

Taking Stock of Philippine Sociology: Arresting Declines and Mapping New Directions

VIRGINIA A. MIRALAO AND MANUEL P. DIAZ

Writing in the early 1990s on *The future of social sciences in the Philippines*, the late Bro. Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, former Chair of the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC), expressed a preference for comparing past and present records (preferably of the kind “which can be quantified and graphed”) as an approach to forecasting (Gonzalez, 1992-1993). He preferred this over the other known approaches at that time, for example, the Delphi Technique which relied on interviews with concerned groups and influentials about their aspirations and predictions of the future. An examination of past and present records allows one to map conditions and trends over time and extrapolate how the future may look like.

Broadly adopting a similar approach, this review of the state of Philippine sociology attempts to compare past and currently available data in two areas that may give us some measure of the “growth” of national (Filipino) capabilities in the discipline. The first area has to do with the human resource base of Philippine sociology, or more specifically, the number of Filipinos trained and schooled in the discipline. This should allow us to see whether or not we have a sufficient pool of

sociologists to ensure the continuity (if not the flourishing) of the discipline in the country. This area has a bearing on the *institutional infrastructure* of sociology as a scientific discipline and whether or not the Philippines has (or is producing) enough sociologists for jobs or tasks that they should be performing for society or the country. The second area has to do with the work or output of the country’s sociologists – in particular, their writings and publications that serve as a measure of their capacity to engage in research and contribute to the production of new knowledge on Philippine social conditions and realities. This area relates more to an *intellectual* dimension to see how much progress has been made in the realm of new ideas and not only in the training of new Filipino sociologists. One supposes that a combination of good training and good ideas pushes a scientific field of study or a discipline forward.

This review has three sections. The first two focus on the local training and schooling of Filipino sociologists and on the membership of the Philippine Sociological Society to describe current infrastructural support for the discipline. The third looks at the *Philippine Sociological Review (PSR)* as a vehicle of intellectual expression of local

sociological research, thinking and analysis. In comparing past and present trends, this review also draws attention to factors that bring about changes in the national and global scene that may account for continuities and/or disruptions in the development of Philippine Sociology as a profession and academic discipline.

THE LOCAL TRAINING AND SCHOOLING OF PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGISTS

Assessments of the future of the Philippine social sciences done at various times in the past (Hollnsteiner, 1973; Makasiar-Sicat, 1976; Bulatao et al., 1979 and Gonzalez, 1992-1993) generally predicted that Philippine sociology would exhibit continuing but modest progress over time. This was in contrast to the much brighter futures predicted for some of the other member-disciplines of PSSC particularly, economics, social work, psychology, statistics, public administration, and communications, owing to the stable, if not growing, demand for these disciplines. Data on the employment of Filipino social scientists in the 1970s, for example, showed substantial and rising proportions of Filipino economists, social workers, psychologists, statisticians, and public administration and communication professionals employed outside of academe, or in government, private industry and business (Bulatao et al., 1979). Consequently, these disciplines attracted large numbers of students. Filipino sociologists, on the other hand, along with their colleagues in anthropology, political science, history, linguistics, and geography were employed almost entirely in colleges and universities, with very few working outside the academe. Enrolment in these latter disciplines therefore, grew slowly.

The modest growth of Philippine sociology was seen to come from the expansion of the country's university curriculum and the size of its higher (tertiary) education sector. During the period of nation-building after World War II, the teaching of a course on Philippine Social Life among university students was deemed a natural assignment for sociologists (Hollnsteiner, 1973;

Makasiar-Sicat, 1976). Later in the 1970s, the imposition of mandatory courses in the college curriculum such as Taxation, Land Reform, Population Education and the New Constitution increased the demand for social science faculty including sociologists (Bulatao et al., 1979). Moreover, the subsequent inclusion of introductory courses in sociology, history, political science, economics and psychology into the core curriculum or in liberal arts programs further assured sociologists of a place in universities (Abad & Eviota, 1983), even as the expected growth of the higher education sector itself as a result of rapid population growth would multiply the demand for sociologists (Gonzalez, 1992-1993).

True to the foregoing forecasts, recent data obtained from the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) on the number of Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs) and those offering degree programs in sociology—along with the size of their enrolments and number of graduates—reveal large increases since 30 to 40 years ago. Formed in 1994 as the lead agency for Philippine higher education, CHED reports that the country today has over 2,000 colleges and universities, 96 of which are listed as offering an undergraduate (Baccalaureate) degree program in sociology.

In contrast, in the 1970s, Bulatao et al. (1979) cite that the country had fewer than a thousand (924) HEIs of which nine to 15 were offering degree programs in sociology. Except for the University of the Philippines-Diliman which had 42 undergraduate- and 31 graduate- sociology majors in Academic Year (AY) 1974-1975, data on enrolments and graduates by discipline were hard to come by at that time.

Today, CHED's data on enrolments and graduates by discipline/degree program remain far from accurate owing to the delay and/or failure of many HEIs to submit their reports. Still, data from some 37 reporting HEIs (out of the 96 with sociology undergraduate programs) provide some indication of the increases in college enrolments and graduates in the discipline. The figures in Table 1 show that these 37 HEIs had a combined

enrolment of between 2,500 to over 4,000 sociology undergraduate majors each AY from 2004/05 to 2008/09. Together, these 37 HEIs also graduated between 400 to 600 sociology majors annually during AYs 2004/05 to 2008/09. Though underestimates, these figures already illustrate how the expansion of Philippine higher education has induced increasing numbers of students to major in the field, and likely become college teachers of sociology and related social science courses.

The University of the Philippines (UP)-Diliman (whose undergraduate sociology enrolment has tripled or quadrupled since the 1970s) remains a major provider of undergraduate sociology training in the country, but several other state universities also now have a steady number of AB sociology enrollees and graduates. As shown in Table 1, these include the other UP campuses in Los Baños, Iloilo and Tacloban, the Mindanao State University (MSU) in Iligan and General Santos, the Mariano Marcos State University in Ilocos Norte, Isabela State College, Bukidnon State University, and Polytechnic University of the Philippines in Metro Manila. Among private universities, those with sizeable numbers of sociology majors are the Mount Carmel College campuses in Baler, Aurora and Negros Occidental, the Bicol University System, and the University of Santo Tomas in Metro Manila. The 37 HEIs are also dispersed throughout the country, so that even as these continue to be disproportionately located in Metro Manila, students interested in majoring in sociology can actually find an institution of higher learning offering this in their own regions.

While the foregoing trends attest to the growth of sociology undergraduate programs following the proliferation of HEIs in the country, comparable data on the enrolments and graduates of MA and PhD sociology programs do not show the latter to have kept pace with growing university undergraduate enrolments in the discipline. In the preceding three to four decades, the number of HEIs offering a master's degree in sociology increased from four (UP Diliman, Ateneo de Manila University (ADMU), Asian Social

Institute (ASI), and Xavier University, see Bulatao et al., 1979) to 11 in 2008/09 (see Table 2). Joining the original four universities are three universities in the Visayas (Central Philippine University, Silliman University, and University of San Carlos) that had benefited from the research training and institutional strengthening programs of PSSC in the 1980s, and UP Los Baños, MSU-Iligan and Visayas State University in Tacloban. Of the 11 HEIs, UP Diliman registered the highest enrolment of MA Sociology students with between 26 to 67 enrollees annually from AYs 2004/05 to 2008/09, followed by ASI and ADMU. In terms of graduates, however, ASI produced the most number of master's degree graduates— some 50 of them over the five academic years from 2003 to 2008 as against the 10 each graduated by UP Diliman and ADMU, and the nine and eight graduates produced respectively by MSU-IIT and UP Los Baños over the same period.

