



INSTITUTE OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES, SINGAPORE

CULTURE AND FERTILITY

The Case of the Philippines

Amelia B. Alfonso

Leda L. Layo

Rodolfo A. Bulatao

CULTURE AND FERTILITY

The Case of the Philippines

Amelia B. Alfonso

Leda L. Layo

Rodolfo A. Bulatao

Research Notes and Discussions Paper No. 20

Institute of Southeast Asian Studies

1980

FOREWORD

It is generally recognized that ethnic diversity is characteristic of Southeast Asian countries. However, very little is known about the relationships between this diversity and other social and behavioural dimensions. In most countries in the region, such relationships have yet to be fully explored, partly because of the sensitivity of the issue and partly because of the dearth of essential data on ethnic behaviour and differentials.

In the case of population behaviour, although several aspects, such as fertility, mortality and a variety of attitudinal dimensions, have been measured successfully in most Southeast Asian countries, they are normally presented as national aggregates, and are often only broken down by rural-urban residence, education, income, household size and ethnic group. Thus, while there is some information available on the relationship between ethnic identity and fertility, the relationship has not been systematically examined in most of the Southeast Asian countries. The lack of this kind of basic data on ethnic differentials in population behaviour in Southeast Asia has definite implications for national population policies and programmes. These policies and programmes are usually implemented or launched on a national level with very little consideration for the ethnic diversity of the country, and are therefore often perceived, on an ethnic group or community level, as being ethnically based, unacceptable or even biased. Perceptions like these certainly have a direct effect on the manner in which such policies and programmes are implemented and received.

With conditions as the foregoing in mind, and in view of the importance of, and the lack of information on, the relationship between dimensions of ethnic identity and population, the Institute in 1975 got together with a group of interested research scholars from Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand and began an investigation of such relationships and their implications for population policies and progress. Entitled "Culture and Fertility in Southeast Asia", this investigation consisted of two separate but linked activities, divided into Phase I and Phase II of the project, with the former focused largely on the analysis of secondary data and the latter on material generated by planned fieldwork and the administration of a questionnaire.

The work that follows forms part of the "country monographs" growing out of Phase I of the project. These monographs, like the project itself, have

been made possible through the co-operation and support of a number of individuals and organizations, particularly the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Ottawa, the various country team leaders and their colleagues, and the two co-ordinators of Phase I, Dr. Rodolfo Bulatao and Dr. Ong Jin Hui. To all of them we say, thank you.

We are also particularly grateful to Dr. Ong Jin Hui who, in addition to general co-ordinative responsibilities, helped to edit the manuscripts on which the country monographs are based.

Whilst thanking all contributors to, and participants in, the project, and wishing the monographs all the best, we hope it is clearly understood that the responsibility for facts and opinions expressed in this publication rests exclusively with the authors and their interpretations do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Institute or its supporters.

5 September 1980

Kernial S. Sandhu
Director
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies

PREFACE

This volume is part of a series of monographs on culture and fertility in Southeast Asia. They arose out of a regional research project, "Culture and Fertility in Southeast Asia", initiated by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, and involving researchers from Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. The first phase of the Culture and Fertility project concentrated on demographic variables and issues in relation to ethnic and other cultural variables.

Each monograph, focusing on a particular country, is developed essentially on the following lines. First, the historical background and the development of the present social structure are detailed. Following this, the patterns of interaction among the various ethnic groups are considered, with particular attention paid to the identification of variables which may influence fertility patterns of the various groups. Against this backdrop, the population policies and family planning programmes are explained. The demographic structure and its changes in tandem with these policies and programmes are then analysed. In order to determine the impact of key variables on fertility patterns, a secondary analysis of available data was carried out, utilizing multiple classification analysis.

There are differences in the substance of the individual country monographs, largely on account of the nature and availability of materials and documentation. All the same, there has been quite an adequate coverage of the areas deemed important in all the volumes. Indeed, the chapters on national population policies and family planning and the ones on demographic structure are almost complete in detail; in addition, they are comparable with one another. On the other hand, the chapters based on secondary analysis have problems of comparability because secondary data were used. Since these data sets were not originally designed to answer to the project's research model, there were difficulties in comparing variable definitions and operationalization. Even more problematic was the fact that some variables were not available in the data sets. Furthermore, the data sets were not comparable in population coverage and time-frame (the target year was 1970). For all these reasons, this chapter in each of the monographs should not be treated as anything more than a preview or pretest of the research model. Seen in this perspective, it not only provides a useful means of identifying relevant explanatory variables but also shows that variations do indeed exist in a number of areas between ethnic groups and between countries.

