

CHANGING RURAL INSTITUTIONS IN A RICE GROWING BARRIO

CAROLINA A. DEL ROSARIO

*Department of Agricultural Education,
University of the Philippines at Los Baños*

Social change refers to changes, in the course of time, to the roles, the institutions or the orders comprising a social structure: their emergence, growth and decline (Merrill 1965). Development, therefore, is inevitably linked to changes in institutions. Tinkering with institutions became the hallmark of development thrusts, past and present. Rural institutions bear the impact of all these innovations and recently, a trend toward replacing these old institutions with new ones has been observed. What has become of these traditional institutions? What are the people's perception and response to these changes in relation to productivity, employment, equity and community relations? The study sought to identify and describe existing rural institutions in the barrio and the changes occurring in these.

Conceptual framework

There is no single and all embracing theory of social change. Likewise, there is no single, prominent cause of social change. Bock's position on social change is adapted. Social change occurs because something happens, either within a society or impinging upon it from without. In neither case can change be fully explained from the nature of the social system itself. Something must be added, and that "something" is an event or series of events that happens at a particular time and place.

In 1966 the dwarf rice varieties (HYV's) came together with the technology package, causing a departure from the practice of planting "self-supporting" rice varieties. Then came the land reform program and a host of development programs. But in step with these

development schemes was the very high birth rate and the tremendous increase of population pressure on the land as well as the nation's resources. The worldwide oil battle and its repercussions was importune in coming, too.

Methodology

The key informant survey was used in establishing and describing existing rural institutions in Barrio Pinagbayanan from 1965 to 1979. The interview schedule was used to determine the prevalence, locale, manner of "practice" and nature of the seven institutions. Perception of the benefits and disadvantages of these institutional changes with regard to productivity, employment, equity and community relations was likewise studied. Analysis of how institutional innovations impinge on the traditional institutional arrangements was also done. Finally, to enable the researcher to gather the data unhurriedly and to enable her to make observations needed in writing, she stayed in a farmer's home for three weeks.

Five farmers were lengthily interviewed. They served as the key informants. And a random sample of 119 drawn from the total of 396 household heads were interviewed to elaborate on the nature and changes in the institutions. The sample was 30 percent of the total and proportionately distributed to 30 percent of each occupational stratum in the barrio. The strata included the farmer, landless agricultural worker, nonfarm employed, fisherman and/or livestock raiser and the jobless sectors.

Percentages, means and frequencies were

used to describe respondent characteristics, as well as to measure patterns of practice of each institution. As a case study, this paper follows the descriptive method.

Description of the study area

The municipality of Pila, Laguna has a total of 13 barrios. It is 87 kilometers south of Manila and about 28 kilometers southeast of the University of the Philippines at Los Baños. It is bounded on the northwestern side by the Laguna de Bay.

Barrio Pinagbayanan is the largest barrio. It is a rice growing community where the first farmers' association was organized. In 1970, The Pinagbayanan Farmers' Association was formed and in 1973 it was re-registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission in compliance with the government's requirements on cooperatives development.

Changes in the seven rural institutions

The Philippine Community Development Program began in the 1950s when the Presidential Assistant on Community Development was created by President Ramon Magsaysay. As early as 1956, the "concept of nation-building based on the self-help philosophy and the holistic approach" was embodied in the nation's community development program. At present, it is regarded as a program designed to "develop and strengthen communities and institutions through a process which shall encourage local initiative and active participation in undertaking developmental activities for national socio-economic progress."

However, this broad objective of developing and strengthening communities and institutions is questionable. The multitude of development programs had its effects on communities and institutions, desirable and undesirable. Subtly, rural institutions decayed or radically transformed. Communities likewise progressed or either tried to cope

with these changes. Some were better able to cope, others less so.

Ironically, rural institutions, were taken for granted in the haste to join the development bandwagon. Institutions were left unstudied and were even labeled as "constraints to rural development on account of scanty evidence and weak theory" (Castillo 1979). Therefore, if one is to know the society and be part in bringing about these changes, its institutions and its genesis merit the first scrutiny. Only after this first step can one proceed to test the effects of these institutions on development.

Changes in seven rural institutions in a rice growing barrio as well as the effects of these changes on the people and the community were studied. People's assessment and preferences for the old and new versions of these institutions and their reasons were also documented. Their perception of the causes of these vast changes were also elicited together with their assessment of changes in their level of living and equality in the barrio through these years.

The seven rural institutions studied were: bayanihan, credit, landlord-tenant relationship, farmer-landless agricultural worker relationship, sources of technology, mechanization and barrio organization.

Bayanihan. In 1965, bayanihan in Pinagbayanan was done in all kinds of activities — farming and livestock activities, social activities which involved individual households or family oriented, fishing and general community activities (see Table 1). "Lusungan" or cooperative farming was engaged in by all farmers and nonfarmers alike. It was a merry occasion because the menfolk and the ladies were engaged in a common endeavor.

