

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Comments

Lino Q. Arquiza and Juan Pia, Jr.

Philippine Studies vol. 19, no. 1 (1971): 115–119

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

continues to hold sacred traditional values of property and commutative justice and ignores other values of more recent relevance, such as those of efficient management, social responsibility, and social justice, would in effect be an unwitting instrument in the perpetuation of traditional social structures rendered obsolete and humanly oppressive by the changing situation in a developing society.

COMMENTS

DR. LINO Q. ARQUIZA

Education is really a process of transforming our behavior towards desirable ends. This is what most psychologists would say. And the classroom is the controlled environment designed to effect these desired changes. The curriculum constitutes the desired behavior changes (which are our cultural values) to be retained or to be changed, our habits, skills, even our literacy and knowledge and other aids, in other words, the objectives that we would like to achieve. Now, the curriculum is what we want to be transmitted, to be innovated, to be discarded, or to be substituted with something else. The teacher and his methods are the vehicle whereby these curricula are to be achieved within the classrooms. In other words, in the area of education these are the factors: transformation towards desirable ends, the classroom, the curriculum, the teacher, and his methods.

Education however does not take place only in the classroom. Knowledge takes place everywhere: here, at home, in the church, in public parks, even nightclubs, *social* clubs, or even in Rotary, Lions, or anywhere. Sometimes, what is learned in the classroom is negated outside by mass media communications like the movie; there might be radio programs that would negate what the classrooms are trying to propagate. Sometimes there is discontinuity in what is taught in the system, therefore, is only one of the vehicles of the educative process of the person. The system may be efficient but not effective as a transformer of culture. Why? Because it can be negated. I have here a relevant sample. We teach in our classrooms modesty and chastity; at least in the Philippine Christian College we try to help our students enjoy good morals but right across us is a nightclub. And some of our students, I was told, go from the classroom where they learn ethics to this nightclub. In the Philippine setting some external factors not within the control of the educator may negate the effectivity of classroom teaching.

I said here that some major problems of education in the Philippines are affected by economics and politics. I have it from good authority that we do not need 6,000 extension classes, but without the recommendation of the Secretary of Education our Congress has appropriated enough funds to open up 6,000 extension classes. This is bad economics: there would be many public school teachers not really needed at the moment, *floating* teachers, attendance teachers, etc., many of whom are frequently wives of supervisors. In terms of personnel, we have educators in our country who can compare well with educators anywhere in the world, real technocrats and well-trained. Politics has, however, placed them in round holes where they are square pegs, or if they are round, in square holes. Some of our top educators who are well-trained are not placed well in certain jobs because they are the people who usually do not go to politicians to get the jobs they want. In other words, they have enough integrity not to go to politicians for placement; they are in private schools.

I say economics because education in the Philippines gets the lion's share in the national budget, and yet it is not in tip-top condition. Why? Because politicians often fill positions with some untrained personnel, at the expense of well-trained individuals. I would not be surprised if a management expert looking at our educational system today would frown on its efficiency rating. There would be an excess of no less than 20,000 teachers who may be fired without upsetting the system. What then may we recommend to alleviate the educational system.

My *first* recommendation is that Congress should not pass any law on education without the recommendation of the Department of Education, or of the National Board of Education. The *second* contradicts the paper of Dr. Reyes where he mentions national support. National support has brought us nowhere. The best way, from my own way of thinking, is to localize the educational support, the national government assisting only the depressed areas that cannot support good schools. Manila, Q. C., Pasay City, Caloocan City, can very well support local elementary schools, government schools. They do not need national support. But areas somewhere in Sulu or maybe up north in Batanes, need national assistance. The *third* is to seek a revamp of our curriculum. We should have a six-year elementary, three-year liberal education, and 5 years of high school broken into 3 years of basic general education, two years of college preparatory, and 2 years vocational leading to technical schools in college. These are for the professionals. The 5 years high school will eventually be what we would call technically a comprehensive high school. This is not really the academic. The comprehensive high school will embody a 3-year basic with 2 years of vocational and this is college-preparatory. This is an improvement of the 2-2 plan which does not work. The reason why the 2-2 plan has not

worked is not that it is not good but that the implementation is not good. Of course, this could be a good plan but the implementation could still be no good. If we can only eliminate Congress from interfering in our system, we will be much better off.

Regarding our Churches (I'm not familiar with the Catholic Church but this is my criticism of the Protestant Churches), I would like to see a coordinated national program of education for our Churches, in the UCCP, or even in the United Methodist Church, or even with the National relation of Churches in the Philippines. I would like to see a plan well-coordinated from elementary to college as the program of the Churches. This is a challenge for those who are from the Churches. I am still waiting for some people in the Churches to get my advice as to the well-coordinated program of the Church. Siliman has its own program; Philippine Christian College has its own program; Central Philippine University has its own program, all uncoordinated with one another. This then is my challenge to those in the Churches.

