

TUBURAN: Internal Structure of Community Relations in a Philippine Village

F. Landa Jocano

THE internal structure of social interaction in the barrio and the attendant socio-cultural imperatives associated with local behavior are important because, after all, it is the people who articulate economic activities in the community. Economic activities are social activities. Even the organization of manpower in purely agricultural pursuits is based on recognized social networks. These social networks constitute another aspect of the environment to which Tuburan residents must adopt in order to achieve a better way of life.

It needs to be stressed, in this connection, that people do not just behave without a framework; much of their reactions are really based on recognized structural principles. In economic activities, the actions carried out by individuals or groups involve choices, decisions, desires, and capabilities to acquire the scarce, available resources

allocated through various channels of the social organization, which, in turn, have structures which hold the different units of group life together. These structures need to be known to innovators or community development workers. Receptivity to our lack of interest in programs of technological change is often affected by the perception people have of the alternatives offered in terms of their social statuses, formal and informal relationships, and the attendant values they uphold as appropriate and desirable.

The term structure is used here advisedly to refer to the perceived network of social relations. Many actual and specific types of interaction as well as general behavior in the community are based on this network. It is likewise from this abstract framework of social experience that people draw the rationale for their actions, statuses, norms, and logical

* This article forms a chapter of a case study of adaptation and peasant life in the barrio (barangay) of Tuburan, Pototan, Iloilo, Philippines, conducted by F. Landa Jocano. Dr. Jocano obtained his A.B. (1958) from CPU and holds an M.A. and a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He is at present the Dean, Institute of Philippine Studies, Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines System, Diliman, Quezon City.

inferences for evaluating behavior. Viewed from within the life sphere of the community, social structure is never static as the term seems to imply; rather, it is dynamic in that it makes possible the realization of social reactions by indicating to individual members of the community the different possible alternative solutions to basic adaptive problems.

The manner in which the structure of Tuburan social system provides the residents with all the necessary postulates for desirable actions can best be understood in the context of two functional dimensions of community life: kinship and the family. The neighborhood is another important unit but for our purpose, we shall deal with the main internal structure of human relations in the community — kinship.

Kinship, defined in this study as a network of relations based on consanguinity, affinity, and ritual co-parenthood (*compadrazgo*), provides much of the basic framework for status acquisition and role performance in the community. This network is made functional and relevant to members of the group through the socialization that takes place within the family. Norms, values, and other standards of the desirable and undesirable in life are first learned from members of this unit, before any other institutional units in the community wield influence over individual or group behavior.

Kinship Structure

As part of the social system, kinship is an abstract concept inferred from

observable behavior and from specific accounts people give to explain their behavior vis-a-vis other people in the community. The social reality of kinship rests in part on the accepted principle of classifying individuals or groups of individuals into kin or non-kin. This classification system, in turn, guides members of the group to behave to one another according to their positions in the total framework. Reinforcing this classification system are the values, norms, rights, and obligations attendant to each position occupied and which are accepted as binding insofar as the articulation of behavior is concerned.

In effect, therefore, kinship may be viewed as the *internal model* of group life on the basis of which certain norms, values, and forms of social control, as well as shared behavior, are organized, articulated, and passed on to the succeeding generations.

The Concept of Bilateral Filiation

Conceptually, Tuburan kinship is similar to those found in other communities in the Philippines. It is perceived by the people as bilaterally structured. That is, members are related to both the father's and the mother's sides. As a model for social organization this structure of relations in the community does not discriminate group affiliations. The allocation of jural status to a child follows a bilateral principle — that is, the child is a member by virtue of birth of two groups of kinship, those of the mother and of the father. These two groups may not be related to each other, except with reference to the child who

functions as the common denominator. To this unit, consisting of the kinsmen of both parents, the child is closely identified and associated.

Because the two kin groups may or may not be related, tracing of descent and defining reciprocal rights and obligations are done along the two laterally recognized groups. The configuration of the two sets of kinsmen into a single unit, insofar as the child is concerned, is an ideal conceptualization of relationship, structurally and functionally. In practice, there are many deviations from the principle. This flexibility is perhaps the reason why bilateral systems are often said to be amorphous, if not structureless.

