

## REPUTATIONAL APPROACH: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN MEASURING SOCIAL STATUS<sup>1</sup>

FEDERICO V. MAGDALENA

*Mindanao State University*

The rationale for taking a reputational approach to socioeconomic status measurement in rural communities has been provided for in this study. A scale developed especially for this approach is shown, and evidence of its positive relationship with an objective measure of family SES demonstrated for two small rural villages in the Philippines. Results are then discussed in light of the implications of using the reputational method to future studies of social stratification elsewhere.

### *Introduction*

A potpourri of techniques for analysis of socioeconomic status has shown up in the literature in recent years. Of these, two general approaches are often utilized: the "objective," and the "reputational." The objective approach for measuring socioeconomic status (SES) of members of a community uses such socially visible indicators as wealth, occupation, education, or even material and cultural possessions (known as level-of-living scales) which rate the social standing of an individual or a family (see Sewell, 1943; Castillo, et al., 1967; Belcher, 1972; Haller & Saraiva, 1972).

On the other hand, the reputational approach utilizes knowledgeable informants, or judges, who evaluate statuses and class rankings of people in their own community into categories of "high," "medium," and "low" (Warner, et al., 1960; Hollingshead, 1949; Abu-Laban, 1965). The approach is thus subjective and indirect since it capitalizes on perceptions of an informed person about the status of another.

Simultaneous application of these approaches is viewed as a research strategy in establishing equivalence or interchangeability of SES measurements, as it has been enunciated in the works of Warner and his associates (1960) and Hollingshead (1949),

among others. This paper extends beyond such comparison by focusing directly on some issues imbedded in a comparative analysis of stratification phenomena. More specifically, the present investigation attempts to demonstrate the research value of, and scale development for, the reputational approach, seen in conjunction with an objective measure of family SES using a level-of-living scale. Data gathered for two Philippine rural communities, as test cases, are examined in this exploratory effort.

### *Some Theoretical Considerations*

Many criteria determine the status of a person. In combination, they represent the status of that person, or of a family, whichever is the appropriate unit of analysis. On this premise, it is argued that a family's SES (unit of analysis taken here) has multiple dimensions. For the sake of convenience, family SES is defined as the social and economic standing of a group of consanguineous individuals in the community with respect to "objective" status criteria (level of living), on the one hand, and "reputation" (what people say), on the other hand.<sup>2</sup>

The objective approach to studying a family's SES is based on certain indicators of wealth and property. In an agrarian society, for example, social status accrues primarily

through direct or indirect control of land (Anderson, 1962; Nurge, 1968). But as the society develops technologically and undergoes some degree of urban sophistication, income or occupation becomes the familiar characteristic for reckoning status (Tiryakian, 1958; Hodge & Siegel, 1964; Tumin, 1967:21). The level of living of a family (or its lifestyle in general) is, in turn, contingent upon the family members' aggregate income or occupational differentiation. (Technically defined, level of living reflects the family's actual consumption of durable goods and/or services to satisfy some of its basic wants.) In the absence of a measure of income, or when income data lack the desired reliability, level-of-living scores provide the investigator with a clue to the family's income and expenditure patterns.

It is assumed that the family status, as defined above, is amenable to measurement by a level-of-living scale, one which comprises a checklist of household possessions or consumption of goods and services (e.g., a radio, a water-sealed toilet, etc.). Various forms of this scale are currently available in sociological literature (Sewell, 1949; Goseco-Rigor, 1971; Castillo, et al., 1967; Haller & Saraiva, 1972; Belcher, 1972) for use in rural areas of dissimilar social organizations.

The advantages of such a scale are many. A level-of-living scale permits one to compare the economic development of two or more social areas for which the scale is valid (Belcher, 1972; Goseco-Rigor, 1971). It has the added advantage of applicability in large or small towns, semi-urban areas, and even in small cities where people bask in wealth more than they do in their social reputation. But some writers doubt whether this scale does apply in "primary" communities where social relationships centering on kinship, particularism, and mutual obligations are stressed. The reason is cultural. People may put higher values on social reputation than anything else. To certain individuals, the "source" (a definition of respectability) or

quality of a family's level of living, by and in itself as a variable, may provide a mirror of social status. In Japan, for instance, the Burakumin have for many years been regarded as an outcast for engaging in tabooed occupations.

