensity of the need for Affiliation. Free emotional exchange is inhibited in the presence of strangers and instead, one makes use of distance-producing mechanisms whereby the other is treated deferentially and distantly while one gives the appearance of self-abasement. Perhaps it is this latter behavior which is seen by friendly foreigners as "smooth interpersonal relations" and by less friendly ones as "servility." From the socio-cultural viewpoint, it is merely the high-abasement, high-deference, low-affiliation drive, which is the obverse of the intense belongingness to one's small group, and a need to *maintain distance from strangers*.

*The SIR Factor.* Juan (1967) factor-analyzed scores obtained by 215 male Filipino college freshmen who in 1964 took a battery of ability and personality tests commonly used in the Philippines. Her Factor B, which she calls the "Smooth Interpersonal Relations Factor (SIR)," is a bipolar factor defined by variables found in the EPPS and Gordon's Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV).[30] As Juan explains it (1967:27–28):

The positive end is defined by 1) the EPPS needs of working hard and keeping at a job till it is finished (*endurance*); of letting others make decisions, getting suggestions from others (*deference*); of analyzing one's motives and feelings in order to understand others better (*intraception*); 2) SIV values of *conformity* which is doing what is socially correct, and *benevolence* which is doing things for other people and sharing with them. Clearly then, these qualities comprise what has usually been defined as maintaining smooth interpersonal relations (SIR), a value that is highly and traditionally treasured in the Filipino society and found at work in almost all human encounters . . . .

The negative end of this factor is defined by 1) SIV values of *recognition* which is being looked up to and admired, and *support* which is being treated with kindness and understanding and receiving encouragement; 2) EPPS needs of going out with members of the opposite sex and being sexually attractive (*heterosexuality*), having others provide help when in trouble (*succorance*), saying witty things and being the center of attention (*exhibition*). The negative end implies the drive for individual recognition, to be catered to by others, to be the center of attention. It involves an element of showing off, of striving to be recognized as better than others. Clearly none of these characteristics enhance the maintenance of SIR.

Juan pursued her investigation further by factor-analyzing the correlations between the 12 primary factors to obtain second order factors. Primary Factor B, along with Primary Factor F and K, defines a second factor which Juan describes (1967:36) as a value dimension.[31] She explains the combination as follows:

All of these factors, B, F, and K reflect individual-oriented behavior; but while B pertains to what is acceptable and valued highly, F and K pertain to what is not. The factor shows that the person who strives towards the maintenance of smooth interpersonal relations is one who is low in autonomy and aggression. The predominance of the SIR value is again brought out in the second order factors.

At the end of her report, Juan sums up (1967:42–43) what she sees as the likely contribution she has made to our understanding of the Filipino.

The significance of this study lies not so much in the validation of tests themselves as in the isolation of a personality value pattern unique in Philippine society. This value pattern has long been believed to be characteristic of Filipinos and has been established by means of questionnaires, interviews, and intuition. The present study not only gives quantitative support to these previous findings but clarifies both their positive and negative aspects. The two personality patterns revealed in the second order factors *a* and *c seem* to be unique to the Filipinos.[32]

At this point we can reflect on the papers of both Bulatao (1963) and Juan (1967). Common to the two studies is the use of the EPPS, either exclusively (Bulatao) or along with other instruments. Now if we consider the EPPS variables that load positively or negatively on Juan's SIR Factor (Factor B), we can ask how they are distributed in the more diverse sample studied by Bulatao.

The EPPS needs in question are, on the positive end, endurance, deference, and intraception; on the negative, heterosexuality, succorance, and exhibition. Assuming that factor structures will differ by sex, educational level, socioeconomic status, and other background features affecting performance on the EPPS, still our knowledge of contrasting performance by sex, residence, and culture (as revealed by the Bulatao study), allows us to make a reasonable prediction. If factor analyses were in fact done for Bulatao's subsamples, the following overall tendencies would most likely appear: the SIR Factor would be more clearly differentiated among Filipinas, provincial males, and Filipino men and women, respectively, than among Filipinos, Manila males, or American men and women.

*Agreeableness.* The relatively less important role played by SIR among American students is suggested by another recent study as well. Guthrie and Bennett (1970) replicated among 80 Manila college students an earlier study (Passini and Norman 1966), one purpose of which was to derive the factor structure that emerged when subjects, assembled for the task, rated one another on a set of personality scales. While the strongest factor in the American studies had been "Extroversion, or Surgency," followed by "Agreeableness," the Filipino study discovered the reverse to be true. Guthrie and Bennett found that Factor I, Agreeableness, accounted for 41 per cent of the total common variance, with Factor II, Extroversion, or Surgency, accounting for only 17 per cent. The comparable percentages for these factors in the American study were 27 and 29 per cent, respectively.

"Agreeableness" is somewhat similar in content to Guthrie's "Interpersonal relations" factor (1970:87—90) and even closer to the "SIR" factor of Juan (1967). It seems permissible to conclude that there is among Filipino college students notably more emphasis on this bundle of qualities than there is among American students.

*Group judgments.* In a study involving 22 Chinese and 66 Filipino "judges," students in a college of business administration in Manila, Peabody (1968) examined the descriptive and evaluative aspects of group judgments. The stimulus groups were Chinese living in the Philippines, Filipinos, Americans, and Japanese. As predicted, the tendency of judges to evaluate their own group more favorably than others is unmistakable and consistent. On the other hand, judges agree regarding descriptive characteristics of the group they rate. Thus, with particular reference to control in impulse expression, Peabody (1968: 125) concludes as follows:

> In contrast to the judgment of Chinese and Japanese as relatively·"tight," the Filipinos are judged relatively "loose." This appears clearly on the first seven pairs of scales, where the Filipinos are significantly judged to be relatively *generous, spontaneous, lenient, gay, flexible, cooperative, and trusting.* However, as scales 9 through 13 show, the Filipinos are not judged as unmixed examples of impulse expression on a "Latin" or "Mediterranean" model. The most striking instance is scale pair 9, where Filipinos are judged *tactful* (and *devious*) rather than *frank* (and *tactless*). This finding corresponds to the observation of anthropologists that Filipinos tend to preserve "smooth interpersonal relations" by avoiding the statement of unpleasant truths . . . .

In support of our conclusion from Guthrie and Bennett (1970) that Filipino college students are stronger on SIR than American students, we have Peabody's finding (1968:123—24) that while Filipinos are judged tactful (and devious), Americans are considered frank (and tactless).

*Communication networks.* Hare (1969) was, like Peabody, one of the research associates who participated in the Ateneo-Penn State Basic Research Program. Before making communication-network experiments in the Philippines, he had earlier replicated the work of Leavitt (1951) in the United States, Nigeria, and South Africa. In his report, Hare compares the performances of male students from three Philippine colleges (Ateneo de Manila, Ateneo de Zamboanga, and Notre Dame of Jolo) with those of students from Haverford College, the University of Ibadan, and the University of Cape Town.

The average Philippine group is noteworthy for the high number of messages they send. They are also more polite than any other group in message content, and tend to give much higher ratings on satisfaction with the experiment. Hare believes these findings can be explained, in part at least, by a concern for SIR, "which leads group members to continually check the extent of their agreement and understanding and to inhibit the overt expression of negative comment" (Hare 1969:43).

*Autonomy.* Since SIR involves both deference and dependence of a sort, it will be instructive to see how Filipino students score on autonomy, which implies independence from others. Hare and Hare (1968) administered a 52-item inventory to 145 Ateneo de Manila male college students, each item to be answered "true" or "false." Of the statements, 36 formed an autonomy scale. Available to the Hares were the results of earlier studies made of students from Nigeria, South Africa, Rhodesia, Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, and the United States. Speaking of the social correlates of autonomy, the authors conclude (1968:103):

With the exception of the Philippine sample, the students from the more developed nations scored higher on autonomy than those from less developed lands. The students in the United States sample had the highest scores, followed by students with a European background in South Africa, then students from Nigeria, Rhodesia, Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania. In the Philippines, the high value placed on a dependent relation to older persons could be responsible for the low scores achieved by students of a nation relatively more developed than most of the African countries in the study.