Published works on bilateral societies are not many and in this regard, sociological principles in the patterning of activities in bilateral systems need to be closely studied. Perhaps one of the questions which has to be asked in this connection is: Do individuals with dual affiliations "see" the world through "bilateral lenses" and act in accordance with this orientation? Or is bilaterality a formula, a guide for statistical choices of kinship relations among kinsmen? In this context, is it the group which is important or the individual? Is the definition of jural status the outcome of multiple activities, affective orientations, and structural principles?

In Tuburan, the bilateral organization of kinsmen is viewed as the major source of ground rules for behavior. It constitutes the framework of ideally upheld "moral order" of community life. The basis of this notion is the fact that people perceive their relationship as initially structured through biological

principles.

It needs to be stressed at the outset that while this is true, there is, at the same time, an operationally defined pattern of action which, even if modeled after biologically structured relationships, is non-biological in conceptual base. This may be called, for lack of a better term, *the rule for optional behavior*; optional in the sense that community behavior is anchored on several organizational frameworks of which kinship is only one. Moreover, the people in Tuburan are not always conscious about kinship when interacting among themselves, although they recognize it to be a key principle of many interpersonal relations. Certain types of non-kinship-based behavior, which may even occasionally contradict kinship rules, are accepted as necessary in structuring other types of relationship even among kinsmen.

In other words, the people in Tuburan recognize that kinship is important but its importance is relative to the situation which makes possible the organization of human relations within the kinship and non-kinship setting. This is particularly true in most activities having economic overtones.

As already stated, this bilateral orientation of Tuburan kinship relates an individual structurally to two groups. Each group is composed of individuals who are likewise linked to two other groups which are structured similarly and so on. The affiliation boundaries of individual relationship in this structural framework overlap a number of times, involving a series of ego-based, bi-laterally organized relations. These overlaps

provide the individual with options as to which of these numerable linkages he shall give priority to without violating much of the ground rules for behavior.

It is clear in this context that, on the one hand, it is the individual who is important in understanding bi-lateral social organization such as in Tuburan, with the group functioning merely as the supporting base insofar as shared values are concerned. On the other hand, however, it is the group, as a whole, which gives the individual a wider latitude of choices in decision-making and sets the rules for the "oughts" and the "ought nots" in community life. It is this perception of the dual source of community norms that accounts for the flexibility and diffuseness of status allocation and role-performance in the organization network of social and economic activities in Tuburan.

As a result, it is difficult to predict with precision the direction of local actions even of known status holders in the community. For example, a recognized leader in one situation may be subordinate to another in a different situation and vice-versa, without such shifts impinging upon his membership in the group. Conflicts are common among kinsmen. However, these are not so disruptive of specific relations as to drastically rend the existing ties. Nevertheless, they are real and sufficient enough to be annoying and to create tensions between norms of kinship and the real facts of community life.

Although a particular set of relatives is never clearly defined as a group, the types of preferred relationships among kinsmen are distinctly recognized by members

of the community and the rules for behavior are explained by them in these terms. It needs to be stressed, however, that such recognition remains only at the level of discourse or, at most, insofar as perceived relations are concerned; the actual behavior obtaining even among close kinsmen is another matter. This emphasis on relations indicates that kinship ties remain ideally central to Tuburan community organization with its ego-based, sibling set functioning as the core unit in the network.

Kinship is traced through the dominant sibling group in the entire universe of kinsmen. In this sense, the principle of bilaterality is best understood in terms of organization of activities along consanguineal lines, with selective emphasis on genealogical ties that narrow down to the dominant sibling unit. It is this selectivity aspect of the organization that oftentimes obscures the ground rules of kinship. At any rate, the dominant sibling units in the over-all kinship system are surrounded by the linked to other groups of conjugal and affinal relatives, composed of parents-in-law and spouses, as peripheral sibling units composed of ego's spouse and parents-in-laws' siblings and their respective spouses. Further segmentation occurs along the same pattern, with Ego or the sibling unit in each overlapping group functioning as the point of departure.

This bilaterality of linkage is not merely a structural principle; it is a social fact as well, wherein the principle of kinship is observed as the norm governing relations. That is, behaviors which are significant to interpersonal or intergroup relations, as structured along the frame-

work of bilateral affiliations, are at once economic, social, religious, jural and moral relations because their articulation in the lifespaces of the people are defined in these contexts. For example, food-exchanges, reciprocal labor marriage rules, rules for social and linguistic etiquette and so forth often transcend the material things or services exchanged. The underlying normative ideas associated with material goods and services exchanged is what, in the end, matter so much. The kind of transactions pursued or of services rendered may not necessarily be the same when similar activities are carried out among non-kinmen. There are implicit rules of propriety governing kinship and non-kinship interactions.