Farmers with contiguous farms were members of this "lusungan" group. When the

Table 1. *Bayanihan activities residents joined in 1965 and 1979*

Bayanihan activities	1965								1979								
	No. of persons involved					Total	Average Range			No. of persons involved					Total	Average Range	
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J					F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J			
Farming and livestock raising activities																	
Land preparation	17	4	4	11	—	36	11	2-30	2	3	—	1	—	6	3	2-3	
Grow, pull, cut, haul seedlings	3	2	1	7	—	13	11	2-30	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	2	
Transplant rice seedlings	1	5	3	3	1	13	14	6-50	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	—	
Harvest/thresh palay	2	2	—	5	—	9	13	4-30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Make, repair dikes	—	1	—	6	—	7	14	3-20	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	3	
Haul palay	1	—	1	2	—	5	6	5- 6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Plant vegetables and fruits	—	2	1	—	—	3	4	3- 5	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	3	
Clean clear ricefield	—	1	—	—	1	2	4	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Weed ricefarm	—	1	—	1	—	2	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Cooking during planting	1	—	—	—	—	1	10	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Haul coconut	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	2	
Social activities (individual) or family oriented)																	
Transfer a house	4	10	14	35	4	67	41	8-100	1	1	6	20	—	38	46	6-60	
Wedding	3	6	7	17	1	34	5 to entire barrio	5 to entire barrio	1	6	7	18	1	33	6 to entire barrio	6 to entire barrio	
Vigil, prayer for the dead	3	4	4	16	1	28	5 to entire barrio	5 to entire barrio	1	4	4	13	1	23	6 to entire barrio	6 to entire barrio	
Build a house	2	5	7	12	2	28	7	2-10	2	—	3	6	1	12	7	2-10	
Baptismai	3	2	2	10	—	17	5 to entire barrio	5 to entire barrio	1	3	1	9	—	14	6 to entire barrio	6 to entire barrio	

Table 1 (continued)

Bayanihan activities	1965						1979									
	No. of persons involved					Total	Average Range			No. of persons involved						
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J					F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J	Total	Average
Courting	1	1	1	2	—	5	20	10-30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Make a coffin	—	—	5	1	1	7	4	2-10	—	—	2	1	—	3	8	2- 8
Build poultry/duck house	—	—	—	3	—	4	3-5		—	—	4	—	4	5	3 8	
Buy/slaughter/inject swine	—	—	2	—	—	2	15	15	—	—	2	—	—	2	15	15
Construct pit privy	—	—	1	—	—	1	3	2- 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dig well	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	3	3
Chop firewood	—	—	—	1	—	1	4	4	—	—	4	1	—	5	4	4
Arbiter for couple who eloped	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Scrub house	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	4	4
Fishing activities																
Dock/launch banca	1	4	7	18	2	32	16	2-40	—	2	2	13	—	17	13	3-20
Bumbon — dalag	3	13	2	13	1	32	8	7-10	2	9	—	8	—	19	8	7-20
Bumbon — shrimp	1	1	—	5	1	8	2	2- 3	—	—	—	7	—	7	2	9
Bumbon — dulong	—	2	—	—	1	2	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pukot	—	3	1	3	—	7	8	5-19	—	3	—	2	—	5	7	5- 8
Pante	—	1	—	1	—	2	2	2	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	2
Kitang	—	1	—	1	—	2	2	2	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	2
Panaklob	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	3	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	3
Repair banca/motor	3	—	2	—	1	6	6	2- 8	1	—	1	1	1	4	2	2
Repair fishnet	—	2	—	3	—	5	7	12-13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Haul snails from the lake	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2	3	3
General community activities																
Pave/repairs road	—	1	4	7	3	15	5 to entire barrio	5 to entire barrio	—	2	1	4	1	8	3	20-50

Table 1 (continued)

Bayanihan activities	1965							1979								
	No. of persons involved					Total	Average Range		No. of persons involved					Total	Average Range	
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J				F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J			
Clean barrio	-	-	2	1	-	3	20	20	-	-	3	4	1	8	15 to entire barrio	15 to entire barrio
Build resthouse	-	-	-	2	-	3	3	5-7	-	-	-	1	-	1	6	6
School activities	-	-	1	-	-	3	4	4	-	1	2	4	-	7	5	2-10
Barangay police	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	12	12
Tree planting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	4 to entire barrio	4 to entire barrio
Total	49	75	74	188	20	406			11	40	61	124	6	221		

Note: F means farmer, LAW—landless agricultural worker, NFE—nonfarm employed, F/L—fishermen and/or livestock raiser and J the jobless.

rain started, anyone in the group could start the rotation of work. Plowing, harrowing, leveling and transplanting were done. Repair of dikes and planting of seedlings for transplanting were part of the job, too. The few farmers who had no carabaos repaired dikes, hauled seedlings or passed lambanog around. The nonfarm workers who joined this activity were laborers who planted or harvested these fields. Some who did not help lingered to partake of the food.

Transferring a house within the barrio was the most common bayanihan activity cited in 1965. It was an ordinary project because many residents did not own the lot where their house stood. When a better location was available, it was not a difficult task to transfer for there were many ready to help.

Social occasions were well attended affairs in the barrio. Weddings, baptisms, vigils and prayers for the dead were cooperatively done. The community acted as one in these events. The time, effort, even expenses were immaterial for "utang na loob" had to be repaid so that when the need arose reciprocal help would come. Constructing houses either for newly-weds or established families were common. Courting was done not solely by the interested male, for he invited friends to help him clean the lady's yard or put up a fence to enclose the yard. Constructing coffins and becoming an arbiter for couples who eloped were not extraordinary those days.

Fishing was popularly joined in. The various fishing operations done needed varying number of persons to help. Repairing fish nets, docking and/or launching bancas were also part of the bayanihan.

Community projects, as expected, were done cooperatively. Barrio roads were paved and made in the 1960s for Pinagbayanan became a barrio only in 1953.

