How We Raise Our Daughters and Sons: Child-rearing and Gender Socialization in the Philippines

Ma. Emma Concepcion D. Liwag
Alma S. de la Cruz
Ma. Elizabeth J. Macapagal
Ateneo de Manila University

The literature on Filipino child-rearing practices as they relate to gender socialization was surveyed in order to describe child-rearing attitudes, beliefs, expectations, and practices from early childhood to late adolescence which demonstrate explicit and implicit differential socialization for sons and daughters. Findings from more than a hundred empirical and conceptual papers on Filipino child-rearing indicated that specific expectations of masculine and feminine behaviors were mirrored in the family in six socialization areas, including 1) parental preferences for children of one gender or another; 2) what parents expect of their daughters in contrast to what they expect of their sons, and consequently; 3) how parents raise their daughters in contrast to how they raise their sons; 4) how families invest their resources unequally upon daughters and sons; 5) the types of differential responsibility training given to daughters and sons; and 6) parental modeling as indicated by differences in the child-rearing behaviors of mothers and fathers. The review affirmed

the role of the family as the major site of gender socialization of Filipino children.

Introduction

All the psychological conceptions of how gender roles are constructed and learned by children stress the central role of the family—the child's fundamental socializing group and natural environment for growing into maleness and femaleness (Hoyenga & Hoyenga, 1993).[1] As socialization is the complex process of learning those behaviors that are considered appropriate and not appropriate within a given culture, the ways that families raise sons and daughters to be men and women— i.e., gender socialization —will also reflect prevailing beliefs about the nature, meaning, and value of being male or female in that culture.

Clear-cut gender role expectations exist for men and women in Filipino culture. For instance, women are essentially perceived as wives, mothers, and homemakers (Baylon, 1975; Asprer, 1980; Gonzalez, 1977; Makil, 1981; Sobritchea, 1990). Their major responsibilities in life are said to be the following: to keep the house clean and orderly, prepare meals for their children and husband, wash and iron clothes (Zablan, 1997). Women are also expected to be the main source of nurturance and emotional support for their children. Behaving contrary to these expectations is likely to invite criticisms from others.

As a consequence of these expectations, certain traits are expected from women and men. Jimenez (1981) studied Filipino concepts of femininity and masculinity and found that femininity—generally thought of in terms of being *mahinhin* (modest), *pino ang kilos* (refined), *mabini* (demure)—is strongly associated with the mother and homemaker roles. On the other hand, masculinity is generally conceived of in terms of being *malakas* (strong), *matipuno* (brawny), *malaki ang katawan* (big bodied), *maskulado* (muscular), and *malusog* (healthy).

2

Just how are these construals of femininity and masculinity translated into differential child-rearing attitudes and behaviors towards sons and daughters in Filipino families? How do parental gender role-expectations participate in gender socialization practices? What gender role images are replicated and reinforced in Filipino child care activities, and how do these practices create gendered home environments that may directly or indirectly communicate differential treatment for sons and daughters?

Answers to these questions were obtained by surveying comprehensively the empirical and conceptual literature on child-rearing practices in the Philippines as they relate to the development of gender socialization in Filipino children. Thus, this literature review sought to describe Filipino child-rearing attitudes, beliefs, expectations, and practices from early childhood to early adulthood (0-18 years) which demonstrate explicit and implicit differential socialization for sons and daughters; and to review the consequences of these child-rearing practices for the development and learning of gender roles and stereotypes among Filipino children, both boys and girls.

Method

A comprehensive library search of both published and unpublished local primary sources from the 1970s to the present was conducted. The three-decade span of research was considered appropriate for analyzing trends—changes as well as stabilities—in Filipino child-rearing attitudes and practices related to gender role development.

Sampling

Sources of local literature that were surveyed included the following:

- Books and scholarly journals in the fields of Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Gender and/or Women's Studies, Family Studies, Communication, Education, and Social Work

3

- Literature reviews and/or annotated bibliographies on the Filipino child and family, and gender studies (e.g., Ventura, 1982; Sevilla, 1982; Torres, 1988; Go, 1993)

- Published conference proceedings

- MA theses and Ph.D. dissertations

- Published and unpublished documents, data-bases, and materials from government agencies (e.g., Department of Social Welfare and Development; Department of Health) private research institutions (e.g., Institute of Philippine Culture), and data banks (such as IBON Facts & Figures)

Procedure

Retrieval of the pertinent studies from the sources listed above was guided by key word searches using terms such as *child-rearing practices, beliefs, attitudes, methods*; *gendered home environments*; *gender role development*; *gender/sex-role stereotypes*; *gender imagery*; *gender role socialization*; etc. This procedure resulted in a corpus consisting of a total of 131 studies. A review and evaluation of the data from the retrieved studies was then undertaken. The substantive content of the studies were analyzed to identify any common results, patterns, or themes.

Gender-Differentiated Child-Reading: The Research Findings

How do Filipino parents raise their children in ways that socialize them to their gender identities and roles? The studies in the literature that directly bear upon child-rearing and gender socialization were found to cluster around six major topics which include 1) expressed preferences of parents for daughters or sons; 2) gender-related expectations that parents have for their children; 3) gender-differentiated child-rearing practices; 4) differences in family investment in daughters and sons; 5) differences in the responsibility training of daughters and sons; and 6) differences in the child-rearing responsibilities of mothers and fathers.

A newborn child enters a world in which its caregivers may already have well-developed expectations, hopes, and desires with respect to the child's gender. Previous research have suggested that parental preferences for their forthcoming child's gender may affect subsequent parenthood experiences (Stattin & Klackenberg-Larsson, 1991). Studies were also found in the local literature dealing with this issue, with rather equivocal implications for sons and daughters.

Sons preferred over daughters. Several studies have shown that Filipino families prefer sons over daughters (Bulatao, 1975; Jurilla, 1986), although this preference is expressed more strongly by fathers, (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a; Estrada, 1983), grandfathers (De Guzman, 1976), male teenagers (De La Paz, 1976), respondents from the military sector (Jimenez, 1981), and those with Chinese ancestry (Ocampo-Go, 1994).

The bias towards male children is revealed in more ways than one. Mendez and Jocano (1979a) and Estrada (1983) both report that fathers' preference for sons applied especially to the first-born. But Bulatao (1975) also found that 25% of his respondents were willing to keep on having children until they had a son. Among Filipino-Chinese families, mothers with daughters are advised to "fight for a son", and Chinese herbal medicine which "guarantee" that a son will be conceived are well-known among Chinese and Filipino-Chinese mothers (Ocampo-Go, 1994). Finally, while a majority (61%) of the respondents in Jimenez' study (1981) indicated, as a first choice, a desire for an equal number of male and female children, 32% wanted a predominantly male brood, and even an all-male brood (6%). In contrast, only 2% preferred a predominantly female brood, and *none opted for a family consisting only of daughters*.

But other studies have pointed out that the Filipinos' supposed preference for sons is actually quite weak (Concepcion, 1986), especially in comparison to other Asian countries such as China, South Korea, Pakistan, and Bangladesh (Castillo, 1993). Indeed, Filipino

mothers, in particular, were more likely to desire a family "of the right size with the proper combination of boys and girls for companionship among siblings" (Bulatao, 1975), prefer a balance of the sexes (De Guzman, 1976; Jimenez, 1981), or express no noted preference for children of either sex (Jocano, 1976; Concepcion, 1986).

Daughters preferred over sons. On the other hand, there are a number of studies indicating that female children are highly desired by Filipino parents, especially mothers (Licuanan, 1979; Estrada, 1983). Eighty-six percent (86%) of Bulatao's respondents (1975) claimed that daughters are very important, but the vote for female children also fall along gender lines - it is declared by more female than male teenagers (De La Paz, 1976), and by more grandmothers and older, post-menopausal women than grandfathers (De Guzman, 1976). In addition, among the elderly who hoped to live with their children, 75% would rather live with daughters than with sons (De Guzman, 1976).

The value of daughters. Why are daughters valued in Filipino families, so much so that they are sometimes preferred over sons? Here is a sample of the most cited reasons for wanting daughters: "so that they can help in housework and family chores," (Bulatao, 1975, 1978), "as a source of assistance in carrying out household tasks" (Licuanan, 1979), *"para makatulong sa bahay"* (so she can help in the home) (Castiglioni, 1982). Only a tiny minority offer other reasons for wanting a girl-child, such as particular qualities of personality or behavior that she may have (Bulatao, 1975), or the fun, happiness, and companionship she can provide - especially to her mother (Bulatao, 1978). Macalandong, Masangkay, Consolacion, and Guthrie (1978) report that in the Maranao culture, female children are desirable because "they command a good dowry from a husband's family", although male children are still preferred because they can be their fathers' "army".

Filipino families are known to generally ascribe incentive value to children—viewing sons as well as daughters in terms of economic utility and psychological security (Bulatao, 1975, 1978; Palejo, 1992)—but the traditional and stereotyped aspects of the woman's role

are still heavily emphasized in the reasons given for a daughter's welcomed presence in the family. A daughter, once she is able, is expected to assist her mother in fulfilling the shared tasks of their womanhood—the work of the household, the work of nurturance.

