Psychology Research in the Philippines: Observations and Prospects*

Allan B. I. Bernardo
De La Salle University, Manila

The paper is an attempt to take stock of the state of psychology research in the Philippines. In particular it seeks to describe the research culture, the problems, and opportunities characteristic of it. To provide a stimulus for this assessment a survey of psychology publications was undertaken. The results of the survey were used as a springboard for making observations about substantive concerns and level of analysis of psychology research in the country. The paper traces limitations of psychology research to the lack of a real research culture and identifies some opportunities that could lead to the development of such. The paper ends with some recommendations regarding how psychology research can grow and play a more important role in the life of our nation.

* This article is based on the paper of the same title presented during the 34th Annual Convention of the Psychological Association of the Philippines, July 3-5, 1996, Philippine Social Science Center, Diliman, Quezon City. Preparation for this paper was supported in part by a Spencer Fellowship awarded to the author by the National Academy of Education (USA). Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to the author at the Psychology Department, De La Salle University, 2401 Taft Avenue, Manila; E-mail: claabb@dlsu.edu.ph,

More and more psychologists in the Philippines are recognizing the value of research in the discipline. What used to be the concern of only a small sector of academic psychologists is now of interest not only to a wider range of academic psychologist, but also to a growing number of psychology professionals and practitioners. Even individuals, institutions, and other organization outside the discipline of psychology are now more frequently seeking out the services of psychology researchers. But what is the status of psychology research in the Philippines? Are the researches being conducted advancing the frontiers of scientific understanding of human behavior? Are these promoting better practice in the discipline? Are these facilitating more active efforts at applying and using psychological knowledge for the pursuit of the goals of our society?

In this paper, I will attempt to take stock of the current state of psychology research in the Philippines. The goal of this exercise is to have some determination of the general state of psychology research being undertaken by Philippine psychologists, and of the problems and opportunities characteristic of the same. For this paper, I will define psychology research in a "minimalist" sense: Psychology research is a careful, systematic, patient study and investigation of some psychological phenomenon. I will also assume that the broad goals of psychology research are (a) to explain human behavior, and (b) to give humankind the power to understand, predict, and control human behavior for society's benefit. These broad goals cover the objectives of both basic and applied researches. I also wish to clarify that in using the word "explain," I take explanations to mean the attempt to relate phenomena to something other than themselves, for example, to causes or predictors.

A Survey of Psychology Publications

As a springboard for my discourse, I undertook a survey of Philippine publications in psychology from 1986 to 1996. By surveying the publications, I assumed that I would get a broad overview of the types of researches being done. I wish to clearly state that the survey I undertook was not intended to be an exhaustive one (although I believe that I was

able to survey an overwhelming majority of the publications), neither are the results intended to be a definitive representation of the psychology research environment in the Philippines. The survey was done to provide a stimulus for the discussions and analysis of the state and future of psychology research in the Philippines.

For the survey, I used the following selection criteria: the published work should have a Filipino as the first author who should be presently or previously based in a Philippine institution. Using this criteria, a total of 151 books, monographs, and journal articles were included in the survey.

The books and monographs were publications of the Ateneo de Manila University Press, the De La Salle University Press, the University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies, the Philippine Psychology Research and Training House, and a few foreign agencies. Textbooks, edited books, and proceedings were not included in the survey.[1]

The journal articles were published in the following periodicals: *Philippine Journal of Psychology* (published by the Psychological Association of the Philippines), *Social Science Information* (Philippine Social Science Council), *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement* (Center for Educational Measurement), *Sikolohiya, UPDP Reports* (both U. P. Department of Psychology), *Layag* (Psychology Department, DLSU), *Philippine Journal of Counseling Psychology* (Counselor Education Department, DLSU), *Philippine Social Science Review* (U.P. College of Social Science and Philosophy), *Edukasyon* (U.P. Education Research Program), *Philippine Journal of Industrial Relations* (U.P. School of Labor and Industrial Relations), *Philippine Journal of Public Administration* (U.P. College of Public Administration), and a few international journals. Articles published in edited

