

## LESSON 5: THE FILIPINIZATION OF PERSONALITY THEORY

Sikolohiyang Pilipino's strong commitment to the development of national identity and consciousness inspired a renewed critical interest in the scientific study of the Filipino personality. In fact, one important meaning of sikolohiyang Pilipino is sikolohiya ng mga Pilipino or Filipino psychology and character. However, studies on national character have been suspect because of methodological problems and the risk of stereotyping a people.

The concepts of national character in general and Filipino personality in particular are wrought with difficulties. Bartolome (1985) maintained that the very "idea of a Filipino personality ... can work against or even be used against the Filipino themselves." He was critical of the way the Marcos regime was apparently endorsing legitimate pride in Filipino national heritage and culture "by resurrecting barangays and other ancient concepts on the pretext that they are great or worthy examples of a great past" but actually exploiting nationalist sentiments with the aim of "obscuring the more compelling social realities" of the nation.

The Philippines after Marcos remained unmindful of Bartolome's warning. In fact, "understanding the Filipino personality and character" took a sinister turn once more, this time in the familiar form of blaming the victim for his sorry state by starting with the assumption that the worst enemy of the Filipino is himself.

A distinction should be made between the concepts of "personality" and pagkatao (Enriquez 1979). Concern with the Filipino character as if the Filipino were an object of analysis from the outside by an outsider, or alternatively by an objective insider, jibes very well with the concept of personality which is rooted in the concept of "persona"----a mask which can be observed from the outside. However, pagkatao is perhaps best rendered as "personhood." Pagkataong Pilipino, therefore, asserts the shared humanity and the kapwa psychology of the Filipino.

Billed by media as an attempt to know "what's wrong and what's right with the Filipino," the Philippine Senate, on September 18, 1987, approved Resolution No. 10, sponsored by Senators Leticia Ramos-Shahani, Alberto Romulo, and Ernesto Maceda. The resolution directed "the committee on education, arts, and culture and the committee on social justice, welfare, and development to conduct a joint inquiry into the strengths and weaknesses of the character of the Filipino with a view to solving the social ills and strengthening the nation's moral fiber." The result was a 68-page report in English by a task group headed by Patricia B. Licuanan of the Ateneo de Manila University, submitted to Senator Shahani on April 27, 1988. In spite of all the good intentions and the stated aim of coming up with a balanced picture, the colonial resulting image reflected more of the colonial instead of the indigenous identity of the Filipino. This is understandable because they relied on a review of the English language literature on the Filipino character as well as a token focused-group discussion in "a depressed, urban poor resettlement area in Dasmariñas, Bagong Bayan, Cavite."

Continue reading at next page >

## PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

The distorted view of Filipino values becomes even worse when the English-oriented researcher, in affixing a label to a supposed value, simply scans the list of indigenous terms which presumably refer to the same and plucks out the one which seems to describe that value best. Without prior study and respect for the language involved, the researcher may be dealing with a list that is both inappropriate and inadequate. The resulting labeling, therefore, may be incorrect, as is often the case.

Language has its own logic; hence, we cannot afford to ignore such a rich resource. The use of the language of the masses in the writing and dissemination of scientific reports makes socio-political sense. However, it is more important to recognize that in the language lie many pieces of the Filipino culture puzzle. The continued denial of the proper role of the indigenous language in social science research and its diminution as a mere source of convenient labels and as a façade for Filipinization and respectability only results, at best, in an unstructured collection of indigenous terms affixed to supposedly Filipino values. Thus, a listing of Filipino values is now conveniently available for scholars and tourists alike who somehow feel that they have a better understanding of the Filipino personality on the basis of their readings of such exotica as *amor propio*, *bahala na*, and *pakikisama*:

*The token use of Filipino concepts and the local language has led to the identification of some supposedly Filipino national values. Among the frequently mentioned values are hiya (shame), pakikisama (yielding to the leader or the majority), utang na loob (gratitude), amor propio (sensitivity to personal affront), and bayanihan (togetherness in common effort). Some regional values which have been recognized include maratibat (a complex combination of pride, honor, and shame), balatu (sharing of one's fortune), ilus (sharing surplus food), kakugi (meticulousness and attention to details), patugsiling (compassion), kalulu (empathy), hatag gusto (generosity), paghiliupod (Githfulness in need or plenty), and pagsinabtanay (fidelity with one's promises) (Elequin 1974).*

Apparently, then, the emphasis in this kind of research is the search for the English equivalent of the indigenous term. The label is fitted, squeezed, and pushed into the mindset concomitant to the foreign equivalent. The term's real significance in the Philippine context is diminished, if not entirely lost. More sinister still, by lifting the indigenous term from its milieu and slapping it on a supposed value, the researcher can attach whatever significance he may assign to the latter. In the hands of a Western-oriented researcher whose motivation in doing the research may concededly be academic, such privilege may, unwittingly, still be supportive of oppressive ends. The inappropriateness of this dangerous approach to the study of Filipino values can best be seen in the concepts most often treated and highlighted in researches of this ilk: *hiya*, *utang na loob*, and *pakikisama*. Many social scientists have studied them as separate values and in isolation from all others. Moreover, popular writers, taking their cue from these studies, often situate these values at the very seat of the Filipinos personality, the absence of which they deem fatal to the former's ethnicity.

