

The Educated Citizen: Cultural and Gender Capital in the Schooling of Aetas' Children in the Municipality of Janiuay

ROME B. MORALISTA, DR. GABRIEL C. DELARIARTE

jerlynagustar@yahoo.com

West Visayas State University Calinog Campus, Calinog, Iloilo

PHILIPPINES

Abstract - *This qualitative research investigate the educated citizen, Cultural and Gender capital in the schooling of Aetas' children in the Municipality of Janiuay is largely focused on three domains or methodologies: grounded theory, phenomenology, and ethnography – although there are many other forms of qualitative inquiry (Murphy et al 1998). This study combines extensive participant observation and in-depth group/individual semi-structured interviews with six (6) elementary teachers and ten (10) Aetas' mothers. The respondents provided their insight to acquisition of elementary education at public elementary school. The result of interview and observations suggested that the educated citizen was a construct that could help explain issues concerning the education of Aetas' children in Janiuay, Iloilo. In addition, the educated citizen seemed to have basic components-cultural and gender capital- intertwined in the children's academic achievement. The results revealed that The male aetas are looked upon by the aetas themselves as the head of the family, its protector and who does the hard work; the female aetas are looked upon as the ones caring the baby, selling products for their livelihood, doing the cooking and cleaning of the house; Aetas don't want to be left behind in the current trends, education, and standard of living; the modern aetas become knowledgeable due to education and they earn it in school; some of aetas are already professionals such as: teachers, seafarers, and administrative aid employee in the municipal office.*

Keywords: educated citizen; cultural; gender capital; schooling; aetas' children; municipality of Janiuay.

I. INTRODUCTION

Republic Act No. 8371 is an act to recognize, protect and promote the rights of indigenous cultural communities/indigenous peoples, created a National Commission on Indigenous Peoples, established implementing mechanisms, appropriated funds therefore, and for other purposes (Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines in Congress, 1997). This Act is known as "The Indigenous Peoples Rights Act of 1997." The State shall recognize and promote all the rights of Indigenous Cultural Communities/Indigenous Peoples (ICCs/IPs) hereunder enumerated within the framework of the Constitution: The State shall recognize and promote the rights of ICCs/IPs within the framework of national unity and development; The State shall protect the rights of ICCs/IPs to their ancestral domains to ensure their economic, social and cultural well being and shall recognize the applicability of customary laws governing

property rights or relations in determining the ownership and extent of ancestral domain; The State shall recognize, respect and protect the rights of ICCs/IPs to preserve and develop their cultures, traditions and institutions. It shall consider these rights in the formulation of national laws and policies; The State shall guarantee that members of the ICCs/ IPs regardless of sex, shall equally enjoy the full measure of human rights and freedoms without distinction or discrimination; The State shall take measures, with the participation of the ICCs/IPs concerned, to protect their rights and guarantee respect for their cultural integrity, and to ensure that members of the ICCs/IPs benefit on an equal footing from the rights and opportunities which national laws and regulations grant to other members of the population; and The State recognizes its obligations to respond to the strong expression of the ICCs/IPs for cultural integrity by assuring maximum ICC/IP participation in the direction of education, health, as well as other services of ICCs/IPs, in order to render such services more responsive to the needs and desires of these communities.

Towards these ends, the State shall institute and establish the necessary mechanisms to enforce and guarantee the realization of these rights, taking into consideration their customs, traditions, values, beliefs, interests and institutions, and to adopt and implement measures to protect their rights to their ancestral domains (Republic of the Philippines Congress of the Philippines Third Regular Session. No. 1728; H. No. 9125, 1997).

The UN Declaration of Human Rights especially on education and the 1987 Constitution of the Republic the Philippines are among the foundations on which this study was anchored. As educators, the researchers are curious about the plight of the Aetas, their hopes and how they see education in relation to their own indigenous culture.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to understand the cultural practices of Aetas' children in the Municipality of Janiuay; to investigate the gender capital in the schooling of Aetas' children in the Municipality of Janiuay; to determine the Aetas' role in preserving their cultural practices as influenced by education recognized and acted upon, when and how.

III. QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGIES

Qualitative research in the educated citizen, Cultural and Gender capital in the schooling of Aetas' children in the Municipality of Janiuay is largely focused on three domains or methodologies: grounded theory, phenomenology, and ethnography – although there are many other forms of qualitative inquiry (Murphy et al 1998). In qualitative research

the sampling processes is usually determined by the methodology employed, although this is not always evident in published qualitative research papers as many qualitative studies appear not to have a clearly defined methodological approach.

Qualitative research may also be underpinned by theoretical frameworks that provide a lens through which phenomena are viewed and interpreted. Silverman (2000) describes theory as: ‘A set of concepts used to define and/or explain some phenomenon.’ Therefore, qualitative research studies that investigate the same phenomena, but adopt different theoretical frameworks, result in a different perspective on the same phenomena. For example, ethno methodology is concerned with how orderly social interaction occurs, as compared with symbolic interactions, which explores the ways in which individuals attach symbolic meaning to everyday interpersonal interactions (Silverman 2000). It is not possible in this article to explore fully the role of theory in qualitative research, but it is important to acknowledge the role of theoretical perspectives in the predominant qualitative methodologies, each of which has associated principles of sampling, as follows.

Grounded theory

Grounded theory is a qualitative methodology developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), the aim of which is theory generation that advances understanding of social and psychological phenomena. The origins of grounded theory are in symbolic interaction (Crookes and Davies 1998). Grounded theory is described by Murphy *et al* (1998) as ‘an elaboration and operationalisation of analytic induction’. Grounded theory is characterised by clearly specified steps in relation to the conduct of the research sampling and analysis. Key concepts are ‘theoretical sampling, constant comparative data analysis, theoretical sensitivity, memo writing, and identification of a core category and the concept of theoretical saturation’ (Webb and Kevern 2000). The sequential processes are important, as data gathering and analysis must occur concurrently; this characteristic of the research design and progressive theoretical sampling is recommended by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Application of the methodology has been further complicated by later divergent conceptualisations of grounded theory by both Glaser and Strauss, which has resulted in a Glaserian approach to grounded theory (Glaser 1978, 1992) and a Straussian approach (Strauss and Corbin 1990). The divergences in methodological approaches have origins in the coding processes. Strauss and Corbin (1990) advocate open coding, breaking down, comparing, conceptualising and categorising data, whereas Glaser (1978, 1992) advocates axial coding using a coding paradigm of causal conditions or properties that lead to another category.

The main issue is that the two approaches, if applied to the same data, may lead to different findings. Grounded theory has been extremely influential in qualitative cultural and gender capital in the schooling of Etas’ children in the Municipality of Janiuary research (Coyne 1997, Murphy *et al* 1998); however, sometimes the term is used inappropriately to signify a form of

analysis rather than a methodological approach that includes research design and progression.

Theoretical sampling is associated with grounded theory and can be defined as an approach ‘in which new observations are selected to pursue analytically relevant distinctions rather than to establish the frequency of phenomena’ (Emerson 1981). The goal of grounded theory is theory generation.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) advocate the continuous use of theoretical sampling during the progression of a grounded theory study to support the development of the emergent theory. The rationale for this is that as each category or theme is analysed more data is required to evidence the emerging theory. Thus, the term adopted to describe further sampling is theoretical sampling. The sample is complete when theoretical saturation is reached, that is when no new emergent themes or concepts are generated. Theoretical sampling is the *sine qua non* of grounded theory.

Ethnography

The term ethnography is derived from the Greek word *ethnos* meaning nation. There are a myriad of more complex and comprehensive definitions of ethnography articulated by social scientists and theorists within the paradigm of qualitative research (Fetterman 1998, Hammersley and Atkinson 1995, van Maanen 1995), although there is a lack of consensus as to a precise definition of ethnography. Atkinson and Hammersley (1998) have called for a flexible approach to defining ethnography and the conduct of ethnographic research. However, it is possible to identify key characteristics that all ethnographies share (Atkinson and Hammersley 1998) in that ethnography is a mode of social research typified by inductive reasoning and the concepts listed in Box 1:

Box 1: Central concepts of ethnography
1.) Central to the process is the scrutiny of specific social phenomena, as opposed to deductive research that tests out hypotheses.
2.) A propensity to elicit ‘unstructured’ data as opposed to pre-coded data.
3.) The sample size is small and may include just one case.
4.) The product of analysis is narrative description that includes an unequivocal acknowledgement of interpretation of the significance and purpose of human behaviour.
5.) There is no quantification of data.