[1] The books of Tomas Andres and Margarita Go Sinco-Holmes were not included because the former does not consider himself a psychologist, and the latter's books are actually compilations of published newspaper columns. The book of the current author was also not included in the survey.

books were not included in the survey; unpublished papers were also not included.[2]

The surveyed publications were first assessed in terms of the substantive area of psychology of the research problem or topic. A particular publication was classified in at least one category, some were coded in more than one category. The frequency of publications per substantive area of psychology are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency of Research Publications for Different Areas of Study in Psychology

Area of Psychology	N	%
Social Psychology	63	41.7
Child Psychology	19	12.6
Family Psychology	15	9.9
Health Psychology	13	8.6
Clinical Psychology	11	7.3
Counseling Psychology	8	5.3
Industrial and Organization Psychology	8	5.3
General Psychology (History/Theory)	5	3.3
Methodology	5	3.3
Educational Psychology	4	2.6
Cognitive Psychology	4	2.6
Psychological Measurement	3	2.0
Cross Cultural Psychology	1	0.7

The publications were also assessed in terms of the type of research involved in terms of the type or level of analysis. For example, a research may a descriptive research study or a research may involve development of theoretical models. A few researches were classified as involving more than one type of research analysis. The frequency of publications per type of research are summarized in Table 2.

[2]The journal articles of the current author were not included in the survey.

Table 2. Frequency of Research Publications according to Type of Research

Type of Research	N	%
Descriptive	78	51.7
Theoretical Analysis	19	12.6
Review Of Literature	18	11.9
Experiment	16	10.6
Theory Development/Model Building	12	7.9
Program Development./Evaluation	10	6.6
Statistical Analysis	4	2.6
Test Development (Reliability/Validity)	3	2.0
Historical Analysis	2	1.3

I used the results of these two classification schemes as the stimulus for making observations which I describe in the following section.

Observations

The first important observation I made was that the publication is not a very good indicator of research activity. In particular, it seems that publications underreport the amount of research being done. For example, the survey of publications shows that a very small number of researches are being done on psychological measurement. However, a recent still unpublished study of Ortega and Lapeña (1996) indicates that there are many research efforts directed at test development, which involves, among others, studies on the validity and reliability of the psychological measures. Clearly the outputs of most of these researches do not see print. There are also a growing number of psychology research studies being conducted in various organizations related to business and industry, and in the political domain. These studies are mostly commissioned researches and hence the research reports are not for public circulation. (An exception is the paper of Lapeña, 1996, which addresses some methodological issues in the conduct of public opinion surveys during elections.) Finally, though the number of student theses and dissertations is growing, as suggested by the emergence of more graduate

programs in psychology, very few of these research efforts are published. All these suggest that a huge majority of research efforts are not published in forms that are accessible to the larger psychology community.

The survey also showed that a big proportion of the studies were on topics related to social psychology. If one considers that at least some of the researches in industrial and organization psychology, health psychology, psychological measurement, and family psychology could be subsumed under social psychology, a clear majority of the studies would be related to social psychology. There are several possible reasons for the large share of social psychology researches. First, there is more support (institutional and financial) for researches in social psychology, particularly for the applied areas like gender studies, migration studies, among others. The substantive concerns of social psychology also overlap with the concerns of other basic and applied social sciences like sociology, political science, public administrations among others. Hence, there are wider opportunities for interdisciplinary research efforts. Related to the two points is the fact that there are more venues for publication of social psychology research (some of those surveyed were published in non-psychology journals).

However, a clear majority of the publications in social psychology report researches are not very sophisticated theoretically. About 68% of the social psychology publications involve descriptive researches; that is, the report merely described some sociopsychological phenomenon in some specific sample, without any attempt to draw some theoretical implications from the data, or even to relate the data to some theoretical framework.

