
Kinship and Social Relations in Filipino Culture*

*Amaryllis T. Torres***

Inilalarawan ng artikulong ito ang kultura at pagkataong Pilipino batay sa mga anyo ng pakikipag-ugnayang makikita sa ilang pamayanang Pilipino. Ipinalalagay na ang mga pangkabuhayan at panlipunang karanasan ng mga Pilipino ay nagbunsod ng iba't-ibang anyo ng tungkulin, kugnasyon at mithiin. Ang kaayusan ng mga ugaling Pilipino ay inilarawan sa pamamagitan ng pagsuri sa pakikipag-ugnayang panlipunan. Inilalarawan ang pakikipag-ugnayan sa agrikulturang paraan ng pamumuhay at sa umuunlad na ekonomiyang pang-industriya. Gayun din, ang tungkulin ng sosyalisasyon sa pagpapanatili ng mga pagpapahalagang pangkalinangan ay binigyan ng pansin.

Interest in examining the influences on behavior of the prevalent Filipino culture has been an inevitable offshoot of research efforts to amplify the configurations of Filipino psychology. Enriquez (1978) points to the importance of history, language and ethnography as bases for acquiring insights on behavior. The need to enhance the internal validity of psychological data has been presented as the methodological argument for doing extensive work within this perspective (Mataragnon, 1980).

Kinship in Philippine Society

Value orientations and the peculiar behavior adaptations characteristic of a people are most fully viewed against the back-

*Batay sa artikulong "A Portrait of Filipino Culture", *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review*, 47 (1-4); 243-264.

**Associate Propesor, Institute of Social Work and Community Development, Unibersidad ng Pilipinas at Professorial Lecturer din sa Departamento ng Sikolohiya, U.P.

drop of key social structures (Jocano, 1966). These structures provide the guidelines for ideal forms of interpersonal relations and prescribe behaviors among the members of the social unit.

A. The Kinship Structure

The kinship structure has been consistently identified as the primary socialization unit in Philippine society (Kaut, 1965; Jocano, 1969; Nurge, 1965, among others). Extensive documentations reveal that the family is the earliest and most continuously functioning agency of socialization. Jocano avers:

Through this structural unit . . . local authority, rights and obligations and modes of relationships are expressed, defined, ordered and systematized. Interpersonal and intergroup movement of people or groups of people are largely determined and controlled by kinship. Group alliances are likewise formed on this basis.¹⁹

The primacy of the family and the kinship structure in an agricultural socioeconomic formation is best understood in terms of the nature of agricultural production. First, land use of farmlands is such that farming is "a nuclear-family affair, with the members as the basic working unit" (Jocano, 1969). The whole family, both old and young members, men and women, help in farm work (Chi-Wen-Chang, 1974; Mangahas, et. al, 1976; Bennett, 1975). As such labor is unpaid, and each progenitor. The latter instance occurs in cases of adoption, because adopted children are given the same duties and privileges as biological offsprings. Thus, it is the social nature of the relationship which largely determines the family as unit (Jocano, 1966, 1969; Kaut, 1966; Murray, 1972).

The nuclear family, as such, includes the father and mother, and unmarried children — both biological offspring

and adoptees. In its extended form the Filipino family includes bilaterally positioned relatives who may reside in the same neighborhood or live elsewhere (Mendez & Jocano, 1974). Kinship relations extend on both sides to include grandparents, siblings of parents, and their own offsprings. Distinct terms are available in the language to denote such relationships, point to the primacy of this structural unit in the lives of the people. Marriage and other rituals expand the kinship structure. Godfathers and godmothers at marriages and confirmations for example, are considered as kinsmen.

Four principles form the bases of the reciprocal behavior pattern expected between kinsmen; bilaterally, generation, seniority and sex. Bilateral relations, as mentioned, describe the inclusion of relatives extending from maternal or paternal roots. Generation refers to one's position in the structure, lineally or collaterally. It refers to being either in the position of aunt or uncle, niece or nephew or son and father. As a relational principle, it emphasizes the importance of "sociological" rather than biological age. Seniority categorizes generations into younger and older members. For example, it defines the reciprocal rights and obligations between older and younger siblings. Sex also defines relationships, as illustrated by the use of specific terms denoting older brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles.

B. Neighbors and Neighborhoods ("Magkapitbahay")

Residence is another factor which contributes to the understanding of kindred relations. In many rural places, it is usually the case that households within neighborhoods contain nuclear families related by kinship to members in adjacent dwellings. Thus, the norms of reciprocal obligations existing between neighbors follow those prescribed for kinsmen (Mendez & Jocano, 1974; Murphy, 1972; Jocano, 1969).

