Sociology, Society and the State: Institutionalizing Sociological Practice in the Philippines

Emma Porio

INTRODUCTION

Within the framework of capitalist development and the modernity project of the state, sociology and sociological practice was established in several universities in the twentieth century (1900s–1970s), and afterwards in the institutions of government, civil society, and the private sector (1970s–2000s). Building on previous assessments of sociological traditions (Abad and Eviota, 1982; Bautista, 1994, 1999; David, 1982; Lamug, 1999; Miralao, 1999), this paper elaborates the political, economic, and institutional contexts of the development of sociology in the Philippines. Interviews with social scientists and sociologists affiliated with the Philippine Social Science Council and the Philippine Sociological Society supplement these assessments.

INSTITUTIONALIZING SOCIOLOGY UNDER THE COLONIAL AND POST-COLONIAL STATE

Alatas (2001) has argued that the national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal, is an 'exemplar for autonomous sociology' for his pioneering counter-Eurocentric analysis of Philippine colonial society in the late nineteenth century. But the institutionalization of sociology was, however, part of the American colonial project, with the establishment of the modern education system and its social engineering program (1900–46). After WWII, the rehabilitation and growth of educational institutions saw the establishment and expansion of sociology departments and research institutes in several universities in different parts of the country (1946–70).

The introduction of sociology into the Philippine education system began over a hundred years ago. Dr. Jose Rizal's writings represent one of the early counter-Eurocentric social analyses in Asia. Rizal's novels, *Noli Me Tangere* (Touch Me Not), *El Filibusterismo* (The Revolutionary), and other essays analyzed the problems created by the Spanish colonial social structure during the late nineteenth century (Alatas, 2001). Rizal's execution in 1896, however, cut short the development of this counter-hegemonic discourse. Interestingly, most chronicles of Philippine sociology do not mention this part of the genealogy (e.g. Abad

and Eviota, 1982). The failure to recognize this as part of the Philippine sociological tradition could be that while Rizal had many professional qualifications (medical doctor, essayist, novelist, linguist, etc.), he did not have any formal training in sociology. Bautista (1999: 382) also argues that early thinkers may have reflected the state of social thought but anthropology, economics, political science, and sociology as academic disciplines with defined theoretical and methodological perspectives, did not exist in the Philippines before the 1900s.

The failure of contemporary sociologists to recognize Rizal's writings as foundational for an autonomous sociology also reflects the Eurocentric influences on education. Moreover, the continuing contentious debate among Philippine historians and nationalists on whether Rizal, a reformist (as opposed to Andres Bonifacio, the leader of the Philippine Revolution) installed by the American colonizers as national hero, is the deserving one of this recognition, may have contributed to his writings, previously ignored by sociologists. But regardless of the politics of recognition surrounding these heroes, Rizal's social analysis, just like the writings of Pedro Paterno, T.H. Pardo de Tavera, and Isabelo de los Reyes (Mojares, 2006) can be regarded as a genealogical strand of Philippine social/sociological thought.

Formal sociology in the Philippines can be traced to early courses in penology, criminology, social ethics, and social philosophy offered at the University of Santo Tomas (established in 1611 by the Dominican friars) from 1896 to 1900 (Catapusan, 1954, cited in Bautista,1994). The teaching of these courses generally reflected a social philosophy orientation. In this context, Rizal's writings and those of other intellectuals could not be seen as foundational materials for teaching sociology, because their counter-hegemonic character rendered them at that time 'subversive' to the educational authorities.

As mentioned earlier, while sociology emerged in the West to explain large scale social changes and upheavals in society, Philippine sociology was part of the American colonial project (1900–46). This approach finds resonance in other third world societies where the modern education system, and social science in particular, were established under the colonial rubric. As argued by Abad and Eviota (1982: 31), 'the social sciences, notably sociology and anthropology, were not used as intellectual hardware for reordering society but, as prescriptions for living or as tools for colonial administration. As such, the introduction of sociology into the well-respected academic mainstream met no intellectual resistance'.

