

Patterns of Kin-Term Usage Among Young Ilocanos and a Method for Determining Them

By DANIEL J. SCHEANS

*Department of Anthropology
Portland State College*

ANTHROPOLOGISTS studying kinship and its associated behaviors and terminologies will generally approach their subject in one of two ways. The first approach emphasizes the normative-ideal system involved and rests on a data base consisting of genealogies and informant interviews. The minimal product in this case is a set of kin-term charts and a description of behaviors appropriate for kinsmen. Examples of this approach are common in Philippine studies and cover such ethnolinguistic groups as the Sagada-Kankanay (Eggan 1960), Bontoc (Himes 1964:159-167), Northern Kalinga (Dozier 1966:65-84), and Suba, Ilocos Norte (Scheans 1963:216-235).

The second approach emphasizes a statistical-real view of what people actually do. It rests on a data base consisting largely of the anthropologist's observations of kinship behaviors performed in varying contexts by numbers of different persons. These observations, in turn, are then used to produce statements about patterned, or modal, behaviors within the group studied. An Ilocano example of

this approach is given by Nydgger when he states that, "Questions and answers particularly, if not softened by the friendly *nana*, *manung*, etc., seem cold and rude" (1960:143). The adduction of such pattern statements is not easy, however, since this approach has built into it an old and nagging problem that has plagued most anthropologists -- How many occurrences, or cases, make a pattern? Some, like Malinowski, were not much worried by this problem, and only he could have written that, "The competent and experienced ethnographer will easily see from the data presented throughout this book where the documentation is thin and where it is full" (1932:xlvii). On the other hand, Kluckhohn, writing about Malinowski, was worried and felt that, "There is surely a tinge of the anecdotal so long as the ethnographer gives us no check upon his statement or implication that a behavior or a pattered set of responses is or is not typical -- in the sense that a type is 'a measure of central tendency in a range of material'" (1962:249).

In this paper I will describe a method I used during 1963-64 as part of a larger study of Ilocano kinship behavior.¹ This method was one of my answer to the problem of obtaining an adequate number of observations on kin-term usage that could serve as the basis for pattern statements about such usages. It is a survey-type technique designed to supplement, but not replace, the traditional participant-observer method which, I believe, lies at the heart of all anthropological field work. Following the presentation of the method, I will demonstrate its usefulness in the study of kin-term usages. In this instance, I will concentrate on a little-studied aspect of this branch of kinship studies -- kin term usage and non-usage by children. All of the data to be discussed were gathered in Barrio Suba, Ilocos Norte.²

The Method

This method consists essentially of having all members of the population studied state their kin relationship to all others in the same population. It was modeled on the technique used by Rose in his study of Australian kinship (1960). The mechanics of it -- simple, but somewhat tedious and time-consuming -- are these: (1) all of the persons to be used are photographed singly, (2) each of them is shown all of the pictures and asked what is her/his relationship to the person in the picture, and (3) the subject's responses are recorded either in full or on a coded response sheet. Ideally, the total number of responses that can be elicited

will be slightly less than the number of subjects times the number of subjects so that even a small population, say of 50 persons, will produce an abundance of responses ($50 \times 50 = 2,500$ minus subject's own pictures = 2,450). Admittedly, the means used are mechanical, but I believe the results obtained are as valid as they would if gathered by confronting the subjects with one another -- a task that would be impossible in most field-work situations.

In Suba the survey was conducted in only one of the four sitios of the barrio: sitio Tempuyog. This was done for several reasons: (1) the barrio population (500+) would be difficult to work with because of its size and semidispersed nature and (2) the barrio is not a social network in the kinship sense since one of its sitios, Tacnir, has no kin ties with the other three hamlets, and a second, the eastern hamlet, has few kin ties within the barrio. Tempuyog, on the other hand, is a kin network and all of its 30 households are related basically by consanguineal ties. Where these are lacking -- in the case of only one household -- affinal ties are found. Additionally, affinal relationships also exist between the other Tempuyog households because of a slight local endogamy produced by second-cousin marriages in the not-too-distant past. Thus, our first selection of subjects for the survey took in all 30 households in the sitio. In addition to these, six other households were included, all from the west side of Paoay Lake adjacent to Suba. Two of these contained persons related to Subans while four of them did not.

