

# Value Orientations of Central Philippine University Faculty \*

*Macario B. Ruiz*

This study aimed to gather information on the value orientations of the faculty members at Central Philippine University. Incidentally, it should be mentioned that this is just one of the many facets of the preparation of instruments of measurement designed for institutional self-analysis.

But why study the value orientations of teachers in this school? Isn't this an exercise in futility, particularly in the context of a pluralistic society. What have these orientations got to do with their work as teachers?

If we consider the fact that value orientations are in the center of the attitudinal domains in psychological space, and if these "give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of acts and thoughts as these to the solution 'common human' problems" [Kluckhohn, et al:1961], it is entirely possible that these values will affect the teachers' attitude towards their students, the subject matter they are teaching, and more importantly, towards the concomitant learnings that they intentionally or unintentionally impart daily.

---

\*First of two studies by Dr. Macario Ruiz on value orientations of Central Philippine University faculty and students.

DESIGN OF STUDY. This design is a modification of Kluckhohn and Stroetbeck [Kluckhohn, 1961], with adaptations from Mead [Mead, 1970], ideas from Lynch [Lynch, 1962], Gorospe [Gorospe, 1966], and Weber [Weber, 1958]. It adopts four of five value orientations known to be universal in application. The fifth is on the nature of man, the postulated variations of which are (a) man is by nature good, (b) man is by nature bad, and (c) man is a mixture of good and bad. It was thought that this dimension does not have as much relevance to behavior as the other four. These four are explained below.

(1) *Man-Nature Orientation*. This refers to one's attitude towards nature or the environment. It has three postulated variations.

(a) *Subjugation to nature*. Some people believe that nature controls man, that he is a slave to his environment, that destiny is pre-determined.

(b) *Harmony with nature*. Others would go for this second variation, that man and nature co-exist, are in harmony, that both are part of the same ecology, neither of which should control or be controlled by the other.

(c) *Mastery over nature*. Those who are of this persuasion would control, change, or modify nature or the environment. This kind of life-style is, to them, the essence of progress.

Whichever variation an individual prefers, his position lies somewhere between the extremes of each variation. It is possible, too, that at one time or another, depending upon the circumstances and emotional set-up, his attitude may shift from one variation to the other, but with a good instrument, his orientation *in general* can be determined.

Item 25 of the questionnaire illustrates the variations of this value orientation.

Man should

(a) let his environment control him. (Subjugation)

(b) live in harmony with his environment. (Harmony)

(c) improve his own environment. (Mastery)

(2) *Activity Orientation*. This refers to a person's attitude towards human activities. There are three postulated variations, as in the case of the first value orientation:

(a) *Being*, which implies a spontaneous expression of what is conceived to be given in the personality, a release and indulgence of present desires. A person of this persuasion,

TABLE 1.0

## Value Orientations and Their Postulated Range of Variations

Orientation	Postulated	Range	of	Variations
Man-Nature	Subjugation to Nature (Su)	Harmony with Nature (Ha)	Mastery over Nature (Ma)	
Activity	Being (Be)	Being-in-becoming (Bd)	Doing (Achievement) (Do)	
Relational	Lineality (Li)	Collaterality (Co)	Individualism (in)	
Time	Past (Pa)	Present (Pr)	Future (Fu)	

like the epicurians, would "eat drink, and be merry, for tomorrow, he will die." He would enjoy life, which, after all is short, and such enjoyment comes only when his desires have been satisfied. Basically, his frame of reference in the things he does is the self.

(b) *Being-in-becoming*, which implies a control of desire by means of meditation and discipline, sternness of character. The goal of the person of this persuasion is "to become," rather than "to be." Like the Taoist or the Buddhist, he controls his desires. He seems to live by the philosophy that the good man is a bad man if he remains just good: but the bad man is the good man if he tries to become good.

(c) *Doing* (Achievement), which implies a measurable accomplishment achieved by acting upon persons, things, or situations. The believer of this variation, like the pragmatist, says that the test of the pudding is in the eating. By the same token, the test of goodness is the activity, the process of achieving.

This item from the questionnaire illustrates this value orientation:

What do you think is a preferable attitude toward life?