Some problems in the use of level-of living scale deserve mention. The scale items lose their ability to discriminate between families, especially in communities which undergo rapid social change. A scale item, such as a radio, which has become so common as a result of urbanization will lack power to distinguish between families belonging to "high" and "low" SES, at least in a statistical sense. Differences in value system, as the notion of undesirability or desirability of cultural items is also termed, hamper efforts of comparison. Using the example, above, the item "radio" evokes prestige on the part of its owner in one culture (Lynch, 1962:45); in another culture radio ownership makes no difference in esteem enjoyed by individuals. Even so, within the same society a set of cultural items may alter its value over time.

The foregoing discussion leads us now into the other important dimension of SES, namely, the reputed status. The reputational approach for analyzing people's status is essentially an evaluative system; it relies on individuals' estimate of others in the same community. The idea put forth is simply this: we tend to attach certain worth to a symbol of status, and at the same time we rank the individual who happens to possess this symbol, relative to others who do not. Any system of social evaluation rests on the assumption that those members interacting in a given community rate one another, and that they explicitly or implicitly are aware of the evaluation they make of one another. In order to understand the socioeconomic structure in a community, the investigator simply asks persons "in-the-know" to rate their neighbors according to their perceptions of what goes with a high social status. The answers are secured through use of one of such rating

procedures suggested by Warner as symbolic placement, comparison, reputation, and simple assignment.

Compared to the objective approach, the reputational method can only show at best the relative statuses of families within a village community. This approach, however, has a wider scope of areal application. The reputational approach is particularly germane in countless number of societies in which the bulk of population is rural. In the Philippines alone, rural population accounts for more than two-thirds of the total inhabitants, a picture shared by most non-Western societies.

An important research value offered by the reputational technique is that with it one can compare results derived from an objective measurement of SES. The extent to which they agree is an indication of construct and concurrent validity of the latter (Kerlinger, 1973:461-464). In point of fact, their agreement suggests something more than just a matter of validity, the degree to which the scale has measured what it purports to measure. It is also an agreement between two prevailing thoughts in stratification study: the "nominalist," represented by the objective measurement of status, as against the "realist" position taken by the reputational approach (see Hiller, 1973). For rural studies of social stratification the ideal would seem to be to develop and compare scales of some sort which have been inspired by these approaches.

#### *Why Use A Reputational Approach?*

Comprehension of the social meaning of status categories has always been a nagging issue in the analysis of social stratification. Because the social scientist frequently deals with such meaning in his data, whatever the nature of these data may be, it is imperative for him to reconcile two divergent perspectives: the actors' view of the world (perceptions of men-in-the-street), and that of his own. Perception of actors is necessary in the search for ways by which people construct

and organize their own little world, a social reality in itself (Hiller, 1973; Berger & Luckman, 1967). Yet, the perceptual ability of the investigator is equally valuable in restructuring such world, with a theoretic stance of objectivity so that it can be communicated to others. The reputational method, as a tool, helps put these two views together in a framework which allows one to understand what lies behind the mask of SES ranking among a coterie of individuals.

The issue at stake, one which the reputational approach addresses itself to, is thus loud and clear. There is need for this method, if one is to provide a tactical solution through which social meanings in everyday life can be incorporated into hard data collected by the social scientist. The reputational approach gives flesh and blood to an otherwise bare skeleton of organized data sets. One specific way of accomplishing this substantiation is to compare results gathered from the two research methods through the statistical procedure of correlation, given that both methods are reliable in the community under study.

#### *Setting and Sample*

Two Philippine rural communities of varying types of social organization served as the sources of material for this study: Barrio San Jose, and Barrio Cruz na Ligas. Fieldwork was conducted intermittently during 1969-1971.