But the same observation can be made for all the other areas surveyed. In general, most researches published were not directed towards developing new or more advanced explanations of psychological phenomena. Indeed, most of researches surveyed do not go beyond reporting the data- gathering process and the data obtained. In most of these researches there was no attempt to relate the data to even the simplest conceptual or theoretical frame. Most of those that attempt to explain or make sense of data patterns do so by appeal to existing

theoretical models developed by foreign psychologists. It would not be inaccurate to say that most of the researches published were atheoretical. Only in very few cases was data used to advance theory even in the slightest way. Psychology research in the Philippines seems to be largely viewed by many researchers as involving only data-gathering and data-description. Theory seems to play no major role in the research enterprise; researches do not lead to theory, and theoretical considerations do not motivate the choice of research variables, method, design, or data explanations.

An interesting observation I made was related to papers published by the proponents of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* and the papers of other social psychologists. The observation regards the lack of any marked difference in the theoretical (or atheoretical) stance of the two sets of papers. Papers in social psychology and in *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* in the past ten years, all tended to be descriptive in nature, made token appeals to theory or to theoretical frameworks, and often did not lead to new theoretical insights about the phenomenon being studied. There are some difference in the methods used to gather data. In particular, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* papers tended to be a little less quantitative than other social psychology papers, although the latter also included a lot of descriptive and qualitative data and analysis. The *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* papers also tended to be more "self-conscious" about the choice of the method and took greater pains at describing and justifying the method. Indeed, if it were not for my knowledge about the publishers of the paper, and of the "affilitations" of the authors, it would have been very difficult to distinguish between the *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* papers and those that were not, at least in so far as the publications of the past ten years were concerned (see related observations raised by Sta. Maria, 1996).

Another significant observation was the very narrow range of topics addressed in the papers published. The researches were very similar in concern. A sizable proportion of studies were on stress and coping, perceived problems, attitudes, and beliefs. These topics are certainly of interest to psychology readers all over. However, the apparent fixation on these topics does not bode well for research in the Philippines because

it suggests that researchers have implicitly set rather narrow boundaries on the range of topics that psychologists can investigate. The boundaries certainly do not reflect the diversity and complexity of the discipline/ profession, nor the lively and dynamic intellectual activity characteristic of research in other broad areas of psychological research. Pragmatically speaking, the greater loss is the fact that the narrow range of topics also do not reflect the range of social and other practical concerns to which psychological theory and knowledge is pertinent.

Overall, it seems that most of recent psychology research in the Philippines is not making as strong an impact on psychological explanation and theory as it could. If this is so, we can also wonder about how much psychology research and knowledge is being used to analyze and understand social problems, to advance psychological practice, and to strengthen advocacy on important issues.

The Absence of a Research Culture: Some Sources of Difficulty

The apparent vapidity in most of recent psychology research and publication are not without causes. In this section, I will speculate regarding the various possible causes of the state of affairs, and most of these causes can be related to the general absence of a research culture.

Lack of research resources. The most basic factor that brings about this lack of a research culture is the lack of available and accessible resources for research. By resources I am referring to sustained financing for researcher initiated projects, access to literature, new ideas, methods, among others. Even in the most developed psychology research communities in the major universities, such resources do not compare to those in our neighboring countries, much less to the centers of research excellence in Europe, North America, and East Asia. But aside from this most obvious obstacle to developing a research culture, there any many others that are or equally gravity. These other factors are discussed in the following observations.

Research as a Marginal Activity. Many Philippine psychologists do not perceive research as being continuous with their primary functions as psychologists, that is, being either in professional practice, teaching, or advocacy work. Many practitioners are not inclined to do research, some probably even have some level of disdain for research which is implicitly expressed in exclamations of the value of actual experience. Most faculty members of different colleges and universities do research and publish mainly to enhance their academic status and/or to augment their income. In other words, many faculty members try do research and try to publish papers to get promoted and/or to attain higher scholarly status among peers. Others may engage in research to supplement their meager salaries with research honoraria that can be quite sizable in some cases. Finally, psychologists who do advocacy work often do not effectively draw from research to advance their causes. Yet if one thinks about it and if one looks at how research has greatly enhanced practice, teaching, and advocacy in other countries, research ought to be integral to all psychology functions. Still, none of the major sectors of the Philippine psychology community truly perceives research as being essential to their functions, and many of those who do research may be doing so not for all the right reasons nor with the right motivations.

