PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGY IN THE SEVENTIES: TRENDS AND PROSPECTS

RICARDO G. ABAD
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Ateneo de Manila University

ELIZABETH U. EVIOTA
Department of Sociology
Rutgers University

Philippine sociology has slowly broken away from its colonial roots, and now strives for a greater indigenization of the discipline. To elaborate this argument, the paper offers an overview of sociology's historical origins in the Philippines; discusses trends in sociological teaching and research, with emphasis on the 1970-1979 period; and considers the prospects for Philippine sociology in the 1980s.

Introduction

Sociology in Europe emerged out of the social shocks that shattered traditional views of life and the existence of traditional institutions. Such disciplines of the time as philosophy, political economy, and law did not adequately explain the variety of social phenomena in the real world, and a "new science" that reflected on the nature and direction of rapid social change was needed (Pieris 1969). In the United States, sociology grew out of a concern for social reform and for the ill-effects of urbanization and industrialization. Early American sociology, notably the variety espoused by the "Chicago School," was bent on studying the transformation of cities and the so-called social disorganization which accompanied city growth.

Sociology in the Philippines began outside these concerns. The Philippines, under colonial rule for several centuries, experienced dramatic social changes arising from external forces. Philippine sociology emerged in this context. Towards the end of the colonial period, enough of the sociological seeds were planted to attract more Filipino scholars into the discipline, to convince the Philippine government of its importance in the school curriculum, and to interest agencies in promoting the discipline.

Sociology remains, however, a relatively new field of study in the Philippines. As the 1970s drew to a close, the discipline had yet to develop the proper intellectual tradition and the infrastructure to sustain the profession. Its practitioners have just begun to develop the kind of social awareness necessary for a mature sociology, and to fashion concepts and methodologies applicable to the Philippine situation. It also strives for greater independence and seeks to build an infrastructure that will provide a fertile ground for richer sociological harvests.

This paper elaborates the process. It begins with an overview of sociology's historical origins in the country; continues with a discussion of sociological teaching and research, with emphasis on the 1970-79 period; and considers the prospects for Philippine sociology in the 1980s.

Philippine sociology: A brief history

Colonial Philippines lacked two conditions essential to the emergence of sociology: the disintegration of traditionalism and a belief in the power of science to examine, and

eventually reconstruct, social realities. The social sciences, notably sociology and anthropology, were not used as intellectual hardware for reordering society, but as prescriptions for living or as tools for colonial administration. As such, the introduction of sociology into the well-respected academic mainstream met no intellectual resistance.

A broadly-defined sociology course was first taught in 1896 at the University of Santo Tomas by Father Valentin Marin, a Spanish Dominican (Macaraig, cited in Hunt and others 1973). In 1899 and 1900, courses in social philosophy, penology, and criminology were added (Catapusan 1954). By the end of Spanish rule, Philippine sociology drew primarily from social philosophy (Weightman 1975).

The dawn of the 20th century and a change in colonial administration from Spain to the United States brought about a shift in sociological teaching. Courses such as social ethics and general sociology began to appear in the curriculum of practically all the private colleges and universities in Manila. In 1911, the University of the Philippines, located in Manila, offered its first sociology course under Professor A. E. W. Salt and then University president, Murray Bartlett, both Americans. In 1919, a similar course was introduced by Clyde Heflin, an American missionary at Silliman University in the Visayas. A sprinkling of Filipino social scientists, like Conrado Benitez and Luis Rivera, who like their foreign counterparts were not strictly sociologists, also began to teach sociology courses. One must note, however, that at this time, study materials such as textbooks and reference works were Western in origin and the courses offered were far from elaborate.

In the late 1920s, Serafin Macaraig, the first Filipino to obtain a doctorate in sociology from a university in the United States, joined the sociology faculty of the University of the Philippines. Macaraig responded to a need for a Philippine approach to sociology with a book entitled, *An Introduction to Sociology,* published in 1938. The book, the first sociology text written by a Filipino, contained a treatise on Filipino culture and beliefs, as well as an elaboration of general western sociological principles as applied to the Philippine setting (Catapusan 1954). The book introduced students to a social problem orientation to Philippine sociology, specifically to the thoughts of Giddings, Ellwood, and Ward and their proposals for man-made improvements of social conditions (Panopio and Bennagen 1981). Macaraig's contributions notwithstanding, most sociology courses in the various universities had not shifted very much from the social philosophy viewpoint fostered in the late Spanish and early American colonial period.

Nevertheless, the teaching of sociology, or the equivalent, gained more acceptance in Philippine colleges and universities, especially those outside Manila. Just before World War II, for instance, sociology benefitted, like history, from a government regulation which made a course called "Philippine Social Life" compulsory at elementary and intermediate levels. At the University of the Philippines, a course in introductory sociology was in such demand that by the early 1940s there were fourteen sections offered by the University's Department of Sociology and Anthropology (Panopio and Bennagen 1981). The content of these courses were characteristically skeletal as most of the teachers who taught them were not adequately trained in sociological theory and methods.

Sociology also made some headway as a distinct academic department. By the early 1940s, sociology at the University of the Philippines was combined with anthropology in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology. H. Otley Beyer, an anthropologist, headed the department, and under his influence, cultural and social anthropological studies proliferated, particularly of the more exotic Philippine ethnic communities. During

and immediately after the war, ethnographic information about the lifestyle of two percent of the Filipinos rather than of the dominant 98 percent was more readily available (Lynch and Hollnsteiner 1961). At this time, subjects in social work, a field regarded as a practical application of the discipline of sociology, also appeared in the University of the Philippines curriculum.

In sum, while Philippine sociology gained considerable academic acceptance in the forties, the scientific state of the discipline remained largely underdeveloped. Benicio Catapusan (1954), one of the early Filipino sociologists, observed that during this period, the discipline was taught mainly as a normative subject and the analysis of sociological principles was oftentimes, if not always, overlooked. Before World War II, then, very little systematic research was done in sociology, and whatever development of social thought there was in the country appeared in the work of foreign sociologists (Bulatao and others 1979). But much of this changed after World War II.

The 1950s witnessed the beginning of systematic, cumulative work, dating from the return of the first substantial group of foreign-trained Filipino sociologists (Hollnsteiner 1973). Opportunities opened for Filipinos to complete graduate studies in the United States under the Fulbright program, or in England, India, Ceylon or Australia under the Colombo Plan — two sources which remain open for advanced studies in sociology. Students also found support from two American foundations, Ford and Rockefeller, which were investing heavily in enlarging the pool of social scientists in the country. Many Filipinos seized these opportunities, and as a result, mainstream American sociological perspectives have greatly influenced the way Filipino sociologists have conducted their own work. As Panopio and Bennagen (1981:10) describe it:

A number of these students attended

schools in the mid-West and the West which were research-oriented universities, imbibing their research tradition and then return to the Philippines imbued with the ideas of the neo-positivism of George Lundberg, the functional theories of Durkheim, Parsons, and Merton, the social psychological theories of Cooley, Faris, G. H. Mead and Weber's value-free sociology. These theories have provided the framework for most researchers undertaken and the structural-functional theory has been utilized in sociological and social anthropological analysis.