In the first half of the twentieth century, Philippine sociology was largely shaped by the dynamic growth and expansion of US sociology. The University of the Philippines (UP) in Manila, established in 1908 as the educational flagship unit of the American colonial government, served as a foil to the heavily sectarian education system dominated by the Roman Catholic hierarchy (Abaya et al., 1999). In 1911, UP offered the first course in sociology and in 1914 established the first sociology department, whereas Silliman University, founded by Protestant missionaries in the Central Visayas region, offered their first sociology course in 1919.

To equip the colonial bureaucracy, many Filipino scholars (*pensionados*) received study grants in the US for advance professional training. Returning scholars established teaching and research programs in the top universities of the country (Lamug, 1999). Serafin Macaraeg, the first Filipino to obtain a PhD in sociology (from the USA) in the 1920s, also became the first Filipino to head the sociology department at UP. He published the first sociology textbook on societal norms and cultural traditions in 1936 (Lamug, 1999). Reflective of the times, most of the teaching and research at that time focused on social problems and social philosophy.

From the late 1940s to the 1970s, sociology and other social science disciplines were introduced in universities in Metro Manila

and in regional centres such as Baguio, Cebu, Dumaguete, Cagayan de Oro, and Davao. During this period, structural–functionalism dominated the sociological imagination of many Filipino teachers and researchers. Sociologists trained in the US under the Fulbright study grants and other similar programs brought neo-positivism (e.g. Lundberg); functionalism (e.g. Durkheim, Parsons, Merton); and social psychological theories (e.g. Cooley, Mead). The early issues of the *Philippine Sociological Review* (Saloma, 2005) reflect these orientations. Filipino sociologists, trained in American universities with their heavy reliance on textbooks from the US, reinforced American influence on these disciplines (Lamug, 1999).

The need of the post-colonial bureaucracy for research and scientific information also led to the growth of research institutes in the national capital and regional centres, in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. The increasing emphasis on empirical research was supported by grants from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. The university-based research institutes created under this rubric, however, are currently facing a crisis of legitimacy, identity, and survival reflecting the tension between teaching and the demands of external donors whose interests could change rapidly, marginalizing institutes that are unable to move with the times.

These developments marked the start of systematic teaching and research programs in the universities, thus professionalizing and legitimizing sociology as a field of study. The presence of many social scientists and/or US trained sociologists led to the founding of the Philippine Sociological Society (PSS) in 1952 followed by the publication of the *Philippine Sociological Review* (PSR) in 1953. A pioneering social science organization, PSS, continues to be one of the pillars of the Philippine social science community today.

The collegiality and dynamism of social scientists made it possible for the establishment of the Philippine Social Science Council

(PSSC) in 1968. Sociologists[1] assumed leadership in the training and organization of young social scientists, with the formation of the PSSC Social Science Research Network (Bautista, 1994) and the institutionalization of social science research in universities outside the national capital.

With the exception of a few universities located in Manila and in regional centres, the faculty of most sociology departments are focused on teaching and administration. Until the 1960s, there was little systematic research conducted, as teaching was the main preoccupation of sociologists (Lamug, 1999). The development of a strong research tradition among social science and sociology departments has been hampered by the deployment of newly minted PhDs in teaching and administration:

> In the UP at around this time, returning PhDs were kept busy performing administrative tasks as deans, directors or heads of department – for these were the usual roles into which new PhDs returning from abroad were cast. The emphasis was to open master degrees – in a word, teaching rather than research. There was almost no time for them to do any serious writing or research after finishing their obligatory dissertations.
>
> (David, 1982: 15).

Although David (1982) was describing the academic situation at UP from the 1960s to the 1980s, this situation persists in most universities today. Sociologists are often called on to perform a wide range of social and political roles in teaching, research, administration, policy, and advocacy (Arce, 1969).