Thus, an act can evoke different kinds of judgments and create different situations for the present as well as for the future interactions of members of the community. The jural rights one claims when dealing with close relatives vary from those he claims when interacting with distant kinmen or with non-kin.

Of course, there are other rules of behavior which are not defined in these contexts. But since most of the actors in the Tuburan social system are related to each other, the value given to an act or artifact is often kinship-bound. The definition is not necessarily biased towards the fact that people are related to one another even if it is on this framework that the social life is anchored. Kinship norms nevertheless are used as points of reference to differentiate interactions between kinmen and between those who are not; as measures for judging the degree of expectations

and of emotional overtones attributable to actions of relatives vis-a-vis those who are not.

In other words, bilaterality as a principle of kinship grouping serves as an ideal concept that structures the range and sets the limit of possible actions among the residents in the community. It accounts for much of the diffuseness of status positions and role performances even within the internal dimensions of a particular family group itself. For example, should a situation which calls for a decision arise outside of the nuclear family, an individual does not immediately make decisions. He consults a number of people and takes into account the opinions of those who have the same right or knowledge as he has over the matter. The reason underlying this strategy for interaction is that statuswise those whom he consulted stand on equal level as kinmen and therefore have equal responsibility over the welfare of the unit to which the individual belongs. Even within the nuclear family, close relatives — like Ego's siblings or those of his spouse — have the right to interfere with the affairs of the couple if only for the reason that the two individuals are extensions* of socially recognized consanguinities.

The Principle of Generation

Aside from bilaterality, the other dominant feature of Tuburan kinship is the segregation of kinmen into units, in the vertical order. There is no specific term for these divisions. However, the people are keenly aware of the principle underlying this patterned segmentation

of relatives. Evidence for such awareness are revealed by the use of terms like *kamal-aman* (elders), *barangay* (bunch) and *langon* (half of a given length) to describe each segregated unit. Sometimes the term *kalanopad* is used instead of *langon* signifying cluster of relatives having the same age as ego. It may be better described as "peer group."

Thus, for lack of a definitive model, the English term "generation" shall be used in this study to approximate Tuburan view of how relatives are grouped, separated, and linked together.

By *generation* then is meant the division of members of the kin group into specific units based on the order of descent. Ego's generation (or one's own) is one step lower than that of his parents and one step higher than that of his children. The people in the community clearly recognize this vertical arrangement and it is on this basis that authority, jural rights and obligations, and group norms are often structured. It is likewise on this vertical relations that the horizontal segregation of kin in one's own generation into specific numerical categories of first, second, third, and so forth cousins are established.

It needs to be kept in mind, in this connection, that as the horizontal range of kinship is set, its vertical extension is moved upward. Functionally, the concept of generation in Tuburan kinship serves as an indicator of the range and limit of Ego's horizontal as well as vertical filiations, defined in the context of two laterally organized groups of the father and the mother.

The Cognition of Seniority

Closely linked with generation is the principle of seniority. It is assumed by many that seniority coincides with biological age, although it is not an exclusive principle of status-conferral. Seniority status may be conferred to an individual because of his generational affiliation and not because of his biological age. The latter is important but not a necessary precondition. For example, should a young woman marry an older man, she is automatically conferred with the seniority status insofar as the husband's younger siblings and kin are concerned, irrespective of her biological age. Correspondingly, the older man is brought down to the junior status insofar as his relations with the wife's older siblings and kin are concerned. There are cases reported where husbands are even older than their wife's own parents. Here the problem of seniority as a structural principle becomes clear-cut, for in spite of biological age, husbands are expected (and they often do) to behave as junior to their wives' parents.

This structural element of Tuburan kinship system has given rise to many personal conflicts in the community. Often older members of household units into which younger persons are married resent the senior role of the latter especially on matters involving supervision and control over certain activities at home or in the farm. In like manner, there is also ambivalence on the part of the persons concerned — whether or not to act according to the generational rules sustaining the positions they occupy or according to biological age they possess within the framework of

the kinship. The dilemma is often resolved through careful and selective assessment of social requirements surrounding the situation in which actions are pursued. Manipulations, go-betweens, cajoling, persuasion and other normative means of achieving conformity are used. Quick, on-the-spot decisions are likewise frequently avoided because of this structural definition of role performance.