By 1979, a radical change in bayanihan was observed. Bayanihan in farm and nonfarm

activities had deteriorated to the point that it was less frequently done and by a smaller number of people. "Lusungan" was practiced rarely and only by a minority. Those who did were mostly relatives and the owners of the few carabaos left in the barrio. Harvesting, clearing the ricefields, weeding and hauling were no longer done in a free-labor basis. Bayanihan in nonfarm activities were still done but not as frequently and enthusiastically as before.

Several reasons account for these changes. Mechanization and the subsequent hiring of landless laborers to do almost all farm operations were perceived to be the prominent factors that brought about these changes. However, the rising cost of living and the rising production expenses were also salient factors. Because of the pressure of providing sufficiently for the family with the meager income earned, many barrio residents preferred to be paid for the labor expended. When their incomes sufficed in the past, they did not mind giving their labor and time free. Now, when a day's labor was barely able to feed a family decently, relationships were given a lesser priority. Providing for one's family took first priority.

It was not surprising that many respondents preferred the old, traditional institution. Sixty-seven percent preferred the 1965 state, twenty-four percent the present and eight percent had no preference.

Many preferred the old bayanihan because it was fun. The cooperative farming or "lusungan" was one activity most referred to. Also, they were able to help one another and had many helpers in their work. Some even perceived it was less expensive to farm because one spent only for the food. Others added that food was unlimited during those years.

Working to earn for their own families was the main reason given by those who preferred the present bayanihan. Some even added they

were able to finish their work in the farms faster than during "lusungan" days. Others surmised that it was less expensive to farm by hiring machines and men than incurring expenses for the food.

Ironically, most barrio residents perceived the old bayanihan will never return because of the present trend of mechanization and the consequent hiring of hand tractors and laborers. And there were only few carabaos left in the barrio.

The change in bayanihan activities affected personal relationships among barrio residents. Some were inhibited to secure help, others preferred not to be disturbed. People wanted to get wages for the labor and time expended. Others did not want to be interrupted in their work. Their reasons, were of course, based on the perceived benefits and economic remuneration, whether accountable or not.

Most farmers were also adversely affected. They were hard pressed to have enough capital for all the wages paid these days. Those with no capital resorted to borrowing at high interest, so there would be meager net gain, assuming the crop will succeed. Others, since they did not have the capital needed, leased their farms to others or simply did not plant.

Credit. From 1965 to 1979, relatives and the sari-sari stores were the primary credit sources (see Table 2). However, there was a decrease in borrowing from relatives during these years. The same trend was observed in the following sources: friends, neighbors, "sa palay," Chinese middlemen and the landlord.

Borrowing cash and later paying in cavans of palay for the equivalent amount is called "sa palay." Lenders under the scheme were either landlords or businessmen. The landless agricultural workers were the main borrowers from this source throughout these years but the farmers had markedly stayed from borrowing from these sources since 1973 for

they have been borrowing from the rural banks.

Chinese and Filipino middlemen or "suki" were also popular because a large percentage of barrio residents were engaged in duck raising. This system also perpetuated the dependence of these raisers on these capitalists.

The rural banks became a well-known source of capital among residents in 1973. This came about through the government's thrust on cooperative development. Membership in the Pinagbayanan Barrio Association and the Pila Multiple-Purpose Cooperative entitled one to non-collateral production loans.

Several reasons account for changes in credit sources. In 1973, many borrowers were able to repay loans upon maturity or earlier. This led many others, even inexperienced ones, to start their duck-raising project. An overburdened lake resulted in harvest of poor quality feed. Prices of these feeds also shot up, and typhoons added to the problem. Ducks reacted to changes in climate and were adversely affected when rains came. It took sometime before the ducks could lay eggs again after these natural calamities. Loans matured, interests piled up and so did the penalty charges. Borrowers found themselves deep in debts, not only to the rural banks but also to other sources.

This phenomenon was not restricted to duck raisers alone. A crop's failure among farmers took some cropping seasons to pay. And they had to keep on borrowing capital because they did not have any savings.

The capitalists seized the opportunity. Because many could not obtain loans anew from the banks, they offered capital to the needy raisers. As with the established practice, duck eggs had to be given in at P0.01 to P0.02 less than the current selling price per egg. This was the interest charged. Money for

Table 2. Sources of credit in Pinagbayanan in 1965 and 1979

Sources	1965						1973						1979								
	Frequency of mention					Total	Percent ^a	Frequency of mention					Total	Percent ^a	Frequency of mention					Total	Percent ^a
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J			F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J			F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J		
Relatives	5	12	13	43	4	77	64.71	3	13	10	41	2	69	57.93	4	12	10	36	3	65	54.62
Sari-sari store	9	12	8	26	4	59	49.58	9	16	10	27	3	65	54.62	8	14	10	25	3	61	51.25
Neighbors	5	6	6	16	1	34	38.65	4	8	4	16	-	32	26.89	4	-	4	14	-	22	10.48
Sa palay	7	10	3	15	1	36	30.25	2	10	1	12	1	26	21.84	2	10	1	10	1	24	20.17
Middleman-Chinese	4	3	6	29	4	46	38.65	1	3	4	15	-	23	19.33	1	-	2	1	-	4	3.36
Middleman-Filipino	4	2	3	4	4	17	14.29	6	2	4	12	2	26	21.84	5	6	4	23	2	40	33.61
Friends	1	2	2	6	1	12	10.08	1	2	-	6	1	10	8.40	2	1	-	5	1	9	7.56
Middleman-fishing	-	2	-	8	-	10	8.40	-	1	-	8	-	9	7.6	-	1	-	10	-	11	9.24
Landlord	6	-	1	-	-	7	5.88	1	1	1	-	-	3	2.52	2	-	1	-	-	3	2.52
Rural Bank	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	12	4	11	19	3	49	41.17	6	1	2	1	-	10	8.40
Private money lender	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	1.68
Children	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	1.68	-	-	-	-	2	2	1.68
Samahang Nayon	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-1	-	1	0.84
Does not borrow	2	2	3	1	1	9	5.88	2	-	2	1	1	6	2.52	2	-	-	-	-	-6	4.20
Total	43	51	45	149	20	308	-	41	60	47	157	15	320	-	36	46	36	128	14	260	-