Interestingly, no fixed physical boundaries define a neighborhood. Rather, it is the quality and intensity of social relationships that apparently sets off a household or a person

¹⁹Jocano, Felipe Landa. *The Traditional World of Malitbog*. Q.C.: CDRC, 1969, p. 153.

as *kapitbahay* or *kaingod*. Taken in this context, the neighborhood represents "the most effective segment of the rural society where collective responsibility and social member gains from his labor in kind — by sharing in the harvest of rice, for example. During planting and harvesting, members of the kin come to assist in the activities. Non-kin labor is also used but usually for pay. While normative reciprocal obligations for production are implicitly between kinsmen, no such expectations are drawn with "outsiders".

The second factor which accounts for the centrality of the family in agriculture is the fact that land use is passed on to the succeeding generations, whether the property is owned by the family or not. Even while parents are alive, parts of the land used in cultivation may already be apportioned among the offsprings. Thus, despite the evident exchange of labor and cooperative farm practices, each member of the family is given responsibility over particular fields of his own (Jocano, 1969; Lewis, 1975).

The system of agricultural production in Philippine society is built on family labor and relations. Thus, this social unit is central to the survival of the individual.

Kinship system in the traditional Philippine social order is seen to be bilateral: individuals reckon kinship equally, whether on the mother's side or the father's side. The parents in a family may either be the individual's biological or sociological control are best carried out²⁰. This means that violations of norms governing consanguinity in neighborhoods may result in ostracism of the violator. Given the web of sanctions existing in society, a disgruntled kinsman-neighbor may choose to uproot himself and relocate to other places where he can form new attachments. The new neighborhood will still likely include kinsmen, nevertheless, inasmuch as

available property for houselots usually remain within the family.

The Dynamics of Social Expectations

A. The Contingency Principle

The typology of kinship relations in various rural villages has been found to be unbounded by strict lines of consanguinity. It is often emphasized that ongoing social relations, rather than structural relations per se, define succinctly the probability of continued interpersonal attachments. Kaut, in studying Tagalog society, postulates that needs — economic, political, or social in nature — rather than prescriptive rules of structure, provide the criteria for social interaction. Grouping, he states, results from a contingency principle.

"The contingency principle . . . stems from specific definitions of social goals on the one hand and the rules of social interaction on the other hand which allow individuals to create among themselves bonds of obligation, negate these and define areas in which there is a lack of obligatory responsibility . . ." ²¹

As an illustration of the principle, townspeople may choose to ignore the rulings of an officially elected barangay captain, who carries with him impersonal-legal authority, and seek counsel from persons viewed as personalitic-traditional leaders (e.g. town elders, *babaylans* or medicine men), because the latter behave in consonance with the accepted values of the group. ²²

Thus, the dynamics of interaction are such that individuals continue to establish alliances insofar as they behave "properly" within the prevailing culture. Every dyadic encounter is

²¹Kaut, Charles, "The Principle of Contingency in Tagalog Society" *Asian Studies*. III (1), p. 4.

²²Jocano, *Op. Cit.*

²⁰Ibid

assessed in this manner and it predicts the probability of continuation or termination of such a relationship.

B. Patterns of Behavior: Pakikipagkapwa

The centrality of social interaction to Filipinos is well represented in the vocabulary of the languages in this society.

Kinship principles, for example are represented by specific terms, such as *tiya* (aunt) or *lolo* (grandfather) to denote generational differences, or *kuya* and *diko* (eldest and second brother, respectively) to refer to seniority positions.

Similarly, one finds that levels and differing modes of interaction find lexical representation (Enriquez, 1976). These include the following concepts.²³

1. *pakikitungo* (civility)
2. *pakikisalamuha* (interacting with . . .)
3. *pakikilahok* (participating with . . .)
4. *pakikibagay* (in conformity with . . .)
5. *pakikisama* (being-along-with . . .)
6. *pakikipagpalagayang-loob* (being in rapport . . .)
7. *pakikisangkot* (getting involved . . .)
8. *pakikiisa* (being-one-with)

These concepts, quite interestingly, correspond in each level to interactions which apparently become more intimate, and seem to conform to a contingency principle. The outcome of interaction at the first level, for instance, would determine whether or not the actors will decide to deepen the relationship or to keep it at the same level. Presumably, each person's assessment of how well the other behaves according to cultural expectations determines the decisions taken.