The americanization of Philippine sociology was evident as well in the academic and professional organization of the discipline. The early 1950s, for instance, saw the departmental separation of sociology from anthropology and the merger between sociology and social welfare established at the University of the Philippines (Hollnsteiner 1962). John de Young, an American cultural anthropologist who was at the state university at the time to strengthen sociology course offerings, created the new department, and became its first chairman. (Sociology only became a separate department at the University of the Philippines in October 1961). The 1950s also saw a number of American Fulbright professors enter the University of the Philippines to help set up undergraduate and graduate degree programs, and to offer such courses as social psychology, rural sociology, crime and delinquency, the family, and a few social work subjects. By the late 1950s into the early 1960s similar undergraduate and graduate programs appeared in Philippine colleges and universities, notably Xavier University (then Ateneo de Cagayan) in Mindanao, Silliman University in the Visayas, and the Ateneo de Manila University and the Asian Social Institute in Luzon. In all these places, the influence of foreign, especially American, sociologists were marked. American Jesuits, for example, were instrumental in setting up sociology departments and social science research centers at Xavier and the Ateneo de

Manila.

The proliferation of sociology departments, the addition of general sociology courses in the liberal arts curriculum of many schools, and the efforts of individual sociologists attracted more Filipino students into the discipline. Several of these students were encouraged to pursue graduate studies abroad. Still a sufficient number of Filipino and non-Filipino social scientists showed interest in coordinating sociological activities beyond the confines of their respective universities. In September 1952, twenty professors from six different institutions met in Manila to organize the Philippine Sociological Society. Benicio Catapusan chaired the meeting and later was unanimously elected president. But the moving force behind the organization of the society was Chester Hunt, one of the American Fulbright professors assigned to the University of the Philippines. When the official journal of the Society, the *Philippine Sociological Review*, appeared in 1953, Hunt became its editor.

The first few volumes of the *Philippine Sociological Review* carried articles on the nature and scope of sociology, ethnic communities, the family, and religion. Yet as Catapusan (1954) notes, the 1950s also saw the start of an era which emphasized a different perspective of sociological teaching and research, that of social planning as means of creating a better social order. In a historical context, this emphasis grew out of the needs of a nation recovering from a devastating war and striving to get back on its feet. None of these perspectives, however, dominated sociological research in the 1950s. At this time sociology (as with the other social sciences) occupied a backseat to economics with its emphasis on natural resources and on measures for improving levels of living. But by the 1960s and the 1970s such factors as social behavior, cultural values, personal motivations, development ideologies and even structural dependency began to be associated with social change and socioeconomic development.

The 1960s ushered in an accelerated interest in sociological teaching and research. As more departments of sociology opened, so did the number of graduate, mainly masteral, programs. Filipino students enrolled in these graduate programs, and some of those who earlier pursued graduate programs abroad returned to teach, do research, and/or occupy administrative positions. Sociological research increased, aided primarily by the appearance of organized research centers. The Community Research Development Council (CRDC) at the University of the Philippines opened in 1957 and began to publish books and monographs on Philippine rural sociology and applied social change. Some of these were Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner's *The Dynamics of Power in a Philippine Municipality* (1960), Agaton Pal's *The Resources, Levels of Living and Aspirations of Households in Negros Oriental* (1963), Prospero Covar's *The Masagana/ Margate System of Planting Rice: A Study in Agricultural Innovation (1964)*, and Francis C. Madigan's *The Farmer Said No* (1968). In 1960, Frank Lynch (who became a naturalized Filipino citizen in 1975) set up at the Ateneo de Manila University the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC), a social science research office engaged in "basic-applicable" research. From the Institute came studies on Filipino values, Sulu culture and social organization, and modernization in rural Philippines — a pioneering set of studies which formed the core of what one sociologist (David 1982) calls "IPC Sociology." All these were published as part of the IPC Paper Series. Other research institutes were also set up, notably three offices which undertook research in Philippine demography: the Population Institute of the University of the Philippines, the Office of Population Studies at the University of San Carlos, and the Mindanao Center for Population Studies and the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture both at Xavier University.

The formation of these research organizations underscores two features of the development of Philippine sociology during

this decade: first, the availability, by the late 1960s, of a core staff of trained Filipino sociologists who could handle research projects; second, the retreat of many foreign sociologists from active involvement in the sociological community. These trends became more manifest in the 1970s when more and more Filipino sociologists occupied key positions in universities, research institutes and social science associations. Increasingly, foreign sociologists who came to the Philippines entered not as key officials of universities or associations but as visiting researchers or as partners in joint research ventures.

The declaration of Martial Law in September 1972 did not halt sociological teaching or research. In fact after a brief period when scholarly publication was suspended, there was an acceleration in teaching, publication and research during the martial law period (Makil and Hunt 1981). But while fear of adverse governmental reaction may have provoked self-censorship inhibiting critical statements from sociologists (see Cariño 1980 for a discussion of the risks faced by social scientists who do research under martial law), there was nonetheless an increase in the number of social scientists, sociologists included, who became employed in government as administrators, consultants, or researchers. Moreover, the government promoted research, particularly those which aimed to evaluate aspects of the regime's programs. Such exigencies plus the financial provisions of international donors, added to the demand for social research.

It would be rash, however, to conclude that Philippine sociology has indigenized by the 1970s. While Filipino sociologists have indeed grown in numbers, and while their influence has been felt in academic and government circles, their theories and methodologies echo their American origins. The majority of advanced degree holders were (and still are) U.S. trained, and sources of research funding for sociologists came largely

from such American outfits as the United States Agency for International Development, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation. During Martial Law, many research topics reflected the immediate concerns of the regime rather than of the researcher or of the citizenry.

As it moves into the 1980s, Philippine sociology strives for a greater voice in public affairs, particularly in matters of advocacy; a larger number of Philippine-trained degree holders in sociology; a more profound understanding of the forces of underdevelopment; and a wider use of research techniques adapted to the local scene. A look at the state of Philippine sociological teaching and research illumines the effect of the historical process on sociological inquiry.