In general, the number of MA Sociology graduates comprises a very small fraction of current enrolments, suggesting a high degree of attrition or that most MA students do not finish their degrees. From 2003 to 2008, the 11 HEIs offering a master's degree in sociology produced fewer than 100 graduates. Over half of these MA Sociology graduates moreover, obtained their degrees from Manila-based ASI which has a significant number of foreign students and which tailors its graduate sociology program towards its application to social development issues or development management concerns (see ASI website). Under a Ford Foundation regional (Asian) scholarship program that it administered in 1998-2007, the ADMU's Department of Sociology and Anthropology also produced 24 MA Sociology graduates, 13 of whom were other Asians and a fewer 11 Filipinos. Interestingly too, this same scholarship program produced some 89 MS Social Development graduates, more than the Department's MA Sociology (24) and MA Anthropology (34) graduates combined. It is worth noting then that (1) a number of the country's MA graduates, who are foreigners, cannot be expected to augment the country's own pool of sociologists;

Table 1 Number of Enrolees and Graduates of Sociology Undergraduate Programs by Reporting Universities and Region, Academic Years 2004/05 to 2008/09

Higher Education Institutions	Enrolment					Graduates				
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Region I										
Mariano Marcos State University - Main	91	95	80	62	40	7	5	9	12	10
Region II										
Isabela State University - Cabagan	107	34	35	32	-	26	11	11	12	-
Our Lady of the Pillar College - Cauayan	5	5	4	2	-	-	2	1	2	-
Region III										
Mount Carmel College-Baler	128	82	82	55	55	40	20	20	31	31
CALABARZON										
Batangas State University-Main	1	1	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-
University of the Philippines - Los Baños	-	190	222	222	210	-	60	27	27	38
Region V										
Bicol University-Main	139	162	-	-	-	31	25	-	-	-
Bicol University-Daraga Campus	160	-	172	166	155	30	-	29	25	42
Camarines Norte State College-Main	99	84	114	151	190	44	66	25	47	53
Region VI										
Kabankalan Catholic College	-	3	-	18	6	-	7	-	7	9
Mount Carmel College	46	38	38	20	22	15	15	15	5	2
University of the Philippines-Visayas	-	-	30	30	13	-	-	5	5	5
Region VII										
Silliman University	88	85	76	138	109	-	4	4	4	5
University of San Carlos	16	16	19	-	10	10	10	4	-	1
Region VIII										
University of Eastern Philippines	-	153	96	96	96	14	18	11	11	11
University of the Philippines in the Visayas Tacloban College	-	31	31	31	-	-	16	16	16	-
Region X										
Bukidnon State University	1,823	-	-	1,090	1,000	-	180	114	-	167
Central Mindanao University	39	13	12	9	12	-	-	-	-	-
Valencia Colleges	-	16	23	10	11	-	6	1	9	1
Xavier University	-	-	-	40	-	12	-	-	11	-
Mindanao State University - Iligan Institute of Technology	149	159	159	161	152	36	31	30	37	36
Region XI										
Ateneo de Davao University	23	22	27	40	40	6	2	5	3	3
Assumption College of Davao	18	11	26	9	9	5	3	6	-	-
Region XII										
Mindanao State University-General Santos	152	130	130	130	135	15	15	15	15	22
Notre Dame University	45	44	215	44	34	9	7	13	5	7
NCR										
Asian Institute for Distance Education	3	3	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	2
Polytechnic University of the Philippines	231	179	205	205	236	45	38	40	40	35
St. Joseph's College of Quezon City	1	1	3	-	-	1	1	1	-	-
University of Santo Tomas	-	-	-	136	139	-	-	-	30	20
University of the Philippines-Diliman	430	142	195	195	118	112	44	32	32	2
ARMM										
Mindanao State University-Marawi	60	60	60	-	-	6	6	6	-	-
Caraga										
St. Paul University Surigao	-	13	5	4	6	-	7	6	2	2
MIMAROPA										
Western Philippines University-Palawan	108	148	109	81	31	-	-	-	29	29
Western Philippines University-Busuanga	-	9	55	65	56	-	-	-	-	-
Western Philippines University-Culion	-	74	80	91	73	-	-	-	-	-
Western Philippines University-Quezon	70	74	64	66	68	-	-	-	15	14
Western Philippines University-Puerto Princesa	-	213	154	212	71	-	-	-	35	-
Grand Total	4,027	2,257	2,491	3,475	3,147	482	607	451	463	567

and (2) the increasing popularity of applied degree programs in sociology (and the other social sciences), in response to the rise of civil society movements worldwide since the 1990s, has shifted graduate training resources (faculty time, scholarships) away from the liberal arts tradition and the specialization thrust of sociology as an academic discipline. Holders of graduate degrees in applied fields of sociology/social sciences are known to join international aid agencies and financial institutions, civil society organizations or the government upon graduation rather than universities.

Local capacity-building at the PhD level has been even more limited. In the 1970s, only two universities (UP Diliman and Xavier University) had PhD offerings in sociology, and since then only one other university (ADMU) has been added to this list. These three HEIs registered a combined annual enrolment of between 16 and 32 PhD sociology students each AY from 2004/05 to 2008/09. The number of graduates during roughly the same period consisted of a much fewer eight PhDs, with Xavier University graduating six, and UP Diliman, two (see Table 2). ADMU still has to produce a graduate from its PhD sociology program, established in 1994.

One notes that the generally limited number of MA- or PhD-trained Filipino sociologists may itself reflect a declining capacity on the part of the country's sociology departments/programs to produce a successor generation for the discipline. Citing a research done by Zarco in the 1970s, Bulatao et al. (1979) write that UP MA sociology students took seven years on the average to earn their degrees. This does not seem to have improved appreciably over the years. Today, most MA sociology students at UP Diliman are still known to exceed the maximum residency requirement (or MRR) of five years and to request for an extension of this prior to completing their degrees.

Given the above developments, the forecast of Abad and Eviota (1981) that Philippine sociology would transition in the 1980s towards "indigenization" or producing and training its own professionals (following the exit of American

sociologists who helped establish the discipline in Philippine universities in the 1950s and 1960s and the return of foreign-trained Filipino sociologists in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s) may have been too optimistic. Although the sociology departments with graduate programs are already based in the Philippines' premiere HEIs (UP Diliman, UP Los Baños, ADMU, MSU-Iligan and Xavier University), they are hard pressed to produce Filipino sociologists in sufficient numbers and quality to replace colleagues who have retired or passed away and to meet new evolving demands on the discipline. The country's graduate sociology departments and programs can probably benefit once again from the infusion of external teaching and training resources—as in the form of exchange or visiting professors from abroad, or fellowships/scholarships to train Filipino sociologists in foreign universities.

In brief, it seems imperative that measures are found to strengthen sociology graduate departments and programs in the Philippines, since their inability to produce enough sociology scholars holds rather dire implications for the further development of the discipline in the country. The most serious implication will be felt in current undergraduate sociology programs which are likely to proliferate in sub-standard condition with the unregulated expansion of HEIs.