San Jose is a small *barrio* (village community) in Nueva Ecija, one of five provinces in Central Luzon.<sup>3</sup> Although accessible by many modes of transportation and communication, San Jose is distantly far (approximately 120 kilometers) from the busy Metropolitan Manila.

Speaking of size, this community consisted of some 125 families as of 1971. San Jose is primarily an agricultural community engaged in rice farming. Ironically, however, a

substantial proportion of the population does not till lands, let alone own a piece of farm. Most families depend on extractive occupations requiring less or simple skills, such as working for wage in an agricultural *hacienda* (large real estate owned by a family), portorage, inland fishing, carpentry, and petty entrepreneurship; among others.

The second community, Cruz na Ligas, is literally a rural enclave within a metropolis. Like San Jose, it is a small and "old" barrio inhabited by about 100 families. Its location is a strategic one, because it is adjacent to the University of the Philippines campus in Diliman, Quezon City, which is just about ten minutes ride by bus or *jeepney* (a remodeled army jeep for public conveyance) from Cubao — the heart of this city. The major callings of the population are small-scale, family-based shoe manufacture, factory work, and office employment such as clerical, janitorial, teaching, and so on.

A total of 130 household heads were interviewed, 100 of these were from San Jose and 30 from Cruz na Ligas. These interviews are the result of a completion rate using census method, that is, an attempt to interview all potential units of analysis. In Cruz na Ligas, the research site was limited to one of its three *sitios* or divisions, namely, *Labas* (literally, outlet) which had 40 households or families at the time of interview in 1969. Ten additional household heads were taken to act as "judges" for the reputational approach: six from San Jose, and four from Cruz na Ligas.

#### *Scale Development for the Reputational Method*

The term "reputational approach" in the current usage is a shortened version of the Warner Evaluated Participation (EP) method.<sup>4</sup> Some modifications were here introduced so as to allow survey techniques in place of the prolonged participant observation originally employed by anthropologists, Warner and

associates (1960) being no exception in their study of small communities in the United States. Moreover, the basic rudiments of EP are preserved in our application of the reputational approach. They are summed up in two: one, the use of community informants or key respondents who provide data on the hierarchy of social status among people in the area; and two, the study of small, traditional, and old communities. The latter are contextual characteristics so necessary as to permit a high degree of intimacy, which will enable community informants to know their neighbors well enough and render an accurate estimate of their statuses.

In essence, the reputational approach to measuring the SES of members of a community consists simply in asking selected individuals from that community to rank their neighbors into various levels of status categories. In practice, however, it has been found difficult (if unreliable) to gauge people's social status without first qualifying what particular status or aspects of it are desired by the investigator. Reason: a holistic conception of social status seldom or does not exist in their minds. This difficulty was overcome by defining SES as derived from four more particular characteristics, namely: (1) level of living, (2) social participation, (3) occupation, and (4) family reputation — each to be evaluated separately by the judges. This procedure breaks up the holistic concept into more concrete subconcepts (see Magdalena & Zarco, 1970).

Such a breaking-up tactic makes it easy for the reputational approach to be adapted to the urbanized sectors of the Philippine population or other Asian countries. In traditional, slow-to-change communities, family reputation may altogether determine a person's social status. In the more urbanized communities, however, where occupations and professions are more diversified, an individual's occupation may be the best determinant of his status. Hence, the desirability for distinguishing four SES

components if the approach is to be used with meaning across the full range of heterogeneous subsocieties in the Philippines.

To speed up the administration of the reputational approach, a sorting technique was utilized. Names of respondent household heads, written on index cards, were handed to the judge for an evaluation. The deck of cards was sorted four times according to the above-cited criteria by each judge on a scale of points ranging from "low" to "high." This procedure took approximately 15 to 30 minutes of a judge's time to sort the deck of cards of 30 to 100, respectively. The judge's literacy, although an advantage, is less than a drawback in the use of this technique. An illiterate judge can be instructed to shuffle all the cards with a fairly high degree of accuracy, provided that the interviewer aids him by reading the names of household heads under evaluation.