After selecting these 36 households we started photographing their inhabitants. In this way we were able to eliminate a number of persons that would not be suitable for the survey: nontalking children,

¹ This study was supported by a National Science Foundation Post-Doctoral Fellowship and by a USPHS Grant (MH-08-72-01).

² Suba, its real name, is one of the five barrios that surround Paoay Lake in Ilocos Norte. Its inhabitants are Iloko-speaking farmers. For a fuller description of Suba and its kinship system see Scheans 1963, 1966.

the incapacitated, blind, etc. Whenever possible, however, the number of photographs for any household was not allowed to fall below what we termed a family minimum -- the father, the mother, one male child, and one female child. In most households, we exceeded this minimum with ease, with our largest photographed household numbering eight persons of varying age and both sexes. When this was done, 144 photographs were selected for survey use; 126 were of Tempuyog residents, seven were of their relatives from the west shore of the lake, and 11 were of nonrelatives from the same area.

Our next step was to conduct the survey, with the aim in mind of having all of the sitio subjects participate. This was not possible, however, since some persons were absent from Suba at the time, while others were sick or too busy to participate. We did manage to interview 112 of the 126 residents of Tempuyog, however, and that group produced over 16,000 responses.

The interviewing of all these persons was the most time-consuming part of the survey and, needless to say, did not go as smoothly as planned. Many older persons, for example, could not see the photographs because of eye trouble. Consequently, my field assistant would have to go through the pictures and give the subject either the name of the person portrayed, or, in the case of children, the names of his/her parents. Small children were also a problem because of their timidity. To overcome this, they were interviewed with their mother in attendance but without their siblings being present. This also helped to eliminate "coaching" on responses by older brothers and sisters. Similarly, parents and others at the interview -- and there were always others

-- were asked not to help the child at any time with his or her responses.

As for the form of the interview, it was conducted in this fashion: my assistant, a male Tempuyog resident, and I would call upon a given household. He would explain in Iloko that the survey was another part of the work that I had been doing in the sitio and ask for their cooperation. He would then say, "We are going to show each of you some pictures of people from this area and would you please state your relationship to the person in each picture?" We would then proceed to go through the photographs one at a time and I would record the responses. It should be noted that the photographs, while in serial order for recording purposes, had been shuffled repeatedly before being numbered, in order to break up household groupings and to distribute the subjects at random throughout the packet of pictures. We did not say anything concerning the possibility of negative responses since we were curious as to what the subjects would do in such cases. Interestingly enough, these negative responses took only two forms: "I don't know," *diák ammó*, and "none," *awán*. The latter we interpreted as a statement of no relationship, while the former was taken to mean that the subject thought he was related to the person pictured but did not know the precise nature of the relationship.

Finally, we should mention the nature of the positive responses that were recorded. The largest number consisted of Iloko terms of reference for consanguineal, affinal, and ritual relationships (See Table 1.) These were supplemented by English terms of reference which we glossed as follows: *auntie* = *ikit*; *uncle* = *ulitég*; *cousin* -- all children of aunts and uncles but particularly *kasinsín*, or first cou-

Table 1
KIN TERMS GIVEN BY ILOCANO CHILDREN CLASSIFIED BY AGE AND SEX OF RESPONDENT,
CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY ACTUAL TERMS USED

Kin term	English equivalent	4 - 10 years		11 - 20 years		Total
		Males N = 8	Females N = 5	Males N = 11	Females N = 7	
CONSAGUINEAL REFERENCE						
kasinsín	first cousin	0	0	207	44	251
apo	grandfather/mother	13	36	37	59	145
kaanakán	nephew/niece	0	0	31	82	113
apo lakáy/bakét	grandfather/mother	53	4	30	11	98
ikit	aunt	4	0	70	22	96
ulitég	uncle	3	0	86	0	89
kapidua	second cousin	0	0	41	14	55
kabsát	sibling	0	0	19	2	21
kapitló	third cousin	0	0	0	20	20
iná	mother	9	2	3	0	14
amá	father	1	0	1	0	2
ENGLISH REFERENCE						
auntie		62	48	92	84	286
uncle		60	44	62	64	230
cousin		1	0	41	4	46
father		0	0	1	0	1
mother		0	0	1	0	1
brother		0	0	1	0	1
ADDRESS						
manong	older brother	157	89	24	111	381
manang	older sister	90	63	13	83	249
nanang	mother	31	43	31	68	173
tatang	father	23	43	43	51	165