- (a) Enjoying life, which is short after all. (Being)
- (b) Trying to become a worthy man. (Being-in-becoming)
- (c) Trying to achieve something great that will remain after death. (Achievement)

(3) *Relational Orientation*. This represents value orientations on a person's relationship to other men. It has three postulated variations:

(a) *Lineality* is a principle in human relationships, which comes both from age and rank. The young are supposed to respect, obey, and accept the authority which resides in those who are older - the children in relation to their parents, in turn to their own parents, the subordinate in relation to the boss, the led to the leader. This is an institutionalized culture pattern, which, we are told, is necessary for organizational continuity. One sees this manifested in Chinese traditional society and in military organizations.

(b) *Collaterality* is a principle of human relationship in which each individual is a part of the social order. The preference for group authority over person authority, for majority rule over rule of a single person is evident in this variation of relational value orientation. In short, relationship is laterally extended (horizontal) rather than lineally (vertical).

(c) *Individualism* is a principle of human relationships in which each individual in the society is responsible for himself, that the autonomy of the individual is the important thing. People of this persua-

sion are "inner-directed, or "self-directed," they want to follow their own life-style, and do not really care what others say.

An item which illustrates the variations of this relational value orientation is:

Which of these do you think is the most important in life?

- (a) To be trusted by superiors. (*Lineality*)
- (b) To be trusted by fellow workers. (*Collaterality*)
- (c) To be confident of oneself. (*Individualism*)

(4) *Time Orientation*. This relates to one's preference towards problems that have to do with time. It has also three postulated variations.

(a) *Past*, as one variation, consists in preferring traditionalism of family, nature, and emphasis on the historical heritage.

(b) *Present*, means that people of this persuasion tend to give more preference to things of the present and to pay little attention to what has happened in the past and to regard the future as vague and unpredictable. "Act in the living present," as the poet says, would seem to be the guiding philosophy of these people

(c) *Future*, means looking forward to the future to be "bigger and better," since this is their expectation, the "futurist" would plan for it.

Here is an item which is designed to measure these variations:

More efforts should be given to

(a) reviewing one's past. (Past)

(b) improving the present life. (Present)

(c) preparing for the future. (Future)

#### THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES.

The following were the research hypotheses: (1) As a group, the teachers are oriented primarily to the mastery-over-nature variation of the Man-Nature value orientation dimension. The basis of this hypothesis is that the group consists of college graduates, and we assumed that they are relatively free from the life-style of traditional and primitive societies and have been exposed to the influences of modernity in an agro-industrial economy.

(2) As a group, the teachers are equally "future and present" oriented, rather than "past" oriented. The Filipino, as an Oriental and

Malayan, lives in and for the present; however, he has been influenced by Occidental countries, which are, for the most part, "future" oriented /Lee, 1972/. It was suspected that both these dimensions of the time orientation would prevail in our culture, more or less, in equal measure.

(3) As a group, the teachers are "doing" (achievement) oriented, rather than "being-in-becoming" or "being" oriented. This is true in the case of modern or semi-modern cultures, particularly those which are materialistic.

(4) As a group, the teachers are "individualism" oriented, in preference to the other two variations of the relational dimension. The basis of this hypothesis is the fact that most of the respondents are reared in a democratic society - at least relatively - and since this is so, the primacy of the individual is stressed, as it is in most democratic countries. The negative ramifications of such common utterances in the dialect as "Iya kalag, iya bakero," "Bisan maguba ang langit, basta indi lang ako ma-ipit," also had some bearing on the adoption of this research hypothesis.

*The sample.* One hundred and sixty-five teachers out of 183, made up the sample, representing 90 per cent of the total number in the faculty. Those who did not follow the directions on the questionnaires were excluded from the tabulations. There were four of the latter.

**METHOD OF SCORING.** Since there are twelve scales in the instrument, the answer sheets were scored twelve times, three times for each of the four value orientations. Three keys to correction were prepared, each with a "keyed direction" of the first preference. For instance, in the case of time orientation:

**Key 1: With Past as the first preference.** Here if the respondent ranked the "Past" variation as 1, the respondent was given three points for the particular item; if he ranked it 2, he was given 2 points; and if he ranked it 3, he was given one point. His total score would thus be the sum of the points on the ten items. Let us say he ranked as 1 all the items with Past variation as specified in the key to correction, his score would be a maximum of 30 ( $3 \times 10 = 30$ ). On the other hand, if he ranked all the ten items, 3, his score would be 10 ( $1 \times 10 = 10$ ). Similarly, if he ranked the ten items 2, his score would be 20 ( $2 \times 10 = 20$ ).