Most researches are actually done by students as part of degree requirement or by faculty members who are full time teachers and/or administrators. Most students do not have time and disposition to re-write thesis for publication nor to sustain research efforts. The research activity is a one-time ordeal that one needs to complete to get the desired degree. It is not uncommon to hear graduate students who do not wish to have anything to do with their thesis or dissertation, or with research in general, after they submit their bound copies. (One wonders what their professors have done to develop such an aversion to the research process. Or maybe we should think about what professors are NOT doing to develop the students' appreciation for their research efforts.)

Unlike the students, most faculty members will actually claim to value research. However, we all know that most faculty members do not have time and resources to do research because of the time and energy

required for teaching and other school activities. So those who manage to do research do so as an auxiliary to teaching.

Random and Isolated Efforts at Research. Because of the condition of faculty researchers, their research activities are often not programmatic. Research efforts, even of one researcher, remain isolated individual efforts that do not build on each other. In some cases, the choice of research topic is determined by exigencies like the availability of research funds. So a faculty researcher might do a research project on sexuality, then shift to a project on peace, then shift to overseas contract workers, as research funds become available in each of these areas.

The non-programmatic nature of research is an important impediment to the advancement of knowledge, practice, and advocacy through research. Significant, substantive contributions to the discipline almost never emerge out of singular research efforts. It is through sustained, disciplined, and thoughtful inquiry on a particular research topic or on related research questions that meaningful insights emerge. Indeed, among the works that I surveyed, the ones that do make substantive contributions to understanding of psychological phenomena and practice in the Philippines are those that seem to be part of larger research programs. Examples of these would be the researches of Carandang (e.g., 1987, 1993) on related aspects of the well-being of Filipino children, of Tan (1997) on factors that shape choices across the lifespan, of Montiel (e.g., 1995, 1997) on related aspects of Philippine political life, of Torres (1997) on the interfacing themes related to gender and labor, of Clemeña (1993) and of Villar (1997) on counseling practices in the Philippines, and of Samonte (1992) on acculturation problems of migrants and other sojourners. If one looks further before the ten years covered in the survey, other notable examples would be the works of Fr. Bulatao, and the late Virgilio Enriquez. Unfortunately the research programs of these individuals are the exceptions rather than the rule.

Lack of a Critical Mass and Peer Review. Another possible artifact of the lack of a research culture is the absence of a critical mass of

researchers that are necessary to initiate and maintain a peer review system of research outputs and to push for theory development. I sometimes feel that the level and quantity of psychology research in the Philippine is still such that a true peer review system might kill what little enthusiasm and energy there is for research. There is that feeling that one needs to be sensitive to the impoverished environment for research. However, peer review need not be viewed as a mechanism that is aimed at cutting down to pieces all works that are deemed below par. Instead, the peer review system can be used to maximize whatever substance and potential impact reside in current work. In other words, we can also adopt a more relaxed peer review system, rather than the nearly cut-throat system that is operating in advanced research cultures. But basic to this peer review system is the willingness to accept constructive criticism in one's work (and not regard such as affronts to one's professional status or personal worth) and the belief that peer review will lead to improvements in one's scholarship. I still do not see this willingness and belief as being an integral part of our present culture.

Myths about Psychology Research. Speaking of beliefs, there are also many misperceptions and myths that many psychologists hold about research that create unnecessary obstacles to research activity. For example, many believe that one needs an advanced degree like a Master's degree or a Ph.D. to do research. Whereas it is true that working for these advanced degrees will provide one with more extensive training on research methodology and exposure to a wider range of theory, such degrees are not necessary requirements for doing research. At the risk of committing a logical fallacy, the irrelevance of such advance degrees are underscored by the fact that a good number of psychology Ph.D.s that I know show very little proficiency in research. I base my assertion on the notion that research is essentially about ideas. Having an M.A. or a Ph.D. does not endow one with ideas. Anyone can have ideas, and the research skills come into play when these ideas need to be developed, systematized, and verified.