HEGEMONIC CHALLENGES UNDER AUTHORITARIAN RULE

By the 1970s, challenges to the functionalist hegemony and positivist methodologies became more visible, partly keeping pace with the worldwide trends, but more importantly because of the political repression and economic crisis experienced under the Marcos authoritarian regime. Marxist-inspired

theories challenged the dominance of structural–functionalism or systems theory, along with the increasing popularity of symbolic interactionist and phenomenological schools (Bautista, 1999).

This period also witnessed the rise of the national liberation movement and the search for alternative social science frameworks for analyzing Philippine social realities. The declaration of martial law in 1972 intensified the application of social science perspectives and techniques for the purposes of the state (Miralao, 1999). The rise of Marxist-inspired theoretical formulations in international social science, while providing exciting alternatives, also provoked intense debates and divisions among sociologists and political scientists. Meanwhile, the search for relevance found expression in analyzing pressing social issues like the agrarian unrest which culminated in the Marxist-inspired critiques and countermovement towards Marcos's authoritarian regime in the 1970s and 1980s (Bautista, 1999).

The martial law regime (1972–86) created fertile ground for Marxist and other brands of critical sociology. Randy David's advocacy for the dependency perspective and his scathing critiques of conventional sociological productions inspired many young sociologists (David, 1982, 1998). Responding to the poverty studies conducted by the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC) in the 1970s, David argued that this type of sociology of poverty reflected more the poverty of sociology in the Philippines, for failing to provide an alternative theory to Oscar Lewis's culture of poverty. The IPC, with sociologists like Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner and the anthropologist Frank Lynch, has been accused by nationalists as being a conduit for American-sponsored research funds. But IPC, with its focused research on smooth interpersonal relationships (SIR), reciprocity, and other values marking Philippine society and culture, has been instrumental in shaping a generation of social scientists.

Another Marxist sociologist, Walden Bello, head of Focus on Global South,[2] wrote searing critiques of the Marcos regime during his self-imposed exile in the United States. The challenges posed by the likes of David and Bello were well known in public debates but these were not reflected in PSR during this period (Miralao, 1999). But in Bautista's (1999) assessment, among the social science disciplines, in the 1970s political science and sociology were influenced most by Marxism. This led to debates in public fora, the teaching of theory and praxis in classrooms, and students going underground to fight the Marcos regime.

While the authoritarian regime created, paradoxically, spaces for critical and public sociology, it also established several government agencies and research institutes to provide the technocratic base of the 'New Society' of the Marcos regime: Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP); National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA); UP Asian Center; and the Population Center Foundation). The demand for sociologists in different government planning and policy programs was greeted with enthusiasm or outrage, depending on one's political persuasion (Lamug, 1999). But many social scientists during Marcos's regime exercised self-censorship to survive the repressive dictatorship (Makil and Hunt, 1981). Critical and public sociology during this period was mainly articulated by sociologists at the UP, Third World Studies Center, and the IBON Data Bank.

To what extent have Marxist and neo-Marxist perspectives influenced Philippine sociology? Chester Hunt, one of the pillars of Philippine sociology, reflecting on his thirty years of sociological engagements, stated:

> While impressed with the survival of the association and the journal over the years, I remain sceptical of the Marxist and neo-Marxist perspectives that have attracted young sociologists because there are more basic problems like rapid population growth, poverty, etc. which need urgent attention. There is pressing need for more research on these problems and more mutual criticism among scholars.
>
> (Hunt, 1984, cited in David, 1984)

Hunt's (1984, cited in David, 1984) assessment seemed a little harsh; he could have been more appreciative of the efforts of young sociologists to apply the Marxist framework to prevailing social issues, although their productions did not find print in the PSR.

Talledo (1993), reviewing Philippine sociology, concluded that by the end of the 1980s, the functionalist hegemony had been largely eroded. In his critical reading of articles in the PSR, he noted the dwindling influence of functionalism through advancements in the area of theory and political economy. He urged his colleagues to develop an emancipatory sociology to counteract the elitist tendencies of contemporary sociology. Bello (1997) echoed this view by urging fellow sociologists to analyze the politics and society that would lead to the weakening of elite control in Philippine political and social life.