Santiago (in Enriquez, 1978) states further that the first 5 categories of interaction apply to dealings with persons deemed as "outsiders" while the last 3 levels pertain to relationships maintained with "insiders". Since we have identi-

fied the family and the kinship structure as the basic social unit, the first levels of interaction are apparently those maintained with persons outside of this social group, while the latter types of relationships are typical of familiar interactions.

At the same time, the existence of interaction levels point to the other fact that even an outsider may eventually be treated as "one of the family", provided the individual finds his behavior to be socially acceptable. Again, this points to the relative flexibility of social relations in Philippine society. Kinship and kindred (*angkan*) do not shut off any person from interaction with others, regardless of socioeconomic standing, provided that reciprocal obligations are known to both parties, and are used as the bases of behaviors. Such developments in social relation usually terminate in ritual kinship ties (as *compadres*, for example), by which mechanism the "outsider" formally becomes "one-of-us". Jocano, 1969).

The value commitment which emerges from the interpersonal context of the kinship structure is that of *KAPWA*. *Pakikipag-kapwa* incorporates these prescribed rules of reciprocal privileges and obligations between kindred members. *Kapwa* is the cognitive image of these relationships, and becomes generalized in experience to include all acceptable forms of social relationships (Enriquez, 1981).

Thus, Enriquez (1979) observes that a person recognizes *kapwa* in a relationship insofar as he himself becomes aware of a "shared identity" with another. The identity process is facilitated by the outcome of interactions which, in this case, apparently moves in a direction of mutual acceptance. It is in such a manner that "outsiders" eventually become considered "insiders" or *hindi ibang-tao* in the *kapwa* network.

Contrariwise, when a person fails to enact the behaviors and values expected by the social network, he is labelled *walang kapwa-tao* ("not one of us"). Such persons may be kin or nonkin who fail to live up to the cultural expectations of the social group.

The Interpersonal Framework of Social Acceptance

We have repeatedly stated that a shared set of reciprocal expectations govern relationships within the social structure. It has also been demonstrated that the social acceptance of an individual hinges on the quality of his interpersonal relations. In this section, the concepts which underlie interpersonal behavior are to be discussed and related to the Filipinos' value commitment of *kapwa*.

A. Principles of Reciprocal Obligation

The fundamental basis determining obligations and privileges in a dyadic situation is in the relative positions of two individuals in the kinship structure. As earlier mentioned, relations are pegged on bilaterality, generation, seniority and sex positions. *Pakikipagkapwa*, therefore, is normatively dictated by these kinship principles. For example, younger members of the family are expected to show overt and implicit respect (*paggalang*) for older relatives. Public signs of disrespect are frowned upon and would be illustrative of *pagkawalang-kapwa-tao*.

The value of respect in relation to generation and age is also evidenced by the use of addresses particular to relations with either sex. Such addresses include words like *lolo* (grandfather, *tiyo* (uncle) or *ate* (dearest sister). Meanwhile, members of the same generation address one another by their nicknames. These observations are true in different communities which have been studied and indicate widespread commitment to the value rather than a peculiarity to separate societies (Jocano, 1966; 1969, Mendez & Jocano, 1974 and others).

Consonant to the primacy of respect as a value, we find that dominance and aggressive expressions are frowned upon in interactions involving persons on different rungs of the kinship hierarchy (Domingo, 1977; Nurge, 1965; Nydegger, 1969, Guthrie, 1966). Children are not supposed to answer back their elders when in disagreement with them; sharing and

giving way (*pagbibigayan*) to others is encouraged and nurtured. Even in interpersonal dealings with others on the same level, such traits are reinforced and cultivated.

Safeguarding the mutuality of interests appears to be the underlying mechanism in the nexus of reciprocal obligations. Respect for elders is tantamount to recognizing them as the authority figures in society. As such, dominance and aggression against their persons are out of place and denigrates their social power. Authority is vested in elders by virtue of their longer experience and also because they have the power to withhold rewards, both material and non-material. Although these norms spring from the family structure, individuals eventually come to have the same expectations of society's members at large. Behavior reinforced within the primary social unit become generalized to other social relationships. For example, in a small rural community studied by Mendez and Jocano (1974), all those individuals in the neighborhood whose assistance could be relied on in time of need were considered *kapwa-tao*. Thus, *kapwa* as the value commitment underlying all forms of Filipino social interaction, springs from the individual's socialization within the family network.

The interdependency of people in a subsistence agricultural economy benefits each one. The system of reciprocal obligations which prescribes the exchange of labor and other goods, assistance during emergencies, at times of distress (*pagdamay*) and significant affairs, functions to enable each person to cope with his personal needs without the necessity for money. It is not surprising, therefore, that *utang-na-loob* is one of the key concepts for social acceptance.