The functionalist value studies popularized by the Institute of Philippine Culture and referred to by Robert Lawless (1969) as the "Ateneo approach" was controversial, to say the least. Dissatisfied with "personalized accounts of behavior with only anecdotal supporting materials," Lawless warned against the "replication of uniformity" and the selection of "whatever data fit expectations," making it difficult to correct "early misimpressions.

Even in granting "authenticity" to "common Asian and feudal-agricultural values," Andrew B. Gonzales (1982) saw what "seemed to be labeling activities" in the earlier attempts by Lynch and Holinsteiner Bennagen (1985) was forthright in his criticism of what he called "verbal Filipinization, that is, the search for Filipino words while using an essentially structural-functionalist perspective." In a call for the full use of Filipino in the social sciences, verbal Filipinization was characterized as *mala-pustisong gamit ng wika* or "token use of the Filipino language" (Enriquez 1981). The token use of indigenous vocabulary should not be confused with the forming of appropriate theory.

The functionalist approach is not without defenders. Convinced that the surface values of *hiya*, *pakikisama*, and *utang na loob* "certainly play strong functional roles in Filipino daily life, notwithstanding the fact that *kapwa* plays a 'superior' conceptual role," Tenant (1987) insisted that "as halting and faltering as the process may be, people still communicate face to face, not core to core." However, he did not deny that communication and social interaction should be interpreted on the basis of core meanings.

Continue reading at next page >

## In Search of Core Meanings: The Role of Language

If one must communicate, language definitely helps. Using the Filipino language, ones sees hiya, utang na loob, and pakikisama merely as surface values, readily apparent attributes appreciated and exhibited by many Filipinos. In addition, these three are recognized as a triad whose legs emanate from a single trunk, the actual core value of the Filipino personality. This core value has been identified as kapwa. Surface values therefore are not freestanding values which anyone can assume at will. The core value must be cultivated and understood first before the full meaning of the surface values can become apparent and appreciated.

Moreover, the use of the indigenous language led to the identification of an underlying precondition for the existence of the surface values, that is to say, the concept and value of pakiramdam. The function of this value is to act as the processor, or pivot, which spins off the surface values from the core value of kapwa. A person without pakiramdam cannot possibly have pakikisama and utang na loob. Similarly, one can not expect hiya from someone who has no pakiramdam.

Perhaps this value system can be best illustrated in the popular Filipino conception of the masamang tao (bad or evil person). The masamang tao can be characterized as one who does not exhibit the accommodative values of hiya, utang na loob, and pakikisama. The denial or absence of each of these accommodative values is labeled: 1) the walang pakisama (one inept at the level of adjustment); 2) the walang hiya (one who lacks a sense of karangalan or honor/propriety); and 3) the walang utang na loob (one who lacks adeptness in respecting a shared dignity, karangalan, and kagandahang-loob).

The person characterized as walang pakiramdam is, of course, worse off than any of the three "evil" characters mentioned above. It is definitely unfortunate, to put it mildly, to be afflicted with such an inadequacy. This particularly sad state is captured in one Filipino word: manhid (numb/ absence of feeling).

However, such a character pales in comparison beside one who is walang kapwa:

*One argument for the greater importance of kapwa in Filipino thought and behavior is the shock or disbelief that the Filipino registers when confronted with one who is supposedly walang kapwa (-tao). If one is walang pakisama, others might still say, "He would eventually learn" or "Let him be. that's his prerogative." If one is walang hiya, others say, "His parents should teach him a thing or two." If one is walang utang na loob others might advise, "Avoid him." But if one is walang kapwa-tao, people say, "He must have reached rock bottom. Napakasama na niya. He is the worst," (Enriquez 1978).*

The surface values can vary cross-culturally. Even the relative importance attached to the pivotal value of pakiramdam is determined by cultural imperatives. Not so with kapwa. In the Philippine value system, kapwa is at the very foundation of human values. This core value then determines not only the person's personality but more so his personhood or pagkatao. Without kapwa, one ceases to be a Filipino. One also ceases to be human.

Continue reading at next page >

## Pakikiramdam: The Pivotal Aspect of Kapwa

Pakikiramdam is the pivotal value of shared inner perception. It refers to heightened awareness and sensitivity. Mataragnon (1987) characterized pakikiramdam as "feeling for another," a kind of emotional *a priori*. Pakikiramdam is an active process involving great care and deliberation manifested in "hesitation to react, attention to subtle cues, and nonverbal behavior in mental role-playing (If I were in the others situation, how would I feel?)" (Mataragnon 1987).

Using pakikiramdam, a person seeks to clarify an ambiguous and therefore critical situation to arrive at an appropriate response. It is a legitimate move leading to *pakikiisa* (being one with others); later, to being able to identify with another's beings and ultimately, to being able to share complete trust.

