



## **The Socio-Language Perspectives on the Filipino Cultural System of the Ilocano Society**

Christopher F. Bueno  
Eden A. Bueno

### **ABSTRACT**

*The study dealt with the socio-language perspectives of the Filipino Cultural System relevant to the terminologies of the Ilocano society. The cultural terminologies are translated into Filipino and English languages as standard forms in the sociology, anthropology, and philosophy books without any perspective as to their view in the Ilocano society. The following were Filipino Cultural Systems included in the contents of sociology: (1) Filipino Value System (pamantayan, asal, diwa, and halaga); (2) Social Acceptance (pakikisama, pakikiramdam, pakikipagkapwa-tao, palakasan, pakiusap, and sakop); (3) Cultural Reciprocity (pakikiramay, mapagmalasakit, kagandahang loob, and mabuting loob ); (4) Non Rationalism (bahala na, tadhana, and gulong ng pa/ad; and (5) Personalism (lakas ng loob, maluwa ang loob, and kagandahang loob, mapagkaloob, saloobin, tapat na kalooban, masama ang loob and masasamang loob); and (6) Culturally Challenged Filipino Traits (ningas kogon, amor propio, probinsiyano, and burong talangka). The elementary and secondary school teachers, administrators, department heads of LGUs and GOs, and instructors of Vigan City, Sta. Catalina, San Juan, Cabugao, and Bantay, Ilocos Sur were the key informants in the descriptive analysis of the socio-language perspectives of this study.*

**Keywords:** Socio-Language perspective, Filipino cultural system, Ilocano translations

### **INTRODUCTION**

In sociology, the Filipino cultural value systems provide the critical understanding of concepts of value system, social acceptance, cultural reciprocity, non-rationalism, personalism and culturally challenged traits. These have been the theoretical foundations to study the genuine nature of the Filipino society that affected the cultural values particularly in politics, economy, tradition, and social life.

In the sociological aspects, the cultural life of the Filipino society has varied language implications as the regionalistic nature has social value distinction that respond to intercultural communication. It is crucial in anthropological studies to place local societies within a broad historical and structural context (Kearny, 1986:341). In the intercultural communication, Mendoza and Perkinson (2003) expounded that differing sense of being among Filipinos consequently gives rise to a reconfiguration of Filipino culture that is able to recover the hidden code governing Filipino cultural communication patterns. Filipino communication scholar Melba Maggay, in her book, *Pahiwatig: Kagawiang Pangkomunikasyon ng Filipino* (2002) describes the whole complex of subtle, elaborate indirect communication found in all Filipino cultures.

The main objective of the study is to present the Socio-Language Perspectives on the Filipino Cultural System of the Ilocano Society.

Specifically, it sought to present the profile of the respondents in terms of age, position/designation, and place of residence, provide the general perspectives as to the Ilokano translations of Filipino Value System along *Pamantayan*, *Asa*, *Diwa*, and *Halaga*; identify the Ilokano translations of the Filipino cultural system in relation to social acceptance in the sociological perspectives along *pakikisama*; *pakikiramdam*; *pakikipagkapwa-tao*; *palakasan*; *pakiusap*; and *sakop*, cultural reciprocity in the sociological perspectives along *pakikiramay*; *mapagmalasakit*; *kagandahang loob*; and *mabuting loob*; discuss the Ilokano translations affecting the sociological perspective of the other variables of the Filipino cultural system along non rationalism on the sociological perspectives along *baha/a na*, *tadhana*, and *gulong ng pa/ad*, personalism on the sociological perspectives along *lakas ng loob*; *maluwag ang loob*; *kagandahang loob*; *mapagkaloob*; *saloobin*; *tapat na kalooban*; *masama ang loob*; and *masasamang loob*, and culturally challenged Filipino traits on the sociological perspective along *ningas kogon*, *amor propio*, *probinsiyano*, and *burong talangka*.