It needs to be stressed, in viewing Tuburan social organization, that these principles — bilaterality, generation, and seniority — constitute the structural ideals of the community. These principles are held as the basis for status-conferrals but not necessarily, as noted, a precondition for specific role performance.

In practice, many of these principles are not followed to the letter, so to speak. Some people narrow the range of their recognition of kin to one side or the other in this bilateral complex, depending upon which group is useful in achieving certain goals (mostly economic) in life. Because structural principles do not, in many cases, coincide with actual situations, tensions, anxiety, conflicts and other incongruities in community life arise. From this standpoint, Tuburan kinship may be best understood in terms of the tensions management aspect of society rather than as a self-equilibrating system.

As a major source of status, Tuburan kinship is structured, as already stated, along three major concepts: consanguinity, affinity, and compadrazgo. Consanguinity, by definition, established relationship through descent. That is, an individual is related to another because he stands in consanguineal (blood) rela-

tion as a son, sibling, grandson, cousin, parent, grandparent, and so on with him. The validity of the relationship rests on the ability of an individual to establish "blood link" to a common unit of ancestors in the upper generations or to illustrate descent with respect to the lower ones.

Seen properly, consanguinity, as a kinship principle, is by nature sociological in spite of its biological base. Cases of children born out of wedlock are best examples for this observation. That is, the status of the child as a consanguineal offspring has to be socially acknowledged by the father by his giving support to both mother and child or by including the child as one of the heirs of his property. In turn, the mother can deny the option by bringing up the child and giving him her family name instead of the "father's." In the absence of any acknowledgement, the child is denied the status of a legitimate offspring by the father himself or as a relative, insofar as the "father's" kins are concerned. In any case, recognition of descent rests on the ability of the mother to establish the link between the child, herself, and the man.

Kinship Terminology

Kinship as a principle of social organization is best indicated by the terminology people use to define the boundaries of interpersonal, as well as inter-familial, relationships. There are only specific individuals or groups of individuals who are accorded with certain terminologies and it is through this socially designated "labels" that role-performances are

defined. Referentially, the terms for father and mother are *tatay* and *nanay*, respectively. Here the sex of the referent is indicated. Sometimes these terms are used to apply to any individual, especially strangers, who appear to be in the parental group. As soon as individuals are accorded the assignation of *tatay* or *nanay*, their behaviors are immediately defined in these terms.

Vocatively, however, the terms used for father and mother are varied. Sometimes the English and Spanish terms like *mommy*, *daddy*, *mama*, and *papa* are used. Or there are cases when, as recorded from five families, children use their parents' nicknames in addressing them. These are nuclear families residing with their families of orientation (either those of the wife or the husband) and the parents' explanation for the "unusual usage" is that "the children followed our siblings' way of calling us."

Grandparents are referentially addressed as *lolo* (male) and *lola* (female). Other terms used are *uwa* and *ulang*. The latter two represent the traditional terms while the first two terms are derived from Spanish. Vocatively, some informants use *nay mal-am* (mother old woman) and *tay mal-am* (father old man).

Children are referentially known to the parents as *kabataan*, a plural form of *bata* meaning "child." Sometimes the term *anak* is used. Vocatively, the *kabataan* are called by the parents and those who are older by their names or nicknames. Nicknames are derived from either physical attributes as in *kayot* (small), *itom* (black), *tikling* (thin, after a bird), or habits like *dinuguan* (fond of blood paste), *laway* (saliva), *koom*

(stingy) and so on.

Parents' siblings are referentially called *tio* (male), *tia* (female), *dada'* (female) and *bata'* (male). Again, the first two terms are derived from Spanish terminologies while the latter two are indigenous to the area. Vocatively, only the *tio* and *tia* are used with personal names. Sometimes the term *tete* is used to address mother's female siblings. *Bata* is occasionally used, vocatively and referentially, to differentiate the parents' male siblings from the father. Often the term *tay* plus the personal name of the addressee is used. The more educated residents of Tuburan use the English loan words *auntie* and *uncle* for the parents' siblings.

Attention should be called at this point to the term *bata* as applied to the parents' male siblings. Lexically, the word is similar to the one used for the child. None of the informants can give a general explanation for this usage. The stress, in pronunciation, is on the first syllable; while the one for the child is on the last: *ba'ta* (uncle) vs. *ba'tá* (child). One informant ventured to state that the merging could "possibly be due to the fact that parents' siblings are considered second parents." While this may be so, the use of the terms are still considered tentative. These will be dropped should, in the future, better terms be discovered. At any rate, it is believed by many that it is the parents' siblings' responsibility to take care of their brother's or sister's children should anything happen to the former.