Thus, Castillo (1993) hypothesized that a daughter is preferred because she is an ever-dependable source of support. Even after marriage, she "holds the family purse so it is easier for [her] to channel support to [her] parents." Aged parents would rather live with daughters because they believe that daughters "provide better care for parents and possess more positive characteristics" than sons (De Guzman, 1976), and Filipino-Chinese families expect daughters to eventually serve as family mediators, binding members to one another (Ocampo-Go, 1994).

Tacoli's (1996) study of female migrant workers further showed that a strong sense of duty impels daughters to earn a living abroad for the sake of their families. They appear to have stronger commitments and obligations to their families (of origin) than males. Though they earn less than their male counterparts, they send more money to parents and normally have no say on how this money will be spent. They are strongly expected to take care of their siblings financially. It would seem then that in Filipino families, the work of caring is one that a daughter is expected to fulfill for life. Taken to its extremes, the result is the *tagasalo* (rescuer) syndrome (described in case studies by Carandang, 1987) where daughters compulsively and single-handedly take responsibility for their families' troubles, at very heavy physical and emotional costs to themselves.

Parental Gender-Related Expectations of their Children

Parents may hold other sex-typed expectations of their children that could affect the way they raise them. This section looks at several studies that explore the character traits expected of male and female children, as well as the aspirations that parents hold for their children, according to gender.

Sex-typed traits. It has been claimed that by and large, there are no salient sex differences in parents' character expectations for children. Sons and daughters are expected to be obedient, honest, respectful, and kind (Licuanan & Gonzalez, 1976). Listings of traits of the ideal daughter and ideal son (e.g., Lynch & Makil, 1968; Guthrie, 1970) also contain many overlapping desired characteristics. Regardless of their children's gender, parents hope that they will grow up humble, considerate, hardworking, and courteous.

Nevertheless, some traits have been idealized more strongly for female children—e.g., industry and thrift (Lynch & Makil, 1968), modesty, obedience and love for the home (Guthrie, 1970)—while others have been idealized more commonly for male children—e.g., morality and modernity (Lynch & Makil, 1968), intelligence and *pakikisama* or being able to get along well with others (Guthrie, 1970).

An unambiguous gender divide in parents' perceptions of their children was obtained more recently by Sobritchea (1990). Girls were described as *matulungin sa bahay* (helps in the house), *masipag mag-aral* (studious), *mahilig makipag-kaibigan* (friendly), *masinop sa gamit* (orderly), *malinis sa katawan* (neat and clean), and *mahilig magsimba* (likes attending Mass). Sons were said to be *mahilig lumayas sa bahay* (always out of the house) and *matulungin sa iba* (helpful). In fact, sons were expected to be unafraid to leave the house even knowing they might be punished. They must somehow learn to defend themselves in a fight although they are not to start a fight themselves.

Sobritchea (1990) found that parents expected their children, both girls or boys, to develop traits of industry, respect, perseverance in studies, and kindness. But only girls were enjoined to be coy, demure, and *mahinhin* (modest) with the opposite sex, to stay at home as much as possible, and to be conscious of their physical appearance. Boys were exhorted to avoid fist fights and violence, as well as vices like smoking and drinking. They should be able to endure physical pain, or at least suffer in silence, whereas girls are privileged to cry or complain when hurt, upset, or sad (Flores, 1969).

Sex-typed aspirations. In many Filipino families, aspirations for the children's future are linked to educational opportunities. Licuanan (1979) reported from one low income urban community that regardless of parents' own educational attainment, most wanted their children to have a college education. This is a goal that they set for *both* male and female children. This view is also reflected among rural families (Illo, 1988) where "majority of parents think that daughters have as much right as sons to be educated". Because of limited finances, not all children may be able to proceed to high school or higher education, but even then, the decision as to who stays in school is not gender-based. Instead, parents continue to invest in those children "who are interested in going to school" (Illo, 1988).

In contrast, Minoza, Tablante, and Botor (1984) report that mothers had higher aspirations for their male preschool children than for the females, although the exact nature of these aspirations is not clear. In Lamug's survey of more than 500 adolescents (1989), parents were found to wield less influence on girls than boys when it came to educational matters. Lamug explains her findings, thus:

> "The differential role expectations of parents from their male and female children also translate into the extent of influence they exert on them. Males are expected to be the future provider for their families. Because education is highly instrumental in value for obtaining secure occupations, education influence of parents tend to be greater for their male children than for their female children." (p. 55)

Gender-Differentiated Child Rearing Beliefs and Practices

In the light of parents' gender-related preferences for and expectations of their children, studies have reported on child-rearing beliefs and practices that differ for daughters and sons. The findings in the literature will be discussed developmentally from the prenatal period to adolescence.

Prenatal and infancy stages. A few studies have shown that a child, from its moment of conception, elicits gender-related responses; for instance, it is believed that the girl-child's gender is evident in the way her expectant mother looks—pretty and not so heavy (Sobritchea, 1990). Other old beliefs about the expectant mother's behavior when she is carrying a girl-child are not as flattering. According to the Tagalogs, when the woman hates her husband during her *lihi* period (i.e., the period when she experiences intense cravings or dislikes for particular food, objects or persons) the baby will be a girl and will look like the mother (Jocano, 1970).

The male unborn child, on the other hand, is believed to already possess certain gender-stereotypical features. He is believed to be strong, to eat more, to grow faster. One possible implication of this belief is that the mother of a girl-child may not be as well-attended after she has delivered, unlike the mother of a boy-child who is given more attention because her labor pains are thought to be more stressful (Sobritchea, 1990).

Early to late childhood .It has been reported that in Filipino homes, boys and girls are treated alike until 5 or 6 years of age (Guthrie & Jacobs, 1966) and that gender socialization only really begins at about age 10 (Stoodley, 1957). Such statements are difficult to confirm or dispute since there is little local research on child-rearing in the very early developmental period from infancy to the preschool years. Among the few studies is Razon's (1981) investigation of 150 mother-preschool child pairs where she found that birth-order, rather than the child's gender, was a more significant predictor of child-rearing differences in urban families. Pelino (1984) studied mothers from Tacloban City, 69% of whom claimed that their approach to child-rearing did not vary in terms of their children's gender. Among the reasons mothers gave: "they are all my children" (39%); "for equality and fairness" (21%); and "they all need me" (11%).

However, a number of researches that looked at early, middle, and late childhood have gathered evidence of differences in the way boys and girls are raised in their families. This discussion will describe

how gender socialization transpires during childhood in various aspects of the Filipino child's life such as gender segregation, play, character formation and discipline.

Gender segregation. In the physically close-knit Filipino household, there is no inflexible gender segregation until children reach school age. Before then, brothers and sisters share sleeping mats or bedrooms; boys and girls bathe and go swimming together in the nude, although the older girls usually wear panties (Jocano, 1970; Mendez & Jocano, 1979a).

But by the age of five, children can no longer wander around without underwear, and some degree of privacy between the sexes is observed—boys especially are reprimanded when they peep or watch their older sisters undressing. Girls can no longer urinate in open places, and mothers refrain from bringing their sons to the ladies' comfort room (Enrile-Santiago, 1977). In conservative Maranao families, the rigid separation of the sexes is also enforced by the age of six, and maintained throughout adult life such that men and women sit separately in mosques and buses never touching one another (Macalandong et al., 1978).

Play. In no other area of socialization does sex differentiation become more evident in childhood than in children's play behavior. Ethnographic observations, for one, have consistently documented the gendering of games that children play. Among young girls, *bahay-bahayan* (playing house) remains the most popular play activity (Estrada, 1983). Variations on this favorite fantasy play include *lutu-lutuan* (cooking; Jocano, 1988) *tinda-tindahan* (store-keeping, sometimes using leaves and flower petals for market items; Lagmay, 1983) and *reyna-reynahan* (pretending to be queens; Mendez & Jocano, 1979a). In these role-playing games, girls enact mother-and-baby scenarios, "performing activities observed in the home and imitating their parents' and siblings' manner of speaking" (Jocano, 1988). Girls also play physical games like *piko* (hopscotch) and *luksong tinik* (jumping over sticks; Lagmay, 1983).

Boys, on the other hand, engage in "rougher, more daring, and more action-filled activities" (Jocano, 1988). Young boys play *teks* (playing

cards), *tatching* (hitting bottle caps), and *baril-barilan* (gun-fighting; Estrada, 1983; Lagmay, 1983); they swim, box and kick in imitation of fist fights they see in the movies (Jocano, 1988). Slightly older boys fly kites, row boats, dive (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a), and pretend to go fishing with small pieces of discarded nets or hooks and lines (Jocano, 1988). Lagmay (1983) also observed "boys in groups shooting birds with their slingshots or sitting in one corner playing *cara-y-cruz* " (heads or tails).

Surveys of children's toy and play preferences in middle and high SES urban areas have uncovered similar gender-based differences. Minoza et al. (1984) and Bernardo (1994) found that more girls played with commercial toys like dolls while more boys played with commercial sports items (Minoza et al., 1984), toy cars, video games, and "fighting dolls", also popularly known as "action figures" (Bernardo, 1994). Lim-Yuson (1982) observed preschool girls favoring more solitary, individual play activities in school such as quiet games (e.g., writing work, puzzles, and on-looker activities) and seeming to have fewer opportunities for pretend play. Contrary to her expectations, preschool boys indulged in more cognitive-dramatic play indoors, mostly portraying super-heroes from television.