Variations and shortcomings of the type above notwithstanding, the five monographs on the whole do provide a useful background to the identification of relevant ethnic variables. Moreover, the lack of comparability of data is currently being corrected in the second phase of the project. A standardized core questionnaire with additional peripheral and specific queries has been designed, based on the findings of the country studies of Phase I. Ultimately, it is expected that the analysis of data collected in Phase II will culminate in an in-depth examination of the relationship between ethnicity and fertility.

1 September 1980

Ong Jin Hui
Editor, Country Monographs
Culture and Fertility in
Southeast Asia, Phase I

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Percentage Distribution of the Philippines by Broad Age Groups: 1903, 1918, 1939, 1948, 1960, 1970 and 1972	37
2 Percentage Distribution of Population by Marital Status, Sex and Year	38
3 Major Geographical Regions of the Philippines Land Area, Population, Density, May 1970	40
4 Total Overall and Marital Fertility Rates for the Philippines and Its Major Regions: 1960 and 1963-68	42
5 Variables in the Analysis	47
6 Multiple Classification Analysis of Fertility-related Measures, Philippines, 1973	48
7 F-ratios in Multiple Classification Analysis of Fertility-related Measures, Philippines, 1973	50
8 Betas in Multiple Classification Analysis of Children Ever Born by Ethnicity, One Other Factor, and Covariates, Philippines, 1973	50
9 Deviations from the Mean in Multiple Classification Analysis of Fertility-related Measures, Philippines, 1973	52
10 Multiple Classification Analysis of Children Ever Born, by Ethnic Group, Philippines, 1973	54
11 Adjusted Deviations in Multiple Classification Analysis of Children Ever Born, by Ethnic Group, Philippines, 1973	55

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
12	Multiple Classification Analysis of Desired Family Size, by Ethnic Group, Philippines, 1973	56
13	Adjusted Deviations in Multiple Classification Analysis of Desired Family Size, by Ethnic Group, Philippines, 1973	57

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	i
PREFACE	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
I: CULTURAL DIVERSITY	1
II: INTERGROUP BEHAVIOUR	18
III: POPULATION POLICIES: PAST AND PRESENT	30
IV: DEMOGRAPHIC AND CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS	36
V: CULTURAL DETERMINANTS OF FERTILITY	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	59

I: CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Introduction

Ethnic diversity and cultural pluralism in Southeast Asia make the region a fertile ground for generating and testing hypotheses about the relationship between ethnic identity and various social and behavioural processes. The understanding of such linkages will bear direct practical implications, particularly when such behaviours are governed directly or indirectly by institutional policies applied on a nationwide scale. This has hardly been done, either on a cross-national or cross-cultural basis. Greater recognition of the salient role of ethnic identity in developed as well as developing political and social systems is gradually increasing. An active search for the independent effects of ethnic identity, the limitations of earlier treatments of the ethnic variable, and a strong quest for a more dynamic theory of ethnicity are some underlying issues in recent literature.¹ The inclusion of the element of ethnic variations in theories of modernization and development has also been articulated.

The monograph is concerned with gaining an insight into the relationship between ethnic identity and population behaviour in the Philippines. Establishing the linkage between ethnic diversity and fertility differentials will have definite implications for population policies and programmes. This interest grows from the general recognition that such policies and programmes have often been planned and implemented on a national scale, with little consideration for ethnic diversity. While the relationship between ethnicity and fertility will not be directly studied or measured in this manuscript, inferences and hypotheses will be drawn from an integration of available literature on the various ethnic groups in the Philippines on the one hand and a review of relevant population data from existing surveys on the other.

Chapter I is divided into two parts. The first part is mainly a brief comprehensive overview of trends and concepts in ethnicity research followed

1 George de Vos and Lola Pomanncci-Ross, eds., *Ethnic Identity* (Palo Alto: Mayfield, 1975); Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, eds., *Ethnicity, Theory and Experience* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975); Richard A. Schermerhorn, *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research* (New York: Random House, 1970); and Sami Zubaida, ed., *Race and Radicalism* (London: Tavistock, 1970).

by a glimpse into the literature on the relationship between ethnicity and fertility. The inclusion of a general review of literature on ethnicity was prompted by (a) the observation that empirical research on Philippine ethnic attitudes has drawn heavily from this body of literature, and (b) the desire to further clarify that the study of ethnicity as a potent determinant of behaviour has been preoccupied with the same types of behaviour (for example, ethnic relations) and that it can be expanded to include other unexplored spheres of application (for example, population behaviour). This last point is then discussed in a review of studies where ethnicity status has been examined in relation to fertility behaviour. While such studies are limited and the analysis of Philippine population behaviour is as yet unexplored, the review reveals the significance of pursuing this type of research.