Another aspect of Tuburan kinship terminology which needs comment is the merging of terminologies for grand-

parental generations with the grandchildren's generations. Grandparents' parents are known as *apoy*. Similarly, the term used for grandchildren is *apo*. Again, why this is so has not been explained by informants. It would seem that the merging of terms follows the familiar relationship that exists between grandparents and grandchildren. It is known that grandparents are more tolerant with their grandchildren than the parents themselves. Reciprocally, grandchildren are more open to their grandparents than they are to their parents. Other than this hypothetical inference, no informant has offered any satisfactory explanation why terminologies are similar for the grandparents/grandchildren cluster.

Teknonymy is another characteristic feature of Tuburan kinship terminology. By teknonymy is meant the use of the child's name to refer to his parents. If an individual wants to call Juan's father, for example, he would say "*boy, tatay ni Juan,*" instead of his real name. Referentially, the term *ama't Juan* is used. In some families female spouses do not address their husband by their personal name. Instead, they use the term "*boy*" — a practice known as "*paboy*." This is mostly practised in cases where marriage is cross-generational, that is, either of the spouse is one generation higher in the kinship hierarchy.

In one's own generation, kinship terminologies also vary. Within the sibling unit, older female siblings are referentially known as *manong*, and the older female siblings *manang*. Vocatively, the abbreviated kinship terms *nong* or *nang* plus the personal name are used for males

and females, respectively. Younger siblings are referentially known as *lubayon*, individually or collectively. Vocatively, they are addressed by personal names. Terms of endearment are usually used in place of the kinship terms. Such terms include *inday, nonoy, nene, toy, to'* and so forth.

A word must be said on the function of kinship terminologies. As applied to living persons they are symbolic categories that define the nature of allowable behavior individuals can articulate in kinship terminologies determine behavior individuals can articulate in daily activities. This does not mean that kinship terminologies determine behavior; they merely set the ground rules for behavior. The actors can in fact ignore the behavioral correlates of kinship terminologies in establishing relations, but such is seldom done. Two individuals calling each other brother or sister can pursue certain actions without being censured; in other situations they find themselves restrained, as in incest.

Kinship terminologies may also be seen as structural categories which classify related persons as *manong, tatay, nanay*, and so on. Younger siblings are likewise differentiated from older siblings by the terms any given individual uses to refer to or address them. It follows from this that there are things an older sibling can do under certain circumstances and the younger sibling can not, and only when open defiance of the rules is registered do conflicts occur. Otherwise, members of the group are able to carry out respective relationship roles along this structural framework, even if other non-structural factors are consi-

dered in the process. Viewed in this way kinship terms may also be interpreted as part of the general pattern of values — a set of communication clues for social control and strategy for interaction.

In addition to relationships structured along consanguineal principles, Tuburan kinship is reinforced by ritually defined types of relations acquired through marriage and *compadrazgo*. The former brings about affiliation through the union of one of the members of the group to that of another. Affective ties are structured through the performance of a religious rite wherein sponsors to the ceremony (marriage included) become automatically quasi-kinsmen. Privileges, rights and obligations accruing from marriage or affinal relations differ from those established either by consanguinity or by *compadrazgo*. In marriage a man is incorporated into the corps of his wife's entire kinship group, and, in turn, his wife is included into his own unit. Since the spouses stand co-equal to each other in terms of kinship status, they are viewed as equally related to the same group of individuals each spouse considers kinsmen.

Here two levels of structural and contextual categories need to be kept in mind: that of consanguineal and affinal relations. The terminologies used to identify persons involved in the relationships may be the same but the structural position in the network may be different. An affine is structurally related to the spouse's kinsmen in exactly the same way as the latter is related to any of them. Contextually, however, his/her role in the universe of kinship is limited in actual practice, especially in decision-making.

The reverse may also occur. In any case, all actions of affinal kin are peripheral to his own nuclear family but important insofar as his wife's group is concerned. His participation in many affairs having to do with his spouse's is dependent upon how well he carried out his relationship with them. The same principle operates with regards to the woman's relation to her husband's kinship group.