1. *Scale Used in the Reputational Approach.*

Ideally, the Warner system of rating should be utilized, where the judges are to be asked to determine the number of status categories. Having done so, they will then classify members of their community according to such categories. Complete reliance on the judges' ability to make this decision, however, rides on the supposition that they are aware of the existence of a class structure and that they are in agreement with one another as to the number of classes, a premise which may not be valid. The concept of class, in Warner's usage, as opposed to status distinctions, may not apply in a typical Philippine *barrio* where consciousness of status is marred (if not obliterated) by mutual dependence among individuals in the various rungs of the social hierarchy (see Lynch, 1962).

Mounting evidence points to certain difficulties in establishing class as a "real" phenomenon. For instance, Fox (1956: 443-444) argues that there are only status

distinctions (no class divisions) within the *barrio*. Even if the existence of class is acknowledged, scholars disagree to the number of classes in Philippine society. Lynch (1959, 1962) reported a two-class system in Canaman town, the "little" people and the "big" people. A few other community studies argued on the dichotomous social classes (Anderson, 1962; Nydegger, 1960; Hollnsteiner, 1963). In the Muslim society in Mindanao, however, a three-class structure was observed (Afable, 1960; Rivera, 1960), but whose validity was criticized by Warriner (1960). In the urban areas, writers proposed a three-class system with a growing, or nascent, middle class consisting mostly of entrepreneurs (Arcinas, 1955; Hunt, et al., 1963).

A reasonable solution to these theoretical and conceptual problems is to treat status rankings derived from the reputational approach as phenomena which co-exist with social class; disagreement on the second does not imply non-existence of the first. In this study, rankings on the reputational method are "continuous" in nature, whereas those implied by the idea of class are "discrete." The scale used for the reputational approach is a modified Likert-type, below:

0	1	2	3
Undecided	Good	Better	Best

A judge rating someone's SES (e.g., occupation) is given the four alternative numbers, or categories, to choose from, on the assumption that a positive scale will yield reliable responses since it is consistent with the prevailing trait of *hiya* or *pakikisama* (literally, shame; sociologically, smooth interpersonal relations) among Filipinos.<sup>6</sup> In rural Philippines, evaluating one's neighbors negatively before an outsider is an uncommon practice prevented by *hiya*. Public censorship seems to be the rule, although backbiting and recrimination do exist in small cliques, for fear of reprisal from saying something unpleasant about others.

A family head, on the basis of the scale, gets four qualitatively different scores from a judge, which may be summed up for all the judges to comprise the family's SES score (see suggested form in Magdalena & Zarco, 1970).

### 2. Selection of the Judges

The criteria for the selection of judges were five:

a) *Length of residence.* To qualify, a judge had to be a long-time resident of the community. The minimum residence requirement was set arbitrarily at 15 years, with the belief that a judge who had stayed this long would have a profound knowledge and ability to make accurate estimates of his townspeople.

b) *Age.* All the judges were at least 30 years of age at the time of interview. They were local-born, and had spent most of their lifetime in the community. This ascribed criterion complemented the length of residence, an achieved characteristic.

c) *Ecological distribution.* The houses occupied by the judges were located far apart from one another, such that no two judges lived close enough to each other. The rationale is to allow a wider span of familiarity with their neighbors, thereby avoiding the possibility that many of these individuals will be left out from the evaluation due to lack of knowledge by the judges about them.

d) *Literacy.* All judges were literate, save one case in San Jose who was later replaced with someone of almost identical SES position. (In this study, literacy was defined as one's ability to read and write in English or in the vernacular. The judge's SES refers to his score in the level-of-living scale.)

e) *Leadership roles.* Three judges in San Jose were elective leaders in the now-defunct Barrio Council, while two of those in Cruz na

Ligas occupied similar positions in such a community organization.

There were variations in the overall procedure of selecting the judges, however. Two criteria were not uniformly applied: sex, and the judge's SES. These two were ignored in San Jose because it was believed that they would not make any difference in the results of the reputational technique when it was first tried in Cruz na Ligas. Apparently they did not.