Another belief that I often hear from Filipino research psychologists is that before one can develop theories and models of some phenomenon one needs large sets and tracks of data; or that one needs to have volumes

of observations before one can begin constructing theory. Theory is assumed to be derived from these large masses of data by induction. But if one looks at the history of how many important psychological theories are developed, one will not find these large tracks of data. The process of deriving theory comes from an interesting mix of inductive and deductive processes, creativity and speculation. Again, theories are about ideas; ideas can come even from single observations.

The previous myth is most likely related to the unusual sort of empiricism I observe among research psychologists. This empiricism takes the form of letting the data speak for itself. Often I think Philippine research psychologists think that data gathering IS research, and that the research process ends with a description of the data and some notes on data patterns. This point is certainly verified by the preponderance of descriptive researches among the publications surveyed. This type of empiricism (which might be vestiges of the atheoretical empiricism of radical behaviorism) will lead to lots of data, but almost surely will never lead to understanding of psychological phenomena. In the history of most sciences, data have never spoken for themselves, scientists have always had to use their wits to discern what these data can say about the things that hold their interest.

Having sat in a number of thesis and dissertation panels, I also observe a common belief that large sample sizes are needed to make one's research meaningful. The larger the sample size, the more meaningful one's research is. Fortunately, we have access to the theories and publications of many clinical and counseling psychologists who have amply demonstrated the usefulness and fruitfulness of small sample or even single subject designs. Of course, sample size is a consideration that needs to be reckoned with depending on the specific research goals and methods.

A more apparent fascination among academic research psychologist is that about method. It is not uncommon to see and hear even senior academic psychologists who speak of methodological restrictions as if they are part of the ten commandments. In reality, the assumptions of different methods are negotiable and are negotiated within the community

of researcher scholars investigating a topic. It is easy to adhere to this mistaken belief, if one is not part of an active research community. The tendency is to think that the tenets described in the research textbooks should dictate actual research practice. But if one is truly immersed in a sustained pursuit of answers to important questions, one realizes that methods are tools that one needs to deploy using careful discernment and judgment. The recent ruminations of Torres (1997) on her research activities is most consistent with this last point.

In summary, the absence of a viable research culture is not solely defined by the absence of certain elements (like research resources, peer review system, or programmatic research agendas). Rather, from the above discussion, we can see that the absence of this viable research culture is defined by the existence of features in the current culture (beliefs, attitudes, perceptions of psychologists, and structures in the organizations of the different sectors of psychologists).

Prospects and Opportunities

So far, this paper has sounded like a series of cynical complaints and supercilious remarks. But I do not wish to simply decry the state of psychology research in the Philippines. I also see many bright prospects and opportunities for growth in psychology research. These opportunities will not only lead to greater research activity, but also to a greater impact of research activity on the advancement of theory, practice, and advocacy.

For example, there is a clear and visible increase in demand for research leading to theory/models from non-academic sectors. Some industry researchers, who previously would have simply wanted accurate profiles of their target markets, now want to ground their strategies on sound, and if possible, verified theories about Filipino behavior. Advocates and community workers in many Non-Government Organizations have seen their various efforts bear fruit in some cases but not in others, and now want some theoretical understanding of why these things happen. These demand for theoretical understanding could

prove to be an important force for advancing psychological theorizing in the Philippines, if the Philippine psychology researchers decide to respond to the demand.

Another bright spot is the fact that there seems to be a little bit more funds for research from various non-academic sectors. Industry, government, non-government organizations, private foundations, among others also fund various specific types of research activities. But I do not wish to give the impression that the research community is awash with money; there is a little bit more out there and that can go a long way if we plan and program our research activities rationally.

Likewise, college and university administrators are quickly recognizing research as integral to higher educational functions. Even the Commission on Higher Education (CHED, 1995) explicitly articulated their belief about the value of using research as means to improve higher education. As a result, colleges and universities, particularly those who are concerned with accrediting their programs, are now channeling some parts of the budget for faculty researches. It is also not coincidental that in the proposed minimum requirements for B.A. and B.S. Psychology programs, research courses take up a good chunk of the required number of units (Intal, 1997). Notable, there is also an increase in the number of venues for publication and presentation of research outputs. These venues are usually initiatives of different colleges and universities.