Gender-neutral activities have been noted as well. Mendez and Jocano (1979a) report that in the communities they studied, children of both sexes played *luksong tinik, patintero* (an indigenous variation of tag), and *taguan* (hide-and-seek). Street football is also played by mixed groups of older children, with those too young to play lined along the sides of the streets to watch and cheer (Lagmay, 1983). Minoza and her colleagues (1984) found that more urban middle class boys and rural boys played with mixed toys than the other SES groups they studied. And in Lim-Yuson's (1982) study, no significant gender differences turned up in terms of cooperative social play suggesting that boys and girls are able to play together fairly well, at least when they are in preschool.

Nevertheless, there are consequences for violations of gender-based demarcations in play activity. Sobritchea (1990) reports that girls are still cautioned against engaging in "masculine" pursuits like *larong bola*

(ball games) and *paggala-gala* (wandering about). However, boys are more likely to accept girls in their play activities than girls are to include boys in theirs (Pablo, 1971). This suggests that peer pressure on gender-selection of playmates is more rigid for boys than girls, and the social penalties for "crossing the line" more severe. For instance, boys are merciless teased and taunted by their peers as *bakla* or sissy when they insist on joining the girls' games (Jocano, 1988).

Other gender-related standards pervade children's play. Boys are reportedly given more time to play because they do not have to help out so much at home (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a). More girls were found to play *indoors* rather than outdoors, because girls were either more protected or had more toys inside the house (Minoza et al., 1984). On the other hand, significantly more boys (41%) than girls (26%) complained that their mothers do *not* play any games with them, and in general, more boys report that *both* parents do not play with them (Bernardo, 1994).

When parents did play with their children, they tended to be just as sex-typed. Children reported that their mothers played more "word games" or board games with them demanding or testing verbal skills (e.g., Scrabble, Boggle) while more fathers were inclined to play "strategy games". These games include chess and checkers that involve strategic planning, but also "combat games" wherein the goal is to conquer the game pieces of the "enemy". Children, both girls and boys, played video games equally often with their mothers and fathers, but girls reported playing active, motoric games only with their fathers (Bernardo, 1994).

Freedom versus restrictions. While Filipino child-rearing has been generally described as gentle, permissive, indulgent, and un-hurried (Enrile-Santiago, 1977), a clear difference in the amount of freedom granted to boys and the degree of restrictions that girls have to cope with has been noted from past (Quiambao, 1965; Mendez & Jocano, 1979a; Razon, 1981) to present (Jocano, 1988; Ramirez, 1988; Espina, 1996). This appears to be true for both urban and rural families, at all socio-economic levels, including families of urban streetchildren

(Porio, 1994). It is equally marked in the Mindanao Muslim cultures, where the traditional practice among Maranao and Maguindanao families is to keep girls at home, while boys are allowed to go out and mix with other children (De la Cruz, Santos, & Vida, 1971).

Girls are kept closer to hearth and home for what seems like obvious gender-stereotypical reasons—e.g., a girl's place is believed to be in the home (De la Cruz et al., 1971); she is needed to help out in the efficient running of the household (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a); she needs to be protected for her own safety and welfare (Porio, 1994; Espina, 1996). Porio questions why the latter reason should not apply to boys as well given enough evidence that male streetchildren are just as vulnerable to brutality from the police, pimps, pedophiles, drug-pushers, and even bystanders.

Aggression. In keeping with the general air of laxity that characterizes the rearing of the boy-child, parents are also reportedly more permissive towards male children when it comes to handling aggression (Razon, 1981). It does not appear, however, that overt aggression is encouraged even among male children (Lagmay, 1983; Sobritchea, 1990), if anything they are constantly warned by mothers not to get into fights and to avoid peers who are prone to violence.

The boy-child does have to learn to defend himself and his family honor. Among the Maranaos, this is conceptualized as *maratabat* or intense self-pride, described by Macalandong et al. (1978), thus:

"The boy is taught to defend his own and his family's good name. If he hears an insulting statement from among his playmates or from anyone else, it is his duty to seek an explanation. The one who uttered the statement must be forced to apologize, and promise not to repeat such allegations. Failure to apologize may lead to bloodshed among the children and then among the adults... In the event of a frank outbreak of warfare between two or more families and their followers, a boy must stand and fight with them. Each boy must be prepared to fight for his family's safety and honor.

From about six years of age, one must be careful not to insult a child or his family in his presence, because by this time, he has developed an intense self-pride or maratabat which leads him to react very strongly to insults." (p. 19)

Mangawit (1981) writes very similarly of the Kalingas:

"To the Kalingas, to revenge or sustain a quarrel is a sign of courage. It is not uncommon to hear elders call their sons 'balus', a ridicule for cowards, when they do not retaliate or revenge the wrong done to them or to their kin.... the Kalinga child does not fight his own fight alone to the last. There is almost always an involvement of two or more companions in the fight. Aggressiveness of the boys can be shown in the way they ganged themselves in fights against a [considered] enemy." (pp. 87-88)

No research was found that looked into how parents reacted to and handled physical aggression among girls.

Discipline. Studies of disciplinary practices in the Philippines rarely mention any analysis of gender differences in the frequency, severity, and types of punishment administered to children. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of Pelino's (1984) Tacloban City mothers claimed that their approach to discipline did not differ for boys and girls. But in the two rural villages that Sobritchea (1990) investigated, the normative form of punishment for boys, i.e., beatings with a wooden stick, was not imposed as often upon girls who were thought to be physically more fragile. Instead, for their transgressions, girls were more often pinched in the waist, slapped on the buttocks, and/or scolded. Jocano (1970) also mentioned that punishment for the children in the Bay, Laguna area include threats of pinching the vagina for girls, and threats of castration for boys.

For all that, most parents believed that girls can be more easily disciplined, obey more readily, and learn faster from their mistakes (Sobritchea, 1990). Yet Minoza et al. (1984) found that girls are actually

more resistant to scolding than boys. They attributed this to the more numerous scoldings that girls receive from their mothers, due to the rigid set of restrictions that apply more so to girls than boys.

Adolescence. The adolescent years mark a period when the differential treatment of sons and daughters become even more dramatic and pronounced. After all, it is the onset of puberty that defines girls and boys as full sexual beings, in possession of the complete reproductive capacities of their respective genders.

For the girl-child, menarche is the major event that earns her the sobriquet of *dalagita* or *dalaga*. But unlike circumcision, the counter-part rite-of-passage for boys, the coming of the menses is not as "celebrated" (Jocano, 1988). Instead, mothers react in very practical ways to the event, instructing daughters on issues of hygiene and pain avoidance. Among the rituals that are taught are the following: the girl must jump from the third step of the staircase to limit her menstrual period to only three days, and she has to pour water over herself to "strengthen and protect her during her period" (Jocano, 1970).

Restrictions during her menstrual period include the following: she cannot do hard work or carry heavy loads (Jocano, 1970); she should not take a bath (Jocano, 1970; Lagmay, 1983), wash her hair (Jocano, 1988) or wet her feet (Lagmay, 1983); she cannot eat sour foods like vinegar and green mangoes (Lagmay, 1983). In the Visayan region, she is also told to avoid places where there are watering plants (Jocano, 1988). Bad complexion, falling hair, and irregular periods may result if these restrictions are not heeded (Lagmay, 1983).

Because of her burgeoning sexuality and the perceived vulnerabilities that it brings, continuing themes of constraint and control carry over to other areas of the girl's life—especially in her deportment and in her relations with the opposite sex. Puberty means giving up her girlish mannerisms and games (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a), even as she is advised by the older folk to avoid loud laughter and undignified

behavior (Baylon, 1975). "She can no longer slump on a chair like she used to or walk with careless gait, otherwise her attention will be called" (Jocano, 1988).

In many veiled and implicit ways, the adolescent girl is sent a message that men are out to prey upon her; she is even separated from her brothers! (Enrile-Santiago, 1977). It is no longer considered safe and proper for her to be outside the protective cocoon of the home and special attention is paid to enforcing her curfew (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a; Asprer, 1980). Even a slight delay in returning home may result in a severe scolding or beating (Lagmay, 1983). Although she may be courted (Jocano, 1988), she may not flirt (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a) or go out unchaperoned (Baylon, 1975).

She is urged to be careful and circumspect in dealing with boys, often without explanation of the dangers she is being warned against. In fact, majority of teenagers get their sex education from other sources such as friends and books (Enrile-Santiago, 1977; Raymundo & Lusterio, 1995a) rather than parents. What girls hear from their parents, instead, are vague admonitions, in metaphor and euphemism, to "take care of [herself] against malicious men that abound" (Enrile-Santiago, 1977; also Dionisio, 1994). Porio (1994) reports that in streetchildren's families too, girls are allowed to work in the streets only if parents, brothers, and other relatives are also living or vending nearby. Girls, but not boys, are seen as susceptible to *disgrasya*, literally, an accident, but euphemistically, the loss of one's virginity. Porio concludes that even in the streets, "the continuity of protectiveness that surrounds females is still preserved."