The second part of Chapter I presents a general description of the ethnic situation in the Philippines. This is intended primarily to provide an overview of ethnic diversity in the Philippines based on an integration of demographic, geographical, anthropological and historical data. Groups are not equally described in detail, since information and data on every group vary in quantity, quality and availability. On this basis, certain groups have been preselected for convenience in analysis in subsequent chapters.

The Nature of Ethnicity: A Review

Defining an Ethnic Group

A basic difficulty encountered in comparative studies of ethnic groups is one of definition. An ethnic group has been most frequently defined as a collection of people distinguishable from other groups by having in common one or more of certain characteristics, namely, religion, racial origin, national origin, language and cultural traditions.²

This definition remains the most commonly used research definition. Several conceptual problems have been advanced, however, and these have led

² Melvin M. Tumin, "Ethnic Group," in J. Gould and W.L. Kolb, eds., *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences* (New York: Free Press, 1964), pp. 243-244; and Raoul Naroll, "On Ethnic Unit Classification," *Current Anthropology* 5 (1964): 283-312.

to extensive discussions on the meanings and functions of ethnic groups. On the whole, the problems which have been raised do not suggest any definite revisions of meaning; they are critiques of various interpretations which have been attached to this traditional definition.

In general, this traditional definition has guided ethnographic work which has been criticized as being too static, simplistically descriptive and nothing more than a taxonomy of trait inventories particular to each group. Some Philippine ethnographic research may be considered to be of this sort. A critical stance is generally taken against the assumption that ethnic groups are mutually exclusive units developing in isolation from one another; rather, ethnic boundaries are maintained not by differences *per se* but by the social significance given to these differences. Social contact between groups maintains the boundaries. Similarly, Patterson emphasizes that what is critical about an ethnic group is not the particular set of symbolic features distinguishing groups but the social uses of these features.³ In actual research, Campbell and LeVine have proposed the use of questions on "own group identity" as a relatively unbiased approach to discovering the levels of most salient group identification.⁴

Thus it appears that critiques of definition are actually an expose of problems encountered in locating ingroup-outgroup boundaries. Moreover, one major focus of this critical assessment is the prevailing practice among researchers of using a common feature of differences in separating groups that are to be compared, whether or not this applies equally to the groups. For instance, a comparison between Thai ethnic groups and Pilipino ethnic groups should not perhaps be based on linguistic differences alone; while both may be differentiated according to linguistic differences, Thai ethnic groups are more meaningfully bound by descent rather than language.⁵ Indeed, group differences vary qualitatively and widely within each society, between societies and at different historical periods.⁶

3 Orlando Patterson, "Context and Choice in Ethnic Allegiance: A Theoretical Framework and Caribbean Case Study." In N. Glazer and D. Moynihan, eds., *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975).

4 Donald T. Campbell and Robert A. LeVine, "A Proposal for Cooperative Cross-cultural Research on Ethnocentrism," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 5 (1961): 82-108.

5 Charles F. Keyes, "Toward a New Formulation of the Concept of Ethnic Group," *Ethnicity* 3 (1976): 202-213.

6 Pierre van den Berghe, *Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative Sociology* (New York: Basic Books, 1970); Zubaida, op.cit.

Related Concepts

The emergence of ethnic groups as a category of social grouping in the social sciences was attended by the rise of a constellation of related concepts in the literature, the most notable of which are ethnic attitudes, stereotyping, ethnocentrism and prejudice. Studied independently or jointly, the relationships among these concepts are immediately clear. Two assumptions implicitly or explicitly underlie the usage of these concepts. First, there is always some consciousness among members of the ethnic group about his sense of belonging to the group. Group consciousness is assumed to be basic to ethnocentrism, ethnic identity, prejudice or even stereotyping. Secondly, it is apparent that the study of ethnicity is frequently not conceived neutrally: usage of the concepts is charged with social concern for real or potential sources of group conflicts. The prevalence of an applied approach has been noted by many writers and must indeed have been the important source impetus for sustenance of active research in the field.⁷

