By eliminating the first column we lost df = 1, and we are left with df = 2. With df = 2, $X^2d = 2.7175$ had P > .05, clearly, not significant, an indication that this part of the table is homogeneous. The soundness of Dr. Pal's conclusion is upheld.

Notice that if we had tested the homogeneity of table 3 by means of ordinary chi-square formulas, we would have obtained, $X^2 = 6.7366$ with P < 0.5, and would have arrived at false conclusions. The reasons for this discrepancy are:

a. the ordinary chi-square formula gives estimates of E_{ij}, from the DTC. Since the information from the original table is not fully used the procedure violates the requirement of exhaustiveness in the utilization of data, necessary for correct interpretation of chi-square.

b. the ordinary chi-square formula does not correct for lack of goodness-of-fit; as a matter of fact, it does not even consider the possibility that this may occur.

The Bresnahan-Shapiro formula (Bresnahan and Shapiro, 1966), by requiring that E_{ij}'s be estimated from the intact table satisfies the criterion of exhaustiveness and by correcting for lack of goodness-of-fit, assures a fair sample of the population at hand. In this manner, conclusions arrived at on the basis of DTC's can be generalized with confidence to the whole intact table.

Finally, it is possible to use the Bresnahan-Shapiro formula to systematically explore a complex table of contingencies by successive combinations and/or elimination of categories of data. This procedure, requires additional rules to assure independence of the chi-square derived from derived table.

For the time being we will simply point that we obtained two DTC's with 1 and 2 df, respectively, which add up to df = 3, the df of the intact table. Also the sum of the X^2's is 24.1609 + 2.7275 = 26.8884 ($X^2 = 26.8884$) within negligible computational error replicate the total chi-square obtained for the intact table.

We intend to discuss this matter in a subsequent communication.

Bresnahan, J., and Shapiro, M. "A General Equation for the Exact Partitioning of Chi-Square Contingency Tables," 66, 1966 *Psychological Bulletin,* 252-262.

Pal, Agaton, "Aspects of Lowland Philippine Social Structure,"XIV:1 *Philippine Sociological Review,* 1966, 31-39.

Book Reviews

Burgess, E., Locke and Thomes, *The Family,* third edition. New York: The American Book Company, 1963, 582 pp.

There are four outstanding features of *The Family* by Burgess, Locke and Thomes: (1) the use of personal documents which are effectively presented at the beginning of each important topic to illustrate the problems and to present illumination of concepts; (2) the employment of the ideal type method developed by Max Weber of identification, isolation and accentuation of logical extremes; (3) the presentation of findings from various studies on the family; and (4) the suggestion of other areas to be studied.

Analysis of the family is made from the interactional approach. The family is accordingly viewed within the scope of this framework, shifting the theoretical focus on the family as an institution to the family as a companionable relationship.

Burgess, the senior author of the book, is remembered for his classic statement on the family as "a unity of interacting personalities." The book explicitly directs itself toward this hypothesis and successfully adheres to it throughout.

A family does not consist of or exist on a legal or a contractual basis but in the interaction of its members. The family lives as long as there is interaction and only dies when the interaction ceases. Thus, the family is a living, growing, and changing unit.

This focus on the dynamic relationships between husband and wife, parents and children and siblings brings about the discussion of dating, mate selection, function and roles, family stability and unity, marital accord and discord, and marital adjustment.

Much attention is also given to the formation of personality in the parental family. The individual is not born social or antisocial but asocial, with potentialities for social development. The individual develops a personality only in association with others, particularly his family and social group. In the intimate and personal contacts in the family, the child in time incorporates into himself the behavior patterns of his group. The mechanism through which personality is developed is communication or interpersonal interaction.

In the beginning chapters, there is a comparison of families in different societies and at other times. This comparison shows the importance of folkways and mores in determining the form of marriage and the type of family organization.

Basic terms are defined in the ideal-construct method. These are interaction, definition of the situation, institutional and companionship family, family types in urban areas, role taking, symbolic communication, socialization, familism and individualism, degrees of family unity, continuity, and mobility.

One of the purposes of the book is to arouse the interest of the student in research in marriage and the family. A taste for research is inescapable here as it stimulates curiosity and further investigation through the presentation of research, especially on the measurement of marital success or failure and on the prediction of adjustment in marriage. These can very well serve as models for future research on the Filipino family.

The American family is exhaustively and accurately described, with the use of current statistical data. One wishes, after reading this book, that with all the wealth of articles and studies on marriage and family in the Philippines, our own experts on family life would also take time to devote some efforts in the collection and organization of more valid and reliable data on the subject.