**Key 2: With Present as the first preference.** The same procedure was followed, except that in this case, the *Present* variation was given a weight of 3. If, for example, the respondent ranked an item of this category 3, he would be given a score of 1 on this item; if he ranked it 2, he would be given a score of two; and if he ranked it 1, he would be given a score of 3 on this item.

**Key 3: With Future as the first preference.** The same procedure was followed with the *Future* variation as the first preference.

It is thus possible to compare the scores of a respondent in the three postulated variations of each value orientation. For instance, the scores of one respondent are as follows:

Future Variation - - - - 20

Present Variation - - - - 24

Past Variation - - - - - 16

Within the limitations of probability, errors of measurements, and sampling, the "orientation" of this respondent on time value orientation is the present. He tends to give preference to things of the present as against the future or the past.

**FINDINGS.** The findings are reported in the tables below.

**Man-Nature value orientation.**

Table 3. 1a  
 Distribution of Scores on Postulated Variations  
 Man-Nature Orientation

Scores	Mastery Over Nature (Ma)	Harmony with Nature (Ma)	Subjugation by Nature (Su)
30	5	—	—
29	30	—	1
28	36	—	—
27	40	—	—
26	20	—	—
25	11	—	—
24	12	2	—
23	3	6	—
22	2	23	—
21	3	45	1
20	—	41	2
19	—	27	1
18	—	13	3
17	—	5	3
16	1	2	2
15	—	—	11
14	—	—	21
13	1	—	36
12	1	—	35
11	—	—	42
10	—	—	6
N	165	165	165
Median	26.35	20.37	12.50

The data substantiated Research Hypothesis (1), that the teachers as a group are mastery-over-nature

oriented. The differences in the medians (Table 3. 1a) are too big to be attributed to chance or sampling

Table 3. 1a

	Mastery Over Nature (Ma)	Harmony with Nature (Ma)	Subjugation by Nature (Su)
SD	2.63	1.54	2.60
SE <sub>mdn</sub>	.26	.16	.26
SE <sub>d</sub> (Ma-Ha)	.305		
CR(Ma-Ha)	21.00		
SE <sub>d</sub> (Ha-Su)		.305	
CR(Ha-Su)		25.00	
SE <sub>d</sub> (Ma-Su)			.366
CR(Ma-Su)			39.00

Note: All differences of the medians are significant at the 1 per cent level.

errors. Table 3. 1b shows that about 80 per cent of the group have high scores on the "mastery over nature" variation, whereas nearly 73 per cent scored very low on the "subjugation to nature" variation. The conclusion is thus apparent: The group is "mastery-over-nature," "harmony-with-nature," and "subjugation to nature," oriented in that order. They believe in change, but its direction should be charted, that when they find themselves in most difficult situations, they would improve the situation rather than take things philosophically.

The data on this dimension were further analyzed to answer this question: Basically, what is the direction of the differences between each teacher's scores on the mastery-over-nature variation and the second choice, harmony-with-nature variation? What per cent of the teachers are, on the basis of their scores, more harmony-with-nature oriented rather than mastery-over-nature oriented? Are there teachers who had equal scores on both scales? The findings are presented in Table 3. 1a.



Table 3. lb  
 Percentages of Number of Respondents Based on  
 Very High, High, Medium, Low and Very Low  
 Scores – Man Nature Orientation

Scores	Category	Mastery Over Nature (Ma)		Harmony with Nature (Ha)		Subjugation Nature (Su)	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
26 – 30	Very High	131	79.38	—	—	2	1.21
22 – 25	High	28	16.97	33	19.39	1	
18 – 21	Medium	3	1.82	126	76.36	6	3.64
14 – 17	Low	1	.61	7	4.24	37	22.42
10 – 13	Very Low	2	1.21	—	—	119	72.11
Total		165	99.99	165	99.99	165	99.99

Note: The highest possible score is 30; the lowest, 10. The division into five groups, with intervals indicated under "Scores" is arbitrary.