An important development is the easier access to new information afforded by the electronic media, particularly the Internet. A researcher who has access to Internet service will have a valuable pass to a large library of information (the problem will be muddling through the mass of information) to supplement whatever library resources are available in the nearest university. The availability of Internet services is significant because the cost of the hardware and services required to have access to large amounts of information is quite inexpensive compared to the costs of acquiring the range of journals and books that would cover the same range of topics. The reasonable costs could provide an opportunity for

organizations with limited financial resources to allow their staff to have access to the latest information about the discipline that would be very expensive in other forms.

Probably related to the development of electronic media, there are currently more opportunities for collaboration with foreign researchers. Aside from the easier means of communication provided by electronic mail, there is also a growing interest in cultural, cross-cultural, and also interdisciplinal research efforts all over the world. Lest I be accused of catering to foreign interests rather than local ones, I wish to clarify why these opportunities for international collaborations are important. First, I think that any form of collaboration is valuable and a potentially rich source of intellectual advancement for those involved. This is particularly so if the collaborating parties come from different perspectives, frameworks, and experiences. Such meetings of different minds is always a fertile ground for insights to grow. If participants in the collaboration have co-equal status, the intellectual reward in such a collaboration will most likely be mutual. Second, many foreign researchers have more access to research funds, simply because their countries have long decided that research is a worthwhile long term investment. However opportunistic this may sound, collaborating with such researches will allow us to benefit from their bounty, so to speak. Third, many foreign researchers also have more access to research literature, research tools like software, equipment, and others. Many also have active research laboratories or research teams which provide communities for peer review of works in progress. Many also have access to venues for publication and dissemination of research findings. Hence, collaborating with such psychology researchers will give Philippine psychologists a chance to enhance their research skills, shape their own values about research work, and draw from the existing research supports and resources available.

The final window of opportunity I note is the increasing number of collaborations among practitioners and academics. In recent years, I see more joint efforts between psychology practitioners in government, in industry, in schools, and in private practice on the one hand, and psychologists in academe. This cooperation between previously autonomous sectors (see Dayan & Bernardo, 1997) will most definitely

only lead to good things. The rich insights of practitioners from the field can only complement the analysis of scholars in academe. This complementation will not only serve as the onus for many research efforts, but can also ensure that research ideas and findings are pushed to their fullest implications and applications.

Again, I have to put caveats to my assertions, for I do not also wish to sound too optimistic. The various prospects and opportunities I just described are still rather restricted in scope. I do not think and envision major changes that will alter the research milieu. Indeed, it seems to me that the people or sectors of the psychology community who can take advantage of the opportunities described are those who are already ahead in the research game. In particular, the research psychologists in the three major universities: Ateneo de Manila University, De La Salle University, and the University of the Philippines, Diliman, and those who work with these units, would have the research track record that would necessary to attract the support from different sectors who wish to do research, and to establish linkages with foreign researches, and so on. They will be in the best position to benefit from these windows of opportunity, and the reality is the almost everyone else will be at a competitive disadvantage.

Conclusion: Challenges and Exhortations

I did not paint a very rosy picture of the psychology research culture in the Philippines. Many of the limitations characteristic of psychology research were traced to a lack of a viable research culture in the psychology community. There are a number of Filipino research psychologists who have been making contributions to the development theory and practice in Philippine psychology. However, their efforts cannot mask the larger reality in which the pursuit of new ways of understanding the Filipino experience is viewed as a poor cousin of the other functions of psychologists: practice, teaching, advocacy. There are also important developments that open windows of opportunity for creating a research culture in the Philippines, yet the reality is that only a small proportion of the total population of Philippine psychologist

and of psychology institutions have the wherewithal to compete and take advantage of these opportunities.