The third edition is certainly an improvement on the previous ones. Some materials were omitted and others added. But the authors have kept in mind to make the book simple and uncomplicated. It is a book with a sociological frame of reference that well suits the needs of a course on Family Life Education.

— Adelisa A. Raymundo
Department of Sociology
Liberal Arts & Sciences
University of the East

Francis C. Madigan, S. J., (ed.) *Human Factors in Philippine Rural Development: Proceedings of the Anniversary Seminar on Rural Development.* (Cagayan de Oro City: Xavier University, 1967), 318 pp.

This book is a systematic and comprehensive presentation of the proceedings held during the anniversary seminar on rural development. It gives the readers a full perspective of the discussions in each session. The scheme of presentation in this edition which includes the papers for each session, the comments and replies to the comments on the papers read, and the open forum, all in its original text, gives the readers an opportunity to evaluate for themselves the issues taken up in the seminar.

The following is a brief review of the different themes explored:

Session I.   Traditional Filipino Values and Economic Development

In this connection, it is noteworthy to cite some points in the Background and Assessment of the Current State of Rural Development in the Philippines.

> Agricultural development programs have in general not succeeded in raising average productivity in staple crops per hectare on a national basis. Lack of requisite technological knowledge, economic or agricultural, has not blocked progress; such knowledge is available. Rather, human factors have blocked the way. The masses, especially the rural people, value ways of behaving which are not consonant with a highly developed modern economy.

With these and other assessments mentioned in the book, replies and commentaries of the different experts from various fields as Sociology, Anthropology, Economics, Mission work, Community Development and other disciplines were presented.

Session II. Cultural Aspects of Rural Development
The Human Factor in Economic Development

Session III. Politics and Rural Development
Politics and Rural Development Programs in the Philippines

Session IV. Psychological and Psychiatric Aspects of Rural Development
Resistance in the Filipino to Economic Progress

Session V. Population Growth and Rural Development
Population and Levels of Living in the Rural Philippines

Session VI. Rural Sociology and Agricultural Development
Food Production Program from the Viewpoint of a Rural Sociologist.

Session VII. Applied Social Anthropology and Rural Development Projects
Some Hints for Rural Development Projects from Applied Social Anthropology.

Session VIII. Agricultural Education in Relation to Agricultural Development
Production Education

Session IX. The Change Agent and Community Development
Some Human Obstacles to Rural Projects

Session X. Recommendations of Seminar Participants

Closing session: Highlights and Important Issues of the Seminar.

With these above-mentioned topics, the reader can choose any particular session that suits his interest and read the proceedings in this edition.

This compilation is significantly helpful to all those who are engaged in rural development programs. Reading this book would enable the reader to have a broader and more realistic appraisal of rural development in the Philippines.

IONE BUENO MISON
Behavioral Sciences
College of Business Administration
University of the East

General Sociology: Focus on the Philippines

Felicidad V. Cordero and Isabel S. Panopio with a foreword by Ofelia D. Regala-Ongangco. Published by the College Professors Publishing Corporation, 1967. ± 465 pp., with glossary, bibliography, and index.

It is not so often that a textbook is written like a good monograph which one can enjoy reading and, at the same time, learn the principles of human society. *General Sociology: Focus on the Philippines* by Felicidad V. Cordero and Isabel S. Panopio, faculty members of the University of the East, is one such book. Intended as an introductory text in general sociology course for undergraduates, the book is written in a style which is neither too technical for the beginners nor too elementary for the professionals. To strike at this happy medium is a commendable achievement in the field of textbook writing. The authors accomplished this *feat* by weaving a tremendous amount of empirical data around basic sociological theories.

The book is divided into five major parts, excluding the introduction which discusses the basic framework of modern sociology. Part I deals with *Normative and Action Systems* which includes an analysis of culture in general, contemporary Filipino value-orientation, social groups, socialization and personality. Part II covers the *Dynamics of Human Behavior* as exemplified in social interaction and social processes, social change, and collective behavior. Part III discusses *Social Organization* in terms of integrated norms and acts in different levels of organized behavior like social class and stratification. Part IV shows the *Interrelation of Social Institutions* like the family, economics, religion, politics and education. And Part V describes the *Locus of Social Systems* in the context of ecology of rural-urban communities and demography.

Insofar as the organization and discussion of sociological theories, I have no quarrel with the authors. I think what they have done is a bold attempt at exposing students to new sociological thinking, heretofore wanting or inadequately handled in Philippine social science teaching and research. A perusal of publications coming out in different journals supports this observation. It is refreshing to note that we are catching up and initially with this book under review.