In San Jose, two female judges were added to the list in keeping with the number of female household heads in the total sample. The sex ratio of household heads is about eight to one, indicating an overwhelming male dominance. In Cruz na Ligas, the number of female household heads is insignificantly small; hence, no female judge was included in the panel.

Another area of variation is in the SES of the judges, where this concept is measured by their level of living. In Cruz na Ligas, the judges were of equal (middle) SES background, those in San Jose were not. In part the logic of this procedure is to determine whether the difference would matter in the consistency with which they rate people; in another, to offset criticisms against use of judges with homogenous status characteristics.

### 3. Problems in Communication

A special note must be entered on the conceptualization of "level of living" to make it meaningful to the judges. The term is admittedly technical, and may have no equivalent in any of the Filipino dialects. Yet its correct translation will be crucial in the validity of the study. It is for this reason that we took time to explain to the judges the meaning of level of living in the event that they could not understand precisely our instructions. We encountered no such problems with "family reputation" and

“occupation,” but “social participation” we translated to mean the amount of involvement of a family in community welfare. A wide range of social and community activities was cited as examples to the judges, which revolved around participation in *bayanihan* or community cooperation, attendance in or financial contribution for a vigil during times of death, and cognate indices of social participation.

Finally, a check employed to find out whether a judge understood instructions was to get feedback from him/her describing the components of the reputational approach’s SES in his/her own interpretation of the constructs.

4. *Reliability of the Scale*

The scales used in the two communities are fairly reliable. A composite reliability formula suggested by Holsti (1969:137) was calculated for each of the four subscales or components of the reputational approach, yielding product-moment coefficients at the order of  $r = .89$  to  $.94$  (arithmetic means of the correlations range from  $r = .59$  to  $.80$ ).

In Cruz na Ligas, however, only the combined scale scores were analyzed to determine the full SES scale’s reliability (Table 1). The procedure entailed a comparison of two judges at a time, for pooled ratings of a household head based on the four subscales, giving a composite reliability of  $r = .94$  (arithmetic mean,  $r = .80$ ).

Table 1: *Matrix of Interjudge Coefficients of Agreement\**  
*(Aggregated Subscales of Reputational Method)*  
 Cruz na Ligas Sample, N = 30 Families, Ca. 1969

Judge	A	B	C	D
A	...	.77	.85	.77
B		...	.77	.84
C			...	.82
D				...

\*All the coefficients reported here and in the succeeding tables are calculated using Pearson’s product-moment formula. Tests of significance for the correlations are dubious as the cases are not strictly a random sample. For those who wish to test them, however, the correlations appearing in Tables 1 through 3 are more than significant (by *t*-test) at  $p = .01$  level.

In the case of San Jose, a more detailed interjudge comparison was performed for all the separate subscales of the reputational approach in an effort to purify the whole SES scale. More technically, this procedure is one of item analysis. With the idea of purification in mind, two of the four subscales were dropped for lack of interjudge agreement: family reputation subscale (mean  $r = .16$ , and

social participation subscale (mean  $r = .15$ ). While these components are by themselves theoretically important aspects of status, their inclusion in the data analysis is expected to result in depressed correlations with an external “variable.” Hence, the retention of only two SES subscales is regarded desirable (Table 2).

Table 2: *Matrix of Interjudge Coefficients of Agreement\**  
*(Two Separate Subscales of Reputational Method)*  
 San Jose Sample, N = 100 Families, Ca. 1971

Judge	A	B	C	D	E	F
A	...	.63	.51	.69	.65	.71
B	.58	...	.52	.67	.62	.63
C	.41	.50	...	.43	.49	.46
D	.68	.69	.35	...	.66	.70
E	.75	.62	.39	.73	...	.70
F	.64	.59	.39	.72	.64	...

\*The upper half of the matrix consists of intercorrelations for seven judges, who rated the family heads' level-of-living status; the lower half, for the same judges rating these family heads' occupational status.