Table 1 (continued)
 KIN TERMS GIVEN BY ILOCANO CHILDREN CLASSIFIED BY AGE AND SEX OF RESPONDENT,
 CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY ACTUAL TERMS USED

Kin term	English equivalent	4 - 10 years		11 - 20 years		Total
		Males N = 8	Females N = 5	Males N = 11	Females N = 7	
lola/lila	grandmother	8	22	64	12	106
lilo	grandfather	9	27	25	39	100
ading	younger sibling	6	0	33	3	42
AFFINAL REFERENCE						
ipag	sister-in-law	0	0	8	9	17
kayong	brother-in-law	0	0	1	3	4
RITUAL REFERENCE						
amá ti bunyág	godfather by baptism	1	1	11	0	13
iná ti bunyág	godmother by baptism	3	0	7	2	12
apó ti bunyág	grandchild by baptism	0	0	7	0	7
amá ti digos	godfather by <i>digos</i>	0	0	4	1	5
kabagis ti bunyág	godsibling by baptism	0	0	5	0	5
kabagis ti kasár	godsibling by marriage	0	0	4	0	4
compadre	"co-father"	0	1	1	0	2
kabagis ti digos	godsibling by <i>digos</i>	0	0	2	0	2
lila ti bunyág	grandmother by baptism	0	0	1	0	1
anak ti bunyág	godchild by baptism	0	0	1	0	1
iná ti digos	godmother by <i>digos</i>	0	0	1	0	1
TEKNONYMOUS		42	8	2	0	52
FIRST-NAME IDENTIFICATION (NAME USAGE)		161	97	12	98	368
RELATIONSHIP ASSUMED		367	178	521	110	1176
NO RELATIONSHIP		2	0	20	0	22
MISCELLANEOUS		33	10	9	5	57

sins. The next largest category consisted of consaguineal terms of address. Other categories of response were these: miscellaneous, no relationship, don't know (relationship assumed to exist), name usage, and teknonymous.³

Findings

Our category of respondents which we labeled "children" included 31 unmarried persons (19 males and 12 females) from four to 20 years of age. Eight males and five females were ten years of age or younger while the remaining 11 males and seven females were in the 11 to 20 year-old bracket. As categories these classifications accord roughly with Ilocano folk categories in that the youngest set (4-10 years) would be called *ubbing* while the older set would be classed as *baró* (young unmarried males) and *balasang* (young unmarried females).⁴ Additionally, as the survey progressed it became apparent that our category of "children" was meaningful so far as our aims were concerned since the responses that we obtained from them differed greatly from those given by adults. This terminological self-segregation did not appear to be random, as may be seen by examining in detail the patterns of children's responses by terminological categories.

Iloko Consaguineal Reference Terms

Table 2, which presents percentages of responses in each category relative to the total number of all responses, shows that as children age they use more Iloko con-

³ Teknomy is a practice whereby a child does not take its name from its parents, but rather parents derive a name from their child. For example, an adult is known as the "father of so-and-so."

⁴ Technically, the younger girls who had not reached menarche should be classified as *balasitang*.

sanguineal reference terms. This pattern of increase reflects their continuing socialization and their increasing ability to denote individuals within their local kinship world. Later in life their use of such terms should be even greater. Indeed, other data show that 64 percent of all of the responses given by 21 married adults in Tempuyog between the ages of 21 and 40 were Iloko consaguineal reference terms (Table 3). If we turn to Table 1 (number of responses per kin term) and examine it, several sub-patterns within the gross pattern of increased consaguineal term usage just described, can be noted.⁵ There we see that the very young (4-10 yrs.) use only those reference terms applicable to ascending generations, especially the *apo* (grandparent, sir, or madam) form. Seemingly, this would indicate that respect for elders is a lesson learned early in a Suban child's life. After the age of ten the number of kinds of consaguinees discriminated increases, with the *baró/balasang* category labeling persons of all generations, though with varying degrees of ability.

Of particular interest are their cousin discriminations. Only females responded with all three of the expected cousin terms: *kasinsín* (first), *kapiduá* (second), and *kapitló* (third). Males seem to prefer to bring cousins closer to themselves

⁵ Table 1 includes only the 38 kin terms given as responses by the children. This number is 20 less than the total number of kin terms given by adult respondents. The difference between the two totals is due to the age and degree of social involvement characteristic of each category. Thus, adults did, but children did not, use the following terms:

half-sibling (two forms), child, stepchild, grandchild, great-grandchild, sister, son, daughter, parent-in-law, co-parent-in-law, spouse, co-sibling-in-law, child-in-law, mother-of-the-wedding, father-of-the-wedding, co-parent (old form), co-parent-of-the-bath, child-of-the-wedding, child-of-the-bath.