In the 1990s, an assessment of the teaching of sociology in the country showed that sociology courses in most HEIs were taught not only by faculty members without graduate degrees but who did not even major in the discipline (Bautista, 1994). This situation has changed little to this day. By CHED's own admission, two-thirds of faculty members in the country's HEIs have no advanced degrees even as the Commission has set as a minimum standard that faculty members for tertiary-level instruction must hold a master's degree in the fields/programs that they teach.

Relatedly, the foregoing quality-deficit in sociology undergraduate teaching is seen in the poorly conceived AB Sociology curriculum being offered by HEIs and in the poor quality of textbooks used in introductory courses of the

Table 2 No. of Enrolees and Graduates of Sociology Graduate Programs by Reporting Universities and Region, Academic Years 2004/05 to 2008/09

MA										
Higher Education Institutions	Enrolment					Graduates				
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
CALABARZON										
University of the Philippines - Los Baños	-	10	7	8	4	-	4	1	1	2
Region VI										
Central Philippine University	7	-	4	-	5	-	-	1	-	1
Region VII										
Negros Oriental State University- Main Campus	7	3	3	-	-	1	2	1	-	-
Silliman University	9	7	2	4	3	-	1	-	1	-
University of San Carlos	-	-	5	7	5	-	-	-	1	-
Region VIII										
Visayas State University	-	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	-
Region X										
Xavier University	-	-	-	9	9	-	-	-	-	-
Mindanao State University - Iligan Institute of Technology	-	9	12	11	9	-	2	-	2	5
NCR										
Asian Social Institute	58	37	10	5	39	5	17	14	7	7
Ateneo De Manila University- Quezon City	13	20	15	13	6	2	3	2	1	2
University of the Philippines- Diliman	67	26	64	64	49	-	4	2	2	1
Grand Total	161	106	121	120	131	8	33	21	14	18
PhD										
Higher Education Institutions	Enrolment					Graduates				
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Region X										
Xavier University	8	-	5	9	8	2	3	1	-	-
NCR										
Ateneo De Manila University- Quezon City	3	6	2	6	2	-	-	-	-	-
University of the Philippines- Diliman	21	10	17	17	18	-	2	-	-	-
Grand Total	32	16	24	32	28	2	5	1	-	-

discipline. CHED has also sponsored the drafting of an undergraduate (and graduate) curriculum in sociology by a technical panel of professional sociologists which seeks to promote the creation, transmission and utilization of sociological theories and methods in social analysis. However, this remains a draft to the present time and has yet to be adopted by HEIs. Hence, with the exception of the undergraduate sociology programs of the country's better universities (e.g.,

UP Diliman and Los Baños, Xavier and MSU-Iligan), there is much apprehension over the standards and content of sociology undergraduate programs in the country. An indication of this may be seen in the textbooks prepared and used for Introductory Sociology, one of which is titled *General sociology, culture and family planning*. A reading of this text readily shows a most superficial treatment of the theories and methods that define the discipline. It is neither intellectual nor thought-

provoking. Like many other textbooks that are prepared to comply with mandated guidelines, the contents of *General sociology, culture and family planning* reflect a concern with topics considered by government, other organized groups and growing public opinion as the pressing issues of the day (e.g., family planning, poverty alleviation, globalization, nationalist development alternatives etc.). For the most part, the treatment of these issues/topics remains shallow and hardly contributes to an informed and critical understanding of social phenomena and processes.

Finally, a word should be said about strengthening the country's sociology graduate departments/programs not only to raise the quality of undergraduate instruction in the discipline, but to meet the research functions expected of sociologists. It is generally agreed that through research, a scientific discipline can grow and produce new knowledge, information and publications to assist in the common effort of uplifting human conditions. But given a very narrow resource base, one cannot expect Philippine sociological research to prosper quickly in coming years. The limited number of Filipino sociologists with MAs or PhDs and who are based in universities complain of heavy teaching loads and low salaries and their lack of time and incentives to pursue their own research interests. Further compounding this has been the rise of contract/commissioned research, noted globally to have weakened research scholarship in Third World universities even as research capacities and a research culture have yet to develop in these institutions of higher learning (Nwaka, 2000). As shown by Ducanes' article in this volume (see pp. 184 to 195), the higher-paid research and development work of international funding/aid agencies as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and UN agencies has drawn graduate students away from completing their master's and/or doctoral studies, and social scientists from engaging in the kind of basic and independent research associated with universities. Contract or donor-driven research thus, has caused the equivalent of an internal brain drain, leaving

HEIs with a shortage of trained social science expertise to foster research within the halls of academe.

THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY (PSS)

Earlier state-of-the-art reviews of Philippine sociology also took note of the number of practicing Filipino sociologists from the lists or directories of social science professionals compiled by PSSC for each of its member-disciplines. In 1976, 83 names appeared under sociology in the list, which ranked a poor second to the many more names (329) under economics; while all the other disciplines as political science, psychology etc. had fewer than 83 names each (Bulatao et al., 1979). In 1991, PSSC's *Directory of social science practitioners in the Philippines* listed some 114 names for sociology, showing an increase of 31 over the 15-year period since 1976. In preparing these lists and directories, PSSC sought to include the names of those engaged in teaching and/or research or in technical jobs or occupations using the knowledge and skills of their respective disciplines.

For the current period, this review consolidated the Philippine Sociological Society's (PSS) list of paying members from 2004 to 2009 to have some sense of the size of the country's community of sociologists and how this may have grown over time. Here, it should be noted that when PSS was incorporated in March 1963, it also counted among its members anthropologists, demographers and colleagues from other fields that still had no professional associations of their own. At the time of its founding, PSS's main objectives were to encourage the study of sociology and anthropology, disseminate research results emanating from the disciplines, and improve the teaching and instruction of both sociology and anthropology courses in the universities (a number of which had, and still have, joint sociology-anthropology departments). PSS also took over the publication of the *Philippine Sociological Review* (see next section) and managed various forums including the Society's annual national sociological

congresses/conferences. Outside of the sociology departments and programs based in universities, PSS provides about the only other infrastructure for forming a community of sociology professionals and researchers in the country. It shares with university-based departments the task and mission of moving Philippine sociology forward by ensuring adequacy in the numbers, and quality in the training and work of Filipino sociologists. PSS's list of paying members from 2004 to 2009 yielded a total of 232 names, of which a fewer 189 had some additional information on their majors and highest educational attainment and/or their current positions and institutional affiliations.

Table 3 presents the composition of PSS members by their highest degree attained and major discipline and expectedly, we note that the majority of PSS members majored in the discipline (103 out of 189). Another fourth (46) obtained their

degrees in other social science disciplines as anthropology, social work, political science, demography, psychology and other member-disciplines of PSSC, as well as philosophy and Philippine and Asian Studies. Still another fifth (40) majored in related applied fields as social development, health social science, development studies, education, environment and management sciences.