Teaching of sociology

The indigenization of sociology in the Philippines relies largely on the numbers of Filipinos who enter the discipline, undergo training in the country, become active practitioners, and take control of the content and direction of educational and research programs (Loubser 1979, Cariño 1979). While this process has begun in the Philippines, more work needs to be done to achieve a real indigenization.

A cursory examination of social science education in the Philippines suggests, for instance, that more effort is called for in the recruitment and training of future sociologists. While there has been an increase in the numbers of sociology departments, trained faculty members, and student majors since the 1950s, these have not been adequate to meet the research demands of the 1980s and to help promote the profession. Enrollment in the social sciences is, on the whole, lower than that in business, education, and the physical sciences (Feliciano 1977). As a result, social science departments, sociology included, have been generally small and relatively expensive to maintain (Bulatao and others

1979). Within the social sciences, moreover, there are more students enrolled in psychology, social work, economics, and public administration than in sociology.

The 1979 *Philippine Statistical Yearbook* lists a total of 924 institutions of higher education in the year 1974-75. Of this number, nine offered bachelor degree programs in sociology, while five offered masteral programs. By 1979, the number of undergraduate degree programs rose to 15, and the masteral programs increased to eight. Most of these institutions, particularly those with masteral programs, are situated in the Metropolitan Manila area. There was no doctoral program until 1972 when Xavier University in Mindanao launched its course offerings. In 1978, the University of the Philippines in Diliman started its own program (it has since been suspended). Before the 1970s then, the only way Filipinos could secure Ph.D. degrees in sociology was to go abroad, especially to the United States where more scholarship opportunities were visible and available. Fortunately, as Parel (n.d.) observes, Filipino social scientists had a higher rate of return migration from the United States than the natural scientists.

Enrollment figures in sociology programs are difficult to estimate. A recent survey finds that the number of undergraduate students majoring in the social or behavioral sciences varied from 15 to 197, with sociology majors concentrated in the lower end of the range (Lauby and others 1981). The number of graduate students ranged from 10 to 43 per department, with sociology again taking the backseat to psychology. Earlier data show essentially the same picture (Bulatao and others 1979). Among private university graduates in school year 1969-70, psychology and social work majors were the most numerous followed by economics and public administration majors. Sociology majors ranked last in a list of eight. At the graduate level as well, psychology, economics, and public administration attracted more students than sociology and social work.

Enrollment figures at the University of the Philippines in Diliman are no different. In 1974-75, the number of undergraduate majors in psychology, mass communication, statistics, and economics far outweighed the numbers of those in sociology and anthropology. At the graduate level, statistics, mass communication, and economics had more students than the other social sciences. Comparative figures from the Ateneo de Manila University reveal similar trends. The more popular social science disciplines at the undergraduate level were economics, psychology, and communications. The bachelor's degree in sociology and anthropology was not offered in 1978 owing to the lack of students. At the graduate level, psychology attracted the largest number of students. Two reasons account for the general popularity of psychology and economics as social science majors: first, these disciplines are more familiar to students than sociology; second, these disciplines have immediate practical, i.e. employment, applications after college. Sociology, in turn, generally requires at least a master's degree for professional practicability.

The relative unpopularity of sociology *vis-a-vis* other social science disciplines does not imply a non-recognition of the field's importance in the school curricula. In the 1950s, as mentioned earlier, a government decree required schools and universities to offer a course in Philippine social life. More recently, several of the courses mandated by the Ministry of Education and Culture have sociological bearing, among them agrarian reform, population education, and social issues. Beyond this, the majority of schools require three units of sociology as part of its core curriculum.

Yet the problems which plagued sociological teaching in the 1950s remain. There is still a lack of qualified, well-trained sociologists to teach general courses and to handle more advanced presentations of the subject. Two recent surveys on social science teaching (Angangco and Jurado 1980; Lauby

and others 1981) imply this fact. Both studies report that social science teachers, particularly at the undergraduate level, are overburdened with teaching duties, receive small compensation, and engage in little research. Typically, they are bachelor degree holders. Moreover, as Angangco and Jurado (1980) point out, social science teachers are expected to teach a variety of social science subjects, some of which lay beyond the scope of their training. While many teachers feel the need for more training, they are unable to pursue advanced degrees because this would generally mean looking for substitute teachers (which is difficult to do) and taking leaves without pay. Many schools are ill-equipped to support faculty development programs in the social sciences, and few scholarships are available both locally and internationally.

The remuneration of social science teachers needs special mention. Bulatao and others (1979) estimate that in 1972-73, social scientists earned, on the average, between P4,000 and P5,000 a year from teaching. More recent data show an increase. By 1980, the mean per capita annual income of social science teachers was P9,283 for Metropolitan Manila and P8,688 for those teaching outside Metropolitan Manila (Angangco and Jurado 1980). However, the social scientist's salary from teaching still falls *below* the poverty threshold line of roughly P11,870 a year for Metropolitan Manila and of about P9,300 for outside the Metropolitan Manila area. The situation forces many social science teachers to seek supplementary income such as teaching in other colleges or universities, research, consultancies, and sometimes non-academic work. Others have gone abroad to seek temporary or permanent positions and obtain better financial rewards.

In large part, low salaries are a structural problem. A good majority of academic institutions in the country, about 92 percent, are private colleges and universities which derive over 90 percent of their revenue from tuition fees alone. (The comparable tuition-derived figure for state colleges and universities is only 23 percent, with the national government subsidizing the remainder of the institutions' income.) Given this dependency on tuition fees, private schools and universities are unable to compete with salaries in business and industry. Many of these schools also find it convenient to pay teachers on a modest hourly basis, a rate which automatically excludes extra amounts for social security, medical insurance, and other fringe benefits. Faced with inadequate earnings, many social scientists teach everyday, sometimes in different schools, or accept other part-time employment to augment their salaries (Bulatao and others 1979). This situation leaves them with little time to do research, keep up with professional work, or prepare for classes. Some senior sociologists remark that the burden of university work leaves them little time to engage in field work.

Conditions are a little better in some state and private institutions where social science faculty members — often the best in their fields — are paid on a monthly basis, are given lighter teaching loads, receive faculty benefits including sabbaticals and summers off from teaching, have better access to research funds, and have opportunities for professorial chairs. But even here, faculty salaries are still lower than those received by persons of less or equivalent academic experience in business and industry. It is not unusual for these faculty members to accept research work and consultancies to supplement their university income. Not a few have left the university setting to seek better financial rewards. Others have gone abroad. The situation prompts Bulatao and others (1979:76) to observe that: "it may be that social scientists in education are not grossly undercompensated at the lower levels, but may be seriously disadvantaged at higher levels of experience and qualifications."