**Time Orientation.** As mentioned in the previous section (Section 1), time orientation has to do with one's preferences to problems or matters that have to do with the past, the present, or the future. The findings on this value orientation are reported below.

The data do not confirm Research Hypothesis (2). It turns out that the teachers as a group are "present" oriented, rather than equally oriented to the future and

the present. The difference between the medians is too big to be attributed to chance or sampling errors. The percentages do not show the same general trend, however, as in the case of the Man-Nature dimension (See Table 3. lb). This time, only about 8 per cent had "very high" scores on the "present" variation, as against 79 per cent in the case of the former. In the instant case, about 53 per cent made scores from "high to very high," whereas in the former 96 per cent made scores on these two categories.

Table 3. 1c  
 Direction of Raw Score Differences Between the  
 Mastery-over-Nature Vs Harmony-with-Nature  
 Variations (Man-Nature Orientation)

Difference	No.	Sub-total	Per Cent	
14	1			Table reads: Ninety-six per cent of the teachers have higher scores on the mastery - over-nature scale than on the harmony - with-nature variation. This represents a significant difference at the 1 per cent level; One teacher had equal scores on both scales; Five teachers or 3 per cent have higher scores on the harmony-with-nature scale than on the mastery-over-nature.
13	2			
12	4			
11	8			
10	9			
9	23			
8	18			
7	26			
6	18			
5	20			
4	13			
3	8			
2	4			
1	<u>5</u>	159	96.35	
	<u>1</u>	1	.61	
- 1	1			
- 2	1			
- 3	-			
- 4	-			
- 5	-			
- 6	-			
- 7	1			
- 8	<u>2</u>	5	3.03	
Total	165	165	99.99	

TABLE 3. 2a  
Distribution of Scores on Postulated  
Variations: Time Orientation

Scores	Future (Fu)	Present (Pr)	Past (Pa)
30	—	—	—
29	1	—	—
28	—	1	—
27	1	3	—
26	1	9	1
25	1	10	1
24	10	15	—
23	4	21	1
22	18	29	—
21	23	24	4
20	31	22	2
19	28	8	6
18	21	8	19
17	9	4	24
16	8	8	34
15	5	2	25
14	2	1	15
13	2	—	16
12	—	—	4
11	—	—	2
10	—	—	1
N	165	165	165
Median	19.74	21.70	16.07
SD	2.58	2.94	2.35
SE <sub>mdn</sub>	.25	.29	.23
SE <sub>d</sub> (Fu-Pr)	.38		
CR (Fu-Pr)	5.6		
SE <sub>d</sub> (Pr-Pa)		.37	
CR (Pr-Pa)		15.0	
SE <sub>d</sub> (Fu-Pa)			.34
CR (Fu-Pa)			10.8

Note: All differences in the medians are significant at the 1 per cent level.

TABLE 3. 2b  
 Percentages of Number of Respondents Based on  
 Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low  
 Scores – Time Value Orientation

Scores	Category	Future		Present		Past	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
26 – 30	Very High	3	1.82	13	7.88	1	.61
22 – 25	High	33	20.00	75	45.45	2	1.21
18 – 21	Medium	103	62.42	62	37.57	31	18.78
14 – 17	Low	24	14.54	15	9.09	108	65.45
10 – 13	Very Low	2	1.21	—	—	23	13.94
Total		165	99.99	165	99.99	165	99.99

This suggests that the group is more “mastery-over-nature” oriented than “present” oriented. The comparison is valid, since there are equal number of highest and lowest possible scores in both dimensions.

To these teachers, concern for the present life is more important than preparing for the future, which is, to them maybe, uncertain. One is reminded of the verse in the Bible, “. . . do not be anxious about tomorrow”. . . (Matt. 6.34). Or perhaps, this group of teachers cannot but live in the present, what with the cost of living so high that being concerned for the future is simply out of the question. One has to be able to meet the basic needs in the present before he can think of the future.

Findings on the direction of the differences between the present and the future variations of the time value orientation are given in Table 3. 2c.