Leading the 103 PSS members who majored in the discipline are 27 PhDs, most of whom obtained their doctorate degrees in sociology from universities abroad (see Table 4, primarily from US universities but also from universities in the UK, Germany, Canada and Australia). Only nine of PSS's PhD Sociology members obtained their degrees in-country, since there are only three Philippine universities offering doctoral programs in the discipline. With a few exceptions, PSS's PhD Sociology members are based in universities or

Table 3 PSS Members by Highest Degree Attained and Major Discipline

Major Discipline	Highest Degree Attained			ALL
	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's	
Sociology	27	53	23	103
Other Social Sciences	16	23	7	46
Other Applied Fields	13	26	1	40
ALL	56	102	31	189

Table 4 PSS Members who Majored in Sociology by Highest Degree Attained, University Attended, and Current Institutional Affiliation

	Highest Degree Attained			ALL
	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's	
University Attended				
Foreign University	18	5	0	23
Local University	9	45	15	69
No data	-	3	8	11
ALL	27	53	23	103
Current Affiliation				
University	20	47	17	84
Other Academic	4	-	1	5
Government	2	2	-	4
NGO	1	1	1	3
International Aid Agencies	-	1	0	1
Private Institution	-	-	1	1
No data	-	2	3	5
ALL	27	53	23	103

other academic bodies (e.g., the National Academy of Science and Technology). But though the majority of them continue to teach and/or do research in academic settings, it should be mentioned that a number of PSS's prominent PhD members are retired who continue to practice their profession in an emeritus capacity or in a post-retirement position. Finally, only 10 HEIs in the country benefit from the expertise of these PhDs—with UP Diliman and ADMU having the greater number of PhD Sociology holders among their faculty. These findings demonstrate the need for additional Filipino sociologists with advanced PhD degrees to replace those who are retired or retiring, and to reach the many universities in the country with sociology course/program offerings.

The more typical PSS member is a locally-trained MA Sociology graduate (see Table 4). Only five of the 53 MA Sociology members of PSS earned their degrees abroad, while the greater number earned their master's from UP Diliman, ADMU and ASI, and some others from MSU-Iligan, Central Philippine University and UP Los Baños. Again, the majority (47) of these MA holders are currently teaching/working in universities: nine each at UP Diliman and ADMU and the remaining 29 distributed among 20 other HEIs across the country. It is worth noting that four of these MA holders are currently pursuing their doctorate degrees in foreign universities (two at the National University of Singapore and two at the University of Birmingham, UK). Their return to the country in the next few years will do much to boost the pool of trained Filipino sociologists.

We basically see the same pattern among the AB Sociology members of PSS. They received their baccalaureate training locally, specifically from the three leading Philippine universities with better undergraduate degree programs in the discipline: UP Diliman, UP Los Baños and MSU-Iligan. With a few exceptions, they currently work in universities teaching Introductory Sociology and other social science courses in the General Education curriculum. As with their PhD and MA counterparts, their services are spread rather too thinly across several universities nationwide. The

17 university-based AB Sociology members of PSS currently work or teach in nine different universities.

Comparable data on the non-sociology majors among PSS members are shown next in Table 5. As mentioned earlier, these members have been categorized into (1) those majoring in other social science disciplines under PSSC's fold including philosophy/theology and area studies; and (2) those majoring in related applied fields as social development, health social science, education and management. It is not surprising that under the first category, PSS still counts several (10) anthropologists and some demographers among its members. (It will be recalled that PSS began as an association of the country's sociologists and anthropologists, while demography continues to be treated as a subfield of sociology even as it has branched out as a separate field of specialization.) PSS also has members from almost all the disciplines under PSSC—psychology, social work, political science, geography, public administration, and communications. In the second category, PSS members include as many as 19 educators, several other health social scientists, environment and development experts, and management professionals. The diverse disciplinary backgrounds of PSS members suggests that sociological studies and discussions (as those that transpired in PSS national conferences or contained in *PSR* publications) are of interest to others outside the boundaries of the discipline. It is also known of course that some PSS members trained in sociology are themselves members of other professional disciplinary organizations. Broadly, one can look at the multiplicity of the backgrounds of PSS members and the sometimes interlocking membership among disciplinary associations as reflecting a move towards interdisciplinarity in recognition of the value of interdisciplinarity exchange and borrowing (or of the fact that each discipline has much to gain from learning the theories and findings of other disciplines).

Except for the PhD members of PSS who majored in anthropology, demography, geography and philosophy and who earned their degrees

Table 5 Non-sociology Majors who are Members of PSS by Highest Degree Attained, University Attended, and Current Institutional AffiliationMajors of other Social Science Disciplines

University Attended	Highest Degree Attained			ALL
	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's	
Foreign university	8	4	-	12
Local university	8	19	7	34
ALL	16	23	7	46
Current Affiliation				
University	14	19	3	36
Other academic (NAST, ICSI, PSSC)	1	2	1	4
Government (DFA, Congress)	-	1	-	1
International Aid Agencies	1	1	-	2
No data	-	-	3	3
ALL	16	23	7	46

Majors of other Applied Fields

University Attended	Highest Degree Attained			ALL
	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's	
Foreign university	-	10	-	10
Local university	13	16	1	30
ALL	13	26	1	40
Current Affiliation				
University	13	19	1	33
Government (DFA, Congress)	-	1	-	1
NGO	-	2	-	2
Private Institution	-	1	-	1
No data	-	3	-	3
ALL	13	26	1	40

from foreign universities, all the other non-sociology majors among PSS's membership with advanced degrees earned theirs from local universities. Interestingly, too, all the PhD holders in the applied fields (see Table 5 above) obtained their degrees locally, suggesting that graduate degree/doctoral programs in the country cater more to the applied fields of the social sciences than to the basic science or academic side of the disciplines.

Like the sociology majors among PSS members, the large majority of the non-majors are currently teaching or working in universities. The 69 university-based non-majors are to be found in some 35 different colleges and universities in the country.

In sum, the membership records of PSS show that the number of Filipino sociologists has grown over the years, although as noted earlier, this growth lags behind the continuing expansion of student enrolments and sociology program offerings in Philippine universities. The large majority of the Society's over 200 members teach and work in universities but their presence and services are spread too thinly among the country's numerous HEIs. Hence, with the exception of the few universities with better established sociology departments and several sociologists among their faculty (as UP Diliman, ADMU, Xavier University), one can hardly speak of a critical mass of sociologists or of PSS members in any one of the HEIs with sociology program offerings. Often,

there is only one PSS member coming from a university, as Isabela State University for example, which has a sizeable enrolment of undergraduate sociology students. But even more revealing is the fact that PSS has no members from some of the HEIs with the largest undergraduate enrolments in sociology as Bukidnon State College, Camarines Norte State College, and the Western Philippines University in Palawan. Reaching out or finding ways to engage the sociology faculty and programs of these universities may be a worthwhile undertaking for PSS. This may open possibilities for joint review, with concerned HEIs, of their sociology curriculum and textbooks for the purpose of upgrading the standards of sociology undergraduate education in the country.

THE PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW (PSR)

The *Philippine Sociological Review (PSR)* is the official journal of PSS and the major venue for publishing sociological (and sociology-related) articles in the country. *PSR*'s first volume was issued in 1953. Records show that it was planned to be a quarterly journal. However, for various reasons, the association found it difficult to sustain a quarterly publication. In fact, it was only in 1979 that PSS released four issues (per year) of the journal. On the other hand, *PSR* was published bi-annually, or two issues per year for only six years (1977, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1989 and 1998). No issue of the journal was released at all in 1990. Between 1991 and 2008, the period covered by this review, the PSS put out one issue of *PSR* per year, except in 1998 when the society released two issues.