In her adolescent years, therefore, the daughter continues to experience more severe restraints on her behaviors while her brothers continue to enjoy comparatively greater freedom and license (see Mendez & Jocano, 1979a, 1979; Asprer, 1980; Porio, 1994). Ostensibly, she is being protected from irresponsible boys, from her own vulnerability to pregnancy, and from the untold embarrassment that this will cause her

family (Jocano, 1988). Dionisio (1994), however, fears that because of this, a girl "learns to associate her passage into womanhood with shame [and] the fear of men."

Differential Family Investment in Sons and Daughters

Economists who study the distribution of family resources have revealed interesting findings in the differential costs of rearing male and female children. In Cabanero's (1977) rural sample, girls were found to require less food expenditures than males, especially at ages 3 to 5 years, and at 15 years and above. Except in infancy where no differences were found, male children appear to consume more food than female children. While no direct relationships between children's health status and gender differences in food consumption have been studied, it may be worthwhile to note that the incidence of malnutrition in the Philippines has been found to be higher for girls than boys (Food and Nutrition Research Institute 1989-1990 National Nutrition Survey, cited in *IBON Facts & Figures*, 1993).

Cabanero's rural families also spent more on clothing for male than for female children. The reverse was found, however, in the low to middle SES urban families in Cotabato City that Gomez (1988) surveyed where parents allocated more of the family clothing budget to their daughters. On health-related costs, opposing findings were likewise obtained from the two studies, with Cabanero reporting higher medical expenses for female children (especially at ages 6 to 8 years, and at 12 years and above), and Gomez reporting that male children required more money to keep them healthy.

As for educational expenses, both studies consistently estimated that female children received greater schooling outlays than their male counterparts. Cabanero explains that in her sample, more girls than boys were enrolled in school at all age levels.

The two studies conclude that overall, female children are more expensive to raise (costing almost twice as much as male children, according to Cabanero's estimates). Yet males enjoy greater outlay in

terms of family human capital investment (which includes the time spent in their rearing). However, the return of this investment comes earlier for the boy-child who becomes a net benefactor to the family by ages 12 to 14 years, compared to the girl-child, who begins to benefit her family only by ages 15 to 17 years. This difference in the family's financial gains from male and female children's labor will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

Differences in Responsibility Training of Sons and Daughters

Responsibility training is a hallmark of Filipino child-rearing practices; it begins early and proceeds quite systematically. While very young children do not have to work on chores regularly, they are gradually given light tasks from as early as 4 years of age (Licuanan, 1979; Lagmay, 1983). By the time the child is about 7 years old, he or she experiences an increased demand for household responsibilities. In Ilocos, for instance, the child is now considered *mabalin a mabaonen* (one who can be sent out to run errands; Jocano, 1988). At this stage of development, Lagmay (1983) writes, "...assigned tasks...have increased in number and difficulty. Poor performance which was tolerated in earlier years is now checked more rigorously."

As a result of this training, children in the Philippines become critical contributors of unpaid household work and child care (Boulier, 1976). That the assistance of children in household labor, including caring for younger siblings, is not trivial may be evidenced by Popkin's (1976) finding that due to children's assumption of some of their working mothers' child care duties, the per capita child care time of households with non-working mothers is not much greater than those with working mothers. Boulier (1976) also notes that the work of older children of both sexes increase substantially their mothers' opportunities to enjoy some leisure time.

Responsibility training continues through adolescence to prepare adolescent girls and boys for their future adult roles (Lagmay, 1983). In poor households, they are now, if not earlier, fully expected to assist their families in subsistence activities (Licuanan, 1979; Jocano,

19

1988). This is consistent with economic estimates showing, for instance, that in farm families (Boulier, 1976), fathers supplied about 65% of work time, mothers about 20%, and children 15%. While children contributed proportionately less to crop cultivation and poultry and livestock raising, half of their income-earning time is spent in wage paying jobs (including working on the farms of others for wages), and about a fifth is spent in income-generating home production. Children in non-farm families participated less in family income earning activities and non-income home production, but gave more time to child care. Thus, the total amount of income contributed by children in farm and non-farm families were found to be almost equivalent (Boulier, 1976).

Boulier reported these findings from two decades ago, but present-day labor statistics furnish more dismal figures. According to the Department of Labor and Employment (cited in *IBON Facts & Figures*, 1996), child workers in the country have increased from 2.2 million in 1991 to 5.0 million in 1994. In The Survey of Children 5-17 Years Old conducted by the National Statistics Office (1995) for the International Labor Organization, 3.7 million children in this age bracket reported having worked in the last 12 months. Majority of these children (67%) were from the rural areas and engaged in farm activities (also cited in *IBON Facts & Figures*, 1996).

The issue at hand, however, is whether children's responsibility training (whether it eventually results in paid or unpaid child labor) is also gender-differentiated. Numerous references to this issue in various studies lean towards the view that the tasks assigned to daughters definitely differ from those assigned to their brothers.

Tasks assigned to girls. The diverse tasks assigned to daughters may be collectively defined as domestic, indoors, and nurturant, in other words, work that is stereotypically feminine (Licuanan & Gonzalez, 1976; Rojas-Aleta, Silva, & Eleazar, 1977; Pineda, 1981; Shimizu, 1984; Dionisio, 1994). This has been observed in studies conducted in all parts of the country, in both rural and urban settings, including Kalinga (Mangawit, 1981) and Cordillera communities (Dandan, 1990), and Chinese-Filipino households (Ocampo-Go, 1994). All told, daughters

render assistance in virtually all the day-to-day aspects of managing the home, and the listing of their chores from various studies is quite extensive.

Daughters' housework. Daughters assist in meal preparation from start to finish, including preparing ingredients, cleaning fish, cooking, setting the table, and washing dishes, pots, and pans (Baylon, 1975; Jocano, 1976; Mendez & Jocano, 1979a; Estrada, 1983; Lagmay, 1983; Illo, 1988; Illo & Veneracion, 1988; Jocano, 1988; Sobritchea, 1990). According to Estrada (1983), a 6-year old girl, especially if she is the eldest, may already be expected to cook rice for the family.

Daughters help in washing clothes (Baylon, 1975; Lagmay, 1983; Jocano, 1988; Sobritchea, 1990), and when a little bit older, in ironing clothes, too (Jocano, 1976). They have to clean the house, inside and outside, and begin by rolling the mat in the morning (Jocano, 1976; Mendez & Jocano, 1979a, Illo, 1988; Jocano, 1988). In Bicol, they help their mothers in keeping the kitchen gardens as well as in tending ornamental plants. They may be tasked to feed animals, especially the fowls (Illo, 1988; Illo & Veneracion, 1988).

Not surprisingly then, female children contribute more housework time than males and become independent at an earlier age in terms of taking care of themselves (Gomez, 1988). Daughters may start out as their mothers' assistants, but as they get older and their skills improve, greater responsibility for household chores is transferred to them (Estrada, 1983; Jocano, 1988). The eldest daughter is usually made to bear the hardest work at home (Lagmay, 1983).

Child care. Caring for younger siblings is another major area where daughters are expected to provide meaningful hours of assistance. This help includes minding, feeding, and rocking infants to sleep, and watching over or playing with toddlers and older children (Baylon, 1975; Boulier, 1976; Popkin, 1976; Jocano, 1976; Mendez & Jocano, 1979a; Estrada, 1983; Lagmay, 1983; Illo, 1988; Illo & Veneracion, 1988; Jocano, 1988; Sobritchea, 1990; Ocampo-Go, 1994). Minoza and her associates (1984) found that older sisters were ranked the no. 1 caretakers of non-eldest

girls in their urban poor sample. Similarly, daughters in Laguna, more than sons, were cared for longer periods of time by older siblings, presumably because sons were supervised more directly by their mothers (Cabanero, 1977). Thus, carers and the cared-for are both predominantly female.

Among rural families, Popkin (1976) confirmed that by ages 7 to 15 years, daughters act as mother substitutes. Older girls in poor households were found to replace some of their working mothers' child care time. In families with non-working mothers, the results varied by socio-economic condition. Among well-off families, having additional daughters aged 7 to 12 years simply increased the child care hours of non-working mothers. In poor families with non-working mothers, however, having younger siblings meant increased child care time by older children. Older daughters aged 13 to 15 years, by serving as mother-surrogates, even reduced mothers' breastfeeding time (Popkin, 1976). Older daughters appear to substitute as well for their fathers' child care time by relatively large amounts (Boulier, 1976). Therefore, fathers do not have to put in as many hours of child care when there are older female children in the family.

Girls' economic activities. As Cabanero (1977) puts it, Filipino children cease being "welfare recipients" early on in their lives. Girls, as well as boys, actively participate in their families' means of earning a living. This is as much a part of their responsibility training as any. Adolescent girls help in the fields in the planting and harvesting seasons. In Tagalog fishing villages, daughters help their mothers arrange the fish in the basket in preparation to selling. Those who drop out of school after the elementary grades completely take over the household chores while their mothers go off to the market to sell the fish. As they grow older, daughters accompany their mothers to the market so they can learn to sell fish or native snacks (which they themselves prepare) on their own (Jocano, 1988).