According to Jocano (2000), the Filipino value system or *pamantayan* has three elements, namely: *halaga*, *asal*, and *diwa*. *Halaga* denotes observed traits that make the virtuous person. Jocano (2000) exemplifies the meaning of *asa* in the *pamantayan* standards of *kapwa* (relational), *damdamin* (emotional), and *danga* (moral). While *diwa* represents the idea of *nakem*. In the Filipino philosophy Mercado (1994) expounded deeper meaning in the critical metaphysical analysis of the *loob*, *buot* and *nakem*. It provides critical understanding about inner-self (*nakem* and *loob*); the psychic domain of thought and interpersonal relationships with the group. It is the intrinsic quality of self through *nakem* as the conscious expression of

human dignity within the ethical and moral dimension of personal thought. The internal valuing process comes from the traditional culture and interrelationships of society attributed by the ethical and spiritual values of life (Bueno, 2012).

On social acceptance and cultural reciprocity, according to Lynch (1963), the concept of social acceptance is gained and enhanced by smooth interpersonal relations; its loss is guarded against by two sanctions discouraging behavior disruptive of these relations. The first and general sanction is *hiya*, or shame; the second and specific safeguard is *amor propio*, or self-esteem. By these positive and negative means the lowland Filipino strives to have his fellows take him for a good man, an acceptable member of the community. Mulders (1994) explained that the basic moral rules are the same: conscience is located in relationships; not fulfilling obligations, not showing gratitude cause the discomfort of shame. Disrespectful behavior is a breach of elementary order, yet must be expected where the prize of competition is prestige. In this area, a person can expand his networks by ingratiating others, so becoming a patron, or by, conversely, seeking patronage. Altogether, it remains an intensely personal, relational world, the backbone of which is hierarchy, but where positions and the obligations they entail fluctuate.

Lewis (1971) pointed out that basic characteristics of Ilocano social relationships observed in the daily lives of the village, which imply 'the essential elasticity of social ties and the stress on the situational logic of cultural themes' with emphasis on bilateral kinship ties within a close circle. Enriques (1992) expounded that within the schema of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, the core value of *kapwa* (shared being or identity) along with its associated values of dignity, justice and freedom, are what constitutes the deep structure of the cultures of Filipinos. On the other hand, the SIR complex of "social acceptance," "social equity" (as in *utang na loob* or debt of gratitude) and "social mobility" (crab mentality) are deemed merely the reductionist/functionalist mis-interpretations of surface codes without regard for their deeper, underlying dynamic (Enriquez, 1992).

On non-rationalism, personalism and culturally challenged this reflects the human beliefs on fate and destiny as part of the life struggles. Mendoza and Perkinson (2003) cited in the study intercultural communication of *kapwa* along *bahala* and *talangka* that *Bahala na* (fatalism) as "determination and risk-taking," "a way of pumping courage into [one's] system so that [one does] not buckle down" in the face of formidable obstacles (Pe-Pua 1991). *Talangka* or crab mentality became a call for community members to acknowledge indebtedness to others and to work for the good of the entire community and not just for themselves (Mendoza and Perkinson, 2003).

In reaction to the universalizing pretensions of American psychology that negatively framed difference in the native culture, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* necessarily was forced to construct a profile of Filipino culture and personality responding to the negative colonial ascriptions by assigning a positive valence to the list of negative traits and alleged core values attributed to Filipinos.

## METHODOLOGY

on the research design and technique, the study utilized the qualitative and descriptive analysis as to the Ilocano translations of the socio-language perspective along : (1) Filipino value system;(2) social acceptance; (3) cultural reciprocity ;(4) non rationalism;(5) personalism; and (6) culturally challenged Filipino traits. It also utilized qualitative research method through the culture-based analysis of the Filipino value system and cultural value system. The respondents of the study were the elementary school teachers who were currently teaching Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE).

The population sample of the study was the elementary school teachers, secondary school teachers, administrators, and department heads of LGU and GO and instructors of Vigan City, Sta. Catalina, San Juan, Cabugao and Bantay to identify the social acceptability of the terminologies and concepts in culture as presented in this study.