The affinal term of male siblings of Ego's spouse is *bayaw*: for females, *hipag*. *Biras*, on the other hand, applies to the husband/wife of the siblings of Ego's spouse. There is no fixed rule as to the usage of the term. Some informants use the term vocatively; others referentially. Ego's spouse is *manugang* to his/her parents, regardless of sex. Ego is, in turn, *manugang* to his/her spouse's parents. *Manugang* is derived from the word *dugang*, meaning "to add" — i.e. in addition. The same terminology is applied to Ego's parents when addressed by the spouse except that it is in the abbreviated form, *ugangan*. The parents of Ego and those of his spouse are called *magbalayi*; they call each other *balayi* or resort to ritual kinship terms like *comadre* or *compadre*.

Ritual Kinship

As already stated, *compadrazgo* is established through sponsorship in rites such as baptism, confirmation, and marriage. In its original concept, this quasi-kinship relation was aimed at providing a child with religious co-parents or guardians, as in the case of the parents' sudden death or prolonged illness.

As in other parts of Western Bisayas,

the term for ritual kinship is *kumparibay*. Although initiated mainly on a spiritual basis, the tie "actually develops and emphasizes a primary social bond between the parents of children and the godparents, hence, the *compadre* system is best defined as "ritual co-parenthood." Concomitant to this bond are certain reciprocal rights and obligations between godparents and godchildren, godparents and godchildren's parents, and between godchildren and their godsiblings.

Ritual co-parents are expected to help each other in time of need. The godparents, who are called *maninoy* (male) and *maninay* (female), contribute to the upbringing and education of the child. Reciprocally, the godchild is expected to assist the godparents or to help resolve whatever difficulties the latter encounter. He has to obey them as though they were his actual parents. The term for godchild is *igsoon* and it is reciprocally used to refer or address godsiblings. As in real kinship, this special relationship is extended to the siblings of both *compadres* who also address each other *kumpadre* or *kumadre*.

Most *compadres* are selected from among members of the kinship group. As many informants relate: "You are not bound to give an elaborate and expensive feast if your *compadre* is your cousin, or better still, your sibling. It is otherwise when your *compadre* is not related to you. It is shameful if you do not give any *punsyon* (feast)."

As in other parts of the Philippines, *compadrazgo* is structurally amorphous. While it is established ideally on the basis of mutual obligations between contractants or those who initiate its forma-

tion and have agreed explicitly and formally to become ritual kin — the articulation of the relationship in actual practice is dependent upon whether or not the parties concerned cooperate with each other. There is no clearcut jural authority created with the establishment of the bond. What is formalized with the rite is a moral obligation, and this is supported merely by the expectations of those involved in the relationship. The right concomitant to the obligation does not have the force of structural duties, as in actual kinship, wherein the parties to the agreement (as in marriage) or affective relationship (as parent-child) can be required, either by public opinion or by law, to fulfill his part of the contract. In fact, some people exploit *compadrazgo* for economic reasons and social advancement; others avoid this for the reason that "once started, the reciprocal exchange of goods or services becomes complex and cumbersome."

Thus, in spite of what has been written about *compadrazgo* in the Philippines, Tuburan data show that it does not represent a powerful social mechanism through which non-kin are recruited as members of the kinship group and through which individual or family goals such as social mobility and economic security are achieved. It is weakly structured in Tuburan. Quarrels and enmities among *compadres* are common. In fact, sexual relations between co-parents or between co-parents and godchildren have been reported. These cases represent, perhaps, contemporary changes in the internal structure and content of local norms. *Compadrazgo* is maintained as a matter of practice but has lost much of

its institutional forms and functions as the cohesive force in the social system.

Summary

Thus far, we have described the kinship system in Tuburan and indicated its significance in understanding the dynamics of local social organization. Many community workers in studying specific communities stress the study of the patterns of consumption, investment, labor, etc., or community as the variables associated with development. The study of the internal structure of the social system has often been neglected. But it is this intangible principle of social relationships, of which kinship is an important component, which influences

decision-making, labor organization, investment risks, etc. of the people and provides them with resources for social, economic, and psychological support.

In other words, the nature of the social system affects the direction and degree of change associated with development. The assignment of priorities in the people's lives is strongly linked with the institutionalization of roles, collectiveness, values, norms, sanctions, and so forth. Knowing therefore the internal structure of relations of a community enables the innovator or fieldworker to formulate a plan for priorities and realistic strategies for intensifying what are already taking place.