Marxist and neo-Marxist discourses, challenging the dominance of structural–functionalism and positivist-oriented methodologies in sociological practice, marked this period. Ironically, the role of sociologists during this time also increased in the formulation and assessment of policies/programs of both government and non-government organizations (NGOs), especially in overseas development assistance programs (ODA). In subsequent decades, this pattern of sociological practice became more intense and complex.

DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSES, PLURALISM, AND CONVERGENCE IN THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY

Several forces in the last two decades have shaped contemporary sociological practices. These include: (1) the increasing democratization and decentralization of political and civic life; (2) the declining dominance of the university as the centre of knowledge production; (3) increasing privatization and commodification of knowledge production; and (4) the emerging theoretical and methodological pluralism in sociological practice.

The 1986 People Power Revolution ushered in a democratic regime that led to the decentralization of politics and civil society participation in political affairs, coinciding with the neoliberal discourses of democratization, decentralization, and privatization that swept the world to inform social science discourses and practices. The end of authoritarian rule in 1986 also blurred the lines between critical sociology and policy sociology, because the new democratic regime created spaces for collaboration with the state. The growths of development-oriented NGOs also facilitated many underground activists' move to parliamentary struggles and their engagement in development-oriented research. The ascendance of participatory development approaches in research displaced positivist-oriented methodologies (e.g. surveys) and opened up spaces for meaningful engagement and opportunities for social scientists to apply them to problems of development and nation-building.

Partnership with the subjects of research and development marked a new ethos in research practice in the 1990s. There was a premium for action oriented research to aid development programs (Porio, 1998). New intervention strategies were identified by researchers, clients, and subjects of development; participatory research tools were in the forefront in bringing development to the people. Process documentation, one of the key participatory tools, provided policy directions and critical inputs in reorienting development programs (Veneracion, 1989). Participatory action research, then, became the politically correct research mode during this period, in part due to the creeping anti-intellectualism that started in the 1970s and was fed by the increasing dissatisfaction with universities, largely perceived as ivory towers, wherein research was far removed from social realities.

The development agenda and its discourses, to a large extent, shaped the research priorities of Philippine social science. This can be seen in the population studies of the 1970s to studies on social forestry, irrigation,

and agrarian reform of the 1980s; and the research and advocacy on gender, reproductive health and sexuality, environment, HIV-AIDs, street children/child labor, and civil society participation, in the last two decades. Perhaps with the exception of economists, participatory development approaches became the major trademark of most studies of development-oriented projects, largely supported by the government and ODA.

This trend is not unique to Filipino sociologists. Mukherji (1997[2001]) described Indian sociologists as having to attend to necessary 'distractions' such as evaluations and consultancies that leave them hardly any time to write theoretically-oriented research and pursue high quality teaching. Shamsul's (1995: 101, cited in Alatas, 2001) notion of 'kratonization' or fragmentation of the social sciences in Malaysia into government, academic, or private sector types of engagement; where research and writing is largely driven by the interests of these sectors, confirms this.

The 1980s also saw the convergence of seemingly opposing theoretical and methodological perspectives as reflected in Gidden's theory of 'structuration' – integrating the political–economic structures with the symbolic interactionist's and Weberian emphasis on human agency or the integration of Marxian and Weberian perspectives with a macro–micro approach to the understanding of social order and action (Bautista, 1999). Following the Marxist and feminist revolution of the 1970s and 1980s, sociology has found a more convivial ground for theoretical and methodological convergence. Increasingly, multidisciplinarity, coupled with methodological triangulation, characterizes sociological practice from the 1990s to the present (Bautista, 1999).

Another factor that contributed to the theoretical and methodological pluralism in sociological practice was the emergence of an alternative training ground for Filipino sociologists. Up until the 1970s, most sociologists pursued their graduate studies in American universities, but during the last few decades, many sociologists have increasingly gone to universities in Europe, Australia, and Singapore (Lamug 1999; Porio, 2006).