There is, however, one point (and a minor one) to which I wish to call the attention of the authors. And that is, the negative treatment of Filipino cultural traits. Of course this is not their fault because most of the materials about Filipino society and culture seem to stress the so-called "weakness" of the Filipinos. Because they accepted the data without question they were led to make generalizations about the function of *hiya, bahala na, pakikisama, utang na loob* and others in a manner similar to other observers. For example, *bahala na* is viewed as expressive of fatalistic attitude. I wish to differ from this opinion. I think *bahala na* is one of the most dynamic, risk-oriented norm in Filipino culture, the function of which is to provide an individual with self-confidence to deal with difficult situations. Thus, a person, after exhausting all possible means of resolving his problem and yet still finds himself in a tight fix, shrugs his shoulders, says *bahala na*, and plunges deep into another venture, hoping that by this new approach he can find solution to his difficulties. The same attitude is expressed by most businessmen. I have watched farmers and slum-dwellers, in the course of my fieldwork, who took risks of serious magnitudes because of *bahala na*. They did not follow the "line of least resistance" as most writers like to think of a Filipino. On the basis of these actual field experiences I have doubts about the veracity of the so-called fatalism in *bahala na* attitude.

Following Guthrie, the authors characterized the Filipino family as authoritarian because "the parents wield an influence on their children to a greater extent and over a longer period of time than American parents do." I think Guthrie, like other observers of Philippine society, is in error here. Simply because Filipino parents wield influence over their children for a long

period of time does not make them more authoritarian than American parents. Filipino society imposes upon Filipino parents different rules of interactions and different sets of expectations which to Western observers seem to be a direct contrast with those in the West. Using a concept drawn largely from Western societies, the description of Filipino society is thus advanced and oftentimes in a manner of a generalization not supported by adequate comparative materials.

I think the Filipino family is more *supportive* than authoritarian in character. By *supportive* I mean an individual usually enjoys the support of his kin group rather than being thrown into conformity by virtue of authortiy. Because of the bilateral structure of the kinship system, an individual can count on the support of the father's and the mother's relatives. In fact, when parents punish their children, the children can run to their uncles or grandparents and exact redress from them if the parents were unreasonable. I have actual cases recorded in my field notes. Frequently, a Filipino is an *arbiter* because should the first cousin or second cousin from the mother's side quarrels with the first cousin or second cousin from the father's side, he finds himself in an embarassing and tight position. Should he choose to defend one he courts the ire of the other. Not only that, the entire kin group would turn against him. Thus he makes a compromise, a way of settling the case without taking the sides. I have discussed this subject-matter in detail in a separate paper and I shall not therefore elaborate it here.

On the whole, however, the book is a welcome addition to a few number of texts on the subject. *General Sociology: Focus on the Philippines* is so far a better textbook than any of the ones available

that I have read. The chapters are well-balanced and the complicated sociological theories are presented simply but without lessening their academic tone. Social workers, economists, community development workers, educators, medical practitioners, and laymen interested in Philippine society may find this book useful. Whatever are its shortcomings, these are compensated by its wide theoretical coverage.

FELIPE LANDA-JOCANO
Associate Professor of Anthropology
University of the Philippines

The American Sociological Association's 62nd Annual Meeting*

MARY R. HOLLNSTEINER**

Presentation of papers

While the annual meeting is organized around the reading and discussion of papers, this is not the only purpose of the gathering. Many other functions are apparent, among them the establishing of informal contacts with colleagues, sizing up potential faculty members, and the operation of a formal employment agency. I attended a number of the announced sessions, choosing especially those symposia dealing with urban problems, social change, and the development of sociological theory. The sessions were generally interesting and profitable. It was gratifying to observe many of the "giants" of American sociology in action and to meet a number of them personally.

Luncheon round tables

This is a recent innovation in ASA meetings and might well be adopted at Philippine professional conventions. A list of topics for discussion is published well in advance, along with the names of the chairman and presentor of each subject. Eight persons may then sign up on a first-come-first-served basis to discuss the subject with its proponent over lunch. The presentor does not give a formal paper but merely discusses an idea currently of interest to him; the chairman sees to it that the session remains informal but directed enough to be profitable for all.