Pakikiramdam is necessarily tied to the operation of all Filipino surface values.

Regarding *pakikisama*, Mataragnon (1987) writes, "A person who knows how to get along well with others is one who is 'magaling makiramdam' (good in sensing cues)!"

She sees circumspection in pakiramdam:

*... hiya demand[s] that one conducts oneself in a circumspect manner, e.g., with pakikiramdam. Kahihyan could be avoided by sizing up the situation first and watching how others react. In being considerate and behaving as kapwa, one tries not to cause kahihyan to others: in saving face and preserving amor propio, one tries not to bring kahihyan upon oneself. In all this, pakikiramdam may be seen as some kind of golden rule.*

Without pakiramdam, there is no sense of time and *kalooban*. Thus, *utang na loob* is not only reduced to reciprocity but also vanishes completely:

*It is with one's loob (being) that one feels. One could have a debt and pay it back in business-like fashion without utang na loob. On the other hand, the emotional component is at a maximum in utang na loob reciprocity ... Voluntary initiation of the action is also extremely important, for the spirit in which a service is rendered, the giving of self that is involved, lends an emotional content to the relationship that is lacking in contractual and quasi-contractual reciprocity (Lynch 1973). Without pakikiramdam, one cannot acquire a sense of utang na loob; neither can one know when and how to express this sense of gratitude.*

The improvisatory character of pakikiramdam is operative in *bahala na*:

*Bahala na strikes a curious relationship with pakikiramdam. At first sight, it appears that bahala na is reckless and fatalistic while pakikiramdam is careful and humanistic... Lagmay mentions the "improvisatory personality" of the Filipino which allows him to be comfortable with unstructured, indefinite, and unpredictable situations. It is this same "improvisatory personality" that is at work in pakikiramdam (Mataragnon 1987).*

Continue reading at next page >

## The Centrality of Pakiramdam in Behavioral and Interpersonal Domains

The recognition of a parallelism between the triad of accommodative surface values and the behavioral-phenomenological domain of biro-lambing-tampo (tease/joke-sweetness/caress-resent/disappoint) generates a number of fascinating hypotheses. Biro (joke/tease) is most relevant to the domain of the surface value of hiya. The initial tension attributed to hiya during interpersonal encounters, which is most likely to occur at levels of interactions below pakikipagpalagayang-loob can be neutralized by a biro. Even the expression "Napahiya ka ano?" can actually be a biro disguised as chastisement. Biro and hiya are actually correlated, though not ordinarily recognized as such. In a culture which uses teasing as a form of socialization or even as a strategy for establishing rapport, this relationship is easier to apprehend.

Even less intimately related, and often thought of as unrelated, are the surface values of pakikisama and the behavioral pattern of lambing (sweetness/underlying fondness). Lambing behavior is more likely to be observed in situations where pakikisama is operative. There are situational constraints to the manifestation of lambing. For example, it is supposed to be absent in pakikisama among male barkada (indigenous peer group). However, it can be argued that lambing is simply manifested in different ways depending upon sex, status, age, nature of relationship, and the like. Similarly, tampo is the behavioral pattern and phenomenological feeling most frequently associated with perceived disregard for utang na loob. Again, the two are not normally thought of as related, and yet tampo is the first thing felt and/or manifested in the face of a supposedly unrecognized or unreciprocated utang na loob. Basic to all these is the value of pakiramdam.

## The Internality-Externality Dimension in Pakiramdam

Dissecting the term pakiramdam yields two related concepts. The first would be paki- which is an affixation indicating a request or a plea.

The second would be ramdam, a variation of damdam which means to feel. Although damdam and dama would both mean "to feel," this English equivalent does not consider the externality-internality dimensions of feeling. Strictly speaking, dama is external in quality; that is, having a social dimension, concerning one's interaction with other people.

Pakidama would, therefore, be external in character. On the other hand, damdam is internal in nature; that is, it involves one's "loob," the recognition of a person's individuality.

## Portrait of the Compliant Filipino

Readily observable surface values are often mistaken for distinguishing attributes of the Filipinos as opposed to other nationalities. That may cause a bit of confusion as was mentioned earlier, as these values may vary among the different ethnic groupings of the archipelago. Moreover, the misconception that the triad of hiya, utang na loob, and pakikisama constitutes the entirety of surface values is fostered by colonial social science. One researcher even went as far as identifying a surface value as a Filipino "goal, purpose, and objective." While bordering on the absurd, the idea is perpetuated in English social science textbooks (e.g., Hunt, Quisumbing, Espiritu, Costelo, and Lacar 1987). The hiya-utang na loob, pakikisama triad forms only one category, the accommodative surface values. Its counterpart grouping maybe referred to as the confrontative surface values.

As can be gathered from the adjective, accommodative values function primarily to maintain the status quo either on an individual or group basis. Over the years, American-oriented researchers have seized on this category to such an extent that all other values have been pushed to the sidelines. Because of the sheer visibility of studies made on the subject, translation labels for each of them have seeped into popular usage and have been taken as appropriate.