But the involvement of these social scientists in non-academic settings has positive consequences. Bulatao and his colleagues

observe (1979:76-77):

> From the standpoint of education, the need of business and industry or government for a particular discipline is a two-edged sword: whereas it can improve faculty earnings, it can also lead to their teaching only part-time or to their leaving the institution altogether. Nevertheless such social demand has a salutary effect, and may be the main avenue in the future for improving the status of the social scientist in education.

This may be so, but an inadequate incentive system for social scientists in general, and for sociologists in particular, weakens the country's capacity to indigenize the discipline. Worse, it aggravates the brain drain problem in Philippine colleges and universities.

The problem of obtaining teaching materials also hampers the teaching of sociology. While there has been an increase of Philippine materials since Macaraig first published an introductory sociology textbook, difficulties have been encountered in the dissemination, promotion, and accessibility of these materials. Although there is now a wider choice of introductory sociology textbooks geared for the Philippine setting, most of which are in English, very little attention is paid to detailed treatments of such topics as social change and development, social stratification, or specific social problems. Foreign, mainly American and British, texts are available, but the prices of these books are well beyond the reach of the average student. Philippine reprints of some of these books have been published, but the variety of titles in sociology is less compared, for instance, to titles in management or statistics. Locally published materials are also costly, and many school libraries are unable to purchase the latest texts or to subscribe to local, much less foreign, journals. There are even fewer materials on the teaching of sociology to Filipino students (Lauby 1980). Both students and teachers suffer in the process, and little is achieved in exposing students to current sociological materials.

Nonetheless there are good sociology programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels. These are found in those schools where programs have direction, faculty members are well-trained, library acquisitions are adequate, and resources are available for faculty and student research. The problem these programs face, however, is survival. Despite their sound programs and topnotch faculty, these schools do not attract sufficient numbers of students in sociology programs, or in sociology courses beyond those required in the liberal arts core curriculum. Given inflationary trends, these programs have become too costly to maintain (especially for private schools), and university administrators have contemplated on the abolition of sociology departments or a merging of sociology with other social science departments. The difficulty is more acute on the graduate level where enrollment is less and investments per student are relatively higher.

Despite these problems, however, two institutions — Xavier University and the University of the Philippines — have set up doctoral programs in sociology. No formal evaluations of these programs have been circulated and made public, so it is not known how they have fared. The only assessment available is on Philippine doctoral programs as a whole (Gonzalez and Corro 1980). It seems that doctoral programs in sociology have not attracted many students and of those in the program, only a small number have completed the Ph.D.

The formation of professional sociologists in the country tends to concentrate on the masteral programs, and it seems necessary to develop these before more solid Ph.D. programs can emerge. Thus far, master's programs in sociology are general in nature, offering as many courses as the faculty can handle including the basics of theory and research. But several masteral programs have specific thrusts. De La Salle University offers a Master of Arts program in the Social

Sciences with the aim of producing knowledgeable and flexible teachers for high schools and colleges. University of the East also offers a master's degree in the teaching of sociology. Ateneo de Manila University, in addition to its regular masteral program in sociology, also grants a Master of Science in Applied Sociology and Anthropology for students who wish to learn specific skills in program evaluation and other applied work.

Much work remains to be done to improve graduate curricula, and to make these more relevant to the needs of Philippine society. The present curricula, for instance, has suffered too long from a close patterning after American models. These fail to consider the interests of Filipino students who enter graduate school, or to the kinds of courses which permit a greater appreciation of Filipino or Asian concerns (see Laquian 1980). Such steps require tremendous institutional support from universities, government agencies, foundations, and social science associations. The costs involved may require graduate sociology departments to combine efforts (e.g. a consortia). It is encouraging that over the years reliance on foreign professors in sociology has diminished considerably as Filipinos have assumed positions as administrators and faculty members. It remains to be seen whether a numerical increase of Filipino sociologists and of students trained by these sociologists will enhance the profession.

In summary, the decolonization or indigenization of the teaching of sociology has begun with the increased reliance on Filipinos to teach sociology courses, run departments, and write textbooks. But the indigenization process during the past decades has moved at a turtle's pace. Hastening the process requires a restructuring of the incentive system, a greater commitment to the professionalization of teachers, and a more concerted effort to recruit the ablest minds into the discipline. These tasks, in turn, will benefit the quality of Philippine sociological research.

Research in sociology

Systematic research in sociology began in the 1950s when a number of foreign-trained Filipino sociologists returned to the Philippines to displace the traditionally-favored social philosophy and social reformist orientation of the previous decades. Research was concentrated only in universities, notably the University of the Philippines in Luzon, the University of San Carlos in Visayas, and Xavier University in Mindanao. The research topics focused mainly on selected aspects of rural life. The Community Development Research Council, established in 1957, was a pioneer in this effort.

The 1960s saw the emergence of more research studies, spurred in large part by the appearance of social research agencies and the increased number of sociologists to conduct research. The more well-known of the agencies were the Institute of Philippine Culture at the Ateneo de Manila University, the Population Institute of the University of the Philippines and the Asian Social Institute. The University of the Philippines at Los Baños initiated social-science-based studies on the social and cultural components of agricultural production and extension programs. In 1968 the creation of the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC) gave an added boost to research activities. The Council granted a variety of research grants for theses, dissertations, and national surveys. Annual conventions of the Philippine Sociological Society and the Baguio Religious Acculturation Conferences provided a forum for the observations coming from these investigations.

The imposition of martial rule in 1972 did not diminish the research output of Filipino sociologists. Indeed, the opportunities for research multiplied, as a technocratic government called for scientifically-based information with which, it claimed, to plan and chart the country's social and economic development. Foreign sources for research support also expanded dramatically. But these

researches, nonetheless, favored certain sociological subfields over others. The research component built into the Philippine projects of the United States Agency for International Development and the World Bank, for instance, led to greater interest in applied social change, program evaluation, and impoverishment in rural and urban communities. The creation of the Bicol River Basin Development Program and the Social Survey Research Unit at the Ateneo de Naga, Camarines Sur illustrates this emphasis very well. Similarly, the United Nation's concern with population growth in Third World countries contributed to the availability of abundant funds for demographic and family planning research. The creation of the Commission on Population and the formation of the Population Center Foundation demonstrated not only the importance which the Philippine government began to give to population issues, but also the value placed on demographic research. Without a doubt, research agencies such as the Institute of Philippine Culture at the Ateneo, the Population Institute of the University of the Philippines, the Mindanao Center for Population Studies and the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture at Xavier University, the Office of Population Studies at San Carlos University, and the Davao Research and Action Office benefitted from this largesse of research funds.