Table 2
KIN TERMS GIVEN BY ILOCANO CHILDREN CLASSIFIED BY AGE
AND SEX OF RESPONDENT, CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY KIND
OF TERMS USED

Kin-term category	4 - 10 years		11 - 20 years	
	Males N = 8 %	Females N = 5 %	Males N = 11 %	Females N = 7 %
CONSANGUINEAL REFERENCE	7.2	5.9	33.3	25.4
ENGLISH REFERENCE	10.8	12.9	12.6	15.2
ADDRESS	28.7	40.1	14.8	36.7
AFFINAL REFERENCE	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.2
RITUAL REFERENCE	0.3	0.1	2.8	0.3
TEKNONYMOUS REFERENCE	3.7	1.1	0.1	0.0
FIRST-NAME IDENTIFICATION (NAME USAGE)	14.1	13.6	0.8	9.8
RELATIONSHIP ASSUMED	32.1	24.9	33.1	11.0
NO RELATIONSHIP	0.2	0.0	1.3	0.0
MISCELLANEOUS REFERENCE	2.9	1.4	0.6	0.5
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES	1,144	715	1,574	1,001

Table 3
KIN TERMS GIVEN BY ILOCANO RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY AGE
OF RESPONDENT, CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY KIND OF TERMS USED

Kin-term category	4 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	N = 21
	N = 13 %	N = 18 %	21 - 40 years %
CONSANGUINEAL REFERENCE	6.7	30.2	64.4
ENGLISH REFERENCE	11.6	13.6	3.5
ADDRESS	33.1	23.3	2.8
AFFINAL REFERENCE	0.0	0.8	12.0
RITUAL REFERENCE	0.3	1.9	5.2
TEKNONYMOUS REFERENCE	2.7	0.1	0.0
FIRST-NAME IDENTIFICATION (NAME USAGE)	13.9	4.3	0.0
RELATIONSHIP ASSUMED	29.3	24.5	8.0
NO RELATIONSHIP	0.1	0.8	3.7
MISCELLANEOUS REFERENCE	2.3	0.5	0.4
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES	1,859	2,575	3,003

by not using the term for third cousin at all. At the same time they labeled many more persons as first cousins than females did. Tentatively, I would interpret this as evidence for a practice that is common in Suba among *baró* males: the establishment of peer groups of "cousins." Girls of the *balasang* category also form groups of this type but they lack both the frequency and duration of interaction that characterize male groups since girls their age are required to stay close to home in order to help their female kin and to obey the canons of maidenly modesty that structure the *balasang* role. That *baró* and *balasang* did distinguish in some measure between first and second cousins is an indication that by the time children enter these categories they are showing an awareness of Suban marriage rules. Traditionally, the marriage boundary within the kinship circle was set at first cousins, so that second cousins could be, and indeed were, married. The result of such unions was a modest endogamy characterized by both marriage partners coming from either the same sitio or from within the barrio. Such unions have become rare in recent times, however, since another Suban marriage preference is for marriages between persons who do not share the same family name -- and second -- cousin marriages in the past tended to decrease the number of such names within the sitio. Thus a young Suban today may well have a good number of second and third cousins within the sitio but they will not be thought of as potential mates since Ego and the cousins will have the same patronym.

English Reference Terms

The use of these foreign terms is positively associated with youth in Suba.

This can best be seen by comparing children with adults: the total number of English reference responses given by the 31 children studied was 565 (12.7 per cent of their total number of all responses) while the 21 married adults studied gave only 104 such responses (3.45 per cent of their total number of all responses). This usage of English terms by the young can be interpreted as an expression of "Westernization" on the part of the older children in that they have had some contact with movies, periodicals, people, and schools that used English. As for the younger children, they undoubtedly picked up these terms from older children and/or parents with some knowledge of English. Suba, it should be noted, has a good number of the latter in the form of persons schooled in pre-Republic days and "Hawaiianos" -- people who migrated to Hawaii and later returned to the barrio. Another factor that could have motivated the children to produce these English responses was my presence at the interviews. Unfortunately, we did not check on this factor during the survey by reinterviewing subjects who used English terms with only native Iloko speakers present.