Continue reading at next page >

## PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Hiya got bandied about as "shame" or embarrassment." Utang na loob got to be known as "reciprocity." But no one really got carried away except when pakikisama was elevated to the status of a value and passed off as a Filipino "goal, purpose, and objective."

Unlike the seeming institutionalization of accommodative values, the confrontative values were either ignored or misinterpreted outright. The popularization of bahala na as fatalism is a case in point since the basic confrontative meaning of the concept was not duly recognized. Another nonconfrontative value, lakas ng loob, never came to the fore as did utang na loob, another loob-related value found in the other category.

This oversight seems linked to the observation that utang na loob happens to be consistent with subservience and servility. The same is the case with pakikibaka, the last of the triad of confrontative values. This concept was paid only scant attention, perhaps by being "out of place" in a society widely presented as "servile," "fun-loving," and "hospitable." Increasingly, however, this triad of confrontative values is now beginning to get the attention and appreciation due them.

### The Moral Dimension of Hiya

One of the earliest studies done on hiya (propriety/ dignity) was by Sibley (1965), an anthropologist with the Philippine Studies Program at the University of Chicago. He went to the Philippine island of Panay and studied huge (which is equivalent to hiya among the Tagalogs, according to his study). Sibley came to the conclusion that hiya is "social" in character. He failed to appreciate the moral dimension of the concept precisely because he did not pay attention to a major characteristic of the indigenous language: the system of affixation.

The system of affixation is a very important aspect of the Filipino language which should not be glossed over by root word-oriented analysts of Philippine values. This distinction can be illustrated by citing an attempt by Sibley to bolster his claim with a Tagalog salawikain (saying) which was reportedly used to refer to a woman who committed suicide to escape hiya: Nahiya sa tao; sa Diyos ay hindi.

His translation was erroneous. One should not confuse mahiya with nakakahiya. When one says "Nakakahiya sa tao; sa Diyos hindi," one is concerned with the social, instead of the moral, aspect of the behavior. A loose but idiomatic translation of this would be "It's a shameful sin against society but not against God." Obviously, this cannot be said of suicide. However, the saying "Nahiya sa tao, sa Diyos hindi" is ironic; it precisely means "Dapat ay nahiya din sa Diyos" or "she should not have sinned against God either." This is clearly a moral injunction missed by Sibley. The affix na- says something very different from what nakaka- implies. "Nahiya « to: sa Diyos ay hindi" implies "Dapat ay mahiya sa Diyos," thereby attaching a socio-moral significance to the concept of hiya. Sibley missed the point altogether by ascribing to the word nahiya the meaning appropriate to nakakahiya.

In fact, the slang "dyahe" came up in the '70s to communicate the purely social aspect of the concept of "hiya." "Dyahe" is actually the inversion of the syllables of ya-hi, coupled with a change in the initial sound from "h" to "dy". Wearing bell bottom trousers when everyone else is sporting a semi-baston (slightly tight-fitting pants) is dyahe. The sanction is social. The moral question is not involved at all. Sibley got the meaning of dyahe but missed out on hiya altogether. To think that it was just a matter of distinguishing the affix na- from nakaka-. What more if he were to encounter the nominal form of hiya in kahihiyan?

Armando Bonifacio (1976) was right when he called attention to the fact that "napahiya" is not "nakakahiya" and certainly not "ikinahihiya." Aside from na- and nakaka-, we have napa- and ikina-, not to mention ka. an. Salazar' (1981) ground-breaking study of affixation and hiya supported once more the importance of the externality-internality dimension in the analysis of Filipino psychology. He identified the two aspects of hiya, namely, the labas (external/interpersonal) and the loob (internal/being). The labas aspect of hiya is the natural domain of behavioral psychology; as in hiyain, ikahiya, and manghiya. Earlier studies on hiya captured the external aspect of the concept and characteristically ignored the more important internal or loob aspect.

Continue reading at next page >

## PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

On the other hand, the loob aspect of hiya is related to qualities and the foundation or terminal value of karangalan as in mahiyain, kahiya-hiya, and hiyang-hiya. The labas-related meanings also have a social dimension, pertaining to social interactions, such as pakikitungo, pakikisalamuha, pakikibagay, and pakikisama. The loob-related meanings, on the other hand, have an emotional dimension, pertaining to the intensity of one's feeling of hiya. Furthermore, the labas-oriented affix, aside from its social dimension, also denotes that hiya can be a voluntary, conscious act (sinasadya), or involuntary, beyond one's volition (di-sinasadya).

### The Filipino Self-image and the "Blessings" of Utang na Loob

Another surface value given inordinate attention in the Western-oriented studies of Philippine values is utang na loob (gratitude/solidarity). Charles Kaut (1961) admitted that utang na loob is not uniquely Filipino; it can also be found in Washington, DC, except that Americans value kaliwaan (direct exchange) more. Concepts such as lakas ng loob and kusang-loob were summarily ignored because of the minimal appreciation given to the Filipino language and the lack of appreciation of the meaning and significance of the theoretically fertile concept of loob. One can state in detail all the reasons why "American aid" is a form of imperialism (Havter 1971); if utang na loob is a paramount value to an extent where lakas ng loob, kusang-loob, sama ng loob, and other loob-related concepts are ignored, then the Filipino should be grateful indeed.