As research instrument, the study made use of the contextual acceptability on socio-language perspectives of the personal views of the respondents with the following numerical and descriptive interpretation: 1.00-1.80 (Very Highly Acceptable); 1.81-2.60 (Highly Acceptable); 2.61-3.40 (Acceptable); 3.41- 4.20 (Fairly Acceptable); and 4.21- 5.00 (Not Acceptable).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Profile of the Respondents in Assessing the Sociological Perspectives in the Cultural System of the Ilocano Society

Table 1 shows that one-third {28 or 32.94%} of the respondents have an age range of below 25, followed by age range of 35-39 (22 Or 25.88%). A total of 22 respondents also belong to two bracket ranges, 25-29 age range (13 or 15.30%) and 30-34 age range (9 or 10.59%). This means that the respondents are young with an

age range below 25 to 39 years old in assessing and interpreting the social acceptability of the sociological terminologies in the Filipino culture.

The majority of the respondents are designated as elementary school teachers (54 or 63.53%) and reside in San Juan (28 Or 32.94%) and Magsingal (24 or 28.24%). These elementary school teachers are also implementing the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) in the primary grade of their school.

Table 1. The Profile of the respondents.

Description	Frequency	Percent
<b>Age</b>		
Above45	5	<b>5.88</b>
40-44	8	9.41
35-39	22	25.88
30-34	9	10.59
25-29	13	15.30
Below 25	28	32.94
Total	85	100
<b>Designation/Position</b>		
Elementary School Teachers	<b>54</b>	<b>63.53</b>
Secondary School Teachers	8	9.41
Instructors	13	15.29
Administrators/Department Heads	10	11.77
Total	85	100
<b>Place of Residence</b>		
Vigan City	13	15.29
Bantay	8	9.41
Sta. Catalina	9	10.59
Caoayan	3	3.53
Magsingal	24	28.24
San Juan	28	32.94
Total	85	100

### The General Perspectives as to the Ilocano Translations of Filipino Value System

Table 2 shows that the Filipino value system in this study indicates a very highly acceptable assessment of the contextual acceptability on the Ilocano translation of the socio-cultural perspectives along *pamantayan* (*pagannurutan*: 5=4.45); *asal* (*galad*: 5=4.78); *diwa* (*panunot*: 5=4.69); and *halaga* (*kinapateg*: 5=4.57). The *pamantayan* has the degree of contextual acceptability from the Ilocano translation as *pagannurutan* (=4.85). The *pamantayan* (*pagannurutan*) reflected with the socio-language perspectives with very high contextual acceptability along *asal* as *galad* (←4.78); *diwa* as *panunot* (5=4.69) and *halaga* as *kinapateg* (5= 4.67).

Table 2. The contextual acceptability of the sociological perspectives of the Filipino value system.

Culture Value	Mean	Acceptability	Rank
<b>A. PAMANTAYAN</b>			
1. Pagannurutan	4.85	VHA	1
2. Pagallagadan	4.56	VHA	2
3. Pagbatayan	3.78	HA	4
4. Patakaran	3.94	HA	3
<b>B. ASAL</b>			
1. Galad	4.78	VHA	1
2. Sursuro	4.34	VHA	2
3. Ugali	4.23	VHA	3
4. Kababalin	4.20	VHA	4
<b>C. DIWA</b>			
1. Panunot	4.69	VHA	1
2. Kalidad	4.20	HA	2
3. Kaipapanan	2.73	A	4
4. Anag/Ispiritu	3.75	HA	3
<b>D. HALAGA</b>			
1. Kinapateg	4.57	VHA	1
2. Importansiya	4.13	HA	2
3. Presyo	2.13	FA	4
4. Gatad	3.00	A	3

According to Jocano (2000), the Filipino value system or *pamantayan* has three elements, namely: *halaga*, *asal* and *diwa*. The socio-language perspective

the value system interprets *halaga* as what Filipinos find most worthy and *asa*/is manifested in the person's behavior, while *diwa* represents the idea of loob which is relevant to the Ilocano term of *nakem*.

The study of social acceptance and cultural reciprocity reflects the social interaction of individual within a given Ilocano society. The group process plays an important role as to the social inclusion and influence based on certain cultural values system of the Ilocano society.

Table 3. The contextual acceptability of the socio-language perspectives of social acceptance and cultural reciprocity.