As for the kinds of terms used, Table I shows that *auntie* and *uncle*, and to a lesser extent, *cousin*, are the preferred Suban forms. This is different from the situation in "Tarong," Ilocos Sur where only *onkl* and *anti* were commonly used (Nydegger 1960:385). Interestingly enough, the subpattern of usage for the term *cousin* by Suban children is the same as that described for the use of indigenous cousin terms in that, with one exception, it starts after the age of ten. In no case, however, can it be said that English reference terms are part of the standard adult lexicon of kinship in Suba, as they are said to be in "Tarong" (Nydegger, *loc. cit.*).

On a larger scale the Suban and "Tarong" data do seem to fit into a pattern of kin-term borrowing that is found sporadically throughout the Philippines. Tagalog, for example, uses the Spanish *tio/tia* pair (Himes 1964:172), while in Iloko *uncle/aunt* have been adopted. More work needs to be done on the nature and extent of such borrowing, however, since while in the present case the sources of the borrowed terms are apparent, in others they are far from certain. The best example of terms having an uncertain source would be the *lilo/lila* (grandfather/grandmother) pair which appears in Iloko. Himes (1964:166) says that the cognate forms in Tagalog (*lolo/lola*) and Kuyonon (*lulu/lula*) are Spanish derivatives, while Manuel says that the Tagalog forms, which are also found in Bicol and Sambal, are of Chinese origin (1948:38).

Address Terms

These responses are, in a sense, "wrong" responses in that our method was designed to elicit terms of reference. Suban children, as we saw earlier, are not completely in control of the referential aspect of their kinship terminology, and their extensive use of address terms shows this. Indeed the total number of reference terms given by them (904) was somewhat less than their total number of address terms (1,216). That address-term usage is positively associated with youth in Suba may be seen in Table 2, where the percentage of such responses decreases with age. Such a decrease in usage is even more striking if we compare children with adults: all 31 children gave 1,216 address terms (27 per cent of their total number of responses) while the 21 adults in the 21-40 year-old category gave only 84 address terms (2.7 per cent of

their total number of responses). In our view the use of address terms by Suban children represents a projection of their home experience upon the outside world. This interpretation is supported by analyzing the specific kinds of address terms used (Table 1). In contrast to the relative dearth of reference terms for family members (father, *amá*; mother, *iná*; and sibling, *kabsát*) these statuses show up abundantly in their vocative forms (*tatang, nanang, manung, manang, ading*). In both age categories the number of address terms for parents given as responses greatly exceeded the possible number of parents that could have been pictured for that category, i.e., there were 31 children with a maximum of 62 parents but 338 *tatang/nanang* responses. This difference is, as stated earlier, a result of the children projecting a limited kinship vocabulary upon the adult world. The principles that they use in these projections are the basic ones in Suban kinship: generation and sex. Of these two, generation and/or age is the more important one in the normative system, and is undoubtedly of equal importance in everyday usage. This is why the children studied showed a mastery of relative age distinctions for siblings in their extensive use of the *manong/nanang/ading* set of address terms (Table 1).

Affinal Reference Terms

The number of these terms elicited was remarkably, but understandably, small since none of the children were married or had married children. Indeed, the younger children showed no terminological awareness of affinal kin at all (Table 2). Those labeled by the older children were, as one might suspect, in the category of siblings-in-law, *kayong, ipag*. Thus, the major apparent pattern in the

use of affinal terms is one that we saw earlier when other reference terms were discussed -- an increase in their usage with age. This increase will, of course, be most marked after marriage, and in our adult group the percentage of affinal terms elicited was 12 per cent (Table 3).

Ritual Reference Terms

In terms of both total number and percentage of responses this class of responses resembles the affinal terms just discussed. This is partially due to the fact that one subclass of terms covers marriage sponsorship (the *kasár set*), while a second covers a rare form of sponsorship in a curing-name-changing rite (the *digos set*). Nevertheless, the total number of responses recorded for terms that could have been used by the children studied—the baptism/*bunyág set* -- is smaller than I would have expected since most Suban children do have at least one local relative in their list of baptismal sponsors. This underrepresentation of *bunyág* terms is most probably due to the children's choice of terms for persons in the survey who were both consanguineal and ritual kinsmen to them. Since Subans prefer to use consanguineal terms whenever possible, the children undoubtedly gave only a single term for those persons standing in one of these double relationships to them, and that term was a consanguineal one of some sort.