*The problems with the token use of the Filipino psychological concepts in the context of a Western analysis that relies on the English language and English categories of analysis are many. It no doubt can lead to the distortion of Philippine social reality and furtherance of the miseducation of the Filipinos. It is not coincidence that Kaut (1961) hit upon utang na loob (debt of "gratitude") as a key concept for the analysis of Tagalog interpersonal relations, considering that utang na loob is just one among many psycho-social concepts that relate to the theoretically fertile concept of loob. We have sama ng loob ("resentment\*"), kusang loob ("initiative"), lakas ng loob ("guts"), and many others. Samonte (1973) needed no less than three pages just to list down such concepts. In addition, Kaut admitted that "debt of gratitude is not altogether unknown in Washington, DC. Even Americans recognize utang na loob, they just happen to prefer kaliwan or immediate payoffs whenever possible. To argue that utang na loob is a Filipino value is therefore misleading to say the least, and dangerous at best. Utang na loob would be convenient in perpetuating the colonial status of the Filipino mind (Enriquez 1977).*

Perhaps it is not a coincidence that out of a long list of loob-related concepts, utang na loob was singled out and perpetuated as an important aspect of the Filipino national self-image. In addition, the English-language interpretation of utang na loob as reciprocity happens to be useful in promoting the image of the colonizer as benefactor.

Kaut's 1961 study was misused and overdrawn without due regard to the dangers of reductionism when the interpretation of utang na loob, in terms of direct exchange of goods and favors, became the interpretation of utang na loob. Since utang na loob is definitely not so gross and scheming as the pragmatic "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," it is inaccurate and misleading to focus on the gift, the acceptance, the repayment, and the elements of need and surplus.

Although Kaut also had occasion to translate utang na loob into "debt of gratitude," still the mercantilist interpretation of the concept persisted until it got tagged as "reciprocity." Hollnsteiner, (1966) another social scientist, pushed the erroneous interpretation even further by claiming that the interaction emanating from utang na loob is "contractual." While recognizing the significant role of "emotions" (her closest gloss to loob), she claims that the recipient is compelled "to show his gratitude properly by returning the favor with interest (Italics hers)."

Continue reading at next page >

## PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

De Mesa's (1987) analysis of utang na loob as a commitment to "human solidarity" is closer to the logic of Filipino behavior and Philippine language use:

*[Utang na loob functions] prior to any reception of favor. It is used as a plea prior to any favor because utang na loob, the debt owed to another person who shares a common humanity (loob), exists just because we are fellow human beings.*

The absurdity of the mercantile interpretation of utang na loob is embarrassingly humorous in a woman's "bargaining leverage" when in dire need of protection from physical abuse:

*When that protection is neither forthcoming nor possible, she uses the only bargaining leverage she has left: a plea in the name of common humanity, a humanity that needs to be respected. She prefaces her request with "Utang na loob! Please, in the name of the humanity we share and the respect that you owe my humanity ..." (de Mesa 1987).*

Utang na loob is therefore a value which moves to recognize, respect, promote, and, at times, defend the basic dignity of each person.

## Elevating the Status of Pakikisama

Of the three surface values, pakikisama (companionship/esteem) has received the most extensive treatment in the Western-oriented social science literature in the Philippines. It was used by Lynch (1961, 1973) as a primary basis for the construction of "smooth interpersonal relations" or SIR. Again the analysis suffered from the lack of attention to related concepts in Filipino. Pakikisama happens to be only one of the many levels of interpersonal relations in Filipino. In fact, the most valued form of relationship in the Philippines goes beyond pakikisama.

The construct of "smooth interpersonal relations" as proposed by Lynch (1964) is supposed to be acquired and perceived through pakikisama, using euphemism in the language utilizing a go-between. He was successful in penetrating the highest level of interpersonal relations in the ibang-tao category, leading him to believe that pakikisama is a value. However, he did not take cognizance of the importance of the other levels of interpersonal relations beyond pakikisama, making his observation valid only to a certain point, and therefore inadequate. Lynch unwittingly reduced kapwa from the deep solidarity found in a shared inner self to superficial "smooth interpersonal relations" The inordinate attention given to pakikisama aggravates the unintended bigger problem identified by the historian, Renato Constantino (1970), in Dissent and Counter-Consciousness as the miseducation of the Filipino. He showed the academician as the "recipient of miseducation can very well be the Philippine society's miseducator instead of professing the new consciousness."