Culture Value	Mean	Acceptability	Rank
<b>A. PAKIKISAMA</b>			
1. Pannakikadua	4.92	VHA	1
2. Panakilangen-langen	4.68	VHA	2
3. Panakinnanmayet	4.56	VHA	3
<b>B. PAKIKIRAMDAM</b>			
1. Panakipagrikna	4.51	VHA	1
<b>C. PAKIKIPAGKAPWA-TAO</b>			
1. Pinakilangen	4.92	VHA	1
2. Pannakikadwa	4.85	VHA	2
3. Pannaki-abrasa	4.20	HA	3
<b>D. PALAKASAN</b>			
1. Pinnigsaan	4.87	VHA	1
2. Kapet	4.46	VHA	2
3. Baker	4.23	VHA	3
<b>E. PAKIUSAP</b>			
1. Panagpakpakaasi	4.69	VHA	1
2. Pannakipatang	4.50	VHA	2
3. Panakikadwa	3.39	A	4
4. Panangidawat	4.42	VHA	3
<b>F. SAKOP</b>			
1. Sapasap	4.87	VHA	1
2. Seknan	4.00	HA	2
3. Lakon	2.30	FA	4
4. Karaman	3.00	A	3

The social acceptance in this study shows very highly acceptable assessment of the contextual acceptability on the Ilocano translation of the sociological terminologies and concepts along *pakiksama* (*pannakikadua*: 5<=4.95); *pakikiramdam* (*panakipagrikna*: 5=4.51); *pakikipagkapwa-tao* (*pinakilangen*: 5=4.92); *palakasan* (*pinnigsaan*: 5=4.87); and *sakop* (*sapasap*: 5= 4.87).



In the study of MTB-MLE in the Ilocano society, the socio-language implications of the term *pakikiramdam* means *panakipagrikna* has included *pannakisimpatiya* and *pannakisakit* as the sympathetic attitude for those person who suffered deep emotional trouble in life. Lynch (1963) pointed out that the concept social acceptance is gained and enhanced by smooth interpersonal relations. Likewise, Lewis (1971) similarly explained the basic characteristics of Ilocano social relationships observed in the daily lives the village, which imply 'the essential elasticity of social ties and the stress on the situational logic of cultural themes with emphasis on bilateral kinship ties within a close circle.

While the Ilokano term *palakasan* included interesting Ilokano word as *panagsipsip* by giving good impressions about the person which deeply result to destroying the image of someone he/she does not like. This is also a negative public relation for personal motive or interest of giving something favorable to a person. The *pakiusap* meant more on the humble action as *panagkumbaba* when you want something as favor to another person. While term *sakop* has a very highly acceptable socio-language implication on the Ilokano philosophy as *turay*. According to Mercado (1994) the value ranking relevant to *sakop* provides a cluster of values which are related to the in-group (*sakop*) and its equivalent like the extended family. Based from in-group analysis on the parents or superior there are values of authority, power, honor and benevolence.

Table 4 reveals that cultural reciprocity study shows very highly acceptable assessment of the contextual acceptability on the socio-language perspectives along *pakikiramay* (Panakipagladingit:  $\bar{X}=4.87$ ); *mapagmalasakit* (Manakipagsakit:  $\bar{X}=4.73$ ); *kagandahang loob* (Kinasayaat ti ugali:  $\bar{X}=4.58$ ); *mabuting loob* (*nasayaat a tao*:  $\bar{X}=4.86$ ).

There is a consistency as to the contextual acceptability based on the framework of the study identified MTB-MLE study except the Ilokano term *pakikiramay* was more acceptable to use the term *panakipaladingit*, *panakipagrikna*, *panakitulong*, and *pannakisaranay*. On the otherhand, the manangrikna (panakipagrikna is acceptable to pakikiramay) may not be highly acceptable term in *mapagmalasakit*. The acceptable terms are *manakipagsakit*, *manangaasi* and *mannakitinnulong*.

Table 4. Assessment of the contextual acceptability of the socio-language perspectives of the cultural reciprocity.