Utang-na-loob, also called "contractual reciprocal obligation" (Kaut, 1966) is supposedly characterized by the voluntary offering of material or non-material gifts, given without any prior agreement, accepted without any reservation, and repaid in some culturally determined fashion (Kaut, 1966; Hollnsteiner, 1973). Unlike reciprocal expectations emanating

from structural consanguinity, *utang na loob* springs from interpersonal relations. Various observers of Philippine society disagree on the relative weight of this orientation in interpersonal relations. There remains a general agreement, nevertheless, that such a concept does function among Filipinos in a critical fashion. While reciprocity in Tagalog-speaking areas is termed *utang na loob*, the people of Malitbog call it *utang nga kabaraslan* and *utang nga kabubut'on* (Jocano, 1969). Undoubtedly, equivalent words may be found in other Philippine language as well.

In analyzing the dynamics of *utang na loob*, Kaut notes that it underlies three types of social relationships possible within and outside of the neighborhood. These relationships include:

- a. positive relationships based on actual or ritual kinship and reinforced by positive performance of *utang na loob*,
- b. negative relationships resulting from lack of genealogical or ritual ties, or from the failure of the others to honor *utang-na-loob*, and
- c. potential relationships still untested through lack of contact. (Kaut, 1966).

These dynamics point to three things. First, the supposedly "volitional" gift is in fact expected because it is only among such individuals that reciprocal obligations exist. An outsider contracts no moral indebtedness inasmuch as he is not a participant to the set of mutual exchanges within the *hindi ibang tao* group. Thus, he may choose to reject the gift. A member of the kin cannot reject a volitional gift and still be considered as *pakikipagkapwa-tao*. It is part of his obligation to accept, since he will later be called upon to render such services or assistance.

Second, structural relations become secondary in social process. One labelled *walang-utang-na-loob* because of failure to repay his obligation negates his relationships within the

kapwa group. He becomes, through repeated failure to honor his moral indebtedness, *walang pakikipagkapwa tao*, *parang hindi kapwa tao*, or *walang kapwa*.

Third, the seemingly "voluntary" offering of "gifts" is compulsory to some degree. Such behaviors are, in fact, prescribed in the social structure. What is not fixed is the timing of the expression of the behavior. The prescriptions for such actions may again be traced to the principles of kinship. Newly married women are expected to be assisted at childbirth by older, more experienced relatives. During wedding feasts, relations in all rungs of the structure come to assist and to partake of the festivities. At deaths, or even during illness, food and other services are "voluntarily" offered. When one relative achieves wealth or fame, he is expected to assist his kin become socially mobile, too. In Malitbog, Jocano (1969) observed that repayment expectations for *utang na loob* differentiates kin from nonkin, thus explaining the existence of two terms for this indebtedness — *utang nga kabaraslan* and *utang nga kabubut'on*.

B. Hiya: The Emotional Accompaniment of Kapwa

Thus far, the pattern of socially accepted interpersonal relations has been portrayed cognitively in terms of both *Kapwa* and *utang na loob* as value-orientations. It would be unrealistic to believe, however, that fulfillment or violation of reciprocal obligations excludes the expression of feelings. This is especially because we have premised such cultural norms to be individual strivings for survival, which is undoubtedly an intensely personal motive.

Setting aside methodological differences in data gathering, again we find a general consensus that breaches or non-enactment of reciprocal obligations result in the emotional expression of *hiya* (also *ulao* in Cebuano, *huya* in Hiligaynon,

bain in Ilocano *dine* in Pampango, *baeng* in Pangasinan).²⁴

Bulatao (1964) calls *hiya* a "painful emotion" which is expressed in interpersonal situations perceived as "dangerous to one's ego." However, instead of alerting the individual to reprisal or aggression, *hiya* results in withdrawal behavior or the avoidance of conflict.

Jocano, in his highly insightful documentation of Malitbog as a social group (1969) observed that *hiya* is felt by a person when outcomes of relationships infringe upon the following:

- a. the dignity or honor of the individual;
- b. the status of the actor relative to others;
- c. the internal cohesion of the family as a unit; and,
- d. the reputation of the kin-group with respect to the outside world.

The expression of *hiya*, as earlier stated, is introspective rather than confrontative. The following behaviors typify this emotion:

- a. *pangingimi*, or the inability to express feelings openly;
- b. *pag-aatubili*, or hesitation to proceed with an intended act even if the other is known to the actor, and
- c. *alapaap ng kalooban*, which means "inner uncertainty of feelings" resulting in a reluctance to interact more fully and to proceed with intended actions because the other is not yet fully known (Jocano, 1975).