The two round tables in which I participated were the following:

"Design, Institution, and Evaluation of Planned Change"

Presentor: Donald Kent

Chairman: Reinhard M. Bendix

"Social Policy, Social Research and Social Action"

Presentor: Ray H. Elling

Chairman: Edward N. Suchman

In many ways these discussions were much more useful and enjoyable than the

---

formal paper-reading sessions. The ten people at each table had ample opportunity to voice their opinions and reflect on their own experiences with the rest of the group. This exchange of views on a limited topic was enhanced by the opportunity it provided for the younger, less-known sociologists to converse as peers with scholars well established in the sociological world.

Book exhibit

Worthy of mention is the impressive book exhibit of social science material mounted by the various publishers. Many recent titles which I had not noted before were displayed or listed, allowing me to place them either in my personal order file or that of the University Library. Publishers were most generous with their catalogues.

General Observations on the ASA Annual Meeting and Their Personal Implications

1. The experience of attendance at a large-scale professional meeting should prove useful to me when the Philippine Sociological Society, in particular, plans its next national convention.

2. The emphasis on the theoretical implications of the empirical work being reported, usually by younger sociologists, is a pattern we might well stress more in comparable Philippine social science circles. While the commitment to theory development is accepted here, too often the relative novelty of the empirical findings supplies for any formal consideration of their implications for theory building. The sessions proved to me that even where the data, e.g. federally financed U.S. anti-poverty programs, did not bear directly on my own work, the expansion of theory which they allowed made them relevant.

3. The ferment especially characteristic of the business meetings and informal gatherings, stressed the role of the sociologist in his society. Long and heated discussions of the stand the ASA should take or the part the sociologist as sociologist should play in such issues as U.S. involvement in Vietnam, the foreign aid program, Department of Defense sponsorship of social science research, race riots in American cities, and the Johnson anti-poverty program pointed to a growing redefinition of professional responsibility in national and international affairs. A number of themes sometimes portrayed as dichotomies emerged again and again:

(a) the objectivity and traditional detached policy of the social scientist versus his responsibility as an enlightened citizen to get involved in the problems of his society and to suggest and monitor solutions on the basis of his particular expertise, and; (b) the need to return to an earlier concern of American sociology, namely, social problems research versus the current interest in building theory and further refining methodology. While most recognize that both can be done, the "applied," or social problems, partisans decried the low status allocated in the discipline to their kind of research. Already, they warn, the sociologist's potential position of influence in national level planning has been seriously jeopardized by his apparent disdain of research oriented to the testing of lower-level hypotheses and to problem-solving.

Listening to such discussions led to some rethinking on my part of the position of involvement taken by most Philippine social scientists. While we have likewise expressed concern about issues related to our professional roles in a developing nation, we seem far less uneasy than our United States counterparts about actively helping out in private and governmental develop-ment programs. Perhaps the sense of urgency about our society, only now filtering into American sociological cir-cles, has always been a given for the Philippine social scientist. We have never doubted that we have something vitally important to offer administrators, and that it is our responsibility to do so. In this respect we are apparently a few jumps ahead of the American trend.

Attendance at the ASA Meeting re-vealed to me that the American school of sociology's long-time insistence on "value-free" sociology, which has in turn been drilled into many local social scientists trained there, is gradually being rethought. We need not apologize to the scientific world for our avid par-ticipation in development programs, so long as we state our limitations and maintain our objectivity in the explo-ration and treatment of data.

4. Traditionally Philippine social scientists have tended to rely on the United States for theory development. The ASA Meet-ing showed me that local social scien-tists can contribute far more to theory building than we have been accus-tomed to. A number of ASA papers relied for their model-construction on mass data collected from a number of developing countries. Much of this framework, especially regarding social change, we here already assume because it seems so obvious. Apparently, how-ever, it is not. It is clear that local scientists must engage in much more writing and reporting of data in order to extend their scientific contributions beyond Philippines shores.

It is worth noting that the Western-based leadership in theory-building, es-pecially with regard to social change, is traceable in part to the large mass of data from numerous countries available to the social scientist in the U.S. Having a range of evidence to work with provides him a basis for the broad comparisons needed for theory development. This situation is not often found in the Philippines. What material on Asia and other modernizing societies is in usable form tends to be sec-ondary and derived from American and European writings. While these are im-portant sources, Philippine social scien-tists also need to investigate their Asian, African, and Latin American counterparts directly if they wish to put their own modernization experience in perspective.

Report on the Activities of the Philippine Sociological Society for the Year 1967-68

I. *Monthly Meetings of the Society*

The Monthly Meetings of the Society were held at the BLP room, Ateneo Law School, Padre Faura St., Manila, on Sundays, at 4:00-6:00 in the afternoon. On the average, attendance numbered from 20 to 30 persons.