Attention is invited to the twelve teachers who are, as measured by the scales, equally future and present oriented. It would be interesting to find out what kind of background, personal or professional, they have.

**Activity orientation.** The findings on this value orientation are reported below. The reader may want to refer to the definition of the three postulated variations discussed in Section 1.1.

TABLE 3. 2c  
 Direction of Raw Score Differences between the Present  
 and the Future Variations: Time Value Orientation

Difference	No.	Sub-total	Per Cent	
11	4			Table reads: Sixty-one per cent had higher scores on the present variation than on future variation;
10	1			
9	—			
8	9			
7	12			
6	10			
5	10			
4	12			
3	13			
2	10			
1	<u>19</u>	100	60.6	Seven per cent had equal scores on both variation;
0		12	7.27	Thirty - two per cent had higher scores on the future than on the present variation.
- 1	18			The difference of 29 per cent in favor of the present variation (61% - 32% = 29%) is significant at the 1 per cent level, CR being 3.2 where 2.58 is required.
- 2	11			
- 3	8			
- 4	4			
- 5	4			
- 6	4			
- 7	3			
- 8	—			
- 9	<u>1</u>	53	32.12	
Total	165	165	99.99	

TABLE 3. 3a  
Distribution of Scores on Postulated Variations:  
Activity Value Orientation

Scores	Doing (Achievement)	Being-in-becoming	Being
	(Do)	(Bb)	(Be)
30	—	—	—
29	—	2	—
28	—	12	—
27	1	21	—
26	1	25	—
25	2	20	1
24	3	29	—
23	8	17	—
22	15	18	4
21	20	8	3
20	23	8	8
19	28	4	11
18	32	—	20
17	16	—	20
16	9	1	23
15	4	—	32
14	3	—	30
13	—	—	5
12	—	—	5
11	—	—	1
10	—	—	—
N	165	165	165
Median	19.16	24.40	15.88
SD	2.38	2.53	2.32
SE <sub>mdn</sub>	.23	.24	.22
SE <sub>d(Do-Bb)</sub>	.33		
CR(Do-Eb)	16		
SE <sub>d(Bb-be)</sub>		.33	
CR(Bb-be)		26.0	
SE <sub>d(Do-be)</sub>			.32
CR(Do-Be)			10.2

Note: The median differences are significant at the 1 per cent level

**TABLE 3. 3b**  
**Percentages of Number of Respondents Based on Very High,**  
**High, Medium, Low, and Very Low Scores**  
**Activity Value Orientation**

Scores	Category	Doing		Being-in-becoming		Being	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
26 – 30	Very High	2	1.21	60	36.36	—	—
22 – 25	High	28	16.97	84	50.90	8	4.85
18 – 21	Medium	103	62.42	20	12.12	39	23.63
14 – 17	Low	32	19.39	1	.61	107	64.84
10 – 13	Very Low	—	—	—	—	11	6.67
Total		165	99.99	165	99.99	165	99.99

Research Hypothesis (3), that the teachers as a group are “doing” (achievement) oriented is not substantiated by the data. The group is “being-in-becoming” oriented, first, and “doing” oriented next. The median differences are too big to be attributed to chance or sampling errors. The group would tend to be contemplative rather than active, to set their goals on the improvement of the self, rather than achieve what is great or significant through activity. They are for self-actualization, although their perception is towards

the self. The group, however, is not “static” as seen from the low scores in the “being” variation. Table 3. 3b reveals that 87 per cent of the respondents have scores ranging from high to very high on the “being-in-becoming” scale, as against 18 per cent on the “doing” (achievement) scale.