*Self-concepts of high school students.* In a study of the impact of modernization on Filipino adolescents, Licuanan (1970) examined to what degree her subjects differed in self concept, reference groups, need to achieve, and aspirational level. Her independent variables were sex, socio-economic status, and exposure to modern influences; her subjects were 200 high-school seniors (100 boys, 100 girls), 50 each from Manila and three Tagalog-speaking communities located south of the city by about 100, 200, and 400 kilometers, respectively. Ages ranged from 15 to 20 years.

Most important for our immediate purposes is the finding that in describing themselves as they think they actually are, the subjects make very frequent use of adjectives such as friendly, helpful, kind, humble, happy, and close to the family. Consistently avoided by most boys and girls are words like quarrelsome, selfish, boastful, lazy, teaser, and hot-tempered. "Thus it would seem that a high premium is placed on traits that make for pleasant interaction with others while traits that prevent pleasant interactions are considered least desirable." When asked what they would *like* to be (their ideal self concept, as compared with the real self), subjects claim they would prefer being less likely to go along with others, more independent of them in this sense (Licuanan 1970:19–20). Licuanan interprets as modern the person who sees himself as currently (real self concept) less interpersonally pleasant, or who would like to be (ideal self concept) less pleasant to people than he is. In terms of the real self concept, urban adolescents are more modern than rural adolescents; in terms of the ideal, rural adolescents are more modern. Girls see themselves as modern more often than boys do, but in wanting to be more modern, boys reject the SIR, or "nice guy" traits, while girls do not, seeking rather leadership, achievement, and extroversion, without any necessary loss of their interpersonal charm (Licuanan 1970:24–25).

*Studies of mothers of grade-school children*

*Children's personality development.* Guthrie and Jacobs (1966) were interested, like Nurge and the Nydeggers (discussed above), in child-rearing and personality development. Unlike Nurge and the Nydeggers, however, who spent a year in residence in the communities they studied, Guthrie and Jacobs relied on the results of lengthy interviews conducted in 1960 by a select team of senior normal-college students whom the authors had trained for the purpose. The 279 mothers interviewed were parents of first-grade children attending the schools where the student teachers were doing their internships. All schools were located in the Tagalog-speaking provinces in the vicinity of Manila.

In their concluding remarks, Guthrie and Jacobs (1966:203) make this succinct summary.

If one were to develop a theory of personality based on Philippine patterns he would likely emphasize that certain experiences were of crucial significance. It appears to us that there are a half dozen interpersonal skills which a Filipino child must learn at certain more or less specific stages in his development:
1. Recognize subtle cues which reveal the unspoken feelings of others.
2. Cope with angry feelings without striking out at others.
3. Give and receive help; pool his well-being with that of his nuclear and extended family.
4. Ignore activities of others which, although visible, are said to be none of his concern.
5. Tease and be teased without losing his self-control.
6. Recognize his obligations to others for favors received.

The emphasis on SIR-related qualities is suggested by the fact that at least three of these skills (1, 2, and 5) are directly concerned with the assurance of harmonious interpersonal dealings.

*Ideal qualities of children.* As part of her study of the home environment of sixth-grade children from five private schools in Greater Manila, S. M. Bennett (1970) and her associates interviewed a random selection of children and their mothers. The information sought from the 129 mothers in the sample included descriptions of the kind of children they wanted their own boys and girls (a) to be best friends with, and (b) to avoid. Since the child to be avoided was, in general, the mirror image of the hoped-for best friend, I here speak only of her findings on the positive question.

Bennett found that interpersonal skills and good moral character were mentioned with almost equal frequency, though SIR accounted for slightly fewer mentions than morality did (39 v. 34 per cent). Table 6 also confirms another fact, already noted in the report on the desirable characteristics for family members (see Table 1, above): girls (daughters) should be more deferent than boys (sons); boys should be better at pleasant interpersonal dealings than girls.

*Table 6*

*Responses of Bennett-study mothers (sixth-grade children) describing the kind of child they want their own boys and girls to be best friends with, classified by quality, crossclassified by sex respondent's child.*

| Quality | Sex of respondent's child | | |
| | Male (N = 68) | Female (N = 61) | Total (N = 129) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Interpersonal skills | 39% | 38% | 39% |
| Pleasantness[1] | (27) | (20) | (24) |
| Deference[2] | (12) | (18) | (15) |
| Achievement, mobility | 11 | 4 | 8 |
| Leadership orientation, creativity | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Good moral character or morally good family | 40 | 41 | 41 |
| Interests similar to own child's interests | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| Age-appropriate behavior | 4 | 6 | 5 |
| Total | 137 | 97 | 234 |

[1]E.g., friendly, kind, unselfish, considerate of others, good sport, loyal, patient, helpful, courteous, polite.

[2]E.g., respectful, humble, obedient. *Source:* S. M. Bennett 1970.

*Parent-teacher differences on ideal qualities.* The findings of Flores and Gonzalez (1969), however, support the position that the weighting of such ideals as the desirability of various aspects of SIR will vary with the situation (home/school) and role (parent/teacher) which respondents occupy relative to the individuals (children/pupils) about whom they are speaking. Compared with parents, teachers see pupils differently and have different expectations of them. To be more specific, parents, more than teachers, expect the child to be obedient, to get over being mad quickly, and to be courteous and mannerly. Teachers expect sharing and fairness more often than parents do.

### Government-related people

I have chosen to group the next three studies under the rubric of government-relatedness. But this is true of them to varying degrees. Hollnsteiner's neighborhood and district leaders from Tondo, for instance, are either public

officials or private citizens with well-worn, if unofficial, paths to national and city resources. Abueva's middle civil servants and Solina's paratroopers, on the other hand, are on the government payroll.

*Tondo leaders.* In 1965, Hollnsteiner (1970b) studied 24 leaders from the neighborhood of Vitas, Tondo, and another 28 leaders who functioned at the district level; that is, leaders who were recognized to have influence not just in Vitas but also in the rest of Tondo district. In discussing the respondents' conceptions of a good leader, Hollnsteiner states (1970b [9]:7–8):

> The most common area of agreement about leadership qualities among the two samples falls in the area of interpersonal relations, more specifically in the leader's skill at getting along well with all kinds of people, frequently termed his *pakikisama*, or described as *marunong makibagay*. While the district group weights this characteristic equally with the earlier cited personal qualities and service motivation, the neighborhood level sample mentions it far more often than any other single quality. The second ranking criterion is that of the strong, unwavering leader. The two sets agree on the desirability of a leader who is approachable and understanding; but the district group tends to concentrate on the leader's ability to respond to his public, while the neighborhood residents focus on his talent at steering his public subtly and ostensibly of their own free will in the direction of his opinions.

*Middle civil servants.* That Filipinos are personalistic and generally anxious to avoid displeasing others is the view of a group of middle-level administrators about whom Abueva (1970) has written. Details are found in the questionnaires completed in 1966 by 52 middle civil servants who were then enrolled at the Graduate School of Public Administration, University of the Philippines. There is, for instance, "nearly unanimous perception (96 per cent agreed) that as a people Filipinos 'tend to be personal and emotional.' " Almost as many respondents (88 per cent) agree that "practically no one ever gets a rating of 'unsatisfactory' because of our tendency to pity the employe and not to embarrass him" (Abueva 1970:150). Four out of five administrators (82 per cent) feel further that "most officials would rather go around the merit system than antagonize a close friend or relative" (Abueva 1970:158–59). In the light of this reply, it is not surprising perhaps that more than three out of five respondents (63 per cent) *reject* the statement that Filipinos as a people tend to be open and frank about how they really think and feel.[33]

*Paratroopers.* Solina's subjects (1968) were 54 Filipino paratroopers stationed at Fort Magsaysay, Nueva Ecija. His purpose was to do a factor-analytic study of creativity and personality variables, to see if the creativity factor would be loaded with such manifest needs as achievement, change and order. To test his hypothesis, he administered a battery of tests, including the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Five factors were identified: Creativity, Dominance, Intraception, Smooth Interpersonal Relations, and Nurturance. The SIR factor is defined primarily by scores on the EPPS. High scores on needs for endurance, abasement, order

and affiliation are associated with low need for exhibition, intraception and dominance. As Solina describes it (1968:28):

> This factor suggests humility, camaraderie, and the capacity to tolerate tension. The assertive emotions are negatively loaded, while the passive variables that contribute towards harmony in interpersonal situations have significant positive loadings. One is tempted to guess that this is Lynch's "smooth interpersonal relations."