^aPercent of total number of respondents.

Note: F means farmer, LAW—landless agricultural worker, NFE—nonfarm employed, F/L—fisherman and/or livestock raiser and J the jobless.

family expenses could be obtained from these persons, too.

More than half of the respondents indicated preference for the 1965 state, twenty percent the 1979 state and only two percent the 1973 condition. Twenty-four percent had no preference.

Expectedly, the ease of payment of credit in 1965 was the foremost reason for the preference. Also, key informants elaborated that debts were not sought during those years; if ever they borrowed, it was promptly repaid.

Those who preferred the 1979 credit situation in the barrio had diverse reasons. The most common cited was the easy repayment scheme adapted by the Los Baños Rural Bank to enable borrowers to repay. Extension of non-collateral loans was another reason for preference.

In general, the changes in the credit situation these fourteen years were not encouraging. Because of the combined uncontrollable circumstances like typhoons, floods and availability of low priced, good quality feeds and the people's lack of versatility to adapt to these changes, both the lending institutions and the barrio people faced a dilemma. Credit sources could not collect the large amounts lent. The people, in turn, could not pay because they did not have capital and/or ducks to derive income from. The others who were able to survive the times had some other sources and resources which enabled them to continue raising ducks. The beneficiaries of these events were those who had the capital, the Filipino and Chinese middlemen.

Landlord-tenant relationship. In 1965, the relationship between landlord and tenant was favorable. Ricefarms were offered, not sought, for cultivation. Verbal agreements sufficed and needed no yearly renewal. Land owners were frequent sponsors or "ninong" and "ninang" in weddings, baptisms and confirmations.

Tenant could borrow capital with little or no interest, not only for farming needs but also the family's. The paternal relationship existed. Even the landowners rarely checked on his tenants. The "katiwala" did this.

In 1979, barrio residents pointed to the presence of conflict between these two groups as the most conspicuous change. However, the agrarian disputes were not alarmingly many. They referred to the same few cases in the barrio.

Tenants having disposition over the land tilled was also cited. However, this was mentioned by only a minority. Being able to decide on all aspects of production and having the government's protection over their cultivation rights was referred to as "having disposition" over land. During the share tenancy era, tenants waited for the landlord to make decisions on the farm, like what variety to plant, time to harvest and foremost, the capital outlays. Now the tenant makes all these decisions. The advent of the agrarian reform program was unanimously regarded by the respondents to be the cause of the changes in this institution.

More than half of the respondents preferred the new state of relationship between the landlord and tenant. The higher share accruing to the tenant and the government's program of "land to the tiller" were the most popular reasons given for preference. The lesser number who preferred the 1965 conditions cited the absence of conflict between these two farm groups as their reason.

But some preferred the old system because the tenant and his landlord shared in crop losses. Others also judged that the share tenancy arrangement was better because the landlord provided capital with little or no interest charged, and the landlord was not strict on tenants.

The most conspicuous effect of the change

in the landlord-tenant relationship in the barrio was the rise of conflicts between these two sectors (see Table 3). However, only about three landlords had current conflicts with their tenants. Some still had grudges but were not in actual dispute with their tenants. The presence of many ricefarms remaining under share tenancy, inspite of pressures from the Ministry of Agrarian Reform personnel and proddings from some lessees testify that the conflicts cited were only few.

The respondents also report that lessees farm unprofitably today. Previously, under the share tenancy, they perceived that tenants did not suffer any loss; if they did, there was a landlord to share with. Now, the lessees had to produce their own capital — a burden to poor farmers especially those who had unpaid

balances in the rural banks and elsewhere. They had to secure capital from other sources and not surprisingly at much higher interest rates.

The poor lessees were at a disadvantage because of these changes. They had returned to the old situation which the agrarian reform program had sought to banish — indebtedness not only to the landlords but now to the rural banks and other sources, too. The landlords did not lose because they only had to wait for their land rents. They also had lesser headaches because they were no longer obligated to provide for capital needs or to spend for weddings, baptisms and confirmations of their tenants and the latter's children and grandchildren.