The findings on the direction of the differences between the “doing” scale scores and the “being-in-becoming” scale are reported in Table 3. 3c

TABLE 3. 3c

Direction of Raw Score Differences on the "Being-in-becoming" and "Doing" (Achievement) Variations – Activity Dimension

Differences	No.	Sub-total	Per Cent	
14	2			<p>Table reads: Eighty-four per cent of the teachers had higher scores on the "being-in-becoming" scale than on the "doing" scale;</p> <p>Four per cent of the teachers had equal scores on both scales;</p> <p>Twelve per cent had higher scores on the "doing" scale than on the "being-in-becoming" scale.</p> <p>The difference of 43 per cent between the two variations in favor of "being-in-becoming" can be presumed to be significant at the 1 per cent level, since this is much bigger than in the case of the present and future variations (See Table, 3. 2c).</p>
13	2			
12	1			
11	5			
10	15			
9	7			
8	13			
7	15			
6	20			
5	11			
4	18			
3	10			
2	13			
1	7			
		139	84.24	
0	7	7	4.24	
- 1	4			
- 2	3			
- 3	3			
- 4	4			
- 5	2			
- 6	1			
- 7	2			
		19	11.51	
<b>Total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>99.99</b>	



TABLE 3. 4a  
 Distribution of Scores on Postulated Variations  
 Relational Orientation

Scores	Individualism (In)	Lineality (Li)	Collaterality (Co)
30	—	—	—
29	—	—	—
28	3	—	—
27	25	—	—
26	23	—	1
25	23	—	3
24	32	—	5
23	29	1	16
22	10	2	26
21	7	—	38
20	4	6	36
19	1	5	16
18	4	11	10
17	2	18	10
16	1	28	3
15	—	30	—
14	1	26	1
13	—	24	—
12	—	10	—
11	—	2	—
10	—	1	—
Total	165	165	165
Median	24.27	15.15	20.67
SD	2.49	2.86	1.85
SE <sub>mdn</sub>	.25	.22	.18
SE <sub>d(In-Li)</sub>	.31		
CR <sub>(In-Li)</sub>	29.0		
SE <sub>d(Li-Co)</sub>		28	
CR <sub>(Li-Co)</sub>		20.0	
SE <sub>d(In-Co)</sub>			.31
CR <sub>(In-Co)</sub>			11.6

Note: All median differences are significant\* at the 1 per cent level.

TABLE 3. 4b  
 Percentages of Number of Respondents Based on Very High,  
 High, Medium, Low, and Very Low Scores  
 Relational Value Orientation

Scores	Category	Individualism		Lineality		Collaterality	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
26 — 30	Very High	51	30.91	—	—	1	.61
22 — 25	High	94	56.56	4	2.42	50	30.30
18 — 21	Medium	16	9.70	22	13.33	100	60.60
14 — 17	Low	4	4.42	102	61.81	14	8.48
10 — 13	Very Low	—	—	37	22.42	—	—
Total		165	99.99	165	99.99	165	99.99

The conclusion is that the teachers as a group are primarily “being-in-becoming,” “doing,” and “being” oriented in that order.

**Relational value orientation.** The findings on this dimension of value orientation are reported below.

Research hypothesis (4) is not confirmed by the data. As a group, the teachers are significantly more “individualism” oriented than “collaterality” oriented. Table 3. 4b shows that 86% of the respondents obtained scores on the *individualism* scale ranging from high to very high” as against 31 per cent on the collaterality scales. This implies that

they would rather be confident of themselves than be trusted by their superiors or their fellow workers. They tend to regard autonomy as the important thing in life.

Table 3. 4c shows that there are not necessarily more teachers who are “individualism” oriented than those who are “collaterality” oriented, a fact which is not true in the case of the other variations. The difference of 6 per cent is too small to justify the conclusion that it really accounts for a real difference in proportion. Such small difference must be due to chance or sampling errors.

TABLE 3. 4c  
 Direction of Raw Score Differences on the Individual  
 and the Collaterality Variations of the  
 Relational Value Orientation

Differences	No.	Sub-total	Per Cent	
12	1			<p>Table reads:            Fifty-one per cent of the teachers have scores higher on the "individualism" scale than on the "Collaterality" scale;            Four per cent have equal scores on both scales;            Forty-four per cent have scores lower on "Individualism" than on "Collaterality."            The difference of 6.06% (<math>50.90 - 44.84 = 6.06</math>) is not significant at the 5 per cent level, the CR being only .076. A CR of 1.96 is necessary for the difference to be significant at this level.</p>
11				
10	5			
9	1			
8	3			
7	6			
6	10			
5	10			
4	11			
3	17			
2	14			
1	<u>6</u>	84	50.90	
0	7	7	4.25	
- 1	11			
- 2	11			
- 3	5			
- 4	9			
- 5	10			
- 6	6			
- 7	10			
- 8	6			
- 9	2			
- 10	3			
- 11	<u>1</u>			
		74	44.84	
Total	165	165	99.99	