Culture Value	Mean	Acceptability	Rank
<b>A. Pakikiramay</b>			
1. <i>Panakipagladingit</i>	<b>4.87</b>	VHA	1
2. <i>Pannakipagrikna</i>	4.75	VHA	2
3. <i>Pannakaliday</i>	2.25	FA	3
4. <i>Panakitulong</i>	4.75	VHA	3
5. <i>Pannakisaranay</i>	4.25	VHA	4
<b>B. Mapagmalasakit</b>			
1. <i>Manakipagsakit</i>	4.73	VHA	1
2. <i>Manangaasi</i>	3.77	HA	2
3. <i>Mannakitinnulong</i>	3.31	<b>A</b>	3
4. <i>Manangrikna</i>	2.58	FA	4
<b>C. Kagandahang Loob</b>			
1. <i>Kinasayaat ti ugali</i>	4.58	VHA	1
2. <i>Kinaimbag ti nakem</i>	3.62	HA	2
3. <i>Nasayaat a Sursuro</i>	3.28	A	3
<b>D. Mabuting Loob</b>			
1. <i>Nasayaat a tao</i>	4.86	VHA	1
2. <i>Kinaimbag</i>	4.72	VHA	2
3. <i>Na/ing a tao</i>	4.23	VHA	3

Table 5 reveals that non-rationalism shows a very highly acceptable assessment of the contextual acceptability on the Ilokano translation of the socio-language perspectives in *tadhana* (*gasat*:  $5=4.35$ ) and *gulong ng palad* (*pinagtulid ti gasat*:  $X=4.68$ ). The respondents may not seem to accept the sociological translation of *bahala na* into the Ilokano terms as *makaammo ditan* ( $5=1.47$ ) and *Uray aniat mapasamak* ( $=1.70$ ). However, some of the respondents suggested *makaammo ti Dios ditan*. They also suggested other Ilokano term for *tadhana* as *suerte* and *gu/ong ng palad* as *panagbaliw ti rupa ni gasat* and *panagbaliw ti biog*.

Table 5. Assessment of the contextual acceptability of the socio-language perspectives of the non-rationalism.

Culture Value	Mean	Acceptability	Rank
A. BAHALA NA			
Makaammo ditan	1.70	NA	1
Uray aniat mapasamak	1.47	NA	2
B. TADHANA			
Gasat	4.35	VHA	1
C. GULONG NG PALAD			
Pinagtulid ti gasat	4.68	VHA	1

Table 6 reveals that cultural reciprocity shows a very highly acceptable assessment of the contextual acceptability on the Ilocano translation of the sociological terminologies in *lakas ng loob* (*kinatured*: 5=4.75); *maluwag ang loob* (*nalag-an ti rikna*: 5=4.54); *kagandahan loob* (*kinasayaat ti ugali*: 5=4.77) *mapagkaloob* (*managparabor*: X=4.78); *saloobin* (*karirikna*:  $\bar{j}$ =4.69); *tapat na kalooban* (*napudno a rikna*:  $\bar{j}$ =4.67); *saloobin* (*karirikna*: X=4.69); *tapat na kalooban* (*napudno a rikna*:  $\bar{j}$ =4.67); *masama ang loob* (*nasakit ti nakem*:  $\bar{j}$ =4.47); and *masasamang loob* (*managdakdakes*: 5=4.50).

Majority of the respondents similarly accepted the Ilocano translation of the socio-language perspectives of this personal value as *managparabor*, *manangited*, and *managsagot*. There are Ilocano terms suggested by the respondents as to the items of personal value such as *maluwag ang loob* as *kinalukneng ti puso*; *kagandahan loob* as *nasayaat a sursoro*; *mapagkaloob* as *nalukay iti imana*; *tapat na ko/ooban* as *napudno nga panagpuspuso*; and an interesting translation of *masasamang /oob* as *tulisan*.

Table 6. Assessment of the contextual acceptability of the socio-language perspectives of the personalism.

Culture Value	Mean	Acceptability	Rank
<b>A. LAKAS NG LOOB</b>			
Kinatured	4.75	VHA	1
Napigsa a pakinakem	3.66	HA	3
Tured pakinakem	4.07	HA	2
Kinatibker ti rikna	3.60	HA	4
<b>B.MALUWAG ANG LOOB</b>			
Nalag-an ti rikna	4.54	VHA	1
Mannakaawat	4.37	HA	2
<b>C. KAGANDAHAN LOOB</b>			
Kinasayaan ti ugali	4.77	VHA	1
Kinaimbag ti nakem	4.54	VHA	2
Kinadalus ti kaunggan	4.46	VHA	3
<b>D. MAPAGKALOOB</b>			
Managparabor	4.78	VHA	1
Manangited	4.10	HA	3
Managsagot	4.71	VHA	2
Manakipagrikna	3.20	A	4
<b>SALOOBIN</b>			
Karirikna	4.69	VHA	1
Nakem	4.57	VHA	2
<b>TAPAT NA KALOOBAN</b>			
Napudno a rikna	4.67	VHA	1
Nadalus a panagpuspuso	4.45	VHA	2
<b>MASAMA ANG LOOB</b>			
Nasakit ti nakem	4.47	VHA	1
Madi ti rikna	4.23	VHA	2
Nadagsen nga karirikna	4.00	HA	3
<b>MASASAMANG LOOB</b>			
Managdakdakes	4.50	VHA	2
Dakes a tattao	4.72	VHA	1