If we wish to develop a research culture from the status quo, I think the leading psychology institutions need to play a major role. The psychology departments of the major universities, those that already enjoy relatively stronger research support and capabilities should strive to develop effective research cultures in their own institutions. Individual psychologists in these institutions should define their research agenda, and work within these programs of research. The collective mass of psychologists in this unit should create a critical mass that will put in place a peer review system. These psychologists should also strive to showcase what psychological research can contribute to improving psychological understanding of important personal and social phenomena, to advancing psychological teaching, practice, and advocacy. These small-scale communities of researchers can serve as models for other institutions and individuals who wish to engage in meaningful and substantive psychology research. More important, these communities of researcher can serve as centers of psychology research around which smaller institutions can link up and network. Little by little we can develop larger scale communities of researchers who will advance the pursuit of new psychological understanding.

Professional organizations, like the Psychological Association of the Philippines, can also play an important role. These organizations should provide more venues for dissemination and discussion of research outputs. In particular, the organizations should encourage the presentation of research findings and also the public commentary on the worth and usefulness of such research findings. These professional organizations should serve as a resource for accessing information (research literature, available funding, opportunities for collaboration, etc.). Many individual psychologists have no real access to these resources, even in their colleges, universities, offices, and other organizations. The professional organization can be a major source of these resources, or at least a clearinghouse for information about these research resources.

Finally, all psychologists should (re)think how research can complement their primary functions. Research is not only for those who have Ph.D.s (but it would also be good if we have more well-trained Ph.D.s), nor only for a selected number of endowed individuals. Research and systematic inquiry about the human experience can be and should be a responsibility of everyone who wishes to be a psychologist.

It is true that we now know much about the psychology of many aspects of our existence. We know enough that we can present coherent theoretical accounts of many phenomena in our psychology courses. We know enough to make a difference in the lives of our clients and in the efficacy of the different organizations we service. We know enough to make strong positions on issues that concern us. But we do not yet know everything we need to know about human behavior and the factors that affect it. There is so much that we still need to find out and understand. The context within which human experience is developing is constantly changing, forever expanding the range of human experience that need to be understood.

The Filipino psychologist needs to take a more active role in developing substantive and functional knowledge about of the psychological life of the Filipino people. The Filipino psychologist needs to do research that will lead to a meaningful understanding of this psychological life. The culture in which the Filipino psychology researcher exists is an unsupportive one. But there are opportunities, and we must take on the challenge.

References

Carandang, M. L. A. (1987). *Filipino children under stress: Family dynamics and therapy.* Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Carandang, M. L. A. (1993). *Making connections: A group therapy program for Filipino autistic children and their families.* Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Clemeña, R. M. S. (1993). *Counseling psychology in the Philippines: Research and practice* (2nd Ed.). Manila: De La Salle University Press.

Commission on Higher Education. (1995). *Long-term higher education development plan (1996-2005).* Pasig City: CHED.

Dayan, N. A. & Bernardo, A. B. I. (1997, July). *Psychology in the Philippines.* Paper presented in the International Council of Psychologists 55th Annual Convention, Graz, Austria.

Intal, A. M. G. (1996). *The CHED B.A./B.S. Psychology curriculum.* Paper presented during the 34th Annual Convention of the Psychological Association of the Philippines, Quezon City.

Lapeña, M. A. G. L. (1997). 1995 pre-election surveys: A retrospective view of the survey method. *Layag, 1,* 11-38.

Montiel, C. J. (1995). Bargaining for peaceful termination of unsuccessful coup attempts in the Philippines. *The Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 3*(4), 215-227.

Montiel, C. J. (1997). Citizen-based peace-making in a protracted war: Two Philippine cases. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 3*(2), 115-134.

Ortega, S. C. & Lapeña, M. A. G. L. (1996, July). *Locally-developed psychological tests: A critical review.* Paper presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the National Academy of Science and Technology, Manila.

Samonte, E. L. (1992). Sources of stress and coping mechanisms among Filipinas in West Germany and Holland. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 25*(1), 20-39.

Sta. Maria, M. A. (1996). Is the indigenization crisis in Philippine social science resolved in Sikolohiyang Pilipino? *Layag, 1*, 101-120.

Tan, A. L. (1997). Choices through the life cycle. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 30*, 1-16.

Torres, A. T. (1997). Method, mind or meaning: Shifting paradigms in Philippine psychology. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 30*, 17-37.

Villar, I. V. G. (1997). *Western approaches to counseling to counseling in the Philippines*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.