Among the Laguna area families that Cabanero (1977) studied, female children of low-wage mothers were found to contribute to family income as early as 9 to 11 years of age, while daughters of middle wage

mothers became net producers by ages 15 to 17 years. By age 18, 72% or majority of daughters were working for pay.

These early findings are dwarfed by current macro statistics (National Statistics Office, cited in *IBON Facts & Figures*, 1996) showing that nearly 1.3 million girl-children are now working, fully a third of the child labor force. Of these working girl-children, 22% are out of school, 19% have complained of work-related injuries and illnesses, 65% of cuts, wounds, and abrasions, and 61% of body aches and pains. A vast majority (79%) work away from home as domestic helpers for other families, sending the better part of their salaries back home to their own.

Tasks assigned to boys. Tasks that are assigned to boys are predominantly those requiring physical strength and endurance, farther distance from the home, and hardly any socio-emotional skills, in other words, tasks that are stereotypically masculine.

Sons' housework. Domestic chores considered appropriate for boys include fetching water, and for older males, this means having to fill up the big drums kept in many homes without running water (Baylon, 1975; Rojas-Aleta, Silva, & Eleazar, 1977; Licuanan, 1979; Lagmay, 1983; Illo, 1988; Jocano, 1988; Sobritchea, 1990). In houses with no gas or electric stoves, boys help in cutting, gathering and chopping firewood (Baylon, 1975; Jocano, 1976; Rojas-Aleta et al., 1977; Licuanan, 1979; Mangawit, 1981; Lagmay, 1983; Illo, 1988; Jocano, 1988; Sobritchea, 1990). If someone is needed to go to the corner *sari-sari* store, boys are more likely to be sent out than girls (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a; Estrada, 1983).

They are asked to assist in odd jobs inside and outside the house, like sweeping the yard, scrubbing the floor, lifting furniture, carrying heavy objects, and doing some basic carpentry—repairing fences, mending the roof, etc. They may be asked to do some gardening, too (Jocano, 1976, 1988; Rojas-Aleta et al., 1977; Mendez & Jocano, 1979a; Licuanan, 1979; Sobritchea, 1990).

Many of the descriptions of domestic tasks for which boys are made responsible carry the caveat that "feminine" chores are off-limits to boys, except in the event where no daughters are available to do the work. To quote:

"Household chores are not assigned to them unless there are no girls in the family." (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a)

"Boys are generally excluded from participating in tasks attributed to as feminine." (Estrada, 1983)

"No male is expected to do household chores which are considered to be a female undertaking." (Ramirez, 1988)

While sons mainly work side by side with their fathers and serve as their fathers' aides, they provide some relief to their mothers as well. For instance, boys are required to put in child care hours when the girls' services are not available (Lagmay, 1983). Boulier (1976) and Popkin (1976) found that older male children, ages 7 to 12 years, substituted for mother's work time, home production time, and child care time, permitting increases in her leisure time of about 2 to 6 hours a week per child. When sons pitch in for baby-sitting, they also reduce slightly their fathers' time devoted to that task (Boulier, 1976).

Boys' economic activities. In rural communities, boys are given a variety of tasks related to their families' farming or fishing activities. Younger boys watch over the seedbeds and newly planted fields from foraging domestic animals; adolescents boys help their fathers with the heavier work like plowing the fields (Mangawit, 1981; Estrada, 1983; Jocano, 1988; Sobritchea, 1990). They herd, tend and pasture the cows and carabaos (Baylon, 1975; Illo, 1988; Illo & Veneracion 1988; Jocano, 1988), and care for livestock and other domestic animals (Rojas-Aleta et al., 1977; Mangawit, 1981; Shimizu, 1984). In the urban barrio, boys are charged with collecting hog feed from neighbors, and feeding the animals (Lagmay, 1983).

Sons of fishermen assist their fathers at sea or in the lake—running the motor, paddling, or punting while the adults perform the tasks which require finer technical skills (Jocano, 1988; Sobritchea, 1990). Boys are also taught to repair agricultural implements or mend fishing gear. As they learn the rudiments of the job, they are relied upon to do these repairs independently (Jocano, 1988).

Among urban streetchildren in Metro Manila and Cebu, Porio (1994) notes that "...there is a pattern of male dominance in street-based careers. Street-based activities like watching cars, shining shoes, peddling cigarettes, newspapers and candies are thought of as all right for boys but not for girls, especially when they are alone."

Generally, more male children are employed at all age groups, and by age 18 in the rural areas, 96% or nearly all adolescent males are working. In 1977, Cabanero found that sons of low-wage and middle-wage mothers represent net financial gains to their families by ages 12 to 14 years, while high-wage mothers realize positive returns from their sons only when they have turned 15 to 17 years old. Today, two-thirds of the nearly four million children in the nation-wide child labor force are boys (National Statistics Office, cited in *IBON Facts & Figures*, 1996).

Rationale for Gender-biased Task Assignments

The traditional rationales given for gender-designated task assignments are sounded throughout the Filipino child-rearing literature; to wit:

"Teenage girls are given training in domestic activities to make them good housewives when they settle down in the future." (Baylon, 1975)

"The mother prepares the daughter for the duties and responsibilities of a future housewife...The father usually takes

charge in training the son towards the responsibilities of a future head of the family." (Mendez & Jocano, 1979a)

"In Cordillera society, girls are assigned more chores because it is accepted that girls are more responsible." (Dandan, 1990)

"Chinese-Filipino sons are trained to take the role of the father and to manage the father's business or hold a successful career which garner praise for the family name and reputation." (Ocampo-Go, 1994)

The responsibility training of sons and daughters is seen as preparatory to their assumption of the conventional masculine role of "head of the family" and feminine role of "housewife", thereby safe-guarding the status quo and perpetuating society's patriarchal standards.

Finally, it is important to point out the alternative view which suggests that little sex-role stereotyping actually exists in Filipino families with regards to children's assistance in household chores and responsibilities. The mothers in Licuanan's (1979) study emphasized that sons as well as daughters must concern themselves with the various aspects of household management. Estrada (1983) observes that some mothers in the Tarlac area instruct and encourage their sons on the proper skills and attitude in doing household chores regardless of the supposed gender-labeling of these tasks. Bulatao (1975; 1978) found too that mothers (more often than fathers) expected household help equally from daughters (94%) and sons (83%). Illo and Veneracion (1988), Jocano (1988), and Sobritchea (1990) list some of the work that is shared by sons and daughters including the custodial care of younger siblings, gathering and preparing feeds for domestic animals, sweeping the yard, cleaning the house, preparing the meals, clearing the dining table, washing the dishes, and putting things back.

While both Licuanan (1979) and Illo (1998) acknowledge that there are still differences in the primary ranked tasks for sons and daughters (as well as for mothers and fathers), they argue that rarely are the boundaries firm between what men and women can and in fact do. Some

substitutability between male and female labor is present to some degree in many families and communities (Illo, 1988; with Veneracion, 1988). As Jocano (1988) writes of the fishing village of San Antonio:

"While domestic tasks are mainly the women's responsibility, the men also assist in household work as soon as they return from the field or lake. Most men in San Antonio can cook well. We have also seen men sweeping the yard early in the morning. And washing dishes is not strictly a woman's task. Women can help earn a living as well." (p. 84)

More contemporary studies like the McCann Erickson survey (1995) of Metro Manila males 18-55 years old have likewise determined that men (especially those in the middle classes) are gradually yielding to the pressure of getting more involved in domestic chores once only reserved for their wives:

"With half of Metro Manila women now working, more and more men of the house are learning to be just that: men of the house. They do house cleaning, shop at supermarkets, even wet markets, cook meals, do laundry, and yes, care for the kids." (p. 3)

Parents as Models: Differences in Child-rearing

Parents are themselves powerful models of masculine and feminine behaviors for their children. Thus, gender socialization also occurs when children experience different child care behaviors from their mothers and fathers. The studies reviewed show how Filipino mothers and fathers act dissimilarly even when both are exercising their child-rearing responsibilities.

Maternal child-rearing. Although many Filipino families pronounce the belief that child-rearing is a joint parental responsibility (Licuanan, 1979; Aguiling-Dalisay, 1983) and even an extended-family task (Shimizu, 1984), in actual behavior, the mother is still ranked as the primary caretaker of her children (Mendez & Jocano,

27

1979a; Licuanan, 1979; Lagmay, 1983; Minoza et al., 1984; UP CHE, 1985). Thus, the mother "... usually performs tasks like taking the child to the doctor, feeding the child, dressing the child, supervising learning, and escorting the child to school. The mother does most of the decisions in the child's daily routine, schooling, and health." (UP CHE, 1985).