The declining dominance of the university as a center of epistemic culture also affected contemporary sociological practice. Evers and Gerke (2006) argued that in the contemporary knowledge economy, universities have lost their traditional monopoly of knowledge production. Accordingly, the mode of production has become polycentric, with knowledge networks becoming linked to organizations outside academia, with many research engagements and other forms of knowledge production moving to government, the private sector, and civil society organizations (CSOs). Social scientists are increasingly engaged outside academe (e.g. CSOs, ODA programs, or government) where they use their expertise from knowledge production to application (i.e. formulation, administration, and implementation of policies and programs). This global pattern, observed by Evers and Gerke (2006), also applies to sociological practice in the Philippines.

Restrictions imposed by donors on research/consultancy contracts limit access and dissemination of these types of knowledge production. Moreover, academic consultants are too busy to translate or codify their works for publication and dissemination, reinforcing the traditional inability of universities to keep pace with the latest researches. With multiple research actors and sites of production, there is a growing pluralism and convergence of theoretical and methodological perspectives in sociological research and other professional engagements.

Gibbons et al. (1994) observed that research outside academia has increased because academic rhythms and interests make it difficult to synchronize with the priorities and demands of multilateral institutions and the private sector for fast-track research, thus there is a proliferation of consulting firms, NGOs, and academics engaged in commissioned work where control of research and dissemination belong to the donor agency. Continuing demands from civil society groups

for more relevant research anchored on their advocacies of gender/human rights, agrarian reform, environmental/urban issues, and ancestral domain claims reinforce this trend. Sociological research, then, is shaped by demands for relevant and fast-track research by development-oriented agencies and CSOs.

Paradoxically, local sociological practice and knowledge production have become increasingly linked and tied to epistemic centres in the US, Australia, Singapore, and Europe. Through ODA research funds, certain segments of academia are linked to global or regional centers of knowledge production. In the process, selective incorporation and stratification among sociologists have emerged, with some more linked than others. Extra-academic considerations such as policy or economic issues thus dominate priorities in knowledge production, research agendas and social science writing (Shamsul, 1995: 101, cited in Alatas, 2001).

CONTRIBUTION TO POLITICS AND PROSPECTS FOR SOCIOLOGY

What is the contribution of sociology and sociologists to politics today? Randy David asked this question in a plenary session on sociological practices during the 2006 PSS National Conference held at the De La Salle University (Manila). He pointed out that sociology has been a force both for conservatism as well as for radical politics:

> Our graduates have no trouble finding secure positions in both the corridors of private corporations and public bureaucracies and in the dimly-lit 'safehouses' of the underground. . . . Whether sociology yields more technocrats or more activists, I think that will ultimately spell the difference. In periods of relative stability, the various tasks of social planning create ample opportunity for professionals with sociological vision. They work quietly in the (government and corporate) boardrooms. In times of political turmoil . . . the spotlight shifts to public intellectuals. Media audiences hang on to every word they speak or write as political analysts.

> (David, 2006)

By using Burawoy's (2004) division of labor, we can state that Philippine sociology is largely dominated by professional and policy sociology. It is only during brief historical moments (e.g. during the Marcos's authoritarian period (1972–86); People Power II in 2001 that saw the replacement of Estrada by Arroyo), or during the political–economic crises that have dogged the political administrations of Aquino, Estrada, and Arroyo) that critical and public sociological practices and practitioners become prominent in the media, exemplified by the political engagements of Randy David and of Walden Bello. They are often sought by the media because of their searing critiques of the government or of ODA (World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the Asian Development [ADB]). But with the exception of David and Bello, very few critical sociologists or public intellectuals want to be subjected to the appropriative tendencies of the media, specifically, and generally, the state.

In addition, Focus on the Global South, a transnational NGO dedicated to critiquing such neocolonial capitalist structures as the World Trade Organization (WTO), occupies a significant role in global advocacy initiatives like the World Social Development Forum and in ADB annual meetings. Research and advocacy institutes like The Third World Studies Centre and the IBON Data Bank provide critical analyses of mainstream sociological engagements. But, in spite of these initiatives, critical or public sociology is still not visible. Instead, sociologists have been central in institution-building, for example, in UP's Center for Integrative Studies, the Population Institute and Third World Studies, or at the Philippine Social Science Council.