Social scientists who unwittingly single out the concept of pakikisama from pakikitungo, pakikibagay, pakikipagpalagayang-loob, and pakikiisa, and then elevate it to the status of a value is at the same time reinforcing (intentionally or unintentionally) skills and talents ... sold to the highest bidder-usually the elite and vested interest groups. Without question, they reward docility, conformity, and western orientation. The logical consequence is that they shrink away from social protest (Navarro 1974).

Continue reading at next page >

## PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Pakikipagkapwa, not pakikisama, is what Filipinos value the most:

*More accurately, it is not pakikisama as a value which is important but pakikipagkapwa as a Filipino paninindigan. Take the supposed social value of pakikisama. It is not even clear if one should accept or identify pakikisama as a Filipino value. If it is truly a value, how do we explain the fact that many insist in their pagkatao (dignity) and karapatan ("right")- "ayaw kong makisama" ("I don't want to conform")? Supposing one does not want to be part of corruption, he is identified as hindi marunong makisama. If he does not care for docility, conformity, and the Western orientation, he is walang pakikisama. What kind of value is that? What self-image does that create for the Filipino should social scientists perpetuate such an idea? It is probably understandable for a Westerner interested in Philippine society to jump to the conclusion that pakikisama is a Filipino value. After all, he is not immersed in the culture, his interests and goals are different, and he does not even understand the language! However, the Filipino should marshal his knowledge as a culture bearer and as a speaker of the language to heighten his awareness of Philippine social reality ... The barkada ("peer group") would not be happy with the walang pakisama but Philippine society at large cannot accept the walang kapwa-tao. Pakikipagkapwa is both a paninindigan (conviction) and a value. It includes all the other mentioned modes and levels of interaction. Pakikisama is a form of pakikipagkapwa but not the other way around. In fact, pakikisalamuha is even closer than pakikisama in meaning to pakikipagkapwa (Enriquez 1977).*

While pakikisama is a comparatively high level of relationship, it is only so at the category of ibang-tao (not one of us). Pakikisama is only a building block among many in the development of a higher level of relationship. The other blocks include such concepts as pakikipagpalagayang-loob (level of mutual trust), and pakikiisa (fusion, oneness, and full trust). If all these building blocks are present, then the relationship can be said to have moved to its highest plane, the category of hindi ibang-tao (one of us).

Continue reading at next page >

## Bahala Na: Determination in the Face of Uncertainty

Among the first studies leading to the inculcation of bahala na as one of the Filipino's most important cultural values was that done by Lynn Bostrom (1986). Bostrom compared the Filipino bahala na with American fatalism. She, wittingly or unwittingly, wrote that knowing the deeper possible meanings of bahala na is "not so significant as the fact that it is definitely an expression of fatalism." Fatalism here is being understood as a passive acceptance of the turns in the patterns of life, indicated by a dislike for planning and taking responsibility for one's actions.

Bostrom further asserted that bahala na "permeates the people; daily existence and influences their habitual activities. One's resignation to his fate is expected by other members of society." Bostrom again speculates that bahala na is an escapist value which "serves as a reliever of tension and reaction against social structure," and that it is "more strongly supported by society in the Philippines" and "may well be related to the fact that more of the country is rural" and lacking in (Western) education.

It was Osias (1940) who earlier expressed the more balanced view that bahala na is a combination of fatalism and determinism. He wrote, "It is expressive of courage and fortitude, a willingness to face difficulty, and a willingness to accept the consequences..."

Lagmay (1976) has corrected some of the misconceptions about bahala na which gave the value, and to some degree the Filipino, a bad name. Firstly, Lagmay found that bahala na operates in a situation which is full of uncertainty and lack of information. The striking finding was that despite the uncertainty of the situation, very few would avoid or run away from the predicament. A person would instead utter "bahala na" and confront the situation. Therefore, contrary to the connotation of passive fatalism and escapism suggested by Bostrom, bahala na would be a confrontative attitude. It is risktaking in the face of the proverbial cloud of uncertainty and the possibility of failure.

It is also an indication of an acceptance of the nature of things, including the inherent limitations of one's self. However, it is an acceptance which is not passive. It is as if one were being forced by the situation to act in his own capacity to change the present problematic condition. He is being required to be resourceful and, most importantly, creative to make his situation better. Instead of the passive, expectant motivation often ascribed to the operation of bahala na, it is clear that bahala na operates to raise one's courage and determination.

Lagmay sees bahala na as arising from a social structure that spurs one to use his inherent abilities to bring about needed change, and that bahala na is a signal to be persistent in spite of the uncertainty of things. Furthermore, Lagmay states that bahala na reflects the improvisatory personality of the Filipino, allowing him to cope and be comfortable even in indefinite, unpredictable, and stressful situations.

Continue reading at next page >

## Lakas ng Loob: Inner Resource for Change

Coincident with the perpetuation of the accommodative and servile image of the Filipino, as portrayed by the supposed values of *hiya*, *utang na loob*, and *pakikisama*, is the rash judgment that Filipinos lack *lakas ng loob*. If Filipinos don't fare as well as other nationalities in business, it is definitely not because of lack of *lakas ng loob*. It is unreasonable to assume the absence of guts and daring among a people who staged the first revolution against colonial domination in Asia. After all, Lapu-Lapu fought and defeated Ferdinand Magellan in spite of Magellan's superior arms.