These discussions seemingly point to *hiya* as a "reticence" felt in continuing interactions with persons who are not yet adjudged as one of *kapwa*-orientation, or with those already evaluated as *walang-pakikipagkapwa*. For instance, Santiago (1978) vividly describes how eating habits and the quality of food distinguishes between "outsiders" and "insiders" to Bulacan society, such that formality and grandiose meals

characterize dinners with the former while informality and routine meals are shared with *hindi-ibang tao*. Salazar (1981) also illustrates how various modes of affixation of *hiya* result in varying descriptions of social experience. For instance, in relation to "others", one may be *hiyang-hiya* or *nahihiya*. Social situations may be *nakakahiya* or *kahiya-hiya*.

The reticence with which a Filipino approaches new relationships may be reflective of initial attempts to assess whether interactions will fall within culturally acceptable norms. At the same time, he is careful that his own assessments in the eyes of the other actor will be socially acceptable.

Violations of mutual expectations also result in non-confrontative behaviors, perhaps because of socially integrated norms barring dominance and aggression. This would be most characteristic of situations where the offender is of higher status either sociologically or economically.

Besides these two reasons, threats to personal dignity, while painful to the person, may be set aside in anticipation of future needs. *Hiya*, therefore, becomes introspective so as not to imperil prospective interactions where the person may have great need of the assistance of the other. The avoidance of conflict in the present, therefore, merely insures the possibility of renewed mutuality at some future date.

In this sense, *hiya* and *utang-na-loob*, as concepts related to *kapwa*, reflect anticipatory coping mechanisms of the Filipino.

Pakikipagkapwa, therefore, typifies the behavioral adaptations manifested by Filipinos within a network of reciprocal obligations. Inasmuch as the traditional society is interpersonally-oriented, the nuances of *pakikipagkapwa* depend largely on ongoing social processes rather than on stable structural relations. Values and expectations are intensely important to individuals. Wayward outcomes thus in the expression of emotions. *Hiya* is but one of these feelings. *Pagkagalit* (anger)

²⁴Fox, Robert. "The Filipino Concept of Self-Esteem" *Area Handbook of the Philippines* (cited by Bulatao, Jaime. "Hiya", *Philippine Studies*: 1964, (January)

or *pagkainis* (irritation) may be others. Cognitions are likewise rooted in *kapwa*, such as *amor propio*, *pakikisama*, *pakikibaka*, and other *salooing* (see Enriquez, 1977). Their releases in behavioral concomitants depend again on whether outcomes are adjudged favorably or unfavorably. The *kapwa*-orientation thus conforms to the contingency principle underlying social relations.

Kapwa in Contemporary Society

We have stressed the dynamism of social development, especially in terms of socioeconomic life. The question which arises in this context is thus: How much of *pakikipagkapwa* remains in a society besieged internally and externally by pressures for social change? Are these norms, rooted in traditional agriculture, still operational principles in farm relations centered on new technologies, or in urban centers drawn around a new production system?

A. Farm Relations

Castillo (1975) examined separate studies of farmers' reactions to new farm technologies. These investigations in her analysis generally indicate that considerable changes are evident in the life ways of agricultural producers.

... This development has just about ended the era of the traditionally self-sufficient farmer who grew his rice crop on his own, using his farm labor, his seeds, his carabao, his plow, etc. Now he has to establish links with the outside world for his seeds, inputs, credit, market, farm equipment, irrigation services, technical advice and other elements considered essential or incidental to modern agriculture ...²⁵

In other words, farming innovations have removed the boundaries of interdependence from the kinship structure to government and other service delivery institutions in society. Whereas family labor sufficed in the past, use of HYVs dictate

²⁵Castillo, Gelia. *All in a Grain of Rice*. Los Banos; SEARCA, 1975.

a reliance on credit institutions, fertilizer producers and the like. Such groups are obviously outside of the traditional circle of *hindi ibang-tao*.

Coincident to these changes, the farmer has lately re-oriented himself to being in constant indebtedness. Loans for purchase of inputs and machinery are common, since the new methods for fertilization, weeding and pest eradication require considerable capital outlay.²⁶ Whereas, traditional agriculture merely required contractual indebtedness through *utang na-loob*, farmers now find themselves financially indebted to institutions which can never be placed within a matrix of reciprocity. Some observers interpret this situation as a liability to the banking system. Lacking expectations of reciprocal obligations, farmers choose not to pay their bank loans. Besides, the bank is an impersonal entity and *kapwa*-relations are absent between the farmer and the institution. Thus, there is no moral indebtedness implicit to the transaction.