## Studies of urban workers

*Factory workers and job applicants.* In one of the early studies of Philippine conceptions of the desirable, Bulatao (first published 1962; reprinted below) isolated four main values, namely: family, authority, economic sufficiency, and patience. His conclusions were based on the performances of 50 men and 40 women aged 18 to 35 years, who were either workers in one of four Manila factories or job applicants. The instrument employed was a local adaptation of Murray's (1938) Thematic Apperception Test.

Of the second value (authority) Bulatao (1970:78) has this to say:

> This may be defined as: "Approval by the authority figure and by society, authority's surrogate." It is a concern for what the important person is thinking about oneself and a tendency to shape one's behavior accordingly. There is a fear of stirring up conflict with "people who count," this fear giving rise to a need for smooth interpersonal relations. One does not reveal one's real thoughts completely to strangers, or powerful individuals, but only those aspects of one's thoughts which will be acceptable to them. Fundamentally, the fear is that of exposing one's ego to danger. Underlying this value is the anxiety of a "self-esteem based on group estimation." Attack upon this value, as when an authority figure fails to recognize a person's merit or treats a person casually, is a wound to the *amor propio* and may result in violent retaliation.
>
> There is some overlap between this value and Value A2, since parental approval could be classified either as a "family value or as an "authority" value. However, there is a difference, more in emphasis perhaps than in essence, between the two. Value A2 emphasizes the "closeness and security" aspect, Value B the "authority" aspect. It is quite possible that the typical attitude towards parental figures in Philippine culture is somewhat ambivalent, being a desire to be close to the parents and at the same time a need to treat parents "diplomatically."

In his discussion at the end of the article, the author returns to this question. After proposing that the four values be integrated by the unifying concept of an ego greatly in need of security and protection, he goes on to show the relationship between his findings and those I had expressed in the 1961 statement on social acceptance.

> Undoubtedly, the instrument used in a study of values will determine in part the choice of values or their emphases. It is by examining the confluence of various approaches that one gets a feeling of validation of one's own approach. For instance, Father Lynch, by analyzing various dialogues between Filipinos, came to the conclusion that social acceptance, supported particularly by smooth interpersonal relations (SIR), is the primary basic value or theme among lowland Filipinos. The present study with the TAT technique reflects a similar finding, and would explain the need for smooth interpersonal relationships under the "authority" value, the need for approval by society, the placating of potential enemies, the need to be careful of other people's *amor propio*, so that they will be careful of one's own (Bulatao 1970:95).

*Stevedores.* A field study by David (1967) had as its focus the social organization of stevedore groups on the Manila docks. In the year 1966—67 the author observed and gathered information especially from about 25 gang bosses, or *cabos.* He finds (1967:140) that "pakikisama is a vital concept in the waterfront." Its importance is illustrated in two situations: first, the relation between the officials of the stevedoring company and the gangs they supervise; second, the relations among gang members themselves. In the first case the kind of pakikisama called for is a tolerance for faults or delinquencies on the part of the stevedores, provided their negligences are minor and the company does not lose too much. In the second case, pakikisama refers to the ability of a stevedore to get along with his cabo and gang mates.

As one cabo explained, there are three kinds of stevedores: those who know their jobs but cannot get along with others (*hindi marunong makisama*), those who do not know their jobs but can get along with others (*marunong makisama*), and those who know their jobs and can also get along with others (*marunong pang makisama*). Workers of the third category are the best, of course, but they are in short supply. The next best is not the stevedore who knows his job, but the one who knows how to get along with others. As the cabo explained, unskilled stevedores who know how to get along with the others can be easily handled because they fit well; however, those who are skilled but cannot get along are hard to handle. They are not worth having in the system (David 1967:140).

In private conversations with me, David has also spoken of the care that cabos exercise when scolding members of their gangs. A cardinal rule is that the good cabo must "never shout at an ignorant stevedore." In fact, David's Tagalog field notes contain continual references to shouting (*sigáw*) and its proper handling. As one informant stated, touching the chest area above his heart, care is called for because "underneath the muscle there is something that can be hurt."

In summary, David sees pakikisama as a key value among stevedores on the Manila docks—one they themselves talk about and appeal to. It has the meaning of overlooking the minor faults of subordinates, on the one hand, and of adjusting pleasantly to one's peers, on the other.

*Laborers, employes, and professionals.* Marsella and Escudero (1970) studied the stress involved in interpersonal relations. Their subjects were 96 married men of Sampaloc district, Manila, stratified into six groups on grounds of age (30—42 years, 43—55, 56—68) and social class (high or low). The authors' understanding of social class is important:

For inclusion in the high-class group, an individual had to have a monthly income above 900 pesos, have a professional, administrative, or business position, have a minimum of a B.A. degree and come from a high-class family. For inclusion in the low-class group, an individual had to have a monthly income below 500 pesos, have a labor or clerical

position, have a maximum of a high school diploma and come from a low-class family (Marsella and Escudero 1970:3).

The interpersonal-stress task they employed took the form of a self-report, in particular, a frequency check list. It begins with four open-ended questions: (1) "What things cause you the most worry? (Probe)"; (2) "What things make you the most angry? (Probe)"; (3) "What things make you most sad and upset? (Probe)"; (4) "What things make you the most happy? (Probe)." After this, the interviewer explains what the respondent should understand by family, relatives, friends, superiors, and strangers. Then this instruction is given: "Tell me how often you have been upset, worried or angry over the following things," and this is in turn followed by a series of 12 situations such as, for example, "Not meeting obligations to others." Of the 12, five are self-oriented situations and seven are other-oriented. The respondent is supposed to answer each question in reference, respectively to family members, relatives, and the other three categories, using one of these precoded replies: "Often," "Sometimes," "Seldom," or "Never." Although a final section also asks how frequently the respondent becomes upset when members of the same five categories criticize his appearance, house, religion, family, community, and country, Marsella and Escudero report only on the original 12 situations, with their variations.

The authors figured the percentages of "often" and "sometimes" responses to both the self-oriented and other-oriented interpersonal-stress statements, with the following results (Marsella and Escudero 1970:4—5):

(1) For both social classes, the percentages of subjects reporting a high frequency of interpersonal stress were quite large suggesting that interpersonal relations in the Philippines are indeed quite stressful.

(2) A number of social class differences were found among the specific combinations of situations-relationships . . In almost all these cases, the lower class subjects reported the greater frequency of stress.

(3) With reference to the type of interpersonal *situation* found to be most stressful, lower class subjects reported a significantly greater frequency of being stressed than high-class subjects in regard to "not meeting obligations to others," and "saying and doing things you wish you would not have said to others."

(4) With reference to the interpersonal *relationships* found to be most stressful, lower class subjects reported a significantly greater frequency of being stressed than high class subjects by family, relatives, and superiors for the self-oriented stress statements. No differences were found for the other-oriented statements.

(5) Among the specific *situation-relationship combinations* investigated, "Not meeting obligations to family" was the most frequently reported *self-oriented stress* for low-class subjects while "Saying things you wish you would not have said to family" was the counterpart for high-class subjects.

(6) Among the specific situation-relationship combinations investigated, "Not being understood by family" was the most frequently reported *other-oriented* for subjects from both classes.

(7) Although the lower class subjects generally reported a higher frequency of stress than the high-class subjects, there were some reversals in this pattern. For example, high-class subject reported a greater, though statistically insignificant, frequency

of stress for the following situation-relationship units: "Not being able to show my anger, frustration, or dislike to friends and strangers" and "Friends, relatives, superiors, and strangers getting things they don't deserve and acting haughty about it."

(8) Lastly, a rank-order correlation (.47) between rankings of the various interpersonal stress *situations* for the two groups suggested that differences existed among the specific *situations* found to be stressful. In general, lower class subjects reported higher frequencies of stress for *self-oriented* statements while high-class reported greater frequencies of stress for *other-oriented* statements.

## Institutional inmates

*Prisoners.* Ashburn studied four conflict.gangs among prisoners of the Manila city jail. Summarizing the interviews he conducted with his 60 respondents, he states (1965:141): "The one characteristic stressed most frequently and vehemently by all the gang members interviewed was that of deep-rooted friendship and smooth interpersonal relations between all members—otherwise known as pakikisama." Indeed, he sees "Pakikisama and mutual protection in an insecure environment" as the primary functions of these gangs (Ashburn 1965:141).