In 2008, the Board of Trustees of PSSC, of which PSS is a member association, adopted new policies on membership. For monitoring purposes, PSSC enjoined member-associations to inform the Membership Committee of the number of journal issues they were to publish every year and the time(s) of release of these issues. Penalties were to be imposed on associations that fail to meet these commitments. Thus, after a thorough review of *PSR*'s publishing history, the number of manuscript submissions in the recent past, and

PSR's current editorial capabilities, the PSS Board decided that the Society can reasonably put out only one issue a year. It was decided to officially make the *PSR* an annual (rather than a quarterly) publication and set its release date in December.

During the 18-year period covered by this review, 19 issues of *PSR* were published, containing a total of 144 articles, or an average of seven to eight articles per issue. By focusing on the articles published in the journal during these two decades, this review hopes to assess the knowledge-producing activity of professionals in Philippine sociology and provide a fuller description of the questions that Filipino sociologists ask and the topics or themes that they study and write about.

Authorship

The 144 articles that appeared in the *PSR* between 1991 and 1998 were first analyzed in terms of authorship—whether these were written by one individual or jointly written by two or more authors. Table 6 shows that an overwhelming majority of the contributions to the journal between 1991 and 2008 (127 out of 144 articles or 88.2%) were authored by one person, while only 17 (11.8%) by two or more authors. These figures suggest that those who contribute to the *PSR* conduct individual, rather than collaborative, studies.

Table 6 Type of Authorship of Articles Published in the *Philippine Sociological Review*, 1991-2008

Type of Authorship	Number of Articles	Percent
by 1 author	127	88.2
by 2 authors	11	7.6
by 3 authors	5	3.5
by 4 authors	1	0.7
Total	144	100.0

The papers with multiple authorship were those on (1) crime and deviance, most of which were jointly authored by a senior member of the sociology faculty of UP Diliman and his students; and (2) on environment/social ecology, a field

which likely benefits, more than other sub-specializations, from interdisciplinary/collaborative work. Most of the contributions in this latter area came from UP Los Baños.

On the other hand, the listing of authors of the 144 articles published in the *PSR* yielded a total of 168 names owing to cases of joint or multiple authorship. Closer examination, however, reveals only 133 individual contributors as a number of authors contributed more than one article during the period under consideration. Table 7 below shows the number of papers contributed by these 133 individual authors to the *PSR*.

The large majority of authors submitted only one article for publication (or only one of their submissions was published). Nine (9) authors had two of their articles published, while eight others contributed three or more articles.

Contributors were also categorized by geographic location. It was noted first, whether they came from the Philippines or a foreign country. The regional location of the Filipino contributors was determined, that is, whether they came from Luzon, the Visayas or Mindanao. The results of these analyses are shown in Tables 8 and 9.

Expectedly, most of the articles published in *PSR* were contributed by local authors (106 out of 168 or 63%). Surprisingly however, quite a large number of articles were contributed by foreign authors (62 or 37%), although the latter includes some Filipino professionals who at the time that their articles were published were on sabbatical in a foreign institution; graduate students pursuing advanced degrees in universities outside the Philippines; and expatriates now temporarily or permanently residing outside the Philippines. These foreign/foreign-based authors came from the USA, Singapore, Japan, the UK, and Australia.

On the other hand, the overwhelming majority (92%) of the 106 Filipino or locally-based authors came from Luzon, primarily from Metro Manila and some from Regions 2, 4A, and 5. The three authors from the Visayas were from Regions 6, 7, and 8, while the five from Mindanao were from only two regions—Region 10 and ARMM.

Table 7 Number of Articles Contributed by Authors to the *Philippine Sociological Review*, 1991-2008

	Number of Articles contributed	Percent
Authored/Co-authored One Article	116	87
Authored/Co-authored Two Articles	9	7
Authored/Co-authored Three Articles	3	2
Authored/Co-authored Four Articles	2	2
Authored/Co-authored Five Articles	3	2
Total	133	100

Table 8 Location of Contributors to the *Philippine Sociological Review*, 1991-2008

	Number of Authors/Contributors	Percent
Local	106	63
Foreign	62	37
Total	168	100

Table 9 Regional Location of Local Contributors to the *Philippine Sociological Review*, 1991-2008

	Number of Authors/Contributors	Percent
Luzon	98	92
Visayas	3	3
Mindanao	5	5
Total	106	100

Institutional affiliation

In terms of institutional affiliation, Table 10 shows that a large (72%) majority of the local contributors were based in universities or academic institutions. However, a significant number—29 out of 106 Filipino authors or some 28 percent—were doing research outside of these traditional sites of knowledge production. These new sites include government agencies and nongovernment institutions including development agencies, civic and business organizations, and research institutions based outside academe.

In contrast, a larger proportion of the foreign contributors were based in academe or institutions of higher learning—92 percent versus 72 percent for local authors, leaving only eight percent (or five) of the foreign authors based outside of HEIs versus 27 percent for local authors. Most of the foreign contributors from the academe chose the Philippines or some aspects of Philippine society as their areas of specialization; whereas those based outside academic institutions were connected with development agencies or nongovernment organizations.

The figures above show, too, that compared with the past when most research was conducted within universities and other institutions of higher learning, there has been a steady growth in the volume of research being conducted outside of academe, primarily those funded or commissioned by intergovernmental development agencies or international financial institutions. While this trend may not be detrimental to the production of sociological knowledge per se—after all, it can be

argued that knowledge is knowledge wherever it is produced—it has been noted that, in fact, “... the growth of these bodies does not result in as big as an improvement of knowledge... Instead of boosting research capacity and orienting quality knowledge production... funding practices deplete them by privileging short-term studies which do not facilitate the accumulation of knowledge and theorization” (Mweru, 2010: 111). Moreover, this “marketization of research” may aggravate the problems of the quality of sociology undergraduate teaching and graduate training (as we have pointed out earlier) since those who presumably possess the requisite qualities to train students in scientific research—and engage them in social scientific theorizing—are drawn more and more to commissioned research that are non-academic in character.

Academic affiliation of contributors

Regionally, it was earlier noted that the local contributors to the *PSR* came mostly from Metro Manila and a few Luzon provinces. But looking at the institutional affiliation of the 77 local contributors from academe, an equally skewed distribution of institutions is noted. Table 11 reveals that local contributions came from only 14 universities in the country. Moreover, 80 percent of these contributors came from only three institutions: UP Diliman, ADMU, and UPLB. Four out of five local contributors from the academe were based in these three universities.

Table 11 further shows that the number of articles contributed by authors from UP Diliman is more than twice the number of articles contributed by authors from ADMU and UPLB combined (33 vs. 29). However, if we look at articles by single authors (see Table 12), we see that UP Diliman and ADMU almost have the same number of contributions (18 from UP Diliman vs. 15 from ADMU). In fact, all of the 15 contributions from ADMU had a single author versus seven single-authored papers (out of 14) from UPLB.