The appearance within the government sector of research desks, many of which undertake sociological or sociology-related studies, is of equal interest. The more prominent of these is the Development Academy of the Philippines, an office presently concerned with research on applied social change and with in-service training for government officials. One of the Academy's important publications, *Measuring Philippine Development: A Report on the Social Indicators Project* (Mangahas 1976), identifies measures which gauge the quality and pace of Philippine development. Other government centers are the Technology Resource Center,

an agency of the Ministry of Human Settlements; the Philippine Institute for Development Studies, a grant-making agency under the National Economic and Development Authority; and the President's Center for Special Studies, under the Office of the President. The Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, now abolished, also conducted research for the government. Two offices, the National Science Development Board and the Philippine Council for Agriculture and Resources Research in Los Baños, allocate funds for research. The National Research Council of the Philippines also sponsors sociological research and disseminates results through its own publications. Other research offices are under government offices, those, for example, in the National Irrigation Administration, the National Housing Authority, the Ministry of Agrarian Reform, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education and Culture, and the Ministry of Labor (see Jimenez and others 1981). However, in large part, these offices do not employ professional sociologists; rather, they contract them from the university sector.

However, government interest in sociological research is recent. De Guzman (1975) traces the origin of this interest in the early 1970s with the entry of social scientists (notably economists) in policy making echelons in government, and the development of ties between academe and government agencies through seminars, training programs, and other types of professional settings. De Guzman's office, the College of Public Administration at the University of the Philippines (which also employs sociologists) is heavily involved in fostering these ties. The present decade sees a flourishing of these relationships. Action research which merges the interests of program implementors and sociologists is gaining more recognition in the areas of employment, population, family planning, human settlements, community development, agriculture, health and nutrition, resettlement, and communications. The emphasis which the Population Center

Foundation places on research utilization, its problems and its probable solutions, is indicative of this merger (PCF 1978).

The association between sociological research and local or international funding agencies creates a different set of problems for the indigenization of Philippine sociology. Bulatao and his colleagues (1979:81) at the Philippine Social Science Council observe:

> Perhaps the main difficulties are two: that the priorities of funding agencies and researchers do not always match, and that funding is not generally responsive in regard to scale, timing, restrictions, and requirements to the interests of researchers . . . There is often a seriousness and an urgency in these large research projects that precludes the intellectual playfulness that might produce significantly new insights. On the other hand, the urgency is real: many social programs could benefit from applied research. Government funding also assures an appropriate, though not necessarily attentive, audience for research, serving to short circuit some of the problems of research utilization.

The field of social research is also beset with other problems. The flowering of applied research in the 1970s for example, has meant a virtual stagnation of basic sociological research, the kind of "unorganized social research" which Ruben Santos-Cuyugan perceived to be declining in the 1960s. As a consequence, very little advances have occured in theory construction and methodology *vis-a-vis* the Philippine context. Functionalism remains the prevailing theoretical viewpoint (Rixhon 1981, Hunt and Dizon 1978, Hollnsteiner 1963) — a state of affairs brought about by the lack of attention given to basic research, the kind of training sociologists receive, and the imperatives of funding agencies who enforce similar perspectives. Another problem is the orientation of sociologists in relation to policy and the beneficiaries of that policy. Applied social research is a value-laden activity and its practitioners must constantly wrestle with

problems of commitment. The ways to resolve this dilemma are not clearcut, as published discussions on this topic suggest (Makil and Hunt 1981, Cariño 1980, Abad 1978, Lynch 1976 and 1979, Castillo 1974). But clearly, the moot issue sociologists must consider is: sociology for whom?

In this connection, there also appeared in the 1970s (and in the present decade as well) studies which were critical of development efforts under martial rule. While studies of the functional school criticize uneven development from the viewpoint of some sectors in society as having been "missed" or "excluded" from the development process, those which take an alternative perspective view development as part of a global process and question the very assumptions of development itself. Research sponsored by the Third World Studies Center at the University of the Philippines consistently take the alternative perspective; many of these are critical of the pursuit of capitalist goals and challenge the role of foreign capital in economic development. Similarly critical reports also come out of the Research Division of the Apostolic Center, a Jesuit-run outfit which deals with general issues of social justice and poverty.

But the dominant type of sociological research work in the 1970s still remain the contract research type and the beneficiaries of research funds were, for the large part, Manila-based sociologists and research institutes. This is not an altogether surprising development since the Metropolitan Manila schools, specifically few elite and prestigious universities, attracted most of the sociological talent, Filipino or non-Filipino, who came from abroad. These schools also offer relatively better working conditions for the emerging professionals, not to mention the fact that the center of sociological activities and funding sources are all based in Metropolitan Manila. True, efforts to decentralize sociological activities took place as early as the 1960s when the Philippine Sociological Society established such local

units as the Visayas-Mindanao and the Los Baños chapters (see Madigan 1963 for a report of the Visayas-Mindanao chapter's activities). These chapters were short-lived. To mark its coming of age, the Visayas-Mindanao chapter met in Manila in 1965. However, it was difficult to justify the existence of a regional chapter which met in the same city as the national organization, and the chapter eventually became unnecessary (Hunt and Dizon 1978). The Los Baños chapter boasted of several trained sociologists and anthropologists working on agricultural problems, but as Prospero Covar reports in a personal communication (14 February 1981), political problems within the University of the Philippines at Los Baños brought about the resignation of these social scientists and the mass transfer of these scientists, some of whom were sociologists, from the Los Baños to the Diliman campus. By the late 1960s and into the 1970s, most research activities once more revolved around the Metropolitan Manila area.

The consequences of the Manila monopoly were obvious. Sociological research in Manila prospered, while those outside the metropolitan area lagged behind. Xavier University and San Carlos University remained active and continued to attract research funds (particularly for population research), but the capabilities of the other universities and research centers languished. In 1974, the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC) sought to strengthen research capacities in the provinces by establishing research networks in various parts of the country. Some of these network members like Xavier, San Carlos, and Silliman had a research tradition to back them up; others like the Institute of the Philippine Culture and the University of the Philippines Statistical Center in Manila had more resources. But a majority of the centers were fledgling research outfits, staffed by junior social scientists who needed more training and research experience. The PSSC has provided training programs since the summer of 1974, often with the help of staff members from the

more prosperous research network members. To allow networks to gain research experience, the PSSC also sought to involve provincial centers in nationwide surveys, and these surveys were later reported in such works as *Ethnic Attitudes in Five Philippine Cities* (Bulatao 1973), *A Survey on Filipino Family Households: Distribution of Income and Expenditure Patterns* (Parel 1974), *The Filipino Family — Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow* (Porio and others 1975), and *Stereotype, Status, and Satisfaction: The Filipina among Filipinos* (Bulatao 1977). These involvements, however, eventually created dissatisfaction among the staff of provincial centers who perceived themselves as data collectors rather than as active participants in the research process. Indeed, the project leaders of the national surveys were, in all cases, established social scientists based in Metropolitan Manila. Efforts to correct this imbalance have begun, and comprised one of the PSSC's priority activities for the 1980s.