*Mental patients.* Sechrest (1969:312) feels it is almost certain that "the important stresses in the Philippines arise out of interpersonal relations, and there is good reason to believe that some aspects of interpersonal relations are more stressful in the Philippines than elsewhere." He continues by expressing the opinion that despite what others have said about the "smoothness" of interpersonal relations in the Philippines,

one is probably quite wrong if one gets a picture from such writings of easy, tension-free intercourse that runs along nicely with little attention. In fact, interpersonal relations in the Philippines are no smoother than they are elsewhere; they may even be much more difficult. Any achievement of surface smoothness is through careful, constant monitoring and nearly transparent deviousness to obscure difficulties. For example, Filipinos are masters of euphemism, but they are so aware of its use that it fools almost no one. All it does is to preclude the occurrence of an immediate quarrel. The very emphasis in the Philippines on smoothness and care in interpersonal relations shows how difficult they are (Sechrest 1969:312).

Sechrest also believes that the Filipino's strong sense of amor propio gives rise to much of the interpersonal difficulty he experiences. After citing some unpublished data which indicate that Filipino respondents are considerably more sensitive to humiliation than Americans, he concludes:

The Filipino constantly is exposed to the possibility of being "put down" in some manner, but perhaps even more of a strain is imposed by the necessity of avoiding the humiliation of someone else. Thus interpersonal relations are characterized by a superficial aura of good will and an underlying strain and lack of openness (Sechrest 1969:313).

Without firm evidence to support his position that "interpersonal relations in the Philippines are especially difficult" (1969:313), Sechrest nonetheless offers two indications of the correctness of his view: first, the homicide rate in

the Philippines is unquestionably high (Manila's is twice that of Chicago, he says) and, more important, homicides committed in the Philippines, when compared with those of the United States, more frequently develop out of "momentarily difficult interpersonal situations" (his source is his own unpublished study of patterns of homicide in the two nations).

The second indication of the stressful nature of interpersonal dealings in the Philippines is the fact that, more often than with the Americans in his sample, it was interpersonal problems that precipitated the onset of the serious psychiatric disturbances that afflicted the Filipino mental patients he studied. The proportion of Filipino cases in the interpersonal category is 42 per cent; American cases, 26 per cent (Sechrest 1969:313).

Another aspect of the question of stress in interpersonal relations is the problem of hostility and hostile expression. Sechrest summarizes:

Nearly everyone would agree that Filipinos are not given to open displays of hostility, and various observers agree that child-rearing practices stress the suppression of hostile aggression in all its forms (Abasolo-Domingo, 1961; Guthrie, 1961, 1966; Minturn and Lambert, 1964; Varias, 1965). Fights are broken up when they begin, and children are shamed about their aggressive behaviors. My own observations indicate that mothers will themselves deny and relabel the hostility of their children. Thus when a mother hears one of her children say that he "hates" someone, she is quite likely to shush him and to tell him that he is "tired" or that he "doesn't feel well" and attempt to pacify or distract him in some way. Guthrie (1961) found that upper- and middle-class Filipino mothers were much like American mothers in their responses to two "aggression" items but that the attitudes of lower-class mothers, who constitute the majority and who reflect more traditional Philippine attitudes, differed widely. The two items were: (1) A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens; and (2) children should not be encouraged to box or wrestle because it often leads to trouble or injury. On both items lower-class mothers were far more in agreement than either middle- or upper-class mothers. Nor are verbal expressions of hostility much more tolerable than physical ones. The exceptional sensitivity of Filipinos, presumably even Filipino children, to criticism and to threats to *amor propio* make even verbal aggression repugnant and possibly dangerous (Sechrest 1969:320).

## Summary of findings

In the preceding pages, studies on which we reported were grouped according to scope, the range extending from nationwide surveys at one end of the scale to descriptions or analyses of relatively small and well defined groupings at the other. But from a review of each study in the series we learned something about one or more of three different aspects of social acceptance, values, behavior, and personality variables.

These three categories will serve an important function, which is to clarify what we presently know about the theme of social acceptance and the supporting intermediate values of pakikisama and sensitivity to personal affront. For if we are to avoid at least one source of confusion in future discussions of the subject, it is essential that we explicitly and continually distinguish conceptions of the desirable from their related behaviors.

Now, then, we ask our question: What do we know about social acceptance, SIR, and amor propio as of August 1970? It seems to me that, *refinements aside for the moment*, we can make several generalizations, first, about the norms or values themselves, and then about related behavior and personality variables. In briefest form, the statements are these:

VALUES

1. The ability to get along well with others (pakikisama, or SIR) is explicitly and highly valued in Philippine society.

2. Sensitivity to personal affront (amor propio), while not often explicitly mentioned as desirable, is nonetheless regularly recognized and appealed to as the root explanation for approved reactive or retaliatory behavior.

3. The goal of social acceptance is rarely mentioned as such.

4. Both SIR and amor propio appear to be more highly valued among Filipinos than among Americans.

BEHAVIOR

5. Behavior judged appropriate for the above values (Statements 1–3) varies according to situation and the characteristics of the actors involved.

6. Interpersonal activity is frequently stressful, the amount of stress varying by situation and the actors involved.

7. Behavior likely to enhance or repair SIR is more often and more intensively associated with Filipinos than with Americans.

PERSONALITY VARIABLES

8. From the viewpoint of personality, variables that promote SIR are passive qualities such as conformity, endurance, and deference; likely to damage or destroy interpersonal smoothness are assertive characteristics such as dominance, heterosexuality, and exhibition.

9. Filipino students are stronger than Americans on SIR-promoting personal qualities.

I will now explain each of these propositions and add a few substatements.

1. *SIR' is highly valued.* Facility in interpersonal relations is reported as desirable for all family members (Lynch and Makil 1968), especially children (Nurge 1965, Nydegger and Nydegger 1966, Abasolo-Domingo 1961, Jocano

1966a, Guthrie and Jacobs 1966, S. M. Bennett 1970, Flores and Gonzalez 1969, Bulatao 1970). The quality is also considered an important characteristic of the good boss (Guthrie and Azores 1968, Lynch 1970b), political leader (Hollnsteiner 1970b; Abasolo-Domingo 1961), priest (Hottle 1970, Lynch 1970b), and rural-change agent, whether Filipino (Feliciano 1966) or American (Lynch, Maretzki, et al. 1966). Sugarcane planters seek it in their workers (Lynch 1970b), and the latter look for it among their peers (Lynch 1970b) just as street-gang members seek it among theirs, in prison (Ashburn 1965) and out (Jocano 1966b, 1969c). Stevedores on the Manila docks expect to find it in their bosses and gang mates alike (David 1967). Indeed, when thinking about themselves individually or as a culture group, educated Filipinos tend to see this valuing of SIR as characteristically theirs (Abueva 1970, Peabody 1965, Licuanan 1970).

Yet some refinements must be added, for SIR is not equally valued by all, nor is it a simple, uncomplex quality equally desirable *for* all. From the studies reviewed above, the following substatements can be made in clarification and support of the general proposition that SIR is highly valued.

1a. SIR is considered more exclusively and saliently important by the following kinds of people than by their contraries or opposites: rural, lower class, poorly educated, traditional, employes, men (see especially Guthrie and Azores 1968, Guthrie 1970, Lynch 1970b, Hottle 1970, Nydegger and Nydegger, 1966, Hollnsteiner 1970a, Licuanan 1970). Parents apparently want it more for their children than teachers do (Flores and Gonzalez 1969).

1b. The "pleasant" component of SIR is desirable for all; the "deferent" component is more desirable for children, especially girls, than it is for boys or adults (Lynch and Makil 1968, S. M. Bennett 1970, Nurge 1965, Nydegger and Nydegger 1966, Abasolo-Domingo 1961, Guthrie and Jacobs 1966; see also Juan 1967 and Bulatao 1963).

1c. The desirability of SIR varies further by situation and the actors involved. This will be explained under Statement 5, below ("Appropriate behavior is a matter of who and what").

1d. In some special subsocieties, such as street gangs, aggressiveness is a coexistent value (Jocano 1966b, 1969c).

1e. Teaching the value of SIR and behavior in keeping with it is not the duty of teachers or a school (Makil 1970, Flores and Gonzalez 1969); it is apparently the function of parents, siblings, and peers.