REV. JUAN PIA JR.

I would like to say that we are in a society wherein we are bringing up a generation of mass-media individuals, mass-media oriented in the sense that a little child does not worry whether there are six or ten commercial spots in a given thirty-minute block, in contrast to the adult of the previous generation. Or, as the case may be, that young people are not worried about pornography as much as the previous generation. This is the context of the generation we are in. To that extent, therefore, I'd like to say that when we talk about cultural change I wonder whether we are using the same old methodology as well as the same old vehicle that we have been used to because in the first place this was our context of experience, or because this is what has been established in our time. For example, most educators would prefer to teach in classrooms. Of course, Dr. Arquiza has just mentioned that education can happen outside of the classroom. But we still inhibit ourselves from plunging forward in new directions relative to vehicles for cultural change. I do not know why, but one of the reasons could be the fact that our vested interests are involved. When the social scientist tells us that education in the classroom is less efficient than education through the mass media, we nevertheless prefer to use the classroom because we have invested millions of pesos in a given auditorium like this. May I now share with you some of the cold facts about the media, especially and particularly about radio? A study was made among more than 4,000 persons in the island of Luzon. It was discovered among the total samples of households in the provincial Luzon, excluding the Greater Manila area, that newspapers are found in 9% of the households studied, magazines in 18%, and comics magazines in 12%. This quantitative survey

showed that the penetration of print media, that is, in terms of presence of print media in the homes, is much lower in rural areas, than in the barrios, than in semi-urban areas, poblaciones that is, or urban areas. In fact, 2 years ago, Jose Luna Castro was talking to a group of young people and he was saying that the Philippines should by this time be talking in terms of news media and newspapers, should be talking about facsimiles instead of distribution of *Manila Times* by Philippine Air Lines which is affected usually by strikes.

The study continues by saying that nearly 3/4 of all provincial homes, that is, 72% were found not to have any printed periodical. This is also true for 78% of the barrio homes, 61% of the city homes, and 58% of the poblaciones. And now my bias. They found out that an impressive 90% of all respondents interviewed indicated that they listened to the radio. Asked which language is preferred for television programs, and there were 21% of them that had television, surprisingly, nearly 3 out of 4 viewers of television chose Tagalog. This is in the island of Luzon, of course. Summing up, therefore, it is seen that among the major commercial communications media at work in provincial Luzon, radio has the strongest penetration in terms of the number of listeners. Radio is followed by print, that is, magazines, comics, newspapers, and print in turn is followed by cinema, and cinema by television.

In the face of these data, are we really looking into other possibilities or vehicles for cultural change aside from traditional ones? What is the Church doing? The Church says, all right, let us use radio and television. The Church therefore, creates a radio program which in effect transfers the traditionally acceptable in a given sanctuary to the radio studio. It presents a panel discussion program on given social issues, only to find out that whoever listens to it are those who are used to it already. But this is not the type of program that would interest the housewife who, every time there is a commercial ad, goes someplace. In fact it was said that in New York, one way of measuring listenership is to note the increase in the volume of water used at a given time: that means that the commercial ad is not being listened to or heard. What then should be the strategy of the Church in terms of education as well as cultural change?

I would propose three steps. First, as suggested by the workshop, you could put up your own radio stations and compete with the commercial radio stations. This is a little expensive. In fact, my own Church does not want to invest in this kind of project. It prefers to invest in hospitals for example, and educational institutions because these are already there. The second strategy is to cooperate with commercial radio stations. This was suggested in the workshop paper. Again there are two levels to that: you either produce your own programs or establish a dialogue with producers as well as announcers. May I ask, how

many Church groups have ever thought of gathering announcers, disc announcers, of having dialogue on religious issues or social issues as the case may be? I would prefer to think that announcers should have initiative and be innovative enough to think that they could look into their own resources and study the problems. Yet we are very much frustrated, whether the social scientists or Church leaders, because most announcers do not speak from our viewpoint on given social issues. But I think that is our own problem by default and we talk about cultural change and education. The third is that perhaps the Church should begin to think of training its own young people in this direction either for electronics or for print. The Church is doing this to a certain extent—and I refer for example to the column of Fr. Victoriano in *Philippines Herald* or to the columns of Fr. Ben Carreon and of Fr. Araneta in the *Manila Times*, and of some Church leaders. My question however is how adequate is it? Remember that mass media is a reinforcing agent. It may be innovative. I dare cinema producers when they say that movies are only reflective of the culture of society. I would prefer that movies, for example, should be innovative, in fact, *avant garde* to some extent. Thank you.