When the provincial centers, either by themselves or in collaboration with others, undertake their own research, they will initially study various aspects of Philippine poverty. The emphasis on poverty and of allied problems related to the country's socioeconomic development are priority topics among Philippine social scientists (PSSC 1980), and resources have been marshalled to direct research activities to these topics. The deliberate effort at pooling resources is recent. But the research concern on socioeconomic development has been of interest to members of the sociological community for the past two decades. Table 1 presents a distribution of topics appearing among articles published in the *Philippine Sociological Review* for the past three decades (for a similar listing, but with different time breakdowns, see Panopio and Bennagen 1981 and Hunt and Dizon 1978). A quick glance shows that there is a greater number of articles on economic development, social change, and program evaluation in the 1960-69 and 1970-79

Table 1. *Distribution of topics among articles published
in the Philippine Sociological Review,
1953-59, 1960-69, and 1970-79*

Topic	1953-59	1960-69	1970-79	Total
Nature, scope practice of sociology	11	7	5	23
Theory	3	2	0	5
Method	1	9	7	17
Family, Kinship, socialization	8	18	9	35
Religion, including folk rituals and folk beliefs	11	22	2	35
Politics	2	4	5	11
Education	2	2	4	8
Health and medicine	1	3	1	5
Economic development and social change, including evaluation of action programs	9	20	22	51
Rural communities	6	6	9	21
Urban communities including slum and squatter communities and housing	1	2	8	11
Ecology, adaptation, including agrarian reform	3	3	13	19
Social structure and social organization	8	8	10	26
Social stratification and mobility	4	1	3	8
Ethnic communities or cultural minorities, ethnic relations	15	20	19	54
Women and sex roles	1	3	10	14
Deviance	3	5	4	12
Population and family planning	3	14	20	37
Values, norms, personality	0	15	4	19
Language and linguistics	0	16	3	19
Prehistory and Southeast Asia	2	1	1	4
Bibliographies	0	1	3	4
T O T A L	94	182	162	438

*Ends at the second issue of 1979.

periods than in the 1953-59 period. Indeed next to articles on ethnic relations, those on socioeconomic development were most explored by the authors.

The increased interest in socioeconomic development during the 1970s was spurred, of course, by a more intense government involvement in development programs and by

Table 2. *Distribution of topics among master's theses in Sociology at Silliman University, Xavier University, University of the Philippines at Diliman, and Ateneo de Manila University: 1953-59, 1960-69, and 1970-70 (Preliminary listing)*

Topic	Before 1960	Years 1960-69	1970-80	Total
Theory	0	0	1	1
Methods	1	0	0	1
Family, kinship, socialization	1	3	4	8
Religion, including folk rituals and folk beliefs	3	1	3	7
Politics	0	1	1	2
Education	5	1	4	10
Health and medicine	0	1	1	2
Economic development and social change, including evaluation of action programs	3	2	7	12
Rural communities	1	0	2	3
Urban communities, including slum and squatter communities and housing	1	0	2	3
Ecology, adaptation, including agrarian reform	0	0	2	2
Social structure and social organization	1	3	1	5
Social stratification	0	0	3	3
Ethnic communities or cultural minorities, ethnic relations	1	0	4	5
Women and sex roles	1	1	2	4
Deviance	1	1	2	4
Population and family planning	0	3	9	12
Values, norms, personality	0	2	4	6
TOTAL	19	19	52	90

the greater availability of funds from both Filipino and foreign sources. These factors also brought an increase in the 1970s of articles on population and family planning; urban communities, especially problems associated with slums and squatter areas; agrarian reform; and the status of women, an interest precipitated by a concern over male-female inequities in the share of the benefits accruing from the development process.

Similar patterns are discernible among topics for master's theses in sociology in four Philippine universities. Table 2 (a preliminary listing) shows the majority of these topics centered on the "economic development/social change" category and the "population/family planning" category. Table 2 also shows a greater amount of thesis work during the 1970s. Clearly, Philippine universities have produced more sociologists in the 1970s than in previous decades.

There were also more dissertations in sociology from American universities in the 1970s than in the preceding decades. A list of dissertations on the Philippines and on Filipinos obtained from Dissertation Abstracts reveals that of 332 entries, 19 were in sociology. Of these 19 works, 13 were written between 1970 and 1980; the rest were completed before 1970. These dissertations were written by Filipinos and non-Filipinos alike, and the topics covered a wide range. Close to half of the titles, however, were in population/family planning (n=5) and economic development/social change (n=4). Again, the modal choice of topics reflects the kinds of development concerns which sociologist and donors tend to share.

A salient trend of the 1970s has been the codification of research studies on these issues. Gelia T. Castillo's *Beyond Manila: Philippine Rural Problems in Perspective* (1977) integrates various pieces of research on urban-rural inequalities and *The Filipino Women as Manpower: The Image and the*

Empirical Reality (1976) collates published data on male-female differentials in the Philippines. Mildred Bernido's (1979) eight-volume *Social Policy Implications of IPC Research Findings, 1960-1974* summarizes IPC research findings and their policy relevance. Another type of codification appears in the form of annotated bibliographies on population research (Bulatao and others 1973), poverty studies (Abad, Villanueva and Picazo 1978), and women's status (Eviota 1978; Gonzales and Hollnsteiner 1976).

The greater interest in applied social research, particularly on socio-economic development has, in turn, de-emphasized research efforts in other sub-specializations of sociology. By the 1970s, only a few articles in the *Philippine Sociological Review* dealt with the nature and scope of sociology, theory, the family, and religion. Studies on cultural values and norms, which had their heyday in the 1960s, were not as attractive in the 1970s, such that despite many debates, little systematic work has been done to reinforce, modify, or revise the major list of Filipino values identified by social scientists two decades ago. Interest in ethnic communities appears to remain strong, though this actually received less importance in the 1970s than in previous decades. The majority of articles in the 1970s under the headings of ethnic communities stemmed from special issues on the overseas Chinese and the Sagadas of the Mountain Province.