Table 3. *Perceived effect of change in relationship between landlord and tenant on the barrio*

Perceived Effect	Frequency of Mention					Total
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J	
Perceived advantages						
Tenant earned more, bigger share	1	2	6	12	1	22
Tenant free from landlord, has own disposition	7	2	1	6	4	20
Landlord cannot easily get back or eject tenant	—	—	2	—	—	2
Tenants had right over land tilled	—	—	1	—	—	1
Tenants had no other worry except to give land rent	—	—	1	—	—	1
Tenants able to speak up	—	—	1	—	—	1
No conflict because landlord not opposed to leasehold	1	—	—	—	—	1
Landlord happy	—	1	—	—	—	1
Both parties benefited	—	—	—	1	—	1
Perceived disadvantages						
Conflict between landlord and tenant	8	3	7	15	—	33

Table 3 (continued)

Perceived Effect	Frequency of Mention					Total
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J	
Tenant losing-shouldered expenses alone and paid land rent even if crop failed	—	5	8	5	1	19
No relationship except to give land rent	—	1	—	4	—	5
Tenants cannot easily borrow from landlord	—	—	1	—	—	1
Some with conflict, others none	—	—	—	1	—	1
Few landlords with grudges regarding change to leasehold	—	—	—	1	—	1
Landless workers caught in the middle	—	—	—	1	—	1
There was conflict before but barrio had adjusted	1	—	—	—	—	1
No conflict because land actually under share tenancy	2	—	—	—	—	2
No comment/Do not know	—	5	—	5	—	10
No effect	—	—	—	3	—	3
Total	20	19	28	54	6	127

Note: F means farmer, LAW—landless agricultural worker, NFE—nonfarm employed, F/L—fisherman and/or livestock raiser and J the jobless.

Farmer-landless agricultural worker relationship. The most conspicuous change was the decreasing "hunusan" given by farmers to the laborers. "Hunusan" was the payment for harvesting on the farms. For every six sacks of palay threshed, a laborer got one sack for his labor. For weeding, a paddy cleaned fetched a payment of a kerosene can or panega of palay. Weeding bigger paddies cost a panega, smaller ones a kerosene can. All these payments were done during harvest time.

In 1979, "hunusan" was pegged at a 1/7 instead of the 1/6 share followed in 1965. And these were no longer pressed down and left to overflow but gingerly poured and

leveled on top to save on palay. Farmers had begun to do the measurements himself to insure he did not lose any palay unnecessarily.

The new trend of paying wages instead of palay for weeding and harvesting was detrimental to the landless. The laborers are clearly losing when paid in wages than the proportional amount of palay based on the yield.

Some farmers had also managed to have the second weeding operation (pulling weeds by hands) done for free. Payment was the awarding of the right to harvest his field over those who did not weed.

Conversely, wages had correspondingly increased with inflation through the years. However, the landless were unhappy because their losses in "hunusan" were greater. Even though there were more farm jobs available, their losses could not be offset because of the new payment scheme. And there were more landless laborers working on the ricefields than before.

Regarding work on the farm the farmers had increasingly depended on the hired

laborers for almost all farm operations done. Though farmers still cleaned, weeded and prepared the land, the bulk of work went to the landless workers (see Table 4).

The landless, in turn, had begun the practice of hiring others to help them in the fields. Fear of losing the farm they worked on was the primary reason. When the many fields they weeded and harvested needed attention simultaneously, they resorted to hiring others.

Table 4. *Degree farm operations done by farmers and landless agricultural workers in 1965 and 1979*

Farm Operation	Frequency			
	1965		1979	
	F	LAW	F	LAW
Land preparation				
All farmers	9	8	3	—
All bayanihan	9	11	—	—
½ farmer, ½ landless agricultural worker	—	—	1	—
Many landless agricultural workers, few farmers	—	—	5	5
Many farmers, few landless agricultural workers	—	—	—	2
All landless agricultural workers	—	—	9	12
Total	18	19	18	19
Cleaning ricefield				
All farmers	10	10	7	1
All bayanihan	8	6	—	—
Many landless agricultural workers, few farmers	—	—	5	12
Many farmers, few landless agricultural workers	—	3	3	3
All landless agricultural workers	—	—	3	3
Total	18	19	18	19

Farm Operation	Frequency			
	1965		1979	
	F	LAW	F	LAW
Planting				
All farmers	2	—	—	—
All bayanihan	8	8	—	—
Bayanihan and landless agricultural workers	3	2	—	—
All landless agricultural workers	5	9	18	19
Total	18	19	18	19
Weeding				
All farmers	7	6	1	—
All bayanihan	7	4	—	—
Many landless agricultural workers, few farmers	1	2	6	2
Many farmers, few agricultural workers	—	1	—	—
½ farmer, ½ landless agricultural workers	—	—	2	—
All landless agricultural workers	3	6	9	17
Total	19	19	18	19
Harvesting				
All farmers	—	—	1	—
All bayanihan	—	1	—	—
All landless agricultural workers	18	18	17	19
Total	18	19	18	19
Measuring "hunós"				
All farmers	—	—	3	—
Many landless agricultural workers, few farmers	—	—	—	9
½ farmer, ½ landless agricultural workers	—	2	1	2

Table 4 (continued)

Farm Operation	Frequency			
	1965		1979	
	F	LAW	F	LAW
All landless agricultural worker	18	17	14	8
Total	18	19	18	19

Note: F means farmer, LAW—landless agricultural worker.

Competition was more stiff in 1979 than in 1965. The increasing number of the landless and even the children of the farmer and the nonfarm employed who will stay in the barrio will put pressure on employment. Though the landless were giving up paddies put under the 1/7 "hunusan" term others had taken these up. Labor surplus led to perpetuation of the shrinking "hunusan".

Beginning in 1978, the mechanical thresher was being used in harvesting palay. The laborers only cut and piled the rice stalks. The rest was done by the machine. Decision on the use of the machine depended on the farmers but payment was equally shared by the farmer and the laborer.