Ethnic identity refers to the identification of a person with an ethnic group. Basic group identity is composed of primordial affinities and attachments and it is as distinct from all other multiple and secondary identities people acquire because unlike others, its elements are what make up a group.⁸ Ethnic identity thus comprises many dimensions which may be grouped into two basic categories: (1) structural dimensions, generally referring to identification characteristics arising from the social structure of one's group, for example, language and kinship; and (2) attitudinal dimensions, referring to beliefs and practices held by the group, like those pertaining to interethnic perceptions and religion. There is no body of literature written directly about the explicit measurement of ethnic identity. In practice, however, self-reports either used singly or in combination with secondary data are made use of in assessing the structural dimensions of ethnic identity, while traditional survey methods of attitude measurement are used in the measurement of its attitudinal dimensions.

A group's sense of ethnic identity or belonging presupposes the group's *ethnic attitudes* towards other groups. This has often been referred to as

⁷ George E. Simpson and John M. Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

⁸ Harold R. Isaac, *Idols of the Tribe: Group Identity and Political Change* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975).

intergroup attitude, often discussed in terms of cognitive, affective and cognate elements.⁹

When cognitive beliefs about an ethnic group become simplified, generalized, rigidified and insufficiently based in fact, they are labelled *stereotypes*.¹⁰ According to Katz and Braly, cognitive beliefs become fixed impressions which conform very little to facts they represent.¹¹ The conceptual work of Lippman and the methodology described by Katz and Braly have served as models for most of the subsequent theories and empirical work on the cognitive component of ethnic attitudes. This is also found to be true in Philippine studies on ethnic attitudes. Katz and Braly's paradigm consists of a trait selection task attributed to different ethnic groups. Therefore, operationally, cognitive beliefs about an ethnic group usually consist of a description of particular patterns of traits commonly assigned to the group. The patterns of trait assignment are usually fairly consistent over time.

The evaluation of interethnic attitudes has invited the greatest degree of social concern. The concepts of ethnocentrism, prejudice and discrimination are evaluative labels signifying pejorative and potentially destructive consequences of group identity, thereby calling for vigilant attention and remedial solution.

The term *ethnocentrism* was initially used to refer to a dichotomized "we-group" and "others-group" outlook that ethnic groups basically maintain. This classic definition of ethnocentrism may be best described as a syndrome involving a polarized sentiment of loyalty, integration and positive self-regard towards ingroup members in contrast to derogatory stereotype and hostility towards outgroup members. It is reflected in LeVine and Campbell's more recent formulation of ethnocentrism as "covering both the ingroup-outgroup polarization of hostility and the self-centred scaling of all values in terms of group folkways." In other words, one's own group is viewed as the centre of everything and all other groups are scaled and rated with reference to it.

9 M.B. Smith, "The Personal Setting of Public Opinions: A Study of Attitudes Toward Russia," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11 (1947): 507-523; and B.M. Kramer, "Dimensions of Prejudice," *Journal of Psychology* 27 (1949): 389-451.

10 Walter Lippman, *Public Opinion* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922).

11 D. Katz and K.W. Braly, "Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 28 (1933): 280-290.

LeVine and Campbell, inferring from selected social science theories on intergroup relations, provide a large body of propositions hypothesized to be predictive of variations in ethnocentrism both within and between social groups.¹² Realistic group conflict theories, for instance, propose that group conflicts are rational or realistic outcomes when groups have incompatible goals and are in competition for scarce resources.¹³ External conditions, for example, geographic distance between groups, are recognized as producing variations in ethnocentrism.¹⁴

Social anthropological theories of conflict, on the other hand, assert that most individuals are members of more than one group and that the ordering of loyalties to these groups has significant implications for the solidarity of the entire ethnic group.

Prejudice and *discrimination* are perhaps the most stigmatized of the evaluative manifestations of interethnic attitudes, partly owing to the volume of research that has been devoted to these phenomena. Prejudice has been used in different senses by different authors. Three major defining criteria have been suggested: (1) violation of a norm of rationality, occurring in the form of prejudgement, overgeneralization, stereotyped thinking and rigidity in modifying opinions in the face of new evidences or on account of individual differences; (2) violation of the norm of justice when ethnic groups are treated in an unequal manner such as in discrimination; (3) deviation from the norm of "human heartedness" which signifies lack of humane acceptance of others expressed in rejection, indifference and hostility.