These figures also imply that 45 percent (13 out of 33) of the papers contributed by UP Diliman were jointly authored which is roughly the same

Table 10 Type of Institutional Affiliation of Philippine Sociological Review Contributors, 1991-2008

	Number of institutional affiliation	Percent
LOCAL		
Academe	77	72
Development Office/Agency	2	3
Private Organization	5	5
Research Institute	8	7
Religious Institute/Organization	2	2
Civic Organization	9	8
Government Office	2	2
Business Organization	1	1
Total	106	100
FOREIGN		
Academe	57	92
Research Institute	3	5
Development Office/Agency	1	2
Unknown/Unidentified	1	2
Total	62	100

Table 11 Academic Affiliation of Local Authors, 1991-2008

	Number of Authors	Percent
University of the Philippines-Diliman	33	42.09
De La Salle University	3	4.09
Asian Institute of Management	1	1.09
Ateneo de Manila University	15	20.09
Miriam College	1	1.09
University of the Philippines-Los Baños	14	19.84
Visayas State College of Agriculture	1	1.09
Xavier University	3	4.08
Central Philippine University	1	1.09
Philippine Public Safety College	1	1.09
Marawi State University-Iligan Campus	1	1.09
University of the Philippines-Cebu	1	1.09
Cagayan State University	1	1.09
University of the Philippines-Manila	1	1.09
Total	77	100.00

Table 12 Type of Authorship by Contributors from UP Diliman, ADMU, UPLB, 1991-2008

	Articles with single author	Percent
University of the Philippines-Diliman	18	45.0
Ateneo de Manila University	15	37.5
University of the Philippines-Los Baños	7	17.5
Total	40	100.0

proportion—50 percent—as the number of jointly-written articles (seven out of 14) from UPLB. Put differently, more contributors from UP Diliman and UPLB engage in collaborative research and studies than contributors from ADMU. The latter do not seem to do collaborative research at all, or, if they do, they contribute single-authored papers and articles to the *PSR*.

Areas of study

In addition to authorship, the various themes/topics/sub-areas of social science discussed in the articles appearing in *PSR* from 1991 to 2008 were also reviewed. Many of the issues of the journal were on particular themes. Of the 19 issues

included in this review, 13 were themed issues. These themes are shown in Table 13.

Using the foregoing themes as the initial categories, the articles appearing in the non-themed issues were then examined and a longer list of themes or topics was arrived at. The article categories could have been collapsed further, but it was not undertaken to highlight the importance that a number of contributors put on a particular topic. For example, “Social Capital” could have been subsumed under “Nature, Scope, & Practice of Sociology” but it was retained as a separate category to show that the topic has generated some attention in a particular institution: all the contributions to the particular issue were written by members of the faculty and graduate students of ADMU’s Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Indeed, some of the “strengths” of some institutions are reflected in their contributions to the journal. Most of the contributions on environment and ecology, for example, came from UPLB whereas those on crime, delinquency, and social deviance were from UP Diliman.

Topically, migration and migrants were the primary focus of the contributions to *PSR* during the period under review, accounting for 24 or 17 percent of the 144 articles, followed by social change, development, and globalization with 16 articles (11%). In descending order, the other topics focused on in the *PSR* articles were family and households, disasters and disaster management, crime, delinquency and social deviance (12 papers each); NGOs/civil society (9); urbanization and cities (8); and environment and ecology, science and technology, and computer mediated interactive communication technologies (7 each); gender (5); social capital (4); politics (3); Mindanao studies, religion and children (2 each); ethnicity and education (one each).

The articles, however, were not just about one thing/topic/theme/concept. They also deal with at least one other topic/theme/concept with many in fact dealing with more than two topics/concepts.

Table 13 Social Science Themes Discussed in *Philippine Sociological Review* Issues by Year

Year	Theme
1991	Sociology of Development
1993	Philippine NGOs
1994	Family
1995	Crime and Social Deviance
1996	Filipinos as Transnational Migrants
1997	Mindanao Studies
1998 (1-2)	(Re)Imagining Sociology Beyond the 1990s
1998 (3-4)	The Globalization and Urbanization of Cities
2002	Environmental Discourse
2003	Disasters, Coping with Disasters, and Disaster Management
2005	Social Capital
2006	The Culture and Practice of Science and Technology in the Philippines
2007	Computer Mediated Interactive Communication Technology (CMICT)

In terms of secondary focus therefore, 34 (23.6%) of the 144 articles were found to deal with the nature, scope and practice of sociology (See Table 14). Included here were papers that addressed some aspect of theory and methodology, illuminated a concept, or posited hypotheses drawn from other studies, even as they primarily dealt with some substantive issues such as poverty or the impact of migration. Social change, development, and globalization was the second concern of 23 papers (15.97%), while ethnicity and race, politics, NGOs/civil society, and gender were the secondary topics of a fewer number of contributions [12 (8.33%), 11 (7.64%), 12 (8.33) and 9 (7.24%) respectively].

The secondary themes of the second largest number of papers (26, 9.3%) could not be subsumed under the categories used for classifying primary topics. Thus, they are listed under "Others," and these included such themes as social stratification (6), values (4), health and medicine (3), media and social institutions (2 each), and conflict management, microcredit, and human rights (1 each). Among those classified under "Others" were four papers that did not deal with any topic other than the primary one. Three (out of 4) of these focused largely on theoretical and conceptual issues while the fourth was a purely descriptive narration of a single social phenomenon.

To arrive at a clearer picture of the themes of articles and to mitigate the possibility of too subjective a judgment of primary topics, the results of analysis of primary and secondary themes (see Table 14) were combined. Only a little over 15 percent of the papers dealt in some way with theoretical issues—situated observations and observed patterns within a wider context of theory and research, or extrapolated observations outwards in an attempt to further theory. In other papers, theory that informed observations and observed patterns was largely implicit, whereas the large majority of papers simply presented observations or described patterns of social phenomena. They presented documentation but very little explanation.

Only two other topics were the focus of a large number of papers—social change, development and globalization (13.5%) and migration and migrants (9.7%). The other topics (NGOs and civil society and education) were the concern of much fewer number of contributions.

In a similar review of articles published in the *PSR* between 1953 and 1979, Abad and Eviota (1981) found that the topics most written about then were ethnic communities or cultural minorities, ethnic relations (54 articles out of 438), followed closely by economic development and social change, including evaluation of action programs (51 articles). Thirty articles were

Table 14 Topics of Articles Published in the *Philippine Sociological Review*, 1991-2008

Topics	Primary	Secondary	Total	Percent
Migration and Migrants	24	4	28	9.72
Social Change, Development and Globalization	16	23	39	13.54
Family and Households	12	2	14	4.86
Disasters and Disaster Management	12	0	12	4.17
Crime, Delinquency and Social Deviance	12	0	12	4.17
Nature, Scope, & Practice of Sociology/Theory & Method	10	34	44	15.28
NGOs/Civil Society	9	12	21	7.29
Urbanization and Cities	8	0	8	2.78
Environment and Ecology	7	1	8	2.78
Science and Technology	7	6	13	4.51
Computer-Mediated Interactive Communication Technology	7	0	7	2.43
Gender	5	9	14	4.86
Social Capital	4	0	4	1.39
Politics	3	11	14	4.86
Mindanao Studies	2	1	3	1.04
Religion	2	2	4	1.39
Children	2	1	3	1.04
Race and Ethnicity	1	12	13	4.51
Education	1	0	1	0.35
Others	-	26	26	9.03
Total	144	144	288	100.00

published on family, kinship, socialization and religion, including folk rituals and folk beliefs (18 and 22 articles respectively), most of which were written between 1960 and 1969.