Barrio residents perceived that the change in the remuneration for weeding and harvesting was the salient point around which changes in the relationship between these two farm groups revolved. More than half of the respondents believed that farmers decreased "hunusan" in order to cut down on their very high farm production expenses. The high cost of commodities and farm inputs was another reason advanced by the residents in explaining the changes that occurred.

Many preferred the 1965 farmer-laborer relationship because of the higher "hunusan" earned by laborers. Laborers, farmers and the nonfarm-employed expressed this reason for preferring the old relationship. A minority noted the increase in laborer's wages, but no farmer and landless laborer signified preference for the present wage increase.

Central bank data show that even though earning was more in terms of number of pesos, the purchasing power had tremendously weakened. A peso in 1965 had a purchasing power equivalent to P1,6892, now a peso was equivalent to only P0.4170. Inflation was the main culprit. Moreover, there were more mouths to feed than before and the landless had the most number of children in the barrio.

The landless workers were the losers in changes in their institution (Table 5). The farmers who hardly gained from their farming resorted to cutting down payments to a group reliant on them. And the landless, though they had signified dissatisfaction with the new trend by giving up paddies and refusing to work, could not hold out for long because there were many (and increasing) other landless workers taking their place.

Sources of technology. There was no other source of technology in the barrio in 1965 other than the farmers and livestock raisers themselves. In 1979 the farm management technicians from the different government line agencies and the UPLB Social Laboratory were sought for advice regarding their livestock and farm operations and problems. They continued to compare notes regarding their occupations, yet the technicians were regarded as their primary source of technology. The rural folks acknowledged that these persons who spent years studying were more knowledgeable than they who barely finished the elementary grades.

Table 5. *Perceived effect of change in the relationship between landless agricultural workers and farmers on the barrio*

Perceived effect	Frequency of Mention					Total
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J	
Perceived advantages						
Higher wages for landless workers	—	—	2	4	2	8
Many found jobs	—	—	1	1	—	2
Landless workers not tired because of use of thresher	1	—	—	—	—	1
Perceived disadvantages						
Landless workers losing because of decreased "hunusan"	11	15	13	25	2	65
Wages paid for weeding and harvesting in wages instead of palay	3	2	2	4	1	12
Conflict between landless workers and farmers because of "hunusan"	1	—	—	5	—	6
Those with no capital cannot farm	—	—	1	5	—	6
Cannot harvest if did not weed	—	2	1	1	—	4
High farm expenses because all operations hired	2	—	—	—	1	3
Higher income but nothing left because of high cost of commodities	—	—	—	1	—	1
Hired laborers instead of "bayanihan"	—	—	—	1	—	1
Cannot do anything about it	1	—	—	—	—	1
No effect	—	—	4	5	—	9
Total	1	19	24	52	6	120

Note: F means farmer, LAW—landless agricultural worker, NFE—nonfarm employed, F/L—fishermen and/or livestock raising and J the jobless.

The majority welcomed this institutional innovation, and the modern agricultural practices taught was the most cited benefit derived. It was generally regarded as responsible for improved productivity in farming and in a way cushioned the ill-effects of the oil crisis. The modern agricultural inputs which were necessary for better production were also mentioned.

An increased yield primarily benefited the tenant who, in turn, shouldered the escalated production expenses. The landless were also benefited with an increase in yield, for their payments were made on a proportional basis (i.e., 1/7 or 1/6). But the resultant shortchanging of the latter by the farmers because of the higher costs of farming prevented the landless from enjoying this yield increase.

All in all, the barrio was better-off because farmers no longer did farming in an outmoded, unproductive manner yet the increase in productivity was eaten up by expensive measures. One elderly, educated resident observed that modern farming was complete with advanced agricultural practices and inputs and convenient but was not profitable. Traditional farming, though bereft of trimmings brought more net income.

Mechanization in the barrio. Mechanization came about with the appearance of hand tractors and the simultaneous decrease in the number of carabaos. A few farmers bought these machines and these became available to other farmers for hire. The government program to provide loans to enable them to buy light machines to replace the animal also contributed to the process.

Deepening of the ricefields was popularly advanced as the cause of the carabao's diminished use in the farms. Because of the carabao's weight and regular use of the land, the ricefields deepened and cultivation became difficult. The carabao's service life shortened and death eventually followed.

But most barrio residents welcomed mechanization. Land preparation was an easier task for ricefields became shallow. Rice productivity improved because there were more cropping seasons in 1979 than in 1965, and because of the presence of modern irrigation facilities. Since land preparation was no longer dependent on the rains, cultivation was done earlier and faster.

The main benefit brought about by mechanization was the faster work done in the ricefields (see Table 6). Land preparation was also easier because ricefields became more shallow for the machines were lighter than the carabaos.

Some lamented that with mechanization and the subsequent hiring of laborers and machines, there was less cooperation among

barrio residents. It was more difficult to secure help, be it farm or nonfarm related. Fewer people were also willing to disturb and be disturbed in their work.

Also, a new way of farming evolved through mechanization. Augmented by the desire to earn, people preferred to work for wages, not for deferred payments in kind or labor. Almost all farm operations were hired, from cleaning ricefields to hauling of palay. This led to a more expensive farming. Though more landless workers were able to get employment, the increasing number of those with no access to the land had mitigated, if not negated, the availability of employment.

Farmers with no ready capital were adversely affected. The trend in 1979 was to hire, not to contribute labor and to be reciprocally helped later. And there were few who had carabaos to prepare the land. Farmers decreased their "hunusan" to be able to get some net gain from a very expensive manner of farming.