TABLE 3. 5a  
Distribution of Total Development Scores

Scores	No.	Sub-total	Per Cent	Category
120 – 123	–	–	–	Very High
116 – 119	–	–	–	
112 – 115	–	–	–	
108 – 111	–	–	–	
104 – 107	<u>–</u>	–	–	
		0	0	
100 – 103	3	118	71.51	High
96 – 99	23			
92 – 95	38			
88 – 91	<u>54</u>			
84 – 87	29	44	26.66	Medium
80 – 83	10			
76 – 79	3			
72 – 75	<u>2</u>			
68 – 71	2	3	1.82	Low
64 – 67	–			
60 – 63	–			
56 – 59	<u>1</u>			
52 – 55	–	0	0	Very
48 – 51	–			
44 – 49	–			
40 – 43	<u>–</u>			
Total	165	165	99.99	

Median – 90.1

SD – 6.08

SE<sub>mdn</sub> – .59

A *total development score*. We are told that the variations of each of the four dimensions is associated with development attitudes [Lee, 1972]. Each is characteristic of people in developed countries but not so much of people in developing ones. These variations are (1) Mastery-over-Nature, (2) Future, (c) Doing (Achievement), and (4) Individualism. For purpose of this report, we accepted this assumption -- with reservation -- so as to be able to arrive at a composite score which would be reflective of the situation at Central.

#### Steps in the treatment of the data.

(1) The scores of each teacher on the four variations were summed to make up the total development score.

(2) The total development scores were next tabulated and the median, the standard error of the median, and the standard deviation were computed.

(3) In the absence of norms which serve as a frame of reference in comparing the relative standing of the teachers as a group, we did the following:

(a) Adopted a minimum total development score, which we thought would be somewhat "high" in relation to the highest possible

score of 30 in each of the four dimensions. This score was 22, which was, it should be noted, the lower limit of the "high" category of scores (Table 3. 1b).

(b) On this basis, the minimum total development score was 88 ( $22 \times 4 = 88$ ). A subsequent statistical check revealed that, based on the tabulated data, this score was +1.31 z-score units *above* the theoretical mid-score of 80. Under the normal curve, this + 1.31 z-score exceeds 91 per cent of the entire number of cases in a distribution. This minimum total development was considered adequate for purposes of this analysis.

**Findings.** The findings are reported in Table 3. 5a, below.

It appears from the table that there are no teachers with "Very High" total development scores, nor are there any with "Very Low." Seventy-two per cent have "High" and 27 per cent have "Medium" total development scores.

If the median is 90, which is two score points higher than 88 the lower limit of the "High" category of scores, the conclusion cannot but be this: *As a group, the teachers are development oriented.* We are confident of this statement, since the difference of 2 ( $90 \times 88 = 2$ )

is significant at the 1 per cent level. The critical ratio is 3.4 where only 2.58 is needed for the difference to be significant at this level.

This is not to say that the teachers are in practice *development actuated*. What this says is that as a group, the teachers have a great potential for developmental practices in the educational and social tasks in the society. It must, of course, be admitted that there are other socio-psychological teacher factors which are predictive of developmental practices. We know some of these factors, we go by the research in other cultures, but what we do not know how much and what kind are present in the faculty. These could be valuable areas for further investigation.

**CONCLUSIONS.** The findings are summarized below. For a more meaningful interpretation of these findings, the reader might want to refer to the qualitative description of the different value orientations and their corresponding variations (Section 1.1).

1. The teachers are definitely "mastery-over-nature" oriented, primarily, and "harmony-with-nature" oriented secondarily. There are definitely more teachers of the former persuasion than of the latter.

2. The teachers are definitely "present" oriented primarily, and "future" oriented secondarily. There are definitely more teachers of the former persuasion than there are of the latter.

3. The teachers are definitely "individualism" oriented primarily, and "collaterality" oriented secondarily, if the degree or intensity of attitude is the criterion. However, there are not necessarily more teachers of the former than there are of the latter.