It can be noted then that interest in social change continued to be high since *PSR*'s first issue in 1953. It was the topic with the second largest number of papers in 1953-1979 (11.6%), as it was in 1991-2008. (11%). Migration and migrants, which was the topic of the largest number of papers in the current 1991-2008 period, was not even included as a category in Abad and Eviota's scheme although they may have subsumed it under other headings. The increased interest in migration and migrants since the 1980s, including transnational Filipino identities, reflects the currency of Filipino migration and the increased deployment of Filipino workers overseas under globalizing conditions. These two themes—social change and migration—were the primary concerns of 40 or 27.8 percent of the 144 articles published in 1991-2008.

The decline in the number of articles on particular topics between 1953-1979 to 1991-2008 may be attributed in part to the formation of new disciplinary associations and the launching of new disciplinary journals by these associations. For example, Ugnayang Agham Tao (Anthropological Association) which was founded in 1978 most likely attracted articles for *AghamTao*, the anthropology journal, by anthropologists writing on folk rituals and folk beliefs, ethnic or cultural minorities, and ethnic relations. *AghamTao* began publishing in 1978. Thus, from 35 papers (out of 438) between 1953 and 1979, papers on religion dropped to only two (out of 144) in 1991-2008. Practically no paper on ethnic communities was contributed to the *PSR* in 1990-2008, whereas there were 51 such contributions in 1953-1979.

The drop in the number of papers published in language and linguistics may also be attributed to the formation of a new association for linguists. The Linguistic Society of the Philippines was organized in 1970 and it launched its journal,

Philippine Journal of Linguistics on the same year. Correspondingly, the number of *PSR* articles on language and linguistics dropped from 19 in 1953-1979 to nil in 1991-2008.

What these figures suggest, then, is that during its first 30 years, *PSR* was not only a journal of sociologists but also the platform of publication of specialists from other disciplines such as anthropology, linguistics, and political science. This may not be surprising since, as earlier noted, *PSR* was one of the few social science journals in existence at that time. It was, as well, launched not only by sociologists but specialists from other social disciplines who also organized the Philippine Sociological Society. The journal then was truly a multidisciplinary journal. It remains to be one, continuing to attract contributions not only from sociology but from anthropology, political science and psychology as well, although in less significant numbers now than in the first three decades of its existence.

But the major difference perhaps between the earlier 1953-1979 period covered by Abad and Eviota's review and the present one (covering the period 1991-2008), is the decline in the number of articles published in the *Philippine Sociological Review*. Abad and Eviota counted 438 articles published in the *PSR* during those 27 years while only 144 articles were published during the 18 years covered by this review. Put differently, between 1953 and 1979, *PSR* published an average of 16 articles a year, whereas in 1991-2008, there were only eight articles (or half of the average between 1953 and 1979) per year. This decline can be partially attributed to the availability of other journals as noted earlier, where one could more appropriately publish works on particular topics.

It has also been observed that as universities began offering financial incentives for publishing in ISI-listed or internationally refereed journals, increasing numbers of faculty members have also been aiming to publish in such journals and have begun submitting manuscripts owing to the monetary rewards attached to an ISI-listed publication. However, the effect of this on the number of submissions to the *PSR* has at best been

marginal, as has the launching of journals by other social science associations. Abad and Eviota's review show that submissions to the *PSR* had been slowly declining. Dividing the years 1953-1979 into three periods, their data show that *PSR* averaged some 13 articles per year in 1953-59, 18 in 1960-69, and 16 in 1970-79. We then counted the number of articles between 1980 and 1990 (not including Abad and Eviota's and this review) and we found that during this period, *PSR* averaged 10 articles per year. This declined further to eight articles during the period covered by this review, 1991-2008. As already noted, those who have served as *PSR* editors can attest to the difficulties in putting out new issues because of the insufficient number of submissions. Even those papers deemed deficient in scholarly rigor had to be considered. Colleagues and graduate students were prodded to produce and submit articles for publication in the journal. As a consequence of the lack of quality submissions, issues were often released way past their publication dates.

To address this alarming situation, PSS had taken several measures to hone scholarly skills of its members. It had conducted, in cooperation with PSSC, training sessions and workshops on research as well as writeshops to encourage young social scientists particularly those from outside Metro Manila to do research, write, and submit their productions to the journal. These efforts, however, have yet to bear fruit. Meanwhile, those tasked to edit the journal must work to encourage not only a greater number of manuscript submissions but more so, quality output for *PSR*, from among the country's sociologists and other social scientists.

The lack in quantity and quality of manuscripts submitted to the *PSR* does not necessarily mean a real decline in the research and knowledge outputs of Filipino sociologists. As already mentioned, several other social science journals have been launched in the last few decades, in addition to the increasing number of new international journals that aim to be global and which therefore seek out materials and articles from contributors around the world. No doubt, there are some Filipino sociologists who have

published in these other journals and which were not taken into account in this review. But until such time that a more thorough assessment of the articles and other publications produced by Filipino sociologists nationally and internationally is undertaken, it cannot be ascertained whether the decline in *PSR* issues and articles is indicative or not of a palpable decline in knowledge production among Filipino sociologists.

WHERE TO NEXT?

This review began with the task of tracking the progress of Philippine sociology in the last 30 to 40 years, focusing specifically on issues bearing on the continuity and sustainability of sociological practice in the country. Hence, the review concerned itself primarily with the human resource training of a successor generation of Filipino sociologists, and with the institutional infrastructures that support the training of Filipino sociologists (universities), the professional community of sociologists (the Philippine Sociological Society), and the publication of the work and writings of the country's sociologists (the *Philippine Sociological Review*).

Using various data on Philippine universities offering degree programs in sociology and the size of their enrolments and graduates as well as other data on the membership of the Philippine Sociological Society and the articles in the *PSR*, this assessment of the discipline reveals the following findings and conclusions.

- Fueled by the rapid expansion of Philippine tertiary education in recent decades, sociology undergraduate education in the Philippines has also grown quite rapidly. Today, there are over 90 HEIs (as against 9 to 15 in the 1970s) offering a bachelor's degree program in the discipline with annual enrolments reaching to thousands and an annual crop of around 400 to 600 AB Sociology graduates. (Relative to other social science disciplines, however, as economics, psychology, social work, communications and public administration, the growth in sociology undergraduate

education is quite modest, in view of the much higher demand for the former social science disciplines outside academe.) HEIs offering sociology undergraduate programs are found in all regions of the country, although for the most part, these remain concentrated in the National Capital Region and in Luzon.

- The growth in sociology graduate education in the country (at both MA and PhD levels) however, has not kept pace with the rise in the discipline's undergraduate education. From four HEIs in the 1970s, the number of HEIs with master's degree program in sociology has less than tripled (to 11) in the current period, while the number of those with PhD programs increased from two to three HEIs. Those with MA programs registered a combined annual enrolment of 128 sociology majors on average over the Academic Years 2004/05 to 2008/09, while at the PhD level, the comparable enrolment figure stood at 26 doctoral students per year over the same academic years. Very few MA and PhD sociology students complete their degrees. In the last five years, local HEIs produced only some 94 MA Sociology graduates and 10 PhD Sociology graduates, roughly translating to around 10 percent and eight percent respectively of current enrolment in MA and PhD sociology programs.
- There are indications moreover, that the few MA and PhD graduates in the discipline are absorbed by the same universities that produced them as UP Diliman, UPLB, ADMU, Xavier, MSU and ASI. Consequently, this widens the divide between the leading universities with sociology programs and the greater number of HEIs offering undergraduate sociology courses/programs taught by faculty members with no more than a bachelor's degree in sociology, or by others who did not major in the discipline. This lack of graduate-trained sociology faculty in HEIs has caused apprehensions over the quality of sociology undergraduate education in the country. The questionable standards of

Philippine AB Sociology programs are reflected likewise in the ill-conceived and poorly-written textbooks used in Introductory Sociology courses. Sociology undergraduate programs in the country therefore may simply be reproducing mediocrity in the discipline.