Another possible explanation for the small number of ritual reference responses would be that young children have little real interest in what few ritual relationships they are involved in. This is because baptismal sponsorship in Suba is not always directed towards establishing an adult-child relationship but rather towards establishing ties between the pa-

rents of a child and its adult sponsors. *Compadrazgo*, in this sense, would be of little interest to children either terminologically or behaviorally.

Teknonymous

This kind of kin labeling is clearly a younger child's practice in Suba, and it all but disappears some time after the child's tenth year (Table 2); nor does it reappear later since none of the adults studied in the 21-40 year age bracket gave teknonymous responses (Table 3).

First-Name Identification

This category covers only those responses that were given without an associated kinship term and which took the form of first names, i.e., Ben, Mariano, Tasing, etc. Subans do use Christian names in discourse, but only as clarifiers when the specific person referred to by a kin term is unclear. They do not use names alone, especially in address, since such behavior is considered insulting (Scheans 1963:220). This is why the use of names by children shows a marked reduction as they grow older (Table 2). Moreover, name usage, like teknonymy, is a child's practice and should cease by adulthood. This is why none of our 21 adult respondents designated anyone, young or old, by name (Table 3).

Relationship Assumed But Not Known

The responses tabulated in this category come from our interpretation of the subject's statement, "*diák ammó*," literally, "I don't know," when shown a photograph. This response by children meant to us that the child did feel that he was looking at a kinsman's picture but that he had yet to learn the nature of their relationship. Such knowledge comes with

experience and the high number of these responses by the children studied indicates that they do not gain this experience until after the age of 20. It should be noted, however, that even our adult group gave 242 responses of this type (eight per cent of their total responses), which would seem to show that genealogical expertise is not necessarily a characteristic of adult Sugans (Table 3).

No Relationship

Responses in this category come from our interpretation of the subject's statement, "*awán*," literally, "none". The total number of such responses was extremely small (Table 2) and indicates to us that the children studied did feel that the world of persons around them was a world of kinsmen. This is why, perhaps, they gave "I don't know" responses so abundantly. This tendency to see kinsmen where they do not really exist is not confined to children, however, since adults seem to do the same thing to a lesser extent. This is why the total number of "no relationship" responses by our adult category was only 111 (Table 3) when the expected number was actually 231. An alternative explanation for this discrepancy would be that some of the 11 persons chosen as nonrelatives for the survey were actually related to Subans in a manner unknown to me. This, I feel, is unlikely since those persons do not figure in the Suban genealogies that I have collected.

Sex Differences

Up until now we have avoided commenting on what appear to be significant differences between boys' and girls' responses. If anything, the pattern of male responses seems to be a conservative one, while females appear to be more innova-

tive, that is to say nonnormative, in their response patterns. Boys, for example, had a consistently higher percentage of total responses in the following term categories: Iloko reference terms, and relationship assumed but not known. Girls, on the other hand, consistently exceeded boys in percentage to total response in two different categories: English reference and address. Name usage could also be added to this girls' list, at least so far as older girls are concerned.

If our characterization of boys' responses as conservative, or traditional, and girls' responses as innovative, or non-traditional, is a correct one, then the causes for this difference should lie in the view that each sex holds of its local kinship world. Boys, because of the Suban pattern of virilocality, will spend their life in the sitio and among persons who are kinsmen to them. This, I believe, prompts them to learn and use kinship terms and behaviors at an early age, so that they fit into their kinship nexus sooner than girls. Most Suban girls will not remain in the sitio but will marry out of it, into adjoining barrios and nearby towns. There is, then, less need for them to learn and manipulate the total social map of their natal home. Instead they concentrate their efforts on those persons central to their kinship circle since these will be meaningful relatives even after marriage and the change of residence that normally goes with it.

Summary and Conclusions

The aims of this paper are twofold: (1) to describe a survey type of method designed to produce quantitative data on a subject that traditionally is studied in a qualitative manner, kin-term usages; and (2) to utilize some of the material gathered by means of this method as a basis

for the delineation of patterns of kin-term usage that can be said to be characteristic of the Ilocano children residing in one of the hamlets of Barrio Suba, Paoay, Ilocos Norte. We will discuss our second aim first.