What are the prospects for Philippine sociology in the twenty-first century? Bautista (1999) and Lamug (1999) predict that theoretical and methodological pluralism will blur theoretical boundaries, with debates focused on global–local intersections of the political economy and their implications for the Filipino's human security, social

welfare, and development. Research trajectories will continue to be problem-oriented, field-based, and multidisciplinary in character. Meanwhile, theoretical and methodological innovations focusing on trans-local modernities and practices will attract the attention of the younger cohort of sociologists.

Sociology today is also being renewed by the challenges posed by postmodernism and other forms of relativism. On the one hand, the struggle between scientific quantification and the explanatory subject and the interpretive bent towards cultural studies, on the other, continues to make the field more dynamic (Wallerstein, 1999). Debates and controversies about how to integrate concerns with subjectivity, objectivity, intersubjectivity, and practicality in theory and research have resulted in the emergence of critical theory and public sociology, emphasizing the usefulness of sociological analysis to various social groups. The challenges posed by postmodern and post-structuralist approaches have enlivened these ongoing debates. These challenges and debates are not only reflective of Philippine sociology but also find resonance in other parts of the world (Alatas, 2001; Mukherji, 1997[2001]).

Meanwhile, the call for relevant/pragmatic Filipino sociology will continue among some sectors. David (1998), for example, argued that the professional mantle of sociology prevents sociologists from addressing the urgent tasks and concerns of Filipino sociology. For him the development of a pragmatic Filipino sociology includes the following agenda.

(1) Research that focuses on national purposes and priorities aimed at provoking and enriching a broad public debate
(2) Study the factors impeding the attainment of these purposes at various points in history
(3) Craft programs, policies, and institutions aimed at solving the problems that have troubled the nation.

David's pleas for a pragmatic sociology reflect the hope of many Filipinos – that education and development research seek solutions to the poverty and increasing social

inequality, and the crises of political and economic institutions that have plagued the nation. A growing body of studies has emerged on the issues identified by David (1998) but unfortunately, the studies lack the rigor and theoretical depth necessary to make a significant theoretical contribution, having been commissioned by funders to provide practical policy and programmatic solutions.

There is also a hierarchy among universities and research institutes, with the elite institutions in the metropolis able to give higher pay, more research opportunities and better working conditions for their academic staff (Lamug, 1999). Sociologists in these institutions have more opportunities to forge academic networks and consultancies with social scientists based in Europe/USA or are supported by multilateral institutions. The hierarchy among universities is, in part, a function of the distribution of government and private resources, including those of ODA programs, which support scholars and research institutes mainly from the metropolitan centres.

Sociology in the Philippines, however, despite its colonial background, has slowly broken from its colonial roots and strives for greater indigenization (Abad and Eviota, 1982). Philippine sociologists have also increasingly crafted relatively autonomous scholarship, exploring Philippine social transformations, anchored on global society as a point of departure for new spaces for sociological theorizing (Saloma, 2005). It is in the forefront in critiquing that globalization discourse and practices have resulted in a greater social divide in the Philippines and the Asian region. Sociologists have also made an impact in the area of policy and development research, where sociological frames, categories, and concepts have been applied to lend a broader insight to social realities. This can be seen in the participatory development researches of the IPC on the formulation of micro-policies in irrigation, gender, and social forestry, among others.

Do we have an indigenous or autonomous sociological tradition? Alatas (2001) recognized Jose Rizal's pioneering social analysis in

late-nineteenth-century Philippines. In keeping with this tradition and developments in other parts of the underdeveloped world, Philippine sociology continues to craft relatively autonomous spaces. Three major strands of counter-hegemonic discourses can be seen in today's sociological practice: (1) Marxist or neo-Marxist inspired critiques of mainstream sociology and development sociology; (2) alternative theorizing and methodological pluralism in development-oriented research; and (3) a move towards an indigenous sociology anchored on the use of the Filipino language and ethno-methodological approaches.