#### *Scale Development for the Objective Method*

Two variant of the level-of-living scale were applied in this comparative study to measure objective social status: the Castillo scale, and the Magdalena-Zarco scale. The first consists of a 14-item battery especially developed for four Laguna barrios during the early 1960s (see Castillo, et al., 1967). The second, also a 14-item scale, was constructed about ten years later for a barrio in Nueva Ecija according to the principle of Guttman scalogram analysis (see Magdalena, 1971). Both scales rate the social location of a family by way of its cultural and material possessions. Common household items, such as a radio, a bed, a dresser, and use of electricity for light, among others, are also the scale items utilized in making inferences about the level of living of rural families. It must be stressed that these level-of-living scales, although substantially similar in many respects,<sup>9</sup> are not identical in their component items.

Speaking now of quality, both scales are reliable by any indication. The Castillo scale is internally homogenous (by split-half technique, its Pearsonian reliability coefficient is .8). The Magdalena-Zarco scale also shows this property (its coefficient of reproducibility

is .91), aside from being an equivalent form of the Castillo scale. Applied simultaneously in San Jose, these scales are correlated in a high degree ( $r = .93$ ,  $N = 100$  families), which means that they are interchangeable.

#### *Comparing the Two Approaches*

We are now ready to demonstrate the empirical relationship, if any, between the reputational and the objective approaches. The relevant hypothesis to be tested is the expectation that the familial level of living is a status rank directly related to its SES standing in the reputational view of people, as opposed to the hypothesis that this set of ranks is unrelated to each other. Correlations between the objective measures, as represented by two level-of-living scales, and the reputational rankings of families in Cruz na Ligas and San Jose substantiate the predicted relationship (Table 3). In any case, the results are impressive, statistically at least.

What do these findings mean? We venture to explain them in the following terse statements:

First, the agreement between the two approaches to measuring SES is interpretable



Table 3: *Correlations between Level-of-Living Scales and SES Subscales of Reputational Approach, by Community*

Reputational Subscales, by Community	<i>Level of Living Scales</i>	
	Castillo Scale	Magdalena-Zarco Scale
<i>Cruz na Ligas (N = 30)</i>		
1. Level of Living	.59	n.a.*
2. Social participation	.50	n.a.
3. Occupation	.49	n.a.
4. Family reputation	.46	n.a.
<i>San Jose (N = 100)</i>		
1. Level of living	.69	.70
2. Occupation	.67	.65

\*n.a. — data not available for comparison

as an index of validity for the (objective) level-of-living scales since they behave according to the theoretical construct they are supposed to portray. At the same time, these scales can predict, and are in turn predictable from, a concurrently developed measure of the construct "social status." Thus, the observed correlations derived from their comparison are estimates of construct and concurrently validity for the level-of-living measures, especially the Castillo scale when used outside the area where it is developed.

And second, agreement of this nature is an evidence to suggest that categories or strata of statuses, as statistical positions, may capture the elusive social meanings they have been denied of. In a sense, these strata are "real." They are a social reality for the pyramid of socioeconomic status, the way it is built by familial level of living, is defined to be so by and has real consequences to the people perceiving it. That the objective and the reputational ranks match each other is a testimony to the convergence of two important dimensions in stratification analysis, as revealed in the two communities under study.

### *Conclusion*

The techniques, procedures, and findings of this investigation come to grips with the import of the reputational approach for viewing social stratification in rural communities, keeping in mind the strong *gemeinschaft* spirit of solidarity prevailing there. This approach offers to the social scientist a strategy for validation of an instrument, as well as a tactical solution to capture the social essence which others like him/her have often relegated to the background. There is more to it than what has been said however.

In this paper, a quick but accurate way of taking a reputational approach to socioeconomic status measurement has been shown for application in other rural communities in the Philippines, and possibly in other regions the world over where similar cultural conditions exist. The task we have envisioned to accomplish is by no means completed, hence the following proposition is suggested. "Rural communities, where the majority of the population reside, are excellent research sites for the reputational

approach. The more *rural* a community is, the more applicable and valid this approach will be."

