

GUEST EDITOR'S PREFACE

RICARDO G. ABAD

October 1978

The articles which appear in this issue were read at the 1977 National Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society (PSS). The convention was held 30 April-1 May 1977 at the University of the Philippines, Iloilo City. Twenty-two papers were presented during the Iloilo meeting: thirteen centered around the convention's theme, "The use (and misuse) of social science research in policy making and program planning;" four addressed various topics such as demographic measurement, migration, household formation, and reciprocity. The balance of the papers focused on the role of women in Philippine society. These will appear in the next issue of this journal.

Seven convention papers were selected on several grounds. They related, first of all, to the conference's theme. Second, these papers were mimeographed and distributed before the convention started. (Some presentors spoke extemporaneously). Third, they did not represent papers summarizing the findings of the PSS study groups. Fourth, they were judged as representative of the papers read in a particular session of the conference.

The first session, entitled, "Perspectives," began after Lourdes R. Quisumbing, 1976 PSS President, Randolph S. David, 1977 PSS President, and Dionisia Rola, Dean of UP-Iloilo, had read welcome addresses. Two of the papers featured in this session are included here. In the first article, Dolores Alano Endriga assesses the merits of standard sociological and anthropological methodologies for policy science. She claims that it is not a question of whether these approaches are inadequate, for they are indeed limited, but whether they serve the requirements of policy science. Only when a paradigm for policy science has been conceptualized, she adds, can the social scientist judge how appropriate and useful existing research strategies and techniques are. In the second article, Jeanne Frances I. Illo suggests several guidelines in establishing what is called a "socially sound" development program. She presents the general components, the kinds of information needed, and the principles involved in an effort to establish a program which is in the control of those most affected by the decisions made — household heads and their representatives. Implied in the paper is the usefulness of using standard sociological and anthropological methods to test the social soundness of action programs.

The remaining articles were presented in the convention's two "Case Studies" sessions. The third and fourth papers describe the actual experiences of agencies in fashioning programs based on social science concepts. Using his experience among the Ikalahan people as an example, Delbert Rice outlines the tasks of anthropologists engaged in development programs. Four tasks are listed: defining the goals of development, developing the program, establishing the communication bridge, and evaluating the program. In performing these tasks, Rice emphasizes the need for close interaction between the planners and the community. The same need for close interaction, this time between research users and research doers, is expressed in the next article. The paper, prepared by the Population Information Division of the Population Center Foundation, discusses the reasons behind the "research-practice" gap, and documents the foundation's programs to bridge this gap. These

programs stress the role of "linkers," persons who relate well to the languages of researchers and planners.

The next two articles assess selected aspects of the Philippine language policy. Jonathan Malicsi argues that certain features of the government's language policy—specifically the use of Filipino or Pilipino, the bilingual policy in education, and the adoption of a new orthography for Filipino—lack adequate theoretical and empirical bases. To what extent, for instance, are studies of language maintenance and language shift considered in deciding what language policy the Philippines should pursue? What supports will a proposed language policy receive from other social institutions, among them the mass media and the church? Do Filipinos themselves feel that they must learn and speak a Philippine national language in order to be truly Filipino? Rachel Gadiane Silliman tackles the latter question in a survey conducted among a sample of highly-educated Cebuano and Hiligaynon speakers. The answer: the majority of the Visayan respondents do not favor the bilingual policy. Moreover, they are convinced that the implementation of this policy in Philippine schools has been ineffective. Gadiane Silliman ends her article with several recommendations, one of which is to declare a moratorium on the bilingual policy "until a thorough appraisal of the actual implementors, the teachers, is made."

The final article relates authoritarianism to social work management. The authors, Terence and Zinna McGuire, adapted Adorno's F-scale to a sample of personnel from the Department of Social Services and Development, Region 7. They found that the respondents—regardless of profession, place of assignment, or province within the region—tend to exhibit highly authoritarian personalities. The McGuires then point out the implications of this personality pattern for social work administration. They cite the danger of uncritically accepting a plan initiated by office superiors, the difficulty of empathizing with poor clients and the need for checks on higher level administrative behavior.

All the articles in this volume belong to the growing number of studies on social science and policy in the country. The interest on this topic is perhaps traceable to two trends in Philippine social science research: first, to the increasing reliance of private and government agencies on social scientists for objective data and program evaluation; and second, to the increasing dependence of social scientists on private and government agencies for research support. Whether or not this interdependency leads to more intelligent policy-making remains unclear at the moment. Social scientists still need to learn how to focus their theories and methodologies on problems which policy makers consider critical for their programs. Policy makers, in turn, must try to understand what the social science research process entails and what this process can do to solve agency problems. An additional and complicating matter is the orientation of social scientists in relation to policy and the beneficiaries of that policy. Should the social scientist accept the assumptions of social engineering when he or she lists recommendations for action? Should the scientist take the stance of an advocate for the program beneficiaries, usually the poor majority? Or should the social scientist, upon unmasking program defects in the course of the study, turn militant and risk an agency's disfavor? The answers are obviously not clear-cut. What is more evident is a need in social science for more to demonstrate both compassion and scientific rigor in their analyses. The seven articles in this volume, I hope, lead us towards this goal.