*Lakas ng loob* is among the seven most highly valued characteristics of the Filipinos found in a nationwide psychometric study of Filipino personality using the *Panukat ng Ugali at Pagkatao* (Enriquez and Guanzon 1983). With the Maranaos on top, the respondents from twelve ethnolinguistic groups scored high on *lakas ng loob* together with *pagkamatulungin* (helpfulness), *pagkamapagkumbaba* (humility), and *pagkamatiyaga* (perseverance).

*Lakas ng loob* is a key ingredient in the realization of *pagbabagong-dangal*, enabling one to face difficulty, even death, to vindicate the *dangal* (dignity/honor/good) in one's being (de Mesa 1987). *Lakas ng loob* is a *damdamin* (internal feel/attribute/trait) necessary for actualizing the good not only in one's self but also in one's fellow man (*kapwa*), in one's *loob*, and in facilitating the "social good" in *kapwa*.

The People's Power revolution illustrates *kapwa* and *lakas ng loob* as the businessmen and professionals from Makati joined ranks with the urban poor and protesting laborers from Tondo. The voice and *lakas ng loob* from Mendiola and E. de los Santos Avenue (EDSA) in a united move to bring about *pagbabagong-dangal*. Instead of the overdrawn and misused concept of *utang na loob*, the Filipino *lakas ng loob*, supported by his conviction and the social psychology of *kapwa*, was affirmed. The motivation to dislodge a dictator in the light of the values of *katarungan*, *kalayaan*, and ultimately, *karangalan*, led to a demonstration of people's power in a move toward *pagbabagong-dangal*.

## Pakikibaka: Cooperative Resistance

The dialectics of *kapwa* both as a psychology and as a worldview include not only *pakikisama*, as seen in the unity of man and nature, but also *pakikibaka* (level of fusion in a common struggle) in the face of justice and exploitation. *Pakikibaka* as an aspect of a *kapwa*-oriented worldview awakens the Filipino's consciousness of present-day realities and motivates him to be one in the struggle to break away from the clutches of the neocolonial setup. His motivation to struggle might be tempered with reluctance and doubt because the *kapwa* philosophy is basically nonantagonistic. Elequin (1978) discovers this sentiment, reflected as perplexity in a *kapwa*-oriented worldview, in the song *Digmaan* (War) by Florante de Leon:

*Laban sa kalooban ko man,  
Ako'y handang-handang lumaban  
Para sa ating kalayaan  
Ngunit bakit hindi ko maintindihan, Magkapwa-tao'y naglalaban ...*

(Though my conscience disagrees  
I am ready to do battle  
For the cause of our freedom  
But why can't I understand struggle amongst *kapwa* ...)

In a scenario where *pakikisama* is supposed to be the norm, *pakikibaka* is likely to be ignored as a value. First of all, if *pakikisama* is taken to be the motive for *pakikibaka*, that is, if one joins a struggle out of *pakikisama*, then the strength of will and determination implied in *pakikibaka* is not satisfied at all. It is also as if movements and struggles are merely social integration activities with no real higher ideal.

Continue reading at next page >

## PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

On the other hand, it could also be that pakikibaka is understood to run counter to the smooth interpersonal relations congruent to pakikisama. Pakikisama implies an adjusting of one's individuality (i.e. one's beliefs, principles, convictions, etc.) for the sake of some dubious social orientation. Pakikibaka, seen in the light of the corollary concept of paninindigan, can very well be a direct manifestation of "di-pakikisama" or "ayaw makisama."

However, if the normative value is of some higher form of interaction (i.e., pakikipagkapwa), a value which fully respects another person's being, pakikibaka becomes a valid and important value. Pakikibaka affirms one's convictions as part of one's being. It recognizes the meaning of cooperation and concerted action in resistance even when one is utterly powerless, which are aspects of the value of pakikipagkapwa.



In summary, Philippine values are classified into four major categories consisting of 1) surface values; 2) a pivot; 3) a core; and 4) a foundation of human values. The four categories are placed in a system represented through a three-tiered structure with the surface on the top tier; the pivot and the core on the middle tier; and the foundation values on the bottom tier, with the pivotal interpersonal value pakiramdam underlying the surface, and the core anchored by way of the linking sociocultural value of kagandahang-loob on the foundation below.

The surface (on the top tier) is discussed by way of classifying the Filipino disposition as consisting of accommodative and confrontative surface values. The analysis of accommodative surface values includes a discussion of the inadequacy of the social interpretation of hiya (dignity): a critique of the Filipino self-image engendered by the supposed blessings of utang na loob (sense of solidarity); and the mistake of elevating the status of pakikisama (camaraderie) to a terminal value while kapwa (shared identity) is reduced to "social acceptance." The analysis of the confrontative surface values which underlie the psychology behind the Revolution of 1986 includes a phenomenological reinterpretation of bahala na (determination in the face of uncertainty); lakas ng loob (inner resource for change); and pakikibaka (resistance through cooperative action).