4. The teachers are generally "being-in-becoming" oriented primarily and "doing" (achievement) oriented secondarily. There are definitely more teachers of the former persuasion than there are of the latter.

5. On the whole, the teachers are development oriented, if one accepts the criterion that the composite score serve as the index of this orientation.

**DISCUSSION.** We started the previous section by saying that we accepted *with reservation* the definition of total development attitude as a combination of the four variations. We are concluding this report

by speculating, and the first point we are speculating on is "individualism" versus "collaterality." In a culture like ours, or in the context of our work as teachers, which might be given priority over the other?

"Individualism" as a value is basically Occidental, which has ramified into such correlates as self-realization, autonomy, freedom, rights, privileges, and such other concepts as related to the self. As a consequence, personal values like liberty, equality, and opportunity have been preached by pastors, priests, and professors alike. These concepts were exploited as vote-getting slogans by politicians.

These values were paramount when countries were not so congested with people and when living was not so complicated, not to say competitive. We still believe in these, to be sure, but in this day and age when literally there is hardly elbow room because of this population avalanche, it becomes more and more difficult to live in harmony and peace. In these congested areas, "survival of the fittest" has been the by-word of most. In Philippine setting, it has been a case of "individualism, run amuck," with the result that the survivors were those who initially had power and pesos

and came out with more power and more pesos. The economy became excessively lop-sided.

Perhaps more attention should be focused on the need for collaterality and on values which conduce societal welfare. Some of these values are cooperation, discipline, consideration, self-control, respect of law, responsibility, "other-ness," and altruism. After all, society is the bigger self, and the individual, the smaller. Self-realization is an idle goal in a society which does not permit it.

The second point is the variation "doing" achievement versus "being-in-becoming." As revealed by the data, the teachers as a group are "being-in-becoming" oriented. To them, the supreme good is the goal, which may be happiness, for one thing, or self-realization, for another. This is in contrast with "doing," which assumes that the good life is in *activity*, rather than in the attainment of a self-oriented goal per se. The "doing" oriented individual must find something to do, something he can do well, rather than something to eat or drink. He finds satisfaction in *doing*.

We have no quarrel about trying to become what one wants to be.

This is perfectly legitimate. But we must hasten to add that such a goal must be socially acceptable. Nor have we any objection to “doing” as one value orientation. We submit that purpose and process should be socially acceptable.

The implications of this in teaching are easily seen, although, unfortunately not easily done. We cannot attain democracy as a goal if we are in practice authoritarian. We cannot attain goals unless we act. We might have the best socially acceptable goals in our work, but they are meaningless if we do not act. One supervisor put it this way: “Plenty of action programs but no action — only *ningas cogon*.”

There seems to be a lot of good and promise in the fact that the teachers as a group are “present” oriented, that they are not entirely oblivious of the future. We can change the future if we improve the present. But one must also plan for the future. Central will have a better future only as we improve its present situation, which, we like to say, is not too hopeless nor too dim. This, of course, means enhancing the quantity and quality of our involvement in its plans and programs.

The beauty of it is that we are, as a group, development oriented. The real challenge lies in more action.

## References

1. Carroll, John J., SJ, et al, *Philippine Institutions*. Manila: La Solidaridad Press, 1970.
2. Gorospe, Vitaliano R., SJ, *Christian Renewal of Filipino Values*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press, 1966.
3. Howard, J. T., Irene L. Ortigas, and Felix B. Regalado, *Society and Culture in Rural Philippines*. Iloilo City: C.P.U. Press, 1965.
4. Kluckhohn, F. R. and F. L. Strobeck, *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, III.: Peterson and Row, Co., 1961.
5. Lee, Sung Jin, San Jon Lee, James A. Palmore, and Bom Mo Chung, *Psychological Perspectives: Family Planning in Korea*. Seoul: Hollym Corporation: Publishers, 1972.
6. Lynch, Frank, S. J., “Social Acceptance as the Major Cultural Value,” in *Social Foundations of Community Development* by S. C. Espiritu and Chester Hunt. Quezon City: R. P. Garcia Publishing Co., 1964.
7. Mead, Margaret, *Culture and Commitment — A Study of the Generation Gap*. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1970.
8. Weber, Max, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Trans. by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.