The present day oil crisis means that the farm capital needs will only increase not decrease. As farmers observed, mechanization was good when price of fuel has not gone up, but is now impractical and unprofitable because of the staggering price.

Barrio organization: In 1965, there were no joint activities done by barrio residents except the "lusungan" in farming. Even the political concerns which were supposed to be popular were remembered only by a few. The village came to life only during elections and fiestas.

In 1979, the barrio was engaged in more community projects, all organized with the government as the leader. The barangay and *purok* activities were conspicuously joined by many. However, residents themselves regarded the local leadership as weak.

The Samahang Nasyon was regarded as the foremost organization residents were involved

Table 6. *Perceived effect of mechanization in the barrio*

Perceived Effect	Frequency					Total	Percent
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J		
Perceived advantages							
Faster work	1	8	10	30	1	50	42.00
Saves time and energy	2	2	1	2	—	7	5.88
Easier land preparation because ricefield became shallow	3	1	1	2	—	7	5.88
Cheaper because no more bayanihan	—	—	2	1	1	4	3.36
Easier for farmers	—	1	2	1	—	4	3.36
Few people needed in hand preparation	—	1	1	—	—	2	1.68
Two or three crops planted because land preparation faster	—	—	—	—	2	2	1.68
People prefer comfort	—	—	1	1	—	2	1.68
Many able to get jobs	—	—	—	1	—	1	0.84
Crops not destroyed by carabaos anymore	—	—	—	—	1	1	0.84
Perceived disadvantages							
Higher farm expense because of hiring hand tractor and laborers	—	1	2	4	—	7	5.88
No more bayanihan, each to his own work	4	—	1	—	1	6	5.04
Few carabaos left in the barrio	5	—	—	1	—	6	5.04
Carabao owners have no income	—	1	—	2	—	3	2.52
Cannot use machines if there is no gasoline	—	1	1	—	—	2	1.68
Difficult to ask for help	—	—	—	2	—	2	1.68
Ricefields became deep	—	—	—	1	—	1	0.24
No change/No effect	2	3	2	4	—	11	9.24
Good and bad — good when price of gasoline still less but bad because of high price of oil today	1	—	—	—	—	1	0.84
Total	18	19	24	52	6	119	100.00

with. Another barrio association, the Pila Multiple Purpose Cooperative, was mentioned but currently regarded as non-functional because it went bankrupt.

The different rural development programs launched by the government was the perceived reason for changes in the barrio organization.

Organization of cooperatives, mainly the Samahang Nayon and other barrio organizations and the extension of non-collateral production loans to members were the reasons unanimously advanced.

Many residents preferred the present barrio setup, in spite of the claim of a lesser number

Table 7. *Perceived effect of organization of people in the barrio.*

Perceived effect	Frequency of Mention					Total
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J	
Perceived advantages						
Extended loan	1	9	10	10	2	32
United people	4	4	3	12	—	23
Accomplished community projects	—	3	1	8	—	12
Able to help one another	1	—	1	3	—	5
People's progress	1	—	—	—	2	3
High yield	—	—	—	1	—	1
Irrigation provided	—	—	1	—	—	1
Barangay has power in the barrio	1	—	—	—	—	1
People given direction, became disciplined	—	—	—	1	—	1
Peaceful	1	—	—	—	—	1
Samahang Nayon — only organization left	1	—	—	—	—	1
Compact farm — not yet known	1	—	—	—	—	1
Perceived disadvantages						
People disunited	—	3	2	7	—	12
Difficult to ask for help because no more bayanihan	—	—	—	2	—	2
People unable to repay loans/indebtedness	1	—	4	—	—	5
Cannot secure loan anew	1	—	—	—	—	1
People still looking for dole-outs	1	—	—	—	—	1
Borrowed again from middlemen to start duck project	—	—	1	—	—	1
Organization short-lived	1	—	—	—	—	1
Technician asks many questions	—	—	—	1	—	1
No effect, no change	3	1	2	7	2	15
Total	18	20	25	52	6	121

Note: F means farmer, LAW—landless agricultural worker, NFE—nonfarm employed, F/L—fisherman and/or livestock raiser and J the jobless.

that people were more united in 1965 than in 1979. The extension of loans was the reason for preference. Conversely, the unpaid balances in the rural banks and their increasing indebtedness in these was the complaint most mentioned against the

presence of the Samahang Nayon. Ironically, this led duck raisers to borrow from middlemen — a practice which the barrio organization sought to eliminate in the first place.

The extension of loans to the residents through the Samahang Nayon and another barrio association was the most cited effect of the change in barrio organizations (see Table 7). Others mentioned the role of the Samahang Nayon and the barangay in organizing residents to a more cohesive group. However, the presence of many outstanding loans to the rural bank because of the duck project was the complaint raised against the Samahang Nayon. The tight credit situation stemming from these unpaid balances was the

reason for saying people were more disunited in 1979 than in 1965.

Assessment of changes in level of living

Seeing all these changes occurring, an inquiry on people's assessment of changes in level of living was done. Despite these changes in the barrio, the majority reported that their level of living remained the same in 1979 as it was in 1965. Only a third of the total number of respondents reported an improvement in the economic standing (see Table 8).