Despite the "modernizing" outlook of farmers exposed to new rice technologies, vestiges of traditional agricultural values remain. Castillo singles out an apparent fatalism and sense of helplessness in the face of drought, pestilence and other disasters. As such, a large majority of respondents in one study endorsed the statement "a man's fortune is in the hands of God",²⁷ conforming to what Jocano terms as the theological imperatives in social life (1969).

The Filipino farmer's enthusiastic adoption of the new rice technology is noted to be "dramatic but unanticipated" (Castillo, 1969) conforming to the usual outlook that tradition-bound peasants are rigid in their thinking. Yet, the interpersonal framework of social interaction in the pre-

²⁶Ibid

²⁷Ibid

vailing value system of the Filipino negates this notion, inasmuch as his decision-making has repeatedly been observed to rest on personal assessments of outcomes.

Castillo's interpretation of why farmers held positive reactions to new cropping patterns in the late sixties bear out this view. She states:

Change orientation is not only related to the social pressure to conform to the new behavioral pattern but also to the demonstration effect in the sense that modern practices have actually contributed to a higher level of achievement in rice production.²⁸

Farmers chose to adopt the innovation because they had directly witnessed its impact on productivity. This cognitive orientation is still in consonance with a contingency principle. While the social context of behavior has been altered by technology, the underlying rationale for behavior and value orientations has remained unchanged. So have other aspects of social relations.

In an ethnographic study of the town of Baras, a village of Rizal just 50 kilometers from Manila, the patterns of social relationships in 1970 to 1972 were found to be essentially those described in earlier works. Mendez and Jocano (1974) describe the continued prominence of the kinship structure and the values attendant to it. Thus, respect, non-aggression and nondominance were values that continued to be transmitted through socialization. Reciprocity in economic and social relations persisted, and were premised on *kapwa* as the guiding orientation. All these were observed simultaneous to the other fact that new planting technologies were also being introduced in the community.

²⁸*Ibid*, p. 133

B. Urban Patterns

The persistence of *kapwa* and the orientation related to it continue to be found in families within the city. Guthrie (1968) used the Philippine Sentence Completion Test to measure interpersonal behavior patterns in 4 towns scaled according to distance from Manila. (This study was conducted during the same period as the ones cited by Castillo). Granting the cultural validity of this measure, Guthrie claims to have obtained the following results:

- a. deference orientations with respect to higher status persons,
- b. expression of *utang-na-loob* and *paggalang* in relation to parents of the subjects,
- c. inhibited expressions of emotions such as disappointment, anger and anxiety
- d. concern for maintaining good interpersonal relations with others, especially friends;
- e. fear of loneliness and rejection and financial constraints
- f. desire for money, prominence, success and power²⁹.

Differences in orientations are described between samples differing in socioeconomic status (SES). For example, those from the lower SES communities expressed greater dependence on the opinions of others than those from the higher SES towns. Likewise, samples in low SES areas tended to be more "moralistic" and less open in expressing hostility. Thus, it is not the urban setting per se which seems to determine the continued operation of values in the prevailing culture. Rather, socioeconomic class appears to be the more crucial factor. This observation is in accord with the findings Guthrie obtained in another study measuring "modernity". (1970).

²⁹Guthrie, George & Azores, F. "Philippine Interpersonal Behavior Patterns". *IPC Papers No. 6: Modernization: Its Impact in the Philippines*. Q.C.: IPC, 1968.

An extensive study was also done of a low-income community in the heart of Quezon City (Mendez & Jocano, 1974). Project 2 in the Quirino District originally started out in the early 1950s as a residential subdivision to accommodate low salaried employees of government and private institutions. In 1970, it was a melting pot of first and second generation migrants with diverse provincial origins, and many of the residents had few or no relatives in their neighborhoods. Nevertheless, at least one-third of the households interviewed were extended families, usually including grandparents from either parent, or the nuclear family and married children.

While subscription to traditional views of kinship and family relations were expressed by family members, in reality conflicts were experienced by spouses and by parents and children with regard to role definitions. Ideals of respect and reciprocity were still taught to offsprings and were generally maintained. However, strict enforcement of generational or seniority principles of kinship was no longer the rule, and parents felt a greater need to justify punishments meted out to their children for alleged misbehaviors. Undoubtedly, such qualms have been influenced by Western-type standards for the discipline of children.