However, more rural mothers (89%) were ranked no. 1 caretaker than urban, low SES (74%) and urban, middle SES (58%) mothers (Minoza et al., 1984). Child caretaking as an almost exclusively maternal assignment therefore appears more evident in rural areas and in poor urban communities (Licuanan, 1979; Lagmay, 1983). Hollnsteiner (1979) writes of the distinction, thus: "In the rural areas, the roles of family members are clearly prescribed...in the urban or urbanized families, the roles and privileges are less clearly delineated, especially since the mother's role has become multifaceted and less structured." However, Sycip's (1982) investigation of urban, middle SES *working* mothers revealed that though these women were employed outside of the home, they still carried the greater bulk of the responsibility for the home and the children. Thus, majority experienced difficulty in combining and balancing their multiple roles of wife, mother, and worker. A vivid, though not unexpected finding was how stressed these mothers felt when their children got sick - many are so troubled they are unable to concentrate on work and feel that they have to personally take care of the sick child. Even when children are healthy, working mothers still felt stressed by how little time can be devoted to them, and compensated for this by spending all their free time with their children, "interacting with them and *personally* attending to all their needs" (emphasis added).

Sycip's respondents are, of course, referring here to the infamous "double-burden" that women shoulder. Sycip writes:

"Women are traditionally defined as the keepers of the home and ... all kinds of domestic and familial responsibilities are assigned to them. Today's economic conditions decree that they also go out and take on the additional load of ... [ensuring] the financial security of their families. At the same time, they have not been relieved of their other duties. It seems obvious that one set of responsibilities is bound to suffer." (p. 6)

28

And a heavy burden it is. In 1976, Boulier estimated that an infant's arrival can increase a mother's child care time by more than 9 ½ hours a week, reduce her work time by about 4 hours a week, and her leisure time by more than 6 hours a week. Older preschool children increase child care time by 5 ½ hours a week, also at the expense of the mother's leisure time. Gomez (1988) found that children of all ages experienced longer child care hours from mothers than fathers. The differences were largest for infants and preschoolers where mothers served double the number of hours of child care than fathers did.

A mother's greater time investment in the care of her children can be expected to result in greater emotional involvement as well. As Asprer (1980) describes the Filipino mother, "...emotionally and psychologically, her life is intimately intertwined with the lives of her children and husband." Thus, the mother-child relationship has variously been described as one of indulgence, nurturance, responsiveness, warmth, and closeness on the one hand, and strictness and severity on the other hand (Lagmay, 1983). Using a psychological instrument, the Mother-Child Relationship Evaluation or MCRE, Espina (1996) found that overprotection was the most pervasive attitude that mothers exhibit towards their children. She confirms previous observations (e.g., Razon, 1981) that overprotection, virtually synonymous to a mother's love, characterizes one of the most desirable maternal qualities in Filipino culture.

Paternal child-rearing. The Filipino father's chief role is that of family provider, and only secondarily is he considered a child caretaker. Although a quarter of the fathers in Minoza et al.'s (1984) study expressed enthusiasm in helping their wives with child care, a mere 2% of the families they studied cited the father as the main caretaker of his offspring. While he usually alternates for the mother when she is away (Licuanan, 1979; UP CHE, 1985), in some parts of the country, notably Ilocos Norte and Pangasinan, the grandmother is even called upon more often than the father to substitute for a non-working but unavailable mother (UP CHE, 1985). The latter study also found that in families with working mothers, fathers ranked only second to grandmothers as substitute caretakers. In Tan's typology (1989), these findings seem to fit the father-as-procreator and father-as-dilettante patterns only too well.

Forty-five percent (45%) of fathers in Aguiling-Dalisay's study (1983) maintained, however, that they were very much involved in taking care of their children less than a year-old. "Relating" and "playing" were the most frequent activities that the younger fathers in this study did with their children, while older fathers most frequently mentioned "going out on trips" and "relating". Fathers also show their affection towards their children by carrying them, talking, and playing with them (Licuanan, 1979).

Lapuz (1987) has a different view, though, describing the Filipino father as a "...remote person...not quite close, and feeling awkward in getting that close [to his sons]". Asprer (1980) likewise contends that the typical Filipino father prefers the company of his *barkada* (peer group), and that his frequent absences distance him emotionally from his sons (see also McCann Erickson, 1993).

Discipline is the one aspect of child-rearing where fathers seemed to figure prominently, either on their own parental capacity or in concert with their wives (Porio, Lynch, & Hollnsteiner, 1978; Licuanan, 1979; Lagmay, 1983; Minoza et al., 1984; UP CHE, 1985; David, 1994). A familiar sequence begins with the mother taking the lead in disciplinary matters, as she spends more time with the children and exerts greater control in straightening out improper or wayward behaviors. "However, when the children get [too] difficult and unmanageable, they are reported to their father. If a mother thinks her child is turning out badly, she will often tell the father that something must be done to improve his behavior" (Lagmay, 1983). Fathers also tend to be more involved in disciplining older children (David, 1994), and sons rather than daughters (Porio et al., 1978). The opposite is true for mothers who are perceived as more effective in disciplining daughters (David, 1994).

With fathers' manifest role in the domain of discipline, it is no wonder then that interwoven themes of authority, restriction, obedience, and control were found to make up the most ubiquitous pattern of the father-child relationship in the typical Filipino family (Espina, 1996).

Some Consequences of Gender Socialization

Children's Knowledge of and Attitudes Towards Parents' Gender Roles

Do children perceive their parents differently according to the gender-based parental behaviors and styles depicted above? The literature would say so. In Yan's (1984) survey of 13 to 21 year-olds, the subjects generally agreed that the mother should "attend to their children's clothing and food," and "see that the children get to school on time." On the other hand, they generally agreed that the father should "provide for the basic needs of the family", and "be a disciplinarian."

Macrohom (1978) likewise found that female and male adolescents persistently believe that the husband's role is to decide on family investment and business, and take charge of the physical security of the family while the wife's role is family planning and home management - doing the laundry, cooking, and marketing. A mere 7% of female adolescents in the 1982 Young Adult Fertility Survey saw their mother as the family breadwinner while 86% cited their father in this role (Raymundo, 1994). Thus, children more often turned to their mothers for care and succorance, as 89% of mothers in Pelino's study (1984) claimed, because "they could depend on her and she was always around when needed." The few children who would approach their fathers did so primarily (52%) "to ask for money" (Pelino, 1994).

Only 14% of Pelino's subjects saw discipline as falling exclusively within the father's domain, but Lagmay (1983) reports that "while a father...gives less frequent reprimands, many of the children show greater submission to him". The mothers in Lagmay's Kruz-na-Ligas study also complained that the children are less afraid of them than of their fathers. According to Yan (1984), the perceived paternal role of family disciplinarian was generally accepted by her young respondents across demographic, economic, and socio-cultural groupings. Even when adolescents made projective drawings of their families, the most aggressive action was attributed to the father (Caluya-Torres, 1983).

He is also associated with greater achievement-orientation, as fathers, more often than mothers, reportedly encourage both sons and daughters in their schoolwork (Gamboa, Luciano, Cruz, & Laforteza, 1972).

Though the mother is seen as powerful (Carunungan-Robles, 1987), her power appears confined to the household realm. More adolescents believed that their mothers, rather than their fathers, had the right to make them help in household chores. They also reported that mothers exerted greater influence on them in the domestic sphere (88%) and felt that mothers should serve as role models for heterosexual relationships (69%), congruent with the gender role expectations they had for their parents (Lamug, 1989). While it is true that adolescents largely perceived their parents as making joint decisions for the family (80%), a greater number saw the mothers (17%) rather than the father (3%) as the locus of household decision-making, thus "corroborating previous findings that household and family affairs are seen [by children] as the realm of women than men" (Raymundo, 1994).

In sum, Filipino children do tend to view their parents in gender stereotypical fashion, mirroring the gender-differentiated parenting they experience from their mothers and fathers.

Parent-child Relationships and Children's Gender Identity Formation

The few studies which focused on gender identity confirm that in the normal course of gender identity formation, daughters and sons identify with their same-sexed parent. Thus, Mendez and Jocano (1979a) report that during the childhood years, girls naturally become closer to their mothers, while boys become closer to their fathers. Lapuz (1987) made the same observation with respect to the mother-daughter relationship. "The girl-child has a very close relationship with the mother," she writes. "The daughter is exquisitely trained as far as modeling after mother is concerned." Asprer (1980) likewise pointed out that girls may appear modern and liberated but they are really very similar to their mothers, having identified themselves with her.

Lapuz (1987) makes exception of the father-son relationship, though, and does not quite believe that this bond is as warm and comfortable. This is borne out by the latest youth survey from McCann Erickson (1993) which prominently featured the Filipino sons' complaints of their fathers' emotional distance and lack of involvement, and the youth's dissatisfaction with this aspect of their family life.

Studies of the parent-child relationship in the context of gender identity formation have also observed close cross-sex affiliation between parents and children. Mendez and Jocano (1979a) note that in Baras, the consensus is that fathers are usually fonder of their daughters, while mothers are fonder of their sons. Cabanero's (1977) and Gomez' (1988) detailed time analysis provide additional evidence that mothers spend more time with sons *at all ages*, both in terms of direct child care and other housework activity. The only exception was found among infants in Cotabato, who received an equal amount of child care time from their mothers regardless of gender. Infant sons, however, enjoyed relatively more attention from older siblings, relatives, and domestic helpers than infant daughters (Gomez, 1988).