2. *Amor propio is valued consciously but implicitly.* Whereas SIR is explicitly valued, and becomes the object of deliberate inculcation by family members and peers, sensitivity to personal affront is implicitly valued,

indirectly taught. By this I mean that with only one exception (Jocano 1969c) the value placed on amor propio is to be derived less from any straightforward statements in its favor than from the approval or recommendation of actions that must have proceeded from it. Because approval is consciously and explicitly given to this behavior, and not to the norm itself, I consider amor propio under Statement 5, below.

3. *Social acceptance is rarely a conscious goal.* Once more, it is Jocano's street gang informant (1969c) who alone articulates the theme of social acceptance. The general run of informants tend to speak only at the level of intermediate and instrumental values. Which is not surprising, if social acceptance is indeed a theme in Opler's (1948:120) sense of the term.

4. *SIR considered more desirable by Filipinos than Americans.* Although there is more evidence for this difference at the levels of behavior and personality, the comparatively greater saliency of SIR among Filipinos is suggested by its importance in the rating of fellow students (Guthrie and Bennett 1970; see also Statements 7 and 9, below).

5. *Appropriate behavior is a matter of who and what.* This introduces the concept of *social zoning*, first proposed in the 1961 statement on social acceptance. Speaking of some academic conferences I had witnessed in the Philippines, I stated (Lynch 1970c:12, above): "The preference for social process (SIR) over social product (conference results and conclusions) is understandable in a system where the highest value is placed on the pleasant word except when the exchange is between good friends or sworn enemies." In lectures that followed, this idea was developed as a distinction into three zones: a zone for close friends, another for sworn enemies, and a "middle zone" for "friendly strangers and acquaintances, uncommitted neutrals" (Lynch 1963:1).

In the studies under review, this conception is supported by the way in which appropriate, or customary, behavior varies depending on who is responding to what stimulus.

5a. When people of the *middle zone* are nonaggressive and cooperative, they should be dealt with in pleasant fashion (Jocano 1966b, Hare 1969, Kaut 1961); when they give positive and well-meant advice or service in keeping with their official roles, one should show gratitude by taking that advice or appreciating that service (Feliciano 1966; Hare 1969); if they show dislike, annoyance, or avoidance toward oneself, one should not retaliate in anger but suffer the situation in silence (Guthrie and Azores 1968); should they actually prove insulting, however, one may rightly retaliate openly or, if he wishes, keep silent (Kaut 1961, Sechrest 1969, Guthrie 1970, Guthrie and Azores 1968).

5b. When a *close friend* gives well-meant advice it should be taken if at all possible (Feliciano 1966); when a friend speaks against oneself, one may suffer in silence or, if he wishes, retaliate openly (Guthrie and Azores 1968).

5c. Under comparable conditions, those who consider SIR most desirable (see Statement 1a) will be *more* likely than their contraries or opposites to react openly and violently to insult or infidelity on the part of middle-zone people or close friends (Guthrie and Azores 1968; Guthrie 1970).

5d. Children's quarreling with peers is always to be discouraged and suppressed (Abasolo-Domingo 1961, Nurge 1965, Nydegger and Nydegger 1966, Guthrie and Jacobs 1966, Sechrest 1969, Guthrie 1961).

6. *Interpersonal relations are often stressful.* Despite the high value placed on SIR, or perhaps because of it, interpersonal dealings often fall short of the norm. Although it is difficult at this time to give any definite meaning to the term "often," certain substatements are possible.

6a. Stress is more often reported for family members than for strangers (Marsella and Escudero 1970).

6b. Compared with less well educated and poorer respondents, those who are better educated and wealthier report being stressed by superiors more often; by relatives, less often (Marsella and Escudero 1970).

6c. Stressful interactions are reported among both rural and urban Filipinos (Jocano 1966b and 1969c, Marsella and Escudero 1970, Sechrest 1969).

6d. There are some indications that the incidence of interpersonal stress may be greater in the Philippines than in the United States (Sechrest 1969).

7. *SIR-related behavior is more typical of Filipinos than Americans.* This statement is supported in reference to Filipinos and Americans in general by Sechrest's findings (1969) and the student group judgments reported by Peabody (1968). Evidence also indicates that this kind of difference exists among students (Hare 1969) and priests (Hottle 1970) of the two nations.

8. *SIR-related personality variables are more passive than assertive.* This is based on the findings of Bulatao (1970), Juan (1967), and Solina (1968). For this reason it is valid primarily of students and army men, though I know of no evidence that argues against its generalization, at least as a hypothesis.

9. *SIR-related personal qualities are more pronounced among Filipino students than Americans.* Direct comparisons have been made by Bulatao (1963), Hare (1969), Hare and Hare (1968), and Guthrie and Bennett (1970). The statement seems well established.

## DISCUSSION

Several different but related questions have been posed by those doing research on social acceptance, SIR, and amor propio. The most common one asked to date has been that which guided my own exploratory study, namely, "Is smoothness of interpersonal behavior considered highly desirable in the Philippines?" This question has by now been amply answered in the affirmative and need not, in my opinion, be asked in future. It might profitably be replaced, however, by a more probing inquiry for which some answers are already available in Statements 1a to 1e, above: "Under what conditions is SIR considered more desirable, under what conditions less so?"

A second question, less commonly asked to date, is this: "Is interpersonal behavior in fact always smooth?" Since Filipinos are men, not angels, the answer is unfortunately but inevitably No. But there is also a third question that has been asked, at least implicitly, by those who have gathered information on the frequency of open disagreements and stressful encounters (Jocano 1966b, Marsella and Escudero 1970). The question is this: "Is interpersonal behavior in fact smooth more often than not?" What the answer is, we simply do not know, because the available data (Jocano 1966b, Marsella and Escudero 1970) are not conclusive in their present form. Jocano's tabulation of quarrels, disagreements, and misunderstandings is an *absolute* frequency count, which can tell us nothing about the *relative* incidence of overtly rough encounters, and *relative* frequency is the point at issue.[34] On the other hand, Marsella and Escudero derive their percentages from a tabulation of responses in which "Often" and "Sometimes" are lumped in the same category, distinguished from "Seldom" and "Never." An "often" response might possibly be defined as meaning "in the majority of cases," but a "sometimes" answer could not be so interpreted.[35] Hence what we learn from these two studies (relative to our question) is merely that on many occasions disagreements and stressful situations arise. We do not learn in what percentage of cases this occurs.

There is a fourth question that must be asked, namely: "When should a household, or community, be considered 'fraught with conflict'?" (Jocano 1966b:286). To answer this one, considerable exploratory research would be called for, since the question, when asked in the context of frequencies of overtly disagreeable encounters, supposes the prior existence and acceptability of a scale we do not have. This would be a scale by which, for instance, the community's position between "very aggressive" and "very nonaggressive" could be predicted from the known ratio of rough to smooth encounters in a given period of time. However, until we have the results of some representative behavioral studies of families and communities, possibly conducted along the lines proposed and illustrated by investigators such as the Barkers (1961,

1963), Wright (1966), Fawl (1963), or pioneers like Chapple (1940, 1949) and Bales (1950), we cannot hope to construct such a scale. Frankly, I wonder if it would be worth the effort.

In retrospect, I feel that the 1961 statement on social acceptance helped us to learn a few things about Philippine culture. For by setting forth a series of propositions that others could use as foci for their research, it encouraged the systematic examination of several facets of Philippine values. The resulting convergence of anthropological, psychological, psychiatric, and sociological research has enriched both social science and the reading public. It is an added, but unnecessary, comfort to know that the 1961 statement came fairly close in many ways to the findings as they now stand, nine years later.

Looking ahead, I would hope to see even greater coordination in values research, since much time, energy, and money can be saved if those who contemplate studies of this kind will agree to collect their data in such a way as to make their findings comparable with those of other workers. Here I think especially of agreement on sampling methods, and on the instruments and techniques of observation that might, as a general rule at least, be favored. Agreement should also be sought on what segments of Philippine society, what roles, and what situations should be given priority in future studies.[36]

Values research is well worth doing, and well worth doing well. For if there is anything needed at this point in Philippine history, it is a better understanding of what it is that makes a Filipino a Filipino. Without this studied awareness of that special mixture of modal strengths and shared weaknesses that distinguishes us from other strong-weak members of the human family, pronouncements about "the Filipino way" and "the true Filipino" will predictably vary, often in contradictory fashion, from person to person, hour by hour. With this knowledge, however, we can hope to recognize, accept, and build on the great strengths that we rightly claim as our own. One such strength, clearly Filipino, is a courteous respect for the ways and wishes of others.