Table 8. *Perceived change in respondents' level of living from 1965 to 1979*

Perceived Change	Frequency					Total	Percent
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J		
Improved	6	6	5	17	4	38	31.93
Same	11	11	18	34	2	76	63.87
Worse	1	2	1	1	—	5	4.20
Total	18	19	24	52	6	119	100.00

Note: F means farmer, LAW—landless agricultural worker, NFE—nonfarm employed, F/L—fisherman and/or livestock raiser and J the jobless.

The resident's perception of equality in Pinagbayanan was also examined. Majority saw more inequality among barrio residents in 1979 than in 1965 and majority still believed there was a marked distinction between the rich and the poor even in 1965.

Summary and conclusion

The large scale transformation of the barrio and all the institutions studied were summarized and an overall reaction to these were elicited. Population growth, government policies on rural development and the oil crisis were regarded as the reasons for the changes (see Table 9).

Population growth and the resulting pressures were regarded as the major reasons for the transformation in the barrio. Because

there were more people now than in 1965, more were competing for jobs and the reward system was being stretched to meet the demand. And since more were competing for jobs, a surplus meant that the demand for workers would naturally decline. Hence many other landless workers take up the paddies left by older workers because of the undesirable 1/7 "hunusan" given to them. It was also observed that the tenants and the landlords had departed from the long established payment scheme because both were trying to earn more with the same if not more production outlays. The bayanihan spirit deteriorated because people were hard pressed to earn to meet the family's needs in times when prices rise geometrically and earnings stagnate. With the increase in the number of consumers, commodities become scarce and

Table 9. *Perceived causes of change in the barrio*

Perceived causes	Frequency of Mention					Total
	F	LAW	NFE	F/L	J	
Population growth						
Difficulty in earning	—	1	—	13	—	14
Increasing cost of commodities	—	—	9	3	—	12
Many people to feed	2	4	2	—	—	8
Government development program						
Good leadership in the barrio	—	—	1	4	—	6
Many able to study	—	1	—	3	—	4
Mechanization	1	—	—	2	—	3
Many youth employed	—	—	—	1	—	1
Irrigation	—	—	—	1	—	1
Conflict between landlord and tenants	—	—	—	2	—	2
Government taught farmers to become lazy	—	—	1	—	—	1
High cost of commodities/						
High cost of living	2	5	—	16	1	25
High price for farm inputs	5	2	—	—	—	7
Farmers shortchanging landless laborers	—	2	1	—	1	4
High farm expenses but low price of palay and egg	2	—	—	1	—	3
All farm operations hired	2	—	—	—	—	2
Lack of capital	1	—	—	—	—	1
Others						
Calamity in duck raising	—	—	1	4	—	5
Pollution of the lake by factories	—	—	1	1	—	2
People not united, each to his own work	1	1	—	—	1	3
Expensive lifestyle	1	—	2	—	—	3
People becoming lazy	—	—	1	—	1	2
People used to dole-outs	1	—	—	—	—	1
Farmer does not like to owe "utang na loob"	—	—	—	1	—	1
Landless worker not organized	—	1	—	—	—	1
Discrepancy between rich and poor	1	—	—	—	—	1
Total	22	19	27	66	6	140

prices inevitably escalate. And the presence of more mouths to feed rattles the mind.

The government's rural development and support programs contributed to the present state of the barrio organization. Extension of short-term loans had altered the credit, even the financial, state in the barrio. Mechanization had contributed to a decrease in bayanihan activities and the practice of hiring machines and men to do farming for farmers. The land reform program's effect was not outstanding as the other programs for a large area had remained under cultivation by owners and share tenants. The few cases of conflict between the landlords and their tenants were most vivid in the respondent's thoughts because it was, like others, a small community.

In summary, it has been observed that a social system is disturbed when forces, external and internal impinge on the established arrangements and situation. Corresponding changes in the social, economic, political and cultural subsystems occur. Barrio Pinagbayanan had responded to these pressures and as a result, was a different community in 1979 as it was in 1965.

Notes

The original version of this paper was submitted as a master's thesis to the department of agricultural education, University of the Philippines at Los Baños in May 1980. The study was jointly supported by the UPLB/NFAC Countryside Action Program, the Agricultural Development Council and the UPLB Staff Development Program.

References

- Bock, K. E.
1963 Evolution, function and change. *American Sociological Review*, 28(2): 229-37.
- Castillo, Gelia T.
1979 Exploring rural institutions: Notes on the "soft" sector in agricultural and rural development. Notes presented for the A/D/C Seminar on Social Organization of Agricultural Production, Club Solviento, Calamba, Laguna, January 25-27 (mimeographed).
- Merrill, Francis E.
1965 Society and culture. An introduction to sociology. (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY

Volume 13

Number 1 and 2, 1980

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <i>Akira Hoshino</i> | Current Major Trends in Psychology
In Japan |
| <i>David Y. F. Ho</i> | Face and Stereotyped Notions
About Chinese Face Behavior |
| <i>David Y. F. Ho</i> | Reflections on the Development of
Psychology in Hongkong Society:
Students, Teachers, and Academic
Institutions |
| <i>Gregorio H. del Pilar II</i> | A Probe into the Philippines'
Potential for Cross-Cultural
Psychological Research: The View
from Early Sociolization Findings |
| <i>Sagar Sharma</i> | Some Concepts of Social Psychology
in India |
| <i>Wilfrido V. Villacorta</i> | Western Influences on Social Science
Teaching in Philippine Universities |

Place your orders at the PSSC Central Subscription Service, No. 7, Purok
Heneral Aguinaldo, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.