The articles in the *Philippine Sociological Review* do not, of course, represent the major output of sociological work in the country. For a proper sampling, one must examine other journals which feature sociological pieces, the final reports of research agencies, theses and dissertations both in the Philippines and abroad, published books and monographs, government reports, and a host of unpublished documents accessioned in various social science libraries around the country (see Feliciano 1979). Hunt and Dizon (1978) have made an attempt to discuss the major findings

in Philippine sociology according to several topic areas, and their paper provides a beginning for scholars who wish to codify Philippine sociological findings in more detail. They assess the factors influencing Philippine sociological research as follows:

> At least three factors have a major influence on both research trends and the theoretical development of Philippine sociology. First, the demand for sociological data relevant to specific programs of social change especially for information relating to the acceptance of agricultural innovation and the acceptance and successful implementation of family planning. Second, foreign sociologists and Filipinos who were influenced by foreign models in their attempts to replicate Western research designs in the Philippine environment. Third, in spite of the similarity between Filipino and Western research designs, there often is some degree of dissonance and lingering distrust of empirical research (Hunt and Dizon 1978:125).

These points require some elaboration. First, the demand for sociological information about social change programs is expected to increase in the 1980s and indicates the need for a quantum leap in the number of sociologists who can assess program outcomes and recommend innovative lines of action. Second, the demand for sociological data has already expanded beyond agricultural innovation and family planning and into such areas as forestry, communal irrigation, social services, local water projects, and law. Third, the demand for sociological research is not made only by the Philippine government, but by foreign and international agencies as well. Should the foreign and international demands increase further, sociological research in the Philippines, at least those that confront concrete problems of change, will continue to be tied to non-Filipino funds. This aspect may weaken the quest for an indigenized sociology in the country.

Dependence on foreign funds, Weightman

(1978) argues, is a form of cultural imperialism, an extension of the "intellectual straight jacket" foisted upon Philippine socio- logy by its American originators. The argu- ment is difficult to assess partly because the facts and rhetoric of the case are hard to disentangle, and partly because, as Hunt and Dizon (1978) counterargue, there may not be the appropriate vocabulary to address present kinds of Filipino and non-Filipino research collaboration that is not colored with colonial, patron-client shades. But the facts remain that American influence on Philippine sociology — in content, method, and training of personnel — has been considerable; that American and other foreign funds have been instrumental in the maintenance of Philippine sociological research; and that studies by foreign sociologists, many of which deal with basic research or with ethnic communities help fill a gap in Philippine sociological literature.

But one must balance these with other facts. Trained Filipino sociologists, for example, have always been less in number relative to the amount of knowledge that need to be gathered, thus leaving room for non-Filipino sociologists to explore other facets of Philippine society and culture. There has also been no large-scale, systematic effort to lock Filipino sociologists in specific research to evaluate action programs; indeed, the typical problem has been for sociologists to try to articulate from the proponent what the specific, operational objectives of the program are. Moreover, the collected data and written reports have generally been open to the public. Further, there have been more Filipino and non-Filipino research collaborations which operate on an equal reciprocal basis. There is also greater recognition in government circles for the need to control the data which foreign sociologists gather and take home to their respective countries. On a more individual basis, many sociologists have found that the income from research supplement the relatively modest salaries they earn from teaching. Foreign-funded research also offers

opportunities to travel abroad, broaden professional contacts, learn new insights, and gain wider recognition.

Filipino sociologists try to adapt to the situation as best they can. But Philippine sociology can only mature in a supportive setting: academes must be in a manner that it has for law and medicine, and Philippine agencies must contribute a larger share of financial support. Otherwise, Philippine sociology will remain dependent on foreign sociologists and foreign grants, a veritable medusa on the snail. There will be constant squabbles about the futility and irrelevance of social survey techniques, but without support or encouragement to settle the issue systematically or to experiment with other methodologies, the arguments will never be resolved.

Towards the 1980s

Philippine sociology has made advances over the decades and its indications are many: the increase in the number of Filipino sociologists, the wide acceptance of sociology courses in college curricula, the survival of a professional association and an official publication, the appearance of many undergraduate and graduate programs, the appointment of social scientists in government policy-making bodies and of Filipino sociologists as key academic and organizational officials, the greater recognition of the sociological perspective in applied social change programs, the growing opportunities for research, the increased sensitivity of foreign and foreign-funded sociological studies. But Philippine sociology has miles to go before it can establish itself as an indigenous discipline. It must make itself more felt in the public mind. It must attract and train more people, design a better incentive system for its practitioners, search for untied funds, maintain stronger linkages with policy-making bodies, and break the Manila monopoly on talent and resources. It also needs to develop concepts and methodological strategies which

account for the uniqueness of Philippine culture (see Cariño 1979). To do all these will mean a more judicious selection of research projects, a greater familiarity with non-sociological works which bear on a sociological understanding of social phenomena, and a greater time spent in basic research or in painstaking description which will eventually provide the basis for intellectual playfulness. It also means a deeper appreciation of other Asian efforts in fashioning their own sociology. The full development of the discipline will take some time, but the foundations for growth — a greater consciousness of the discipline's strengths and weaknesses and a commitment to solidify infrastructure for training and research — are already present. The Philippine Social Science Council (1981:12) expresses the hope of Philippine sociology for the 1980s and beyond:

> The signs are clear that this decade will be an era of far-reaching political and economic change, a very sensitive period in the nation's development. Old premises will be questioned, and institutions and values will have to be recast. Neither should the new positions taken be overly rigid, rather they ought to be adaptable to possible changes in social circumstances.

> Amid these social transformations, the social scientist will have a more crucial role to play. The Philippine Social Science Council, committed as it is to take a leadership role has endeavored to anticipate the future needs of the social science community and the society that it has pledged to serve.

Philippine sociology, as with several other social sciences, has thus begun to spin out of its colonial cocoon.

Notes

Developing Economies, 1981. Parts of the paper were also presented in a symposium, "Social Science Research: An Evaluative Review," sponsored by the National Research Council of the Philippines, and held at the University of the Philippines at Los Baños, November 6-7, 1981. The authors thank the Institute of Developing Economies for permission to revise the original report.

References

Abad, Ricardo G.
  1978　Guest Editor's Preface. Philippine Sociological Review 26 (April) 87-88.

Abad, Ricardo G., Nora S. Villanueva, and Oscar Picazo
  1978　Philippine poverty studies in the seventies: A preliminary annotated bibliography. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Angangco, Ofelia and Elsa P. Jurado
  1980　The social science competence of Philippine colleges and universities. Report submitted to the National Research Council of the Philippines. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.

Bernido, Mildred
  1979　Social policy implications of IPC research findings, 1960-1974, 8 vols. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Bulatao, Rodolfo A.
  1973　Ethnic attitudes in five philippine cities. Quezon City: Social Research Laboratory, University of the Philippines.
  1977　Stereotype, status, and satisfaction: The Filipina among Filipinos. Quezon City: Social Research Laboratory, University of the Philippines.

Bulatao, Rodolfo A., and others
  1974　Philippine population studies: A preliminary bibliography with selected annotations. Quezon City: Social Research Laboratory, University of the Philippines.