The concept of neighbor remained essentially traditional. Respondents considered as neighbors only those in proximate dwellings who could be trusted in times of need (*kadamay* at *kapanalig loob*). Food exchange and giftgiving were practiced with *utang na loob* as the underlying guide. Ritual kinship ties were extended to those deemed worthy of *kapwa* status. However, it was also observed that reciprocal obligations tended to be expressed more often in terms of monetary assistance. This was particularly true in activities requiring community participation, such as religious events. Rather than provide services, as is true in rural areas, working spouses preferred to contribute money for the Santacruzán (May procession) and the Block Rosary rituals.

Within the same years of 1970 to 1972, we thus find that while residents in a neighborhood within the metropolis continued to conform to the basic orientations of *kapwa* with varying levels of commitment, those in a village near Manila adhered almost religiously to these norms of interpersonal relations. Clearly, there must be some differentiating factor between the two communities.

C. Socialization

Jocano emphatically states that Filipino behavior patterns will remain unchanged so long as Filipino kinship and family ties continue to be solid and encompassing (1966). This pronouncement is premised on the observation that the family is the primary agent for socialization in traditional society, and so long as it retains this role, its value system will continue to be transmitted and will prevail.

Two studies conducted within a span of 13 years on the same community provide an empirical perspective related to value transmission and socialization patterns.

In 1958, when Domingo chose to do her master's thesis by documenting socialization practices in Cruz-na-Ligas, the community was characterized as "semi-rural" (Domingo, 1977). This despite the fact that it nestled only three kilometers away from the central area of the campus of the University of the Philippines. At that time, the main occupations of the residents were in farming or in the shoe industry. Only 517 persons lived in the community, although the place had a long history as a settlement. There was only one main road in the community and hardly any means of transportation to leave the premises.

Within such a setting, the value orientations transmitted through socialization by mothers to their offsprings conformed essentially to *kapwa* orientations. The authority roles were shared by the child's parents and by older relatives and siblings, thus exemplifying kinship principles in rural Philip-

piners. Exchange of food, assistance and services typified relationships between kinsmen and neighbors. Dominance and aggression tendencies were discouraged or punished, while a premium was set on sociality with others. Achievement training was minimal and no rigid standards for excellence in task accomplishment were imposed. Nurturance and suc-
corance behaviors were encouraged, especially since these actions complemented the value system of reciprocal obligations. Similarly, obedience and respect toward parents and elders were inculcated to ensure the smooth operation of kinship norms.

In 1971, Lagmay returned to the community to observe socialization practices within an area already sucked in by urbanization. In this year, Cruz-na-Ligas had more than 4,000 residents, many of whom were immigrants from provinces who came to stay with relatives or settled there while working in the University and other proximate enterprises (Lagmay, 1974). The majority of the residents no longer depended greatly on farming but were engaged in professional, technical and manual occupations outside the community. Transportation was no longer a problem either, and the main road had been asphalted.

Despite these physical and socioeconomic changes, Lagmay found similar socialization practices still in evidence, although nonscientific rituals associated with childbirth were no longer subscribed to. Some change in self-reliance training was also found, and children were generally allowed at earlier ages to feud for themselves. Similar to what Mendez and Jocano observed in Project 2, strict sanctions were no longer attached to disobedience and dominance expressions. In fact, Lagmay reports that more children tended to disobey their parents than was found a decade earlier.

These studies tend to confirm the position that kinship continues to reinforce the values it creates for its members. It must be remembered, however, that these observations have been taken in urban communities principally engaged in

pursuing non-industrial occupations. As such, the pressures for re-examining the usefulness of prevailing customs may not have been too great. The question of whether engaging in industrial labor affects these factors, therefore, remains an unresolved issue and deserves further examination.

The Prevailing Image

The studies reviewed portray the following features of the prevailing culture:

First, Filipino social psychology is best understood in the context of the kinship structure which is the primary building block of society.

Second, the value commitment underlying the pattern of reciprocal privileges and obligations is *kapwa*, an orientation which is manifestly related to dealing with biological and ritual kin while being generalized to include transactions with outsiders.

Third, there are evidences that both the introduction of technology and urban exposure result in new foci of interest of social life, thus leading to a variety in forms of *kapwa* behavior.

Fourth, despite the gleanings of new behavioral adaptations, the underlying principles of interpersonal behavior remain essentially tied to the traditional features of reciprocal expectations.

Fifth, values transmitted in socialization continue to give primacy to family relations while infused with discrete changes emanating from the advent of technology and exposure to urban lifeways.

Studies in the past twenty-five years portray the Filipino kinship structure as the foundation of social expectations and interpersonal relationships. The rootedness of behavior in kinship relations has been seen to spring primarily from the role of family in agricultural production.