Table 7 reveals that culturally challenged Filipino Traits shows a very highly acceptable assessment of the contextual acceptability on the Ilokano translation of the sociological terminologies in *ningas kugon* (*nalaing laeng iti damdamo*: 5=4.82); *amor propio* (*panangipateg ti bagi*: 5=4.52); *probinsiyano* (*tagaaw-away*: 5=4.75); and *burong talangka* (*manangidadanes*: 5=4.42).

Majority of the respondents similarly accepted the Ilokano translation of the sociological terms of culturally challenged Filipino traits, however, the non-acceptable terms of *makaamo ditan* (as applied in *bahala na*) in *ningas kugon*. The respondents interpreted the *burong talangka* mentality more on the Ilokano term *panangipababa ti pada a tao*.

Table 7. Assessment of the contextual acceptability of the socio-language perspectives of the culturally challenged Filipino traits.

Culture Value	Mean	Acceptability	Rank
<b>A. NINGAS KUGON</b>			
1. Nalaing laeng iti damdamo	4.82	VHA	1
2. Nasayat iti rugi	4.27	VHA	2
3. Agpangpang-Laing	3.23	A	4
4. Makaamo ditan	2.38	FA	5
5. Apagbiit a regget	4.08	HA	3
<b>B. AMOR PROPIO</b>			
1. Panangipateg ti bagi	4.52	VHA	1
2. Ayat ti bagi	4.23	VHA	2
<b>C. PROBINSIYANO</b>			
1. Tagaaw-away	4.75	VHA	1
2. Taga-baryo	4.60	VHA	2
3. Taga-probinsiya	4.40	VHA	3
<b>D. BURONG TALANGKA</b>			
1. Manangidadanes	4.42	VHA	2
2. Panangipaba ti pada a tao	4.80	VHA	1
3. Panagapal	4.16	HA	4
4. Madi nga apal	4.30	VHA	3

Lynch (1963) defined the context of the enhanced smooth interpersonal relations in relation to its loss as guarded against by two sanctions discouraging behavior disruptive of these relations. The first and general sanction is *hiya*, or

shame; the second and specific safeguard is *amor propio*, or self-esteem. By these positive and negative means the lowland Filipino strives to have his fellows take him for a good man, an acceptable member of the community.

## CONCLUSIONS

On Filipino Value System, pamantayan represents three elements, namely: *pagannurutan* as *pagbatayan*, *asal* as *galad*, and *halaga* as *kinapateg*. The socio-language perspective of the value system interprets *halaga* as what Filipinos find most worthy and *asal* is manifested in the person's behavior, while *diwa* represents the idea of *loob* which is relevant to the Ilocano term of *nakem*.

On Social Acceptance. The respondents added sociological terminologies relevant to this study that the *pakikiramdam* with one Ilocano meaning panakipagrikna has included *pannakisimpiya* and *pannakisakit* as the sympathetic attitude for those persons who suffered deep emotional trouble in life. The *palakasan* included interesting Ilocano words as *panagsipsip* by giving good impressions about the person which deeply result to destroying the image of someone he/she does not like. This is also a negative public relation for personal motive or interest of giving something favorable to a person. The *pakiusap* added the humble action as *panagkumbaba* when you want something as favor to another person. Finally, the *sakop* included weird but acceptable Filipino philosophy of term *turay*.