Bulatao, Rodolfo A. and others
  1979　A profile of the Philippine social scientists. In First Southeast Asian Workshop of Social Scientists Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Cariño, Ledivina V.
  1979　Ukol sa pagiging Pilipino ng Philippine social science. PSSC Social Science Information 7 (July-September): 2.

Cariño, Ledivina V.
  1980　Research under martial law: The task and risks of the Filipino social scientist. Philippine Sociological Review (January-December):3-18.

Castillo, Gelia T.
  1974　The dialogue between social science research, policy, and action. PSSC Social Science Information 2 (2): 26-46.
  1976　The Filipino woman an manpower: The image and the empirical reality. Laguna: University of the Philippines at Los Baños.
  1977　Beyond Manila: Philippine research problems in perspective, 3 vols. Laguna: University of the Philippines at Los Baños.

Catapusan, Benicio
  1957　Development of sociology in the Philippines. Philippine Sociological Review 3-4 (July-October): 53-57.

Covar, Prospero
  (1964) The Masagana/Margate system of planting rice: A study in agricultural innovation. Quezon City: Community Development Research Council, University of the Philippines.

Cuyugan, Ruben Santos
  1962　The case for unorganized social research. Philippine Sociological Review 10 (July-October): 203-205.

David, Randolf S.
  1978　The use and misuse of social science research. Philippine Sociological Review 26 (April): 93-94.
  1982　Sociology and development studies in the Philippines. Philippine Sociological Review (January-December): 15-22.

De Guzman, Raul
  1975　Trends and directions in social science research in the Philippines. Paper presented at the meeting of the Philippines Studies Council of the Association of Asian Studies, San Francisco, California.

Eviota, Elizabeth U.
  1978　Philippine women and development: An annotated bibliography. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Feliciano, Gloria D.
  1977　The Philippines. In Social Sciences in Asia, vol. 3. Paris: Unesco.
  1979　The social science infrastructure in selected Asian countries: A situation analysis. Paris: Unesco. Mimeographed.

Gonzalez, Andrew and Anicia del Corro
1978 Doctoral programs in Philippine universities. Manila: Research Council, De La Salle University.

Gonzales, Anna Miren and Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner
1976 Filipino women as partners of men in progress and development: A survey of empirical data and a statement of basic goals fostering male-female partnership. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Hollnsteiner, Mary Racelis
1960 The dynamics of power in a Philippine municipality. Quezon City: Community Development Research Council.
1962 News and notes. Philippine Sociological Review 10 (January-April): 73-75.
1963 Comments in an inventory of sociological and anthropological research in progress, Luzon-based institutions/individuals, June 1963. Philippine Sociological Review 11 (January-April): 116-124.
1973 The state of social science in the Philippines. PSSC Social Science Information, 12 (May):1, 14, 17-18.

Hunt, Chester L. and others
1954 Sociology in the Philippine setting. Manila: Alemar's Publishing Company.

Hunt, Chester L. and Dylan Dizon
1978 The development of Philippine sociology. In Donn V. Hart, ed., Philippine studies: History, sociology, mass media and bibliography. Occasional Paper No. 6. De Kalb, Illinois: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University.

Jimenez, Pilar Ramos and others
1981 Directories and general procedures for visiting researchers and foreign scholars. In Loretta Makasiar Sicat, ed., Social science research activities in the Philippines, Joint Research Program Series No. 25, Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies. 144-237.

Laquian, Aprodicio A.
1980 Some recent trends in social science research and teaching in the Third World. DLSU Dialogue 15 (October 1979-March 1980): 56-62.

Lauby, Jennifer A.
1980 Making the teaching of sociology and psychology relevant and interesting. DLSU Dialogue 15 (October 1979-March 1980): 66-69.

Lauby, Jennifer A., and others
1981 The teaching and research in the social sciences in Metro Manila schools and universities. Manila: De La Salle University. Typescript.

Loubser, Jan J.
1970 The need for indigenization of the social sciences. In Jan. J. Loubser, ed., The indigenization of the social sciences in Asia. Ottawa: International Federation of Social Science Organizations.

Lynch, Frank
1976 Field data collection in developing countries: Experience in Asia. Agricultural Development Council Seminar Report, No. 10.
1979 Of blackbirds and boxes: An introduction to evaluation research. Philippine Sociological Review 27 (January):510.

Lynch, Frank and Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner
1961 Sixty years of Philippine ethnology: A glance at the years 1901-1961. NSDB Science Review 2 (November): 1-5.

Madigan, Francis C.
1963 Research in the Visayas-Mindanao Area. Philippine Sociological Review 11 (January-April): 125-129.
1968 The farmer said no. Quezon City: Community Development Research Council, University of the Philippines.

Makil, Perla Q. and Chester L. Hunt
1981 The impact of martial law on sociologists in the Philippines. PSSC Social Science Information 8 (January-March): 3-12.

Mangahas, Mahar, ed.
1976 Measuring Philippine development: A report on the social indicators project. Makati: Development Academy of the Philippines.

Pal, Agaton
1963 The resources, levels of living, and aspirations of households in Negros Oriental. Quezon City: Community Development Research Council, University of the Philippines.

Panopio, Isabel and Pons Bennagen
1981 The status of sociology and social anthropology in the Philippines. Report submitted to the Unesco Regional Office, Bangkok, Thailand. Typescript.

Parel, Cristina
1974 A survey on Filipino family households:

Distribution of income and expenditure patterns. Manila: Statistical Center, University of the Philippines.

n.d.   A report on the survey of foreign-trained professionals and their employers in the Philippines. Quezon City: University of the Philippines and the National Science Development Board.

Philippine Social Science Council
1981   Agenda for the 1980s. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Pieris, Ralph
1969   The implantation of sociology in Asia. International Social Science Journal, 29 (3): 433-444.

Population Center Foundation
1978   A research utilization system in population and development program: The PCF experience, Philippine Sociological Review 26 (April): 119-126.

Porio, Emma and others
1975   The Filipino family — yesterday, today and tomorrow. Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.

Rixhon, Gerard
1981   Workshop on graduate training in anthropology and sociology in the context of Asia's rural needs: A report. Bangkok: Agricultural Development Council Typescript.

Sicat, Loretta Makasiar
1979   Political aspects of social science research for development. Paper prepared for the Third Annual Social Science Conference, Division of Social Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, University of the Philippines at Los Baños. Mimeographed.

Weightman, George H.
1975   Sociology in the Philippines. Solidarity (September-October): 43-58.

1978   Comments on the chapter on Sociology. In Donn V. Hart, ed., Philippine Studies: History, sociology, and mass media and bibliography. Occasional Paper No. 6. De Kalb, Illinois: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University.