Despite the centrality of kinship, however, behavior is flexible to the extent that ongoing social interactions are based on contingency principle. Using this as a guide to social expectations, structural relations may be loosened, modified or even changed as a result of the outcomes of interpersonal relations. This value is epitomized by the set of expectations in *pakikipagkapwa*.

Behavior in the agriculturally dominated society, therefore, is based on both kinship and *kapwa* values. However, the nation in the current decade is being pushed into the spiralling influence of an industrial socioeconomic formation. Against this backdrop, the question of whether the features of Filipino personality will remain the same, or alter in some respects, arises. Foster (1962) would say that the 'old' adaptations will remain to the extent that these continue to effectuate the adaptations of the individual in the 'new' setting.

Undoubtedly, continuing investigations concerning the dynamics and patterns of influence over Filipino psychology will provide answers to these critical questions in the context of ongoing social change.

SANGGUNIAN

Barnett, Milton

- 1975 "Substitute and Transition of Agricultural Development among the Ibaloi." *In M. Hollnsteiner Society, Culture and the Filipino*, Vol. 3, 338-346.

Bulatao, J. "Hiya". *Philippine Studies*

- 1964 12 (Jais) 424-438

Castillo, Gelia T.

- 1975 *All in a Grain of Rice*, Los Banos, Laguna: SEARCA

Chi-When Chang

- 1974 *A Strategy for Agricultural & Rural Development in Asian Countries*. Laguna: SEARCA

Domingo, Maria Fe

- 1977 "Child Rearing Practices in Barrio Cruz-na-Ligas". *Phil. Journal of Psychology*. 10 (2)

Enriquez, V.G.

- 1977 "Filipino Psychology in the Third World." *Phil. Journal of Psychology* 12 (5), 3-18.
- 1978 *Readings in Filipino Personality*. Manila CEU Graduate Sch.
- 1979 "*Kapwa: A Core Concept in Filipino Social Psychology*". Mimeographed.
- 1981 "*Towards a profile of the Filipino Disposition. Some Notes on the Cultural Climate of the Philippines.*" Xeroxed Abstract of Paper Presented at 8th ASIAN ROUNDTABLE, Tokyo, Japan

Foster, George

- 1962 *Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change*. N.Y. Harper & Brothers.

Gutrie, G. & Azores, F

- 1968 "*Philippine Impersonal Behavior Pattern.*" In W. Bello, W and A. de Guzman II *Modernization: Its Impact of the Philippines III*. IPC Papers No. 6 Q.C.

Hollnsteiner, Mary (ed.)

- 1975 *Society, Culture and the Filipino* (Vol. 1-3) Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila Press

Jocano, Felipe Landa

- 1966 "Filipino Social Structure and Value System." In *Filipino Cultural Heritage*. Lecture Series No. 2. Manila PWU.
- 1969 *The Traditional World of Malitbog*. Q.C. CDRC, 1969.
- 1975 *Slum as a Way of Life*. Q.C. University of the Phils. Press.

Kaut Charles

- 1965 "The Principle of Contingency in Tagalog Society." *Asian Studies*. III (2), 1-15.

Lagmay, Leticia

- 1974 *Early Socialization in an Urbanizing Community*. Q.C.: University of the Philippines (unpublished Masters Thesis)

Lewis, H.

- 1975 "The Ilocano Rice Farmer" In *Mary Holnsteiner, Society, Culture and the Filipino* (Vol 3), 356-66.

Mangahas, Miralao

- 1976 *Tenants Lessees, Owners*, Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila Press.

Mataragnon, Rita H.

- 1970 "The Case for an Indigenous Psychology." *Phil. Journal of Psychology*. 12 (1), 3-8

Mendez, P.P. & F. L. Jocano

- 1974 *The Filipino Family in Its Rural and Urban Orientation: Two Case Studies*. Manila: CEU Research and Development Center.

Murray, Jr. Francis

- 1973 "Lowland Social Organization I: Local Kin Groups in a Central Luzon Barrio." *Phil. Sociological Review*. 21.

Nurge, Ethel

- 1965 *Life in a Leyte Village*. Seattle: University of Washington.

Nydegger, W. Tarong

- 1969 "An Ilocos barrio." In B. Whiting, ed. *Six Cultures: A Study of Child-Rearing Practices*

Salazar, Z

- 1981 "Wika at Diwa": Isang Pansikololingwistikang Analisis sa Halimbawa ng Konsepto ng "Hiya". In Ortega, S. (ed). *Ulat ng Ika-labindalawang Seminar sa Sikolohiya ng Wika Ika-7 ng Pebrero, 1981*, 38-43.