Finally, as a note of caution, the empirical relationship between the two approaches is not and should never be regarded as an association of variables in a general sense. It is a correlation between the various indices of

the objective and the reputational SES for the sample *barrios*. As in most such studies, therefore, our findings in Cruz na Ligas and San Jose have yet to be corroborated by others, or verified anew in different settings. Only then can one legitimately lay his claim that the fruits borne by the reputational method are worth the toil in village stratification analysis.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>Part of the material presented here was gathered from fieldwork by the author when he wrote his *masteral* thesis. An earlier, more concise, version is found elsewhere (see Magdalena & Zarco, 1970), comparing the two approaches for the study of social stratification in Barrio Cruz na Ligas, Quezon City. For the purposes of this study, a *barrio* is defined as a small village community with a semi-autonomous political organization, the Barrio Council, now known as the Barangay, which is created by fiat.

<sup>2</sup>Questions relating to criteria for measurement of social status, or the number of strata to be analyzed, are mainly academic. To a certain extent, the answers depend on the methodological or substantive utility of information for the researcher in his quest to explain particular behaviors as determined by status differences (Tumin, 1967: 83-86).

<sup>3</sup>Goseco-Rigor (1971) describes in greater detail the characteristics of the province of Nueva Ecija. In that study, she talks of the influence of *barrio* differentiation and related contextual variables on the family's level of living for a sample of communities there.

<sup>4</sup>A variant of the Warner EP technique was applied in the Philippines by Lynch (1959, 1962), who employed community raters from a small town, Canaman, in the Bicol region.

<sup>5</sup>In many instances, we gave aliases to respondents in lieu of their complete names, if only to facilitate evaluation by the judges. In a typical Philippine *barrio*, townfolks are sometimes better known by *teknonyms* (referencing to their relations with someone or with an occupation or activity), or for their assumed names (called in Tagalog as *bansag*), such as Pedrong *pandak* (dwarf), Juang *taga* (scar), and Mariang *hilot* (local midwife), among others. Aliases are especially tagged for two or more persons who have the same first names for the purpose of differentiation.

<sup>6</sup>Pretest of the reputational approach in Cruz na Ligas (Magdalena & Zarco, 1970) and observations in other communities confirmed this notion. Not a single judge from Cruz na Ligas gave us a negative estimate, or chose a negative category in the scale.

<sup>7</sup>Kornhauser (1953) raised an objection against Warner's use of EP in describing the class structure of small-town America, not as it actually exists but as it is perceived by upper middle and upper class residents who acted as the key informants (judges or raters).

<sup>8</sup>Because of a constraint of space, the Magdalena-Zarco scale cannot be shown here. Suffice it to say that its scale items, together with the percentages of possession by the families, are the following: curtain (82%), clothes closet (77%), radio (66%), chinaware — at least a dozen pieces (52%), at least one book (47%), bed (45%), flower vase (32%), dining room set (27%), electricity or air-pressured lamp for lighting (25%), electric flat iron (12%), phono/stereo (6%), television set (3%), and refrigerator (2%). Altogether, 122 scale errors showed up, those responses which did not fit into the "ideal" or perfect pattern required of a Guttman scale. These data are based on a sample of 100 families from San Jose. This level-of-living scale was also found valid in another community, Parang (Rizal), although with a slightly different set of items.

<sup>9</sup>Seven scale items in the Magdalena-Zarco measure are similar to those in the Castillo scale, but whose cut-off points are different. For example, in San Jose the item "newspapers/magazines" was marked present for families which had one, provided that these reading materials were not older than one week.