On Cultural Reciprocity. There is a consistency as to the contextual acceptability based on the framework of the study identified MTB-MLE study except the Ilocano term *pakikiramay* with low level of acceptability on *pannakaliday*. It is more acceptable to use the term *panakipaladingit*, *panakipagrikna*, *panakitulong*, and *pannakisaranay*. On the otherhand, the managrikna (panakipagrikna is acceptable to pakikiramay) may not be highly acceptable term in *mapagmalasakit*. The acceptable terms are *manakipagsakit*, *manangaasi* and *mannakitinnu/on*.

On Non Rationalism. The respondents may not seem to accept the sociological translation of *bahala na* into the Ilocano terms as *makaammo ditan* and *Uray aniak mapasamak*. However, some of the respondents suggested *makaammo ti dios ditan*. They also suggested other Ilocano term for *tadhana* as *suerte* and *gulong ng palad* as *panagbaliw ti rupa ni gasat* and *panagbaliw ti biog*.

On Personalism. Majority of the respondents similarly accepted the Ilocano translation of the sociological terms of personalism, except the slight changes in the rankings of culture. The respondents have the lowest assessment as to the *mapagkaloob* with *manakipagrikna*. The favorable Ilocano translations of this personal value are *managparabor*, *manangited*, and *managsagot*.

On Culturally Challenged Filipino Traits. Majority of the respondents similarly accepted the Ilocano translations of the sociological terms of culturally challenged Filipino traits, except, the non-acceptable term of *makaamo ditan* (as applied in *bahala na*) in *ningas kugon*. The respondents interpreted the *burong talangka* mentality more on the Ilocano term *panangipababa ti pada a tao*.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Bueno, C. F. 2010. *The basic phenomenological experience on the values of cultural reciprocity along the notion of "naimbag-a-nakem."* Nakem International Philippine Chapter. Presented during the 5<sup>th</sup> *Nakem International Conference* with the theme "*Ada/ken Sirib: Education to Cultural Diversity and Linguistic Democracy*" hosted by the University of Northern Philippines, UNESCO Heritage City of Vigan, December 16-18.
- Bueno, C. F., Bueno E.A., and Rosa del J., 2011 *The Mother Language Education (MLE) integration on the Ilocano translations of the national Filipino perspectives of culture.* Nakem International Philippine Chapter. Presented during the 6<sup>th</sup> *National International Conference* with theme "*Sursuro : Mother Language Education and Cultural Nationalism*" hosted by Ifugao State University at Banaue Hotel, Banaue, Ifugao, Philippines on May 23-25.
- Bueno, C. F. 2012. *The phenomenological account of the "naimbag-a-nakem" along the sociological, anthropological and behavioural approach of the society.* *University of Bicol.* Presented during the *International Academic Colloquium* with the theme "*Reforms and Innovations in Higher Education towards Sustainable Development and Productivity*" sponsored by University of Bicol held at Concourse Convention Center, Legaspi on October 11-13.
- Enriquez, V. G. 1992. *From colonial to liberation psychology: The Philippine experience.* Dilliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Lewis, H.T. 1971. *Ilocano Rice Farmers.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press

shame; the second and specific safeguard is *amor propio*, or self-esteem. By these positive and negative means the lowland Filipino strives to have his fellows take him for a good man, an acceptable member of the community.

## CONCLUSIONS

On Filipino Value System, *pamantayan* represents three elements, namely: *pagannurutan* as *pagbatayan*, *asal* as *galad*, and *halaga* as *kinapateg*. The socio-language perspective of the value system interprets *halaga* as what Filipinos find most worthy and *asal* is manifested in the person's behavior, while *diwa* represents the idea of *loob* which is relevant to the Ilocano term of *nakem*.

On Social Acceptance. The respondents added sociological terminologies relevant to this study that the *pakikiramdam* with one Ilocano meaning *panakipagrikna* has included *pannakisimpatiya* and *pannakisakit* as the sympathetic attitude for those persons who suffered deep emotional trouble in life. The *palakasan* included interesting Ilocano words as *panagsipsip* by giving good impressions about the person which deeply result to destroying the image of someone he/she does not like. This is also a negative public relation for personal motive or interest of giving something favorable to a person. The *pakiusap* added the humble action as *panagkumbaba* when you want something as favor to another person. Finally, the *sakop* included weird but acceptable Filipino philosophy of term *turay*.