Thus, Ramirez (1988) describes the Filipino mother as more likely than the father to attach to, indulge, and even spoil her son. She speculates that this may be a form of compensation for the father's neglect. Others have raised the resulting possibility that more boys than girls experience difficulty in consolidating their sex-role identity, as suggested by the observation that there are more male than female homosexuals (Asprer, 1980).

But where does this leave the girl-child? Using projective cards, Jurilla (1986) obtained stories from parents that depicted sibling rivalry among their children. In these stories, instances of the son being favored were generated by 60% of the parents while instances of the daughter being favored were cited by a mere 11%.

Yet even as girls may lose out on their parents' favor when in competition with their brothers, they demonstrate more positive attitudes

towards their parents than do the boys (Pablo, 1971). This is understandable given cultural expectations on daughters to be more unconditionally nurturant and caring. They also spend more time at home, and in more frequent interactions with their parents. More adolescent girls are also reported to be closer to their sisters and mothers compared to boys who are closer to their brothers (Mendez & Jocano, 1979b).

While boys and girls both report being closer to their mothers than their fathers (Mendez & Jocano, 1979b), mothers and fathers are equally loved (Pablo, 1971; Vajanarat, 1973), and the youth continue to name their mothers and fathers as the persons they most admire (McCann Erickson, 1993). These affirm the suggestion that in their many-peopled family environment, Filipino children easily learn to spread their affections, attachments, and loyalties to both parental figures (Guthrie & Jacobs, 1966; Carandang 1979; Shimizu, 1984).

Children's Gender Stereotypes

Investigators are unanimous in describing the persistent stereotyping of other gender roles among children of both genders. Occupational stereotypes, for instance, abound. Children firmly believe that only men can appropriately work as carpenter, *kargador* (load-carrier), driver, soldier, fireman, policeman, and janitor, while a *labandera* (laundry person), secretary, teacher, sewer, or vendor can only be female. Law and medicine, however, were classified as occupations that can be suitably filled by both genders (De la Cruz, 1986).

Bantug (1996) recently surveyed adolescents and found that fewer females (46%) than males (60%) believed that either sex should not be barred from doing traditionally male or female jobs. The female adolescents believed that there are traits that are properly "masculine"— being gentlemanly, responsible and intelligent—and activities that are peculiar only to males—playing basketball, drinking, reading porno-graphic magazines, and oddly enough in the light of the latter response, respecting women. The male adolescents viewed priesthood, masturbation, smoking, drinking, and courting women as the exclusive domain of males. There were no questions regarding solely "female activities."

34

Alongside these stereotypical beliefs is an emerging broader perspective. Bantug (1996) also noted that 70% of the adolescent respondents were convinced that the roles of men and women are now changing. They were not unaware that today, more Filipino women have careers and head their households.

Children's Attitudes Toward Own Gender and the Opposite Gender

Among Filipino children, there seems to be a more positive attitude towards girls (Pablo, 1971). This may be because children are called upon at an early age to view girls as more frail and delicate and therefore in need of greater protection and respect. But when asked whether they would rather be a boy or a girl, the children in Flores and Gonzales' (1969) study, regardless of gender, preferred to be boys because of the dominance and superiority of the males in our society and their freedom from responsibilities, while females have to live with the ever-present danger of "losing their reputations". At an early age, both girls and boys are keenly conscious of the fact that in our society, being male means being privileged.

Conclusions

It is clear from this literature review that the family continues to be a major site of gender socialization of children. The studies reflect the fact that in the Philippines, sons and daughters are raised and treated differently within the family, in accordance with parents' gender expectations that mirror society's own prescriptions for what is appropriately masculine and feminine (for a review of these prescriptions, see also Liwag, De la Cruz, & Macapagal, 1997).

In particular, the literature reveals some of the disadvantages experienced by the girl-child stemming from the restrictions she has to contend with compared to the boy-child. She is also given more responsibilities inside the house because of the expectation that women should learn how to do household work. If society continues to view household work as inferior work, then it might be concluded that the

girl-child is socialized to be limited in her future options. And when the girl-child becomes a woman, there is still the double burden that she has to shoulder when she strives to manage a household and a career at the same time. On the other hand, the boy-child is also trained, but for a different set of responsibilities, as in work outside the home that prepares and conditions them for a wider range of future vocations.

Although the literature reveals these trends in child-rearing and gender roles in the Philippines, it is unfortunate that methodo-logically, many of these studies actually discussed gender only incidentally. Child-rearing studies rarely used gender as an analytic variable, while on the other hand, studies on gender differences rarely touched on child-rearing to explicitate how the gender stereotypes or differences under investigation came to be. There remain many gaps in empirical research in the Philippines concerning the direct link or relationship between child-rearing practices and the formation of gender roles and stereotypes, so investigations in the future should make a conscious effort to include these variables in the planning, conduct, and analysis of research.

It must also be emphasized that while the review uncovered studies dealing with child-rearing in a wide cross-section of ordinary Filipino families of all socio-economic levels in both rural and urban areas, hardly any extensive or detailed investigations on the dynamics of child rearing in dysfunctional families were found. Unfortunately, it may be in such families where the spectrum of exploitative, abusive, and violent crimes against children are committed, and to which daughters may be particularly vulnerable (e.g., incest, parent-abetted child prostitution).

Finally, although the family is very influential in the formation of gender roles and stereotypes, it cannot be denied that other factors should be considered as well, including peer socialization and school, church, and media influences. They may strengthen or modify the outcomes of family socialization.

References

Asprer, Y. M. (1980). The self-concept as a Filipino self-social co·
Exploration, analysis, and implications. *St. Louis University* ʰ
Journal, 11(1/2), 55-135.

Bantug, C. (1996). A survey on gender relations: She said, he said. *Women in Action*, 52-57.

Baylon, E. (1975). *Family and community life in a Central Luzon Tagalog Barrio: A case study in education and culture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Centro Escolar University.

Bernardo, M. D. (1994). *"Laro tayo!": Parent-child and peer play activities of Filipino children and related variables*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Boulier, B. L. (1976). *Children and household economic activity in Laguna, Philippines* (EDR Discussion Paper No. 76 - 19). Quezon City: Institute of Economic Development and Research, School of Economics, University of the Philippines.

Bulatao, R. A. (1975). *The value of children: A cross national study. Vol. II (Philippines)*. Honolulu, HI: East-West Population Institute, East-West Center.

Bulatao, R. A. (1978). *The value of a Filipino child: Pleasure and profit against cost and concern* (East-West Population Institute Reprint No. 113). Honolulu, HI: East-West Population Institute, East-West Center.

Cabanero, T. (1977). *The "shadow price" of children in Philippine rural households*. Unpublished masteral thesis, University of the Philippines.

Caluya-Torres, V. F. (1983). *Kinetic Family Drawings of institutionalized and non-institutionalized adolescents*. Unpublished masteral thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

Carandang, M. L. A. (1979). The Filipino child in the family: A developmental approach. *Philippine Studies, 27*, 469-482.

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

Carunungan-Robles, A. (1986). Perceptions of parental nurturance, punitiveness and power by selected Filipino primary school children. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 19*, 18-28.

Castiglioni, R. (1982). *Motivational values and childbearing patterns among married urban and rural Filipino women.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines.

Castillo, G. T. (1993). *Where food and population meet: The Filipino household among other households.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies.

Concepcion, M. B. (1986). The 1983 National Demographic Survey: An overview. In *Demography at the crossroads.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Demographic Research and Development Foundation, Inc.

Dalisay, G. A (1983). *Fathers as parents: An exploratory study.* Unpublished masteral thesis, University of the Philippines.

Dandan, V. B. (1990). Women's lives in an ethnic community: A profile of the Samoki. *Review of Women's Studies, 1*, 2-14.

David, F. P. (1994). The roles of husbands and wives in household decision-making. *Philippine Sociological Review, 42* (1-4), 79-93.

De Guzman, E. (1976). *The value of children: The old people's view* (VOCPA Special Report No. 7). Quezon City: University of the Philippines Population Institute.

De la Cruz, A. S. (1986). The impact of maternal employment on family members' perceptions and attitudes towards the maternal role. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 19,* 29-40.

De la Cruz, M. A., Santos, E. C., & Vida, E. R. (1971). Mindanao Muslim child-rearing practices. *Social Work, 16* (1), 28-37.

De la Paz, D. (1976). *Number and sex preferences among the young and the old* (VOCPA Special Report No. 6). Quezon City: University of the Philippines Population Institute.

Dionisio, E. (1994). Sex and gender. In E. Eviota (Ed.), *Sex and gender in Philippine society: A discussion on the relations between women and men* (pp. 16-31). Manila: National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women.

Enrile-Santiago, C. (1977). Growing up Filipino: Child-rearing practices in the Philippines. In *Filipino heritage: The making of a nation,* Vol. III (pp. 661-669). Manila: Pilipino Publishing Inc.

Espina, E. F. (1996). Mother-child relationships in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies, 44,* 153-174.

Estrada, A. (1983). *Maternal and child care in Macalampa, Camiling, Tarlac.* Unpublished masteral thesis, Centro Escolar University.

Flores, P. M. & Gonzalez, M. B. (1969). Sex role development of Filipino children and youth in a changing culture. In *Socio-psychological development of Filipino children.* Manila: Philippine Women's University.