The first strand is exemplified by the writings of David (1982, 1998) and Bello (1997), while the second is illustrated by the development works inspired by post-modernist, feminist, and environmentalist critiques. The third is seen in the efforts made by some sociologists to resist the dominance of Western-based sociological theories and methodologies, through the use of the Filipino language and ethno-methodological approaches in the analysis of Philippine society and culture (Aquino, 1999). But the third strand of analysis has not yet influenced sociological theorizing among Filipino sociologists, such as in the disciplines of anthropology, history, and psychology. It has not made inroads in professional sociology (i.e. teaching and research in the universities) or in PSR, the official journal of the PSS; nor has this strand generated substantial publications and adherents to the movement.

To what extent, then, has Philippine sociology crafted a relatively autonomous tradition? Compared to the first half of the twentieth century, the last few decades have been marked by efforts to develop locally sensitive concepts and approaches. Some researchers use the national and/or local languages in which to publish (e.g. Pilipino, Cebuano, Kapampangan) and emphasize the richness and appropriateness of local conceptions for understanding Filipino culture and identity. But these efforts leave much to be desired.[3] Similar efforts, however, are also being made in other parts of the Asian region (Lee, 2000).

Sociological practice in the Philippines today is distinctly pluralistic, with its utilization of theoretical and methodological models from functionalist, critical, constructionist schools, enriched by participatory concepts/methodologies and trans-local applications. This pluralism is reflective of the increasing democratization as well as privatization of research in multiple sites of knowledge production.

Sociology in the Philippines has also slowly broken from its colonial roots and is striving for a relatively autonomous scholarship in analyzing its society and culture. It is relatively independent from the state and enjoys academic freedom, including publication of sociological work critical of the government, academic establishments, and other institutions of society. The inability to fully exercise its freedom is hindered only by a lack of resources. Philippine sociology is heavily dominated by professional and policy sociology, with critical and public sociology being visible only at certain critical historical junctures, such as during the Marcos authoritarian regime and in times of political and economic crisis.

As in other South-east Asian countries, there is an increasing tendency towards localization of knowledge production in the Philippines. Ironically, this trend is also accompanied with increasing dependence on global support (Evers and Gerke, 2006).

NOTES

1. Sociologists and anthropologists like Dr. Mercedes of the UP Population Institute and Frank Lynch of the Ateneo de Manila's Institute of Philippine Culture were among the key social scientists who pioneered in the organization of the Philippine Social Science Council, a non-government organization of social science disciplinal organizations.

2. Focus on Global South, based at CUSRI, Chulalongkorn University, is an NGO focused on eroding the politics and programs of neoliberal development regimes of the global, political, and

economic order and providing counter-alternatives to the hegemony of these structures (e.g. WTO, World Bank, IMF).

3. Based on interviews with Dr. Clemen Aquino of the Sociology Department, University of the Philippines-Diliman and Dr. Erlinda Alburo of the University of San Carlos, Cebu City.

REFERENCES

Abad, R. and Eviota, E (1982) 'Philippine Sociology in the Seventies: Trends and Prospects', *Philippine Sociological Review* 30: 131–50.

Abaya, E., Lucas-Fernan, M.L. and Noval-Morales, D. (1999) 'Changing Terms of Engagement: A Review of the History of Anthropology in the Philippines', in J. Miralao (ed.) *The Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation, Vol 1*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Alatas, F. (2001) 'Alternative Discourses in Southeast Asia', *Sari* (19): 49–67.

Alatas, F. (forthcoming) 'Religion and Reform: Two Exemplars for Autonomous Sociology in the non-Western Context' (this volume).

Aquino, C. (1999) 'Mula sa Kinaroroonan: Kapwa, Kapatiran at Bayan sa Agham ng Lipunan' (Origins of Identity: Self, Citizenship, and the Nation in Social Science), Professorial Chair Papers, Series 1999, University of the Philippines.