On Cultural Reciprocity. There is a consistency as to the contextual acceptability based on the framework of the study identified MTB-MLE study except the Ilocano term *pakikiramay* with low level of acceptability on *pannakaliday*. It is more acceptable to use the term *panakipaladingit*, *panakipagrikna*, *panakitulong*, and *pannakisaranay*. On the otherhand, the *manangrikna* (*panakipagrikna* is acceptable to *pakikiramay*) may not be highly acceptable term in *mapagmalasakit*. The acceptable terms are *manakipagsakit*, *manangaasi* and *mannakitinnulon*.

On Non Rationalism. The respondents may not seem to accept the sociological translation of *bahala na* into the Ilocano terms as *makaammo ditan* and *Uray anak mapasamak*. However, some of the respondents suggested *makaammo ti dios ditan*. They also suggested other Ilocano term for *tadhana* as *suerte* and *gulong ng palad* as *panagboluw ti rupa ni gasat* and *panagbaliw ti biog*.



On Personalism. Majority of the respondents similarly accepted the Ilocano translation of the sociological terms of personalism, except the slight changes in the rankings of culture. The respondents have the lowest assessment as to the *mapagka/oob* with *manakipagrikna*. The favorable Ilocano translations of this personal value are *managparabor*, *manangited*, and *managsagot*.

On Culturally Challenged Filipino Traits. Majority of the respondents similarly accepted the Ilocano translations of the sociological terms of culturally challenged Filipino traits, except, the non-acceptable term of *makaamo ditan* (as applied in *bahala na*) in *ningas kugon*. The respondents interpreted the *burong talangka* mentality more on the Ilocano term *panangipababa ti pada a tao*.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Bueno, C. F. 2010. *The basic phenomenological experience on the values of cultural reciprocity along the notion of "naimbag-a-nakem."* Nakem International Philippine Chapter. Presented during the 5<sup>th</sup> *Nakem International Conference* with the theme "*Ada/ ken Sirib: Education to Cultural Diversity and Linguistic Democracy*" hosted by the University of Northern Philippines, UNESCO Heritage City of Vigan, December 16-18.
- Bueno, C. F., Bueno E.A., and Rosa def J., 2011 *The Mother Language Education (MLE) integration on the Ilocano translations of the national Filipino perspectives of culture.* Nakem International Philippine Chapter. Presented during the 6<sup>th</sup> *National International Conference* with theme "*Sursuro : Mother Language Education and Cultural Nationalism*" hosted by Ifugao State University at Banaue Hotel, Banaue, Ifugao, Philippines on May 23-25.
- Bueno, C.F. 2012. *The phenomenological account of the "naimbag-a-nakem" along the sociological, anthropological and behavioural approach of the society.* *University of Bica/*. Presented during the *International Academic Colloquium* with the theme "*Reforms and Innovations in Higher Education towards Sustainable Development and Productivity*" sponsored by University of Bicoa held at Concourse Convention Center, Legaspi on October 11-13.
- Enriquez, V. G. 1992. *From colonial to liberation psychology: The Philippine experience.* Dilliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Lewis, H. T. 1971. *Ilocano Rice Farmers.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press

- Kearney, M. 1986. *The invisible hand to visible Feet: Anthropological studies of migration and Development. Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol 15, pp. 331-361.
- Lynch, F. 1962. Philippine values II: Social acceptance. *Philippine Studies* Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 82--99 Ateneo de Manila University.
- Jocano, F. L. 1997. *Filipino value system: a cultural definition* (Vol. 4). Punlad Research House.
- Mendoza, LS and Perkinson J. 2003. Filipino "kapwa" in global dialogue: A different politics of being-With the "Other." *Intercultural Communication Studies: Asian Approaches to Human Communication*. Vo XII, No 4 . *University of Denver Marygrove College*
- Mercado, L. N. 1994. Filipino mind. The council for research in values and philosophy and divine publication, Manila *Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change* Series III, Asia, Vol 8
- Mulder, N. 1994. Filipino Culture and Social Analysis. *Philippine Studies* Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 80-90. Ateneo de Manila University.



A Refereed and Indexed Multidisciplinary Research Journal  
Of the University of Northern Philippines  
Vigan City, Ilocos Sur  
2700 Philippines