## NOTES

1. Mary R. Hollnsteiner, *Reciprocity in the lowland Philippines* ("IPC Papers," No. 1), Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1961. After its first printing this inaugural number of the *IPC Papers* was not issued again as such. The article was instead incorporated into the second number of the *Papers, Four Readings on Philippine Values.*

2. An American friend expressed dismay at this double and triple publishing. Unlike most of the readers we hoped to reach in one journal or another, he could afford all three publications.

3. Most professionals of my acquaintance correctly gauged the article's intent and level of certitude—see, for example, Barnett (1966) and Castillo (1966). Students, on the other hand, were distressingly prone to read the essay as if it were fresh from Mt. Sinai, engraved on tablets of stone.

4. This heading is inserted to highlight the fact that any values found in Philippine society can be found elsewhere. Intercultural value differences are matters of mix, proportion, and stress of various conceptions of the desirable, not questions of their presence or absence.

5. It should be noted that in comparing Filipinos with Americans my purpose is to *illustrate* a difference in norms which I believe to exist. The purpose is not to *prove* anything by the comparison; the study is exploratory, not descriptive or explanatory. Nor is the comparison one of *observed behavior* except insofar as that behavior reveals underlying norms and values (see Williams 1960:409–410). I am comparing norms and conceptions of the desirable.

The "American" referred to here is the average American described by Gillen (1955–56) in his summary of national American values. I have relied somewhat less on Du Bois (1955) and Williams (1960). Gillen's article is especially important, since he incorporates in it the contents of about 30 earlier studies by many authors, with the express intention of deriving a list of values "dominant in United States culture as a whole" (Gillen 1955–56:105). Du Bois, who aimed at portraying the "dominant value system of middle-class Americans" (1955:1232), leaned heavily on the Kluckhohns and their associates (which is good), but also deliberately restricted somewhat the population of which she spoke. To be avoided, I thought, were authors who differed from Gillen and Du Bois in that they limited themselves to those special subcultures found among organization men, the members of particular professions, and people belonging to relatively distinctive regional or ethnic groupings.

The American value of frankness (Gillen's value No. 11: "Honesty or frankness in human relations") is related to other values he identifies, such as "individualism" (No. 7) and "inner-regulated morality" (No. 17). Apropos of the latter, Du Bois (who was portraying *middle-class* Americans) comments that conformity is a "more recent value in American culture." With Gillen I feel it is not yet to be taken as part of the *national* culture unless it be understood as a conformity of similarity, not of interpersonal agreement.

6. The fact that people make great sacrifices to send their children to school, for example, tells us that something highly valued is at stake. It need not be the education itself, of course, but somewhere beneath the complex of human activities involved are conscious and unconscious motivations traceable to the values that interest us here. Similarly, if children are continually indoctrinated in the need for agreeable behavior, are scolded when they fail to behave in this manner, and are commended when they excel in it, we also know that cherished values are likely to be at work. It must be noted, however, that we cannot argue from the mere frequency of violations of norms to their unimportance. One must first ascertain whether or not all presumed violations are in fact just that. A closer examination may show that in some cases the apparent violations are

actually *applications* of the norm, as when a child is pulled out of school, for instance, but only to allow a younger sibling to have *his* chance to study; or when two people have a bitter quarrel, but only because one spoke to the other less softly, or "coolly," than he should have. Another question that must be asked is whether or not the violations are censured, or punished. If they are, there is a sense in which their frequency is irrelevant. For example, if erring drivers are summoned to pay their parking fines, and they do so—however reluctantly—the number of tickets issued is not a concern: "no parking in designated places" is clearly the accepted *norm*.

7. The extremely basic values, or themes, are in my scheme buried below two levels of less fundamental values; namely, *instrumental values*, which are important only for what they can achieve or get, and *intermediate values*, which people appreciate both for what they are and for what they accomplish. As we shall see, the thematic goal of social acceptance is hypothesized to lie below the level of awareness. Enjoying a place of conscious honor, however, are two intermediate values, one outgoing and the other defensive: smooth interpersonal relations and sensitivity to personal affront *(amor propio)*. These in turn are supported and manifested by a number of traditional behavior patterns valued insofar as they make SIR or amor propio genuinely effective.

8. A group of sociology students at the University of the Philippines looked into this child-rearing arrangement by studying 30 faculty families who lived on campus. They concluded that nursemaids, or *yayas*, do indeed transmit traditional beliefs, fears, and bogey men to their charges, despite the parents' contrary wishes and instructions (Aquino et al. 1969).

9. This statement is based especially on the experience of those 15 Filipinos and Americans who participated in the intercultural seminar conducted 1949—53 and mentioned earlier in this article (under "Sources of the essay"). However, the existence of this Filipino-American difference seems to follow from the finding that the reading of nonverbal cues to feeling is a skill the Filipino child must learn at a very early age (Guthrie and Jacobs 1966:203).

10. I have made a change here. The phrase "sensitivity to personal affront" replaces the original words "shame and self-esteem." This formula still seems valid, however: amor propio *equals* self-esteem *equals* sensitivity-to-personal-affront.

11. In this sentence we are speaking about the average American that Gillen (1955—56) had in mind and the rural Filipino we described seven paragraphs back. In the preceding sentence it was the American who comes to the Philippines and the Filipino who goes to the States.

12. This tendency to give the agreeable answer to a friendly stranger is often called the "courtesy bias." It occurs in several forms: most commonly it entails giving the inquirer the answer most likely to please him (e.g., by agreeing to assist him (though one cannot), by declaring his political candidate one's own choice (though he is not), or by saying "yes" when one means "no" (Jocano 1966a:24); another important form is the expression of a "built need," rather than the *felt* need (e.g., asked what his biggest problem is, the rural household head is likely to construct his need to fit the known or supposed identity of the inquirer: if the visitor is from the rural health unit, the answer is a resident doctor and nurse; if from the government water people, the cry is for piped water; if the questioner is from the agricultural extension service, fertilizer, and so on; see Lynch et al. 1966:100—101).

13. These surveys were conducted in both Manila and the provinces.

14. This is the average American again, from Gillen (1955—56).

15. See Footnote 14.

16. See Footnote 14.

17. Most of this paragraph is new. The change is made to make it unmistakably clear that amor propio, or sensitivity to personal affront, is here seen as an intermediate value peculiarly related to social acceptance. Hiyâ also promotes behavior likely to preserve, enhance, or regain social acceptance, but it serves the same function for all other socially approved values and norms as well.

18. The principle of *awâ* was first added to this tentative values outline in 1962, in the first revision of *Understanding the Philippines and America*.

19. When describing the best Peace Corps Volunteer, 63 per cent of respondents mention only pakikisama; when describing the worst, 85 per cent speak only of the lack of it.

20. In order of number of mother-tongue speakers (1960 census), the eight languages are Cebuano, Tagalog, Iloko, Ilongo, Bikol, Waray, Kapampangan, and Pangasinan. BRAC is the acronym for Baguio Religious Acculturation Conference.

21. The actual words and phrases most often used by respondents are given in the footnotes to Table 1. To consider deferential behavior an integral part of pakikisama is justified on grounds of the factor analysis of Juan (1967:27), an association which had earlier been perceived by Bulatao

22. For a detailed description of the good superior, see Guthrie and Azores 1968: 22–23.

23. Research sites were Barrio Mojon (municipality of Malolos), Santol (Bigaa), Cambaog (Bustos), Balatong A and Balatong B (Pulilan). See Feliciano 1966:260, Note 8.

24. Since the funds for this survey were furnished in large part by the National Federation of Sugarcane Planters (NFSP), it is referred to in Table 4 as the IPC/NFSP exploratory survey. The farms finally studied were 63 in number, a 1.4 per-cent sample of the 4,366 farms listed by the eight planters' associations included in the survey (Lynch 1970b:8). In the second phase of the study, not reported here, 193 farms were investigated.

25. Not every farm had the full quota of nine respondents, so that our final count was 63 planters, 45 encargados, 50 cabos, 171 permanent and 116 temporary workers (Lynch 1970b:11).