### References

- Abu-Laban, Baha  
1965 "The Reputational Approach to the Study of Community Power: A Critical

- Evaluation," *Pacific Sociological Review* 8 (Spring): 35-42.
- Afable, Lourdes B.  
1960 "The Muslims as an Ethnic Minority in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review* 8 (January-April): 16-33.
- Anderson, James N.  
1962 "Some Aspects of Land and Society in a Pangasinan Community," *Philippine Sociological Review* 10 (January-April): 41-58.
- Arcinas, Fe R.  
1955 "An exploratory Study of the Socio-Economic Structure of the Diliman Community," *Philippine Sociological Review* 3 (November): 28-39.
- Belcher, John C.  
1972 "A Cross-Cultural Household Level-of-Living Scale," *Rural Sociology* 37 (June): 208-220.
- Berger, Peter L. & Tomas Luckman  
1967 *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Doubleday.
- Castillo, Gelia T., Felicidad V. Cordero & Manuel R. Tanco  
1967 "A Scale to Measure Family Level of Living in Four Barrios of Los Baños, Laguna," *Philippine Sociological Review* 15 (July-October): 67-87.
- Fox, Robert  
1956 "Social Class," in *Area Handbook on the Philippines*, Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago for the Human Relations Area Files, Inc.
- Goseco-Rigor, Amparo  
1971 *Family and Barrio Differentiation in Nueva Ecija*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Haller, Archibald O. & Helcio Ulhoa Saraiva  
1972 "Status Measurement and the Variable Discrimination Hypothesis in an Isolated Brazilian Region," *Rural Sociology* 37 (September): 325-351.
- Hiller, Peter  
1973 "Social Reality and Social Stratification," *The Sociological Review* 21 (February): 77-99.
- Hodge, R. W. & P. M. Siegel  
1964 "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963," *American Journal of Sociology* 20 (November): 286-302.
- Hollingshead, August B.  
1949 *Elmtown's Youth: The Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Hollnsteiner, Mary R.  
1963 *The Dynamics of Power in a Philippine Municipality*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Community Development Council.
- Holsti, Ole R.  
1969 *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences*. London: Addis-Wesley Publishing.
- Hunt, Chester L., et al.  
1963 *Sociology in the Philippine Setting*. Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House.
- Kerlinger, Fred N.  
1973 *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kornhauser, Ruth R.  
1953 "The Warner Approach to Social Stratification," in R. Bendix & S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, Status and Power*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- Lynch, Frank  
1959 *Social Class in a Bikol Town*. Chicago: University of Chicago Philippine Studies Program.  
1962 "Continuities in Philippine Social Class," *Historical Bulletin* 6 (March): 40-51.  
1965 "Trends Report of Studies in Social Stratification and Social Mobility in the Philippines," *East-Asian Cultural Studies* 4 (March): 163-191.
- Magdalena, Federico V. & Ricardo M. Zarco  
1970 "A Comparison of the Objective and the Reputational Approaches in the Study of Philippine Class Structure," *Philippine Sociological Review* 18 (April): 77-85.
- Magdalena, Federico V.  
1971 *Cumulative Scales to Measure Level of Living of Two Philippine Communities*. M.A. thesis, University of the Philippines.

- Nydegger, William F.  
1960 *Tarong: A Philippine Barrio*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Nurge, Ethel  
1968 "Land Ownership, Occupation, and Income in a Leyte Barrio," *Philippine Sociological Review* 4 (April-July): 15-22.
- Rivera, Generoso F.  
1960 "The Maranao Muslims in Lumbayao, Lanao," *Philippine Sociological Review* 8 (January-April): 1-9.
- Sewell, William H.  
1943 "A Short Form of the Farm Family Socioeconomic Status Scale," *Rural Sociology* 8 (June): 161-170.
- Sollie, Carlton R.  
1966 "A Comparison of Reputational Techniques for Identifying Leaders," *Rural Sociology* 31 (September): 301-309.
- Tiryakian, Edward  
1958 "A Prestige Evaluation of Occupations in an Underdeveloped Country: The Philippines," *American Journal of Sociology* 63 (January): 390-399.
- Tumin, Melvin M.  
1967 *Social Stratification: The Forms and Functions of Inequality*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Marcia Meeker & Kenneth Eells  
1960 *Social Class in America*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers First Harper Torchbook Edition (originally published in 1949 by Science Research Associates).
- Warriner, Charles K.  
1960 "Myth and Reality in the Social Structure of the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review* 8 (July-October): 26-32.