- Membership in the PSS has also grown in absolute numbers led by some 27 PhD holders in the discipline (most of whom trained in universities abroad) and a larger number (103) of locally-trained MA Sociology graduates. It is worth noting that for the most part, this core of PSS members continues to teach or work in universities. Not a few of the PhD holders however, have retired or will soon be retiring, raising questions regarding their replacements in coming years.
- A significant number of PSS members are non-sociology majors who obtained their advanced degrees in other social science or applied development fields. This is so because at its founding, PSS served as the joint association of sociologists, anthropologists and demographers. Even as these latter fields now have their own associations, PSS still counts a number of them among its members, in addition to some psychologists, social workers, environmental scientists and development specialists.
- Although PSS members and the diversity of their disciplinary backgrounds have increased over the years, PSS membership remains concentrated in the few leading universities with sociology program offerings. Several of the HEIs with large undergraduate enrolments in sociology do not have faculty members who are affiliated with PSS and hence, may have little opportunity to learn and benefit from the professional ties and activities of PSS.
- There has been a drop in the quantity (and perhaps also in the quality) of manuscripts or articles submitted to *PSR* in the last two decades. Only an average of eight articles per year was issued by *PSR* from 1991 to 2009 as against an average 16 articles per year between 1953 and 1979, and some 10 articles annually

from 1980 to 1990. A substantial number (over a third) of the articles appearing in recent *PSR* issues moreover, were contributed by foreign academics or Filipino scholars based abroad. Local contributions to *PSR* come from authors based in only 14 HEIs and with only three universities (UP Diliman, ADMU, and UPLB) accounting for nine out of 10 articles published. There may be several reasons behind the drop in journal articles. One is the emergence of new journals and publications both locally and internationally which may be competing for the articles authored by Filipino sociologists. A second reason may be the decline of independent, university-based researchers following the rise of commissioned research by governments and international development and funding agencies through consulting firms which then hire researchers from academe or the universities. Because this kind of research typically ends up in reports used primarily or solely for the donors' purposes, this hardly finds its way into articles submitted to peer-reviewed professional or academic journals. Consulting or commissioned research therefore may be engaging Filipino sociologists in research activities but not necessarily in writing and publishing articles that build on and contribute to the knowledge base and tools of the discipline.

In general, the foregoing findings do not augur well for the discipline's sustainability in the long term, and point to the need for strong and/or massive human resource capacity building to address current shortfalls and meet new and emerging demands on the discipline. Capacity building measures are needed to arrest likely declines in (1) the numbers or pool of highly-trained Filipino sociologists; (2) the quality of sociology undergraduate education in the country; and (3) the number and quality of article submissions to the *PSR* and related social science publications. Capacity building measures, if undertaken now, will place Philippine sociology in a better footing to contribute, as much as it

potentially could, to understanding and managing current problems and challenges.

Because of the central role that university graduate sociology programs play in the training of the country's sociologists, capacity building puts a very heavy responsibility on the few graduate sociology departments that we have, e.g., as those at UP Diliman, UP Los Baños, Ateneo de Manila University, Xavier University, Silliman University, University of San Carlos, and Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology. Other than their probably difficult battles within their respective universities to maintain their units and defend their budgets, graduate sociology departments must double their efforts to raise the completion rates of their MA and PhD students. Among their many duties, they have to prioritize the recruitment, advising and mentoring of young bright minds into the discipline from whom one might expect successor generations of Filipino sociologists.

In partnership with the Philippine Sociological Society, graduate sociology departments may also wish to initiate the conduct of sustained and/or regular training programs in the teaching of sociology to improve the quality of sociology undergraduate instruction in the country. This effort may be taken a step further to include the challenging but creative task of developing academically-sound and updated Introductory Sociology textbooks for Philippine HEIs.

PSS too, can assist in upgrading the quality of sociology undergraduate education by seeking or recruiting members across HEIs nationwide, and

improving the Society's connectivity particularly with those HEIs with large and/or stable undergraduate enrolments in the discipline.

Additionally, PSS may wish to capitalize on the multiplicity of the disciplinal/professional backgrounds of its members to push the discipline in the forefront of inter/multidisciplinary collaborations and studies. As a general science of society, sociology (more than perhaps other social science disciplines) tends to look at the many dimensions of social processes and phenomena, thereby attracting the interests of specialists from other disciplines. The current push towards interdisciplinarity in the study of increasingly global and complex phenomena (like climate change) makes sociology an attractive anchor in the social sciences.

But the most daunting challenge that Philippine sociology faces today maybe addressing the dearth of Philippine sociological research and publications. Clearly, this cannot be addressed well and systematically without enlarging the supply of highly-trained Filipino sociologists. As we have noted earlier, the country's pool of sociological expertise is already quite overworked with teaching, advising, administrative and other assignments in the university. A few make time to do research on their own or via consultancy and fewer still write and publish their studies or research. For Philippine sociological research and publications to blossom, there is no escaping the immediate task of schooling significant numbers into the discipline to meet the growing demands on the discipline.

REFERENCES

- Gonzalez, A., FSC (1996). The future of social sciences in the Philippines. *PSSC Social Science Information*, 20(4) - 21(1), October 1992-March 1993. Also reprinted in *PSSC Social Science Information*, 24(3-4).
- Hollnsteiner, M.R. (1973). The state of social science in the Philippines. *PSSC Social Science Information*, 1(1).
- Makasiar Sicat, L. (1976, January). *The state of teaching and research in the social sciences in relation to the development needs of the Philippines*. Paper delivered at the First Conference of the Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC), Tehran, Iran.
- Bulatao, R.A., Felipe, A.I., Gonzalez, A.B., FSC, Gutierrez, C.L., Obias, M.D., Salamanca, B.S., & Zablan, Z.C. (1979). A profile of the Philippines social scientists. *First Southeast Asian workshop of social scientists*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.
- Abad, R.G. & Eviota, E.U. (1981). Philippine sociology in the seventies: Spinning out of the colonial cocoon. In L.M. Sicat, P.R. Jimenez, W.V. Villacorta, R.G. Abad, R.P. Alonzo & D.B. Canlas (Eds.), *Social science research activities in the Philippines* (Joint Research Program Series No. 25). Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies.
- Bautista, M.C.R.B. (1994). Reflections on Philippine sociology in the 1990s. *Journal of Philippine Development*, XXI (1-2).
- Nawaka, G.I. (2000). Higher education: The social sciences and national development in Nigeria. *Prospects: Education in Asia*, 30(3), September.
- Philippine Social Science Council (1976). *Directories of social science practioners*. Quezon City: Author.
- Philippine Social Science Council (1991). *Directories of social science practioners*. Quezon City: Author.
- Mweru, M. (2010). Why Kenyan academics do not publish in international refereed journals. *World social science report 2010*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Social Science Council.