Our analysis of the data showed that the children studied are clearly self-segregating so far as terminological usages are concerned. That this should be so should come as no surprise to any social anthropologist, or indeed to anyone who has been in contact with children -- parents included. In the present instance, however, what we have done is buttress an example of the anthropologist's keen perception of the obvious with specific data that show in what particular ways these Ilocano children differ from adults in their response patterns. The differences in this case were both relative and absolute. Thus, *only* children gave "tek-nonymous" responses or used a person's given name by itself in identifying kinsmen. Relatively, they gave fewer Iloko terms of reference than adults. This difference, particularly in the case of consanguineal terms, was due to two factors: (1) their lack of knowledge about the normative kin terminology used in Suba, and (2) their substitution of terms other than those used by adults. In the first instance, their lack of knowledge, coupled with their feeling that they were identifying kinsmen, led them, in over one quarter of their responses, to assume that there was a kin relationship extent between themselves and others in the survey, even though they obviously did not know its exact nature. In the second instance, they either offered a term of address as a label for the relationship or gave an English term that they thought adequately glossed the Iloko term involved. As for their small number of affinal and ritual

reference-term responses, this was due to the limited participation in what are, in Suba, adult spheres of kinship activity.

It was also demonstrated, but much less conclusively, that there were sex differences in the children's patterns of responses. Boys, on the whole tended to be more conservative (traditionally correct) while girls were more innovative. This may be due to the boys' realizing that a "correct" knowledge of their local kinship world is something they must attain since, in all probability, they will always reside in it. Girls, on the other hand, may well realize that they will in time marry and leave the natal home and have to adapt themselves to a new kin world -- a fact that could well inhibit their interest in mastering a knowledge of the local kin scene.

As for the method itself, it does seem to provide a means whereby a large number of kin-term responses can be elicited from the members of a given population in a fairly efficient manner. Its main use, then would be to mitigate the ethnographic problem of gathering sufficient data from which statements about patterned behavior can be derived with some degree of confidence. Thus, it is one alternative to the impressionistic method of adducing pattern statements which results from "sleeping oneself in the culture and then summing it up in great flashes of insight" (Beals 1967:51).

Beyond this general use there would also seem to be a number of specific uses for it, some of which we will mention here. For example, it could be used as a means for the description of differences between ideal (normative) and real (statistical) kinship behaviors, or segments thereof in a culture. Minimally, it could be used to indicate the nature of cate-

gories in a population (children vs. adults; males vs. females) that are self-segregating so far as their kin-term usages are concerned. Moreover, it could also be used to indicate the direction in which these categories of persons are moving in response to specific causes of change. Thus it might be that the age axis will reflect educational influences of either a formal or informal nature while the sex axis might indicate the degree of contact differences characteristic of males and females in a particular cultural situation.

Ultimately, such demonstrations as those suggested would help to further our knowledge of the kinds of adaptations in social institutions that give direction to social change (Eggan 1963:354). In this way, perhaps, such an elusive, but common, concept as "cultural drift" might be approached on the basis of a "sound phenomenalism" instead of an "arid conceptual realism" that is as misleading today as it was over 30 years ago (Lowie 1937:142).

References

- Beals, A.R. *Culture in Process*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967
- Dozier, Edward. *Mountain Arbiters*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1966.
- Eggan, Fred. The Sagada Igorots of Northern Luzon, in G. P. Murdock, ed., *Social Structure in Southeast Asia*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1960.
"Cultural Drift and Social Change," *Current Anthropology*, 4:347-55
- Himes, Ronald. "The Bontok Kinship System," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. 12, Nos. 3-4, July-October, 1964, pp. 159-172.
- Lowie, Robert. *The History of Ethnological Theory*. New York: Farras and Rinehart, 1937.
- Manuel, E. Arsenio. *Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language*. Manila: Filipiniana Publications, 1948.
- Nydegger, William and Corinne. Tarong: An Ilocos Barrio in the Philippines, in Beatrice B. Whiting, ed., *Six Cultures*. New York: Wiley, 1963.
- Rose, F.J. *Classification of Kin, Age, Structure and Marriage Amongst the Grooteylandt Aborigines*. New York: Pergamon, 1960.
- Scheans, Daniel. "Suban Society," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 216-236.
"Anak ti Digos: Ilokano Name Changing and Ritual Kinship," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (April 1966), pp. 82-85.