The pivot (on the upper part of the second tier) directly underlies the surface of the three-tiered structure. The pivotal interpersonal value, pakiramdam (shared inner perception), is explained and analyzed in terms of its behavioral centrality in the biro-lambing-tampo (tease-caress-resent) domain and in terms of the internality-externality dimension in kapwa psychology.

The core (on the lower part of the second tier) of the value system, otherwise referred to as kapwa psychology, is explained as an extended sense of identity. The concept of a shared inner self is given as a nonreductionistic alternative to the surface idea of "smooth interpersonal relations." Reducing pakikipagkapwa to pakikisama, which also amounts to minimizing the sense of human solidarity to mere social acceptance and approval, is critically debunked as inconsistent with the kapwa psychology and worldview.

The values of kalayaan (freedom), karangalan (dignity), and katarungan (justice) constitute the socio-political elements and foundation of the Philippine value system. Kagandahang-loob (shared inner nobility) is seen as basic/pivotal to all three.

Meanwhile, the constituents of the Filipino concept of social justice as a current rallying point in the Philippine value system are discussed in terms of/and relation to: 1) the distinction between law and the administration of law (Wala sa batas, nasa pamamalakad ng batas); 2) "human rights" (karapatan); 3) equity and fairness (beyond pakikisama); 4) "truth and reason" (katotohanan and katwiran); 5) justice as unity or consensus (pakikiisa); and 6) peace (kapayapaan).

Continue reading at next page >

## Indigenous Identity and the Colonial Image of the Filipino

A scientific and balanced look at personality and culture studies in the Philippines was an important concern for sikolohiyang Pilipino precisely because of the need to correct the imbalance in a situation where the Filipino is primarily characterized from the judgmental and impressionistic point of view of the colonizers. In addition, the native Filipino invariably suffers from the comparison in not too subtle attempts to put forward Western behavior patterns as models for the Filipino. As Lawless (1969) puts it, "in the case of Lynch's comparison, is it not better to be frankly honest than socially ingratiating? And in Nurge's comparison, is it not better to have a 'true verbal description of reality than a deceptive one?" Even Bulatao's metaphor of a "split-level" bungalow relegates the Filipino to the basement and assigns the American to the upper level. Be that as it may, the continuing interest in identity and national consciousness is not a monopoly of psychologists of the sikolohiyang Pilipino persuasion. What makes sikolohiyang Pilipino different is its intense pursuit of developing the indigenous national culture and its program of using the indigenous language in its conferences, research, teaching, and publications.

The massive influence of the United States of America on education, religion, commerce, politics, and the mass media predisposes the Filipino to adopt the colonial viewpoint in studying and explaining the Filipino psyche. Normally, the importation of an alien perspective provides a measure of objectivity to a research since the scholar is not enmeshed and bound by the culture he is studying. The Philippine experience, however, was different. Most of the American-trained social scientists did not only appraise the data that came in but also stood in judgment of their worth and importance, using American categories and standards. The supposedly Filipino values or concepts were lifted, as it were, from the cultural milieu and examined according to inappropriate alien categories, resulting in a distorted and erroneous appraisal of indigenous psychology.

Sikolohiyang Pilipino is not simply concerned with the image of the Filipino or the motive behind invidious comparisons. The evaluation of the Filipino values and patterns of behavior was a question of national interest:

*Comparisons are usually resorted to in explaining the Filipino way of life to strangers. The basis for comparison, the interpretative scheme, should be critically evaluated especially if the observations are made by the strangers themselves. The issue here is not simply the nationality of the stranger observer or his length of exposure to the Filipino way of life. The question, rather, is: from whose national interest should Philippine culture be evaluated? (Samson 1980).*

The colonial character of the Philippine social science, developed and written in the English language, is particularly and painfully evident in studies of Filipino "national character" and values. The majority of these studies rely uncritically on a borrowed language, inapplicable categories of analysis, and a token use of the local language and culture. Designations for supposedly indigenous values and patterns of behavior include terms and expressions from English (e.g., "Filipino time"), Spanish (e.g., delicadeza, amor propio), and a curious mixture of English and Spanish (e.g., mañana habit). If ever Philippine terms are used at all, they simply function as mere labels, more often than not, with very little research and understanding of their deeper significance and content. Moreover, indigenous terms most often found in American-oriented English language researches were drawn primarily from the Tagalog language of Central Luzon (e.g., bahala na, ningas kugon, etc.). A smattering of concepts was occasionally plucked from different regions of the country (e.g. mahay and gaba from Cebuano) but as a whole, the analysis and interpretation of Filipino values is substantially keyed to a foreign language and perspective.

The risks involved in this widespread practice are many. These studies usually conclude by identifying supposed Philippine values and patterns of behavior. More often than not, however, the studies fail to see the values in terms of the Filipino view, experience, milieu. The organization and logic of the values as it is viewed from the indigenous perspective is ignored.

Continue reading at next page >