Aside from subscribing to the idea that prejudice occurs when one or more of the above norms are violated, other authors have preferred to think

-
- 12 Robert A. LeVine and Donald T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behavior* (New York: Wiley, 1972).
 - 13 Leslie A. White, *The Science of Culture: A Study of Man and Civilization* (New York: Farrar, Straus, 1949) and "The Concept of Evolution in Cultural Anthropology," in *Evolution and Anthropology: A Centennial Appraisal* (Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, 1959); Lewis A. Coser and B. Rosenberg, eds., *Sociological Theory: A Book of Readings* (New York: Macmillan, 1957); and Kenneth E. Boulding, *Conflict and Defense: A General Theory* (New York: Harper, 1962).
 - 14 H. Zimmer, *Philosophies of India* (New York: Pantheon Bollinges, 1951); and L.F. Richardson, *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* (London: Stevens, 1960).

of prejudice in terms of degrees and kinds. For example, Williams distinguishes between prejudices based on functional differences in the social order or real differences in value and those emphasizing stereotypes centred on symbolic elements that are of no functional significance such as skin colour.¹⁵ Williams conceives of prejudices as a blanket term covering a wide variety of concrete forms which may be mild or intense, for example, prejudice against groups with which one has no contact in contrast to prejudice with contact groups, or prejudice based on social conformity as against prejudice anchored in deep aggressive hostility. A unified theory explaining the origin of prejudice is still lacking in spite of the voluminous literature on the subject.

Previous Studies on Ethnicity and Fertility

Population research in the West, particularly in the U.S. has concentrated on differences in fertility behaviour among ethnic groups.¹⁶ In general, data from these studies show that different patterns of fertility behaviour are exhibited by different ethnic groups, for example, American blacks display higher fertility than American whites, while Catholics in Northern Ireland have higher fertility than those in the Republic. Data in this series of studies have been interpreted in the context of majority-minority status as well as social, demographic and economic characteristics.

Two arguments have been contrasted as competing explanations of differential fertility between majority and minority groups. The "assimilationist" perspective claims that the fertility of the majority population and that of the minority become similar as social, demographic and economic characteristics of these populations become similar. Also known as the "characteristics hypothesis", it has construed the higher fertility of blacks in America as having arisen from

15 Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947).

16 Clyde Vernon Kiser, et al., *Trends and Variations in Fertility in the U.S.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968); Charles F. Westoff, et al., *Family Growth in Metropolitan America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961); Robert E. Kennedy, Jr., "Minority Group Status and Fertility: The Irish," *American Sociological Review* 38 (1973): 85-96; and Robert E. Roberts and Eun Sul Lee, "Minority Group Status and Fertility Revisited," *American Journal of Sociology* 80 (1974): 503-523.

characteristics of social class, education and mobility that are associated with minority status.¹⁷

The "minority group status" hypothesis is an alternative explanation that has been proposed on the basis of empirical data which did not support the assimilation hypothesis. It was shown that, when social demographic characteristics are controlled, fertility differentials are not eliminated.

The relative efficiency of these two hypotheses was tested by Sly, with results supporting both explanations, that is, (a) minority-group status exercises an independent effect on fertility, and (b) minority group status and certain structural factors interact to affect fertility.¹⁸ The inconsistency in results borne by Sly's study has been reexamined in a later study with the general conclusion that ethnicity has effects on fertility independent of other dimensions.¹⁹ In their paper, Roberts and Lee took note that data used in previous studies were cumulative fertility data and no attention was given to the confounding effects of generational differences, for example, the fertility of younger minority women more closely reflects the dominant group pattern than older minority women. Lack of statistical control on age at first marriage, as well as employment status, was also suggested as weaknesses in Sly's paper. On more basic grounds, it was likewise noticed that none of the earlier papers specified definitions or measures used in locating minority groups.

Defining minority groups and specifying ethnic conditions resulting in differential fertility are relevant issues. Kennedy defines a minority group as "any distinct group comprising less than 50% of a total population."²⁰ Numerical share of total population is a convenient index, though quite remote from more popular sociological definitions. In the latter case, minority

17 M.G. Smith, "Social and Cultural Pluralism," in Vera Rubin, ed., *Social and Cultural Pluralism in the Caribbean*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 83, Set. 5 (1960); and Ralph Thomlinson, *Population Dynamics* (New York: Random House, 1965).

18 David F. Sly, "Minority-group Status and Fertility: An Extension of Goldscheider and Uhlenberg," *American Journal of Sociology* 76 (1970): 443-459.

19 Roberts and Lee, op.cit.

20 Kennedy, op.cit., p. 35.