Gamboa, D. B., Luciano, J. I., Cruz, R. H., & Laforteza, P. G. (1972). *The Filipino child as viewed by himself and others.* Quezon City: Jose Abad Santos Memorial School, Philippine Women's University.

Go, S. (1993). *The Filipino family in the eighties*. Manila: Social Development Research Center, De La Salle University.

Gomez, N. T. (1988). *The economic cost of child-rearing in Cotabato City, Region XII*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ateneo de Manila University.

Gonzalez, A. M. (1977). Filipino women in development: The impact of poverty. *Philippine Sociological Review, 25,* 97-104.

Guthrie, G. (1970). *The psychology of modernization in the rural Philippines* (IPC Papers No. 8). Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Guthrie, G. & Jacobs, P. J. (1966). *Child-rearing and personality development*. PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Hollnsteiner, M. R. (1979, April). *Modernization and the challenge to the Filipino family*. Paper read at the Seminar-Workshop on The Filipino Woman in Management: Problems and Opportunities, Philippine Plaza, Manila.

Hoyenga, K. B. & Hoyenga, K. T. (1993). *Gender-related differences*. MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Illo, J. (1988). Putting gender up front: Data, issues and prospects. In J. Illo (Ed.), *Gender issues in rural development: A workshop report* (pp. 9 -20). Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Illo, J. & Veneracion, C. C. (1988). *Women and men in rainfed farming systems: Case studies of households in the Bicol region*. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Jimenez, M. C. (1981). *Si Malakas at si Maganda: A definition of the masculinity/femininity concepts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines.

Jocano, F. L. (1970). Maternal and child care among the Tagalogs in Bay, Laguna, Philippines. *Asian Studies, 8* (3), 277-300.

Jocano, F. L. (1976). *Children of the Lakeshore: Studies on the value of children in selected Laguna Lake towns.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Population Institute.

Jocano, F. L. (1988). *Social organization in 3 Philippine villages: An exploration in rural anthropology.* Manila: Centro Escolar University Research and Development Center.

Jurilla, L. (1986). An exploratory study of the motivational system for parenthood of rural married couples. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 19,* 5-17.

Lagmay, L. (1983). *Kruz-na-Ligas: Early socialization in an urbanizing community.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Lamug, C. B. (1989). Adolescent perception of parental influence. *Philippine Sociological Review, 37* (1/2), 46-57.

Lapuz, L. V. (1987). In R. J. Bautista (Ed.), *Salute to youth.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Licuanan, P. B. (1979). Some aspects of child-rearing in an urban low-income community. *Philippine Studies, 27,* 453-468.

Licuanan, P. B. & Gonzalez, A. M. (1976). *Filipino women in development.* Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Lim-Yuson, C. L. (1982). *The social-cognitive play of selected Filipino children.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines.

Liwag, M. E. D., De la Cruz, A. S. & Macapagal, M. E. (1997). *Child-rearing and gender socialization in the Philippines: A comprehensive review of the literature*. Makati: UNICEF.

Lynch, F. & Makil, P. Q. (1968). The BRAC 1967 Filipino family survey. *Saint Louis Quarterly, 6* (3/4), 293-330.

Macalandong, R. M., Masangkay, Z. S., Consolacion, M. I. & Guthrie, G. (1978). Protection and pride in Maranao childhood. *Journal of Social Psychology, 105,* 85-97.

Macrohom, J. W. (1978). *Roles of husband, wife, and both husband and wife as perceived by college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Centro Escolar University.

Makil, P. (1981). Philippine studies of women: A review. *Silliman Journal, 28,* 32-42.

Mangawit, G. B. (1981). The implications of Kalinga child-rearing practices towards formal education. *Saint Louis University Research Journal, 12,* 73-92.

McCann-Erickson Philippines (1993, October). Portrait of the Filipino as a youth: The Metro Manila findings. *Highlights,* 1-4.

McCann-Erickson Philippines (1995, July). The McCann Metro Manila Male Study: Insights on the urban Filipino male. *Highlights,* 1-6.

Mendez, P. P. & Jocano, F. L. (1979a). *The family in its rural and urban orientations: Two case studies in culture and education*. Manila: Centro Escolar University Research and Development Center.

Mendez, P. P. & Jocano, F. L.(1979b). *The Filipino adolescent in a rural and an urban setting: A study in culture and education*. Manila: Centro Escolar University Research and Development Center.

Minoza, A. A., Botor, C. O., & Tablante, I. L. (1984). *Mother-child relationships in early childhood.* Cebu: Cebu Star Press.

Ocampo-Go, D. L. (1994). Understanding *Tsinoy* families: A pheno- menological perspective and more. *University of the Philippines Home Economics Journal, 21,* 19-23.

Pablo, R. (1971). A study of Filipino children's attitudes towards peers and students. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 4* (1), 31-36.

Palejo, P. (1992). *Attitudes toward valuing children and their differences in some selected personological variables among urban and rural couples.* Unpublished masteral thesis, Philippine Normal University.

Pelino, H. (1984). *A study of child-rearing practices in Tacloban City.* Unpublished masteral thesis, Divine Word University.

Pineda, R. V. (1981). Focus on Filipino rural women. *Philippine Sociological Review, 29,* 103-110.

Popkin, B. M. (1976). *The role of the rural Filipino mother in the determination of child care and breast-feeding behavior* (EDR Discussion Paper No. 76 -12). Quezon City: Institute of Economic Development and Research, School of Economics, University of the Philippines.

Porio, E. (1994). Children of the streets: Socialization and formation of the self. *Philippine Sociological Review, 42* (1-4), 40-52.

Porio, E., Lynch, F. & Hollnsteiner, M. (1978). *The Filipino family, community, and nation* (IPC Papers No. 12). Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Quiambao, J. S. (1965). *The Asian family in a changing society.* Quezon City: EACC.

Ramirez, M. M. (1988). *Understanding Philippine social realities through the Filipino family: A phenomenological approach*. Manila: Asian Social Institute.

Raymundo, C. M. (1994). The Filipino adolescents: Their implications for Philippine development. In A. N. Herrin (Ed.), *Population human resources and development, Vol. III* (pp. 1155-1184). Quezon City: University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies.

Raymundo, C. M. & Lusterio, C. R. (1995). *Survey reveals factors affecting premarital sex among youth* (Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study: First of a series). Quezon City: University of the Philippines Population Institute.

Razon, P. G. (1981). Child rearing practices of Filipino urban mothers: Relationship to children's cognitive development. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 14* (1-2), 8-15.

Rimando, M. C. (1981). The changing morality of Filipino adolescents' sexuality and its effect on the family. *Saint Louis University Research Journal, 12*, 321-338.

Rojas-Aleta, I., Silva, T. L., & Eleazar, C. P. (1977). *A profile of Filipino women: Their status and role*. Manila: Philippine Business for Social Progress.

Sevilla, J. C. (1982). *Research on the Filipino family: Review and prospects*. Manila: Development Academy of the Philippines.

Shimizu, H. (1984). Filipino children in family and society: Growing up in a many-people environment. In N. Kobayashi & T. B Brazelton (Eds.), *The growing child in family and society: An interdisciplinary study in parent-infant bonding*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Sobritchea, C. I. (1990). Gender inequality and its supporting ideologies in Philippine society. In L. Bautista & E. Rifareal (Eds.), *And she said no! Human rights, women's identities and struggles* (pp. 8-17). Caloocan City: National Council of Churches in the Philippines.

Stattin, H. & Klackenberg-Larsson, I. (1991). The short- and long-term implications for parent-child relations of parents' preferences for their child's gender. *Developmental Psychology, 27* (1), 141-147.

Stoodley, B. H. (1957). Some aspects of Tagalog family structure. *American Anthropologist, 59,* 236-249.

Suffer the women. (1993, August). *Ibon Facts & Figures, 16* (15), 6.

Sycip, L. M. (1982). Working mothers: Their problems and coping strategies. *Social Science Information, 10* (2) 1-8.

Tacoli, C. (1996). Migrating "for the sake of the family?": Gender life course and intra-household regulations. *Philippine Sociological Review, 44* (1-4), 12-32.

Tan, A. (1989). Four meanings of fatherhood. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 22,* 51-60.

Torres, A. T. (1988). Gender imagery in Philippine Psychology: A critique of the literature. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 21,* 24-38.

UP, CHE (1985). *Final report on child-rearing practices: The Philippine setting.* Unpublished manuscript. College of Home Economics, University of the Philippines.

Vajanarat, K. (1973). *Beliefs, problems, and desires of slum children in Parang Elementary School.* Unpublished masteral thesis, University of the Philippines.

Ventura, E. R. (1982). *Child Psychology research in the Philippines: A review.* QC: Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines.

Yan, G. (1984). *Attitudes on family roles of third-year high school students of Southeastern College, Pasay City and their association with selected demographic, socio-cultural and economic variables.* Unpublished masteral thesis, Manuel L. Quezon University.

Young sacrifices. (1996, September). *IBON Facts & Figures, 19* (17), 7-8.

Zablan, Z. C. (1997, February). *Gender issues in fertility and reproductive health.* Paper presented at a lecture series sponsored by the Philippine Population Association, Manila.

Notes