Arce, W. (1969) 'Keynote Address in the 1969 PSS National Conference', University of the Philippines, Manila, 20 October.

Bautista, M.C.R.B. (1994) 'Reflections on Philippine Sociology in the 1990s', *Journal of Philippine Development* 38(21): 1–25.

Bautista, M.C.R.B. (1999) 'The Social Sciences in the Philippines: Reflections on Trends and Developments', in V. Miralao (ed.) *The Philippine Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation*, pp. 381–409. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Bello, W. (1997) 'Sociology and the Centennial: Considerations on Democracy in the Philippines and Southeast Asia', *Philippine Sociological Review* 45(1–4): 216–31.

Burawoy, M. (2004) 'Public Sociologies: Contradictions, Dilemmas, and Possibilities', *Social Forces* June 2004 82(4): 1603–18.

David, R. (1982) 'Sociology and Development Studies in the Philippines', *Philippine Sociological Review* 30(1–4): 15–32.

David, R. (1984) 'Philippine Sociology in Search of an Alternative Paradigm: Trends in Philippine Sociology', Diamond Jubilee Lecture Series, Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines.

David, R. (1998) 'Philippine Sociology in Search of an Alternative Paradigm: Trends in Philippine Sociology', Lecture Series, Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines.

David, R. (2006) 'Public Sociology and the Political Role of the Intellectual', paper presented at the plenary session, The Practice of Sociology, Philippine Sociological Society (PSS) National Conference, De La Salle University, Manila, 19–20 October.

Evers, H.D. and Gerke, S. (2006) 'Glocalizing Local Knowledge: Social Science Research on Southeast Asia, *Sojourn: Journal of Social science in Southeast Asia* (21): 1–21.

Gibbons, M., Nowotny, H. and Limoges, C. (1994) *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.

Lamug, C. (1999) 'Towards a Filipino Sociological Imagination', in V. Miralao (ed.) *The Philippine Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation*, pp. 270–85. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Lee, S-H. (2000) 'The Rise of East-Asian Social Science's Quest for Self-Identity', *Journal of World Systems Research* VI(3) (Fall/Winter): 768–83. Special Issue: Festschrift for Immanuel Wallerstein.

Makil, P. and Hunt, C. (1981) 'The Impact of Martial Law on Sociologists in the Philippines', *PSSC Social Science Information* (January–March).

Miralao, V. (1999) 'The Philippine Social Sciences in Balance: Reflections at the Close of the Century', in V. Miralao (ed.) *The Philippine Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation*, pp. 344–73. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Mojares, R. (2006) *Brains of the Nation: Pedro Paterno, T. H. Pardo de Tavera, Isabelo de los Reyes and the Production of Modern Knowledge*. Quezo City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Mukherji, P.N. (1997[2001]) 'Introduction', in P. N. Mukherji, J. Aikara and C. Sengupta (eds) 'Sociology in South Asia: Heritage and Challenges', proceedings of the ISA Regional Conference for South Asia, Mumbai, 25–27 March.

Porio, E. (1998) 'Participatory/People-Centered Development: A Social Science Discourse in Philippine Politics and Governance', paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, Philippine Social Science Center, Quezon City, 22–23 May.

Porio, E. (2006) 'Globalization and Vietnamese Sociology in the Asian Region', Keynote Address, First Congress of the Vietnamese Sociological Association, Vietnam National University, Hanoi, 5–6 Dec.

Saloma, C. (2005) 'Sociology's Promise', paper presented at the 2005 meeting of the Philippine Sociological Society, Philippine Social Science Council, 17 March.

Talledo, T. (1993) 'Philippine sociology in the nineteen eighties: A review', PhD thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines.

Veneracion, C. (1989) *A Decade of Process Documentation: Synthesis and Reflection*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture.

Wallerstein, I. (1999) *The End of the World as we Know it: Social Science for the Twenty-first Century*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.