26. Compared to his workers, the planter also tends to mention as desirable a greater number of universalistic qualities (Pahilanga 1970:46–47).

27. In this passage, as throughout the article from which it is excerpted (Jocano 1966a), the author makes generalizations about "the Filipino" without qualification–as well he might in a public lecture such as this source originally was. From his Footnote 6, however, and from the examples he gives, I judge he refers especially to the rural lowland Filipino.

28. The circumstances are these: when the speaker (1) does not know, (2) wants to impress, (3) is annoyed, (4) wants to end the conversation, (5) half-understands the instruction or what is being said, (6) is not sure of himself, (7) thinks he knows better than the one speaking to him.

29. The EPPS provides measures of 15 personality variables, based on choices the respondent makes when given 225 paired statements and asked, "Which of these two statements is more characteristic of what you like [or how you feel]? Scoring the schedule consists in counting the number of choices favoring each of the 15 variables. Results are expressed in percentiles for each of the personality variables, or "needs," the names of which are found in the text. For further information, see Allen L. Edwards, *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule* (New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1959).

30. The variables and their loadings on Factor B are these: Endurance (EPPS), .52; Conformity (SIV), .48; Benevolence (SIV), .47; Deference (EPPS), .36; Intraception

(EPPS), .34; Recognition (SIV), -.66; Support (SIV), -.51; Heterosexuality (EPPS), -.50; Succorance (EPPS), -.50; Exhibition (EPPS), -.33 (Juan 1967:26).

31. The first order factors loading on second order Factor a, with their loadings, are the following: Factor B (SIR), .67; Factor F (Autonomy, -.50; Factor K (Dominance), -.51.

32. "Second order Factor *c* is bipolar, identified on one end by Factor D, which is affiliation, and on the other by Factor H, which is leadership. Since this is a doublet, no clear interpretation can be given. However, it is suggested that perhaps some leadership traits are not to be identified with the warm outgoingness reflected in affiliation" (Juan 1967:38).

33. This particular datum is from the first unpublished version of the Abueva study (p. 39). The percentages that appear in parentheses in the preceding sentences come from the second preliminary version of the paper.

34. To arrive at some estimate of the *relative* frequency of overt disagreements in Malitbog and Santa Ana, I made several conservative assumptions about the total number of interpersonal encounters an average person was likely to have in these two communities over a six-month period. Jocano's figures (1966b:286) for quarrels and misunderstandings were then considered against this estimated base. The resulting frequency was much the same in both places: one overtly disagreeable experience for every 600 pleasant ones.

35. Another difficulty I find with the Marsella-Escudero study is its failure to establish even in rough fashion the average absolute frequency of *all encounters* the respondent has, respectively, with family members, relatives, friends, superiors, and strangers. For it seems that if a respondent deals with family members hundreds of times more frequently than with the four other categories of people, we should expect—when we inquire about the incidence of *stressful* encounters with these family members—to get "often" answers in far greater abundance than we otherwise would.

36. In writing this paper I profited greatly from the shared insights of a number of my colleagues at the Institute of Philippine Culture and the departments of psychology and sociology and anthropology, Ateneo de Manila. But my greatest debt is to F. Landa Jocano, University of the Philippines, for had it not been for his thoughtful critique (1966b) of the 1961 statement, I might never have attempted this article.

### References

Abasolo-Domingo, M. Fe
   1961      Child rearing practices in barrio Cruz na Ligas. Unpublished M.A. thesis.
            Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines.

Abueva, Jose V.
   1970      Administrative culture and behavior and middle civil servants in the
            Philippines. *In* Development administration in Asia. Edward W. Weidner,
            ed. Durham, Duke University Press. Pp. 132–86.

Alzona, Encarnacion
   1956      Ideals of the Filipinos. *In* Looking at ourselves. Delfin Fl. Batacan, ed.
            Manila, Philaw Building. Pp. 262–83.

Aquino, Rodolfo, C. Banal, E. Ceniza, R. Songco, and R. Sy
   1969      A study of the role of the yaya in child-rearing practices among U.P.
            faculty members' families. Unpublished research paper. Department of
            Sociology, University of the Philippines.

Ashburn, Franklin G.
   1965      The recent inquiries into the structure-function of conflict gangs in the
            Manila city jail. Asian Studies 3 (1):126–44.

Bales, R. F.
   1950      Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, Addison-Wesley.

Barker, Roger G., and L. S. Barker
   1961      Behavior units for the comparative study of cultures. *In* Studying person-
            ality cross-culturally. Bert Kaplan, ed. New York, Harper and Row.
            Pp. 457–76.

   1963      Social actions in the behavior streams of American and English children.
            *In* The stream of behavior. Roger G. Barker, ed. New York, Appleton-
            Century-Crofts. Pp. 127–68.

Barnett, Milton
   1966      Comment in discussion during the session on values (May 14), Third
            Annual Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society. Philippine
            Sociological Review 14 (4):304–5.

Bennett, Susan M.
   1970      Data derived from preliminary findings of study on home environment
            and creative thinking among sixth-grade students in five private schools in
            Manila. Unpublished manuscript. Quezon City, Institute of Philippine
            Culture, Ateneo de Manila.

Brown, Robert
   1963      Explanation in social science. The International Library of Sociology and
            Social Reconstruction. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bulatao, Jaime C.
   1963      Personal preferences of Filipino students. Philippine Sociological Review
            11 (3–4):168–78.

   1970      The Manileños mainsprings. *In* Four readings on Philippine values ("IPC
            Papers," No. 2). Third edition, revised and enlarged. Frank Lynch and
            Alfonso de Guzman II. editors. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University
            Press, 1970. Pp. 87–95.

Castillo, Gelia T.
   1966      Comment in discussion during the session on values (May 14), Third
            Annual Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society. Philippine
            Sociological Review 14 (4):300–301.

Chapple, Elliot D.
1940    Measuring human relations: an introduction to the study of the inter-
        action of individuals. General Psychology Monographs 22:3–147.

1949    The interactor chronograph: its evaluation and present application. Person-
        nel 25:295–307.

Chirino, Pedro, S.J.
1604    Relación de las islas Filipinas. Ramón Echevarria, trans. Manila, Historical
        Conservation Society, 1969.

Cumming, Elaine, and D. Schneider
1961    Sibling solidarity: a property of American kinship. American Anthropologist
        63 (3):498–507.

David, Randolf S.
1967    Human relations on the waterfront: the cabo system. Philippine Socio-
        logical Review 15 (3–4):135–40.

Delgado, Juan J., S.J.
1754    Historia general sacro-profana, politica y natural de las islas del poniente
        llamadas Filipinas. Biblioteca historica Filipina. Manila, Imp. de El Eco
        de Filipinas de D. Juan Atayde, 1892.

Du Bois, Cora
1955    The dominant value profile of American culture. American Anthropologist
        57 (6):1232–39.

Ealdama, Eugenio
1948    Alameda. Manila, University Publishing Co.

Edwards, Allen L.
1959    Edwards personal preference schedule. New York, The Psychological
        Corp.

Fawl, Clifford L.
1963    Disturbances experienced by children in their natural habitats. *In* The
        stream of behavior. Roger G. Barker, ed. New York, Appleton-Century-
        Crofts. Pp. 99–126.

Feliciano, Gloria
1966    Sociological considerations in communicating change to Filipino farmers
        in five barrios of the land reform pilot area in Bulacan province. Philippine
        Sociological Review 14 (4):257–65.

Flores, Pura M., and M. B. Gonzalez
1969    Interparent-teacher Q-sort agreement in the assessment of children's be-
        havior. *In* Socio-psychological development of Filipino children. Pura M.
        Flores, ed. Quezon City.

Gillen, John
1955–56 National and regional cultural values in the United States. Social Forces
        34:107–113.

Guthrie, George M.
1961    The Filipino child and Philippine society. Manila, Philippine Normal
        College Press.

1966    Structure of maternal attitudes in two cultures. Journal of Psychology 62:
        155–65.

1970    The psychology of modernization in the rural Philippines ("IPC Papers,"
        No. 8). Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Guthrie, George M., and F. M. Azores
    1968        Philippine interpersonal behavior patterns. *In* Modernization: its impact in
                the Philippines III ("IPC Papers," No. 6). Walden F. Bello and Alfonso de
                Guzman II, eds. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press. Pp. 3–63.

Guthrie, George M., and A. B. Bennett, Jr.
    1970        Implicit personality theories of Filipinos and Americans. Unpublished
                manuscript. Quezon City, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila.
                (Typescript)

Guthrie, George M., and P. J. Jacobs
    1966        Child rearing and personality development in the Philippines. University
                Park, Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Hare, A. Paul
    1969        Cultural differences in performance in communication networks among
                Filipino, African, and American students. *In* Modernization: its impact in
                the Philippines IV ("IPC Papers," No. 7). Walden F. Bello and Alfonso de
                Guzman II, eds. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press. Pp. 24–
                45.

Hare, A. Paul, and R. T. Hare
    1968        Social correlates of autonomy among university students in the Philippines.
                United States, and Africa. *In* Modernization: its impact in the Philippines
                III ("IPC Papers," No. 6). Walden F. Bello and Alfonso de Guzman II, eds.
                Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press. Pp. 92–104.

Hollnsteiner, Mary R.
    1966        Comment in discussion during the session on values (May 14), Third
                Annual Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society. Philippine Socio-
                logical Review 14 (4):298–300.

    1970a       Reciprocity in the lowland Philippines. *In* Four readings on Philippine
                values ("IPC Papers," No. 2). Third edition, revised and enlarged. Frank
                Lynch and Alfonso de Guzman II, editors. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila
                University Press, 1970. Pp. 64–86.

    1970b       Manila microcosm: leadership, belonging, and viewpoints in a Tondo
                neighborhood. Unpublished manuscript. Quezon City, Institute of Philip-
                pine Culture. Ateneo de Manila. (Typescript)

Hottle, Joseph M., O.F.M.
    1970        The people's priest: interaction and role expectation patterns in four
                poblaciones of Negros Oriental. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of
                Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila.

Jocano, F. Landa
    1966a       Filipino social structure and value systems. *In* Filipino cultural heritage,
                lecture series no. 2. F. Landa Jocano, ed. Manila, Philippine Women's
                University. Pp. 1–26.

    1966b       Rethinking "smooth interpersonal relations." Philippine Sociological Review
                14 (4):282–91.

    1969a       The traditional world of Malitbog. Quezon City, Community Development
                Research Council, University of the Philippines.

    1969b       Growing up in a Philippine barrio. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

    1969c       Some aspects of the emerging youth culture in the Philippines. Solidarity 4
                (7):53–63.

Juan, Isabel R.
    1967        A factor analytic study of ability and personality tests currently used in the
                Philippines. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Psychology,

Kaut, Charles R.
    1961    Utang na loob: a system of contractual obligation among Tagalogs. South-western Journal of Anthropology 17 (3):256–72.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and W. Kelly
    1945    The concept of culture. *In* The science of man in the world crisis. Ralph Linton, ed. New York, Columbia University Press, Pp. 78–106.

Leavitt, Harold J.
    1951    Some effects of certain communication patterns on group performance. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 46:38–50.

Licuanan, Patricia B.
    1970    The impact of modernization on Filipino adolescents. Unpublished manuscript. Quezon City, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila. (Mimeo.)

Loarca, Miguel de
    1582,    Relación de las Islas Filipinas. *In* The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898. Vol. 5. Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson, eds. Cleveland, Arthur H. Clark Co., 1903. Pp. 34–187.

Lundberg, George A.
    1960    The transition to science in human relations. *In* Readings in sociology. Edgard A. Schuler and others, eds. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co. Pp. 6–12.

Lynch, Frank
    1956    Marriage. *In* Area Handbook on the Philippines. Chicago, Human Relations Area Files, Inc. Pp. 653–58.

    1959    Social class in a Bikol town. Research series no. 1. Chicago, Philippine Studies Program, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.

    1963    Toward more effective Philippine-American interpersonal relations. Outline for a lecture given at an Agency for International Development seminar (Manila, June 18–19). (Mimeo.)

    1970a    Socioeconomic status of Ateneo students and selected inventories of Philippine national problems. Report submitted to the Presidential Committee on University Development, Ateneo de Manila (January 15). Quezon City, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila. (Mimeo.)

    1970b    A bittersweet taste of sugar. A preliminary report on the sugar industry in Negros Occidental. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press.

    **1970c**    **Social acceptance reconsidered.** *In* **Four readings on Philippine values ("IPC Papers," No. 2). Third edition, revised and enlarged. Frank Lynch and Alfonso de Guzman II, editors. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1970. Pp. 1–63.**

Lynch, Frank, M. R. Hollnsteiner, and others
    1962    Understanding the Philippines and America: a study of cultural themes. Quezon City, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila. (Mimeo.)

Lynch, Frank, and P. Q. Makil
    1968    The BRAC 1967 Filipino family survey. Saint Louis Quarterly 6 (3–4): 293–330.

Lynch, Frank, T. W. Maretzki, A. B. Bennett, Jr., S. M. Bennett, and L. D. Nelson
    1966    The Philippines Peace Corps survey: final report. Honolulu, International Programs and Social Science Research Institute.

Makil, Perla Q.
    1970    Preliminary report on the IPC/PAASCU study of influentials. Unpublished manuscript. Quezon City, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila.

Marsella, Anthony J., and M. Escudero
1970 Interpersonal stresses among urban Filipino men from different social classes. Accepted for publication in Philippine Sociological Review 18 (number still not known).

Minturn, L., and W. W. Lambert
1964 Mothers of six cultures. New York, John Wiley and Sons.

Morga, Antonio de
1609 Sucesos de las islas Filipinas. *In* The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898. Vol. 16. Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson, eds. Cleveland, Arthur H. Clark Co., 1904. Pp. 25–209.

Murray, Henry A., W. G. Barrett, E. Homburger, W. C. Langer, and others
1938 Explorations in personality. New York, Oxford University Press.

Nurge, Ethel
1965 Life in a Leyte village. Seattle, University of Washington Press.

Nydegger, William F., and C. Nydegger
1966 Tarong: an Ilocos barrio in the Philippines. Six cultures series, vol. 6. Beatrice B. Whiting, ed. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Opler, Morris E.
1948 Some recently developed concepts relating to culture. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 4 (2):107–122.

Pacana, Honesto Ch.
1958 Notes on a Filipino rule of conduct: non-interference. Philippine Sociological Review 6 (1):29–30.

Pahilanga, Romana J.
1970 Role expectations of sugarcane planters and workers in Negros Occidental. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila.

Passini, Frank T., and W. T. Norman
1966 A universal conception of personality structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 4 (1):44–49.

Peabody, Dean
1968 Group judgments in the Philippines: their evaluative and descriptive aspects. *In* Modernization: its impact in the Philippines III ("IPC Papers," No. 6). Walden F. Bello and Alfonso de Guzman II, eds. Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press. Pp. 114–28.

Phillips, Herbert P.
1966 Thai peasant personality. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Plasencia, Juan de
1589 Customs of the Pampangas in their lawsuits. *In* The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898. Vol. 16. Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson, eds. Cleveland, Arthur H. Clark Co., 1904. Pp. 321–29.

Rivera, Generosa F., and R. T. McMillan
1952 The rural Philippines. Manila, United States Mutual Security Agency.

Sechrest, Lee
1969 Philippine culture, stress, and psychopathology. *In* Mental health research in Asia and the Pacific. William Caudill and Tsung-Yi-Lin, eds. Honolulu, East-West Center Press. Pp. 306–334.

Selltiz, Claire, M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook
1967 Research methods in social relations. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Smith, John E.
    1958     Value convictions and higher education. New Haven, Hazen Foundation.

Solina, Romeo A.
    1968     A factor analytic study of personality variables and creativity among Filipino soldiers. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Department of Psychology, Ateneo de Manila.

Stoodley, Bartlett H.
    1962a    A cross-cultural study of structure and conflict in social norms. *In* Society and self. Bartlett H. Stoodley, ed. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe.

    1962b    Normative attitudes of Filipino youth compared with German and American youth. *In* Society and self. Bartlett H. Stoodley, ed. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe.

Torrance, Paul E.
    1965     Rewarding creative behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Varias, Rodolfo
    1965     Introduction to mental hygiene. Quezon City, Phoenix Publishing House.

Williams, Robin M., Jr.
    1960     American society. New York, Alfred A. Knopf.

Wright, Herbert F.
    1966     Recording and analyzing child behavior. New York, Harper and Row