Essentially, ethnographic research is concerned with the study of culture or sub-cultures (Fetterman 1998, Spradley 1979). This includes both the overt or explicit dimensions of culture that are known and cognitively salient to members of that culture or subculture, and also the covert or tacit dimensions that may not be articulated by members of the culture or subculture, but are nevertheless shared (Fetterman 1998). Therefore the goal is to obtain the most comprehensive and holistic perspective possible (Fetterman 1998).

This is dependent on the ‘cultural immersion’ of the researcher into the culture under investigation; this requires an extensive period of time in the field in a natural setting (Fetterman 1998, Spradley 1979). The key methods of collecting data are: participant observation, interview and documentary analysis. Ethnographic questioning in interviews involves three types of questions: descriptive, structural and contrast (Sorrell and Redmond 1995). There is no single form of ethnography; four major schools exist within the ethnographic tradition that represents a specific philosophical view: classical, systematic, interpretive and critical (Muecke 1994).

Sampling in ethnography is determined by the number of participants in the subculture or group under investigation. In this respect it may not be possible to specify in advance the number of participants. The study sample size in ethnographic research is therefore the total subculture or group under investigation. In the case of a focused ethnography (Morse 1987) that is more common in health services research, a specified number of individuals who have the appropriate characteristics for the study may be contacted in order to achieve a pragmatic solution when time and financial resources are limited. Key informants are significant in the generation of ethnographic study samples (Fetterman 1998). Key informants are individuals who may be gatekeepers that enable the ethnographic researcher greater access to the study population; they are also able to reflect upon cultural practices and share this knowledge with the ethnographer (Roper and Shapira 2000). In this respect, the ethnographic study sample can be described as purposeful or purposive as the participants have specific knowledge or experience of interest to the researcher. Purposive sampling is defined as: ‘Judgemental sampling that involves the conscious selection by the researcher of certain subjects or elements to include in the study’ (Crookes and Davis 1998). In the case of ethnography, a judgement or selection is made in relation to the participant’s membership of the group or subculture under investigation. Other types of samples used in ethnographic research are those that require a participant to recommend another individual to be interviewed or participate in the study; this type of sample is referred to as a snowball (Grbich 1999), opportunistic or nominated sample (Roper and Shapira 2000).

Phenomenology

Phenomenology is a qualitative methodology that seeks to uncover the meaning and essence of given phenomena. The epistemological and ontological foundations are said to rest with Heidegger (1993) and the hermeneutic phenomenological approach (van Manen 2001). Subjectivity is a key component in eliciting the deeply embedded meanings in everyday life and language; the concern is to make the unspoken visible and audible.

Phenomenological inquiry focuses on interviewing and gaining understanding of the meaning of the participant’s experiences (van Manen 2001). In phenomenological interviews the interviewer and interviewee both participate; questions are structured to uncover meaning (Sorrell and

Redmond 1996), for example, ‘what does this mean to you?’. In this sense, phenomenological inquiry is essentially concerned with individual experience and is incompatible with a qualitative method such as focus group (Webb and Kevern 2000), where the group is said to be unit of analysis (Kitzinger 1995). Specific analytical steps are taken and involve such concepts as ‘heuristic reductionism’ (van Manen 2001). The process is complex and cannot be fully explained in this paper. There are many phenomenological forms of inquiry, including transcendental, existential, hermeneutical, linguistical and ethical phenomenology. The type of methodological approach is often associated with small samples sizes because of the in-depth nature of the interviewing.

Sampling techniques in qualitative research

In qualitative research the type of sampling employed is determined by the methodology selected and the topic under investigation, not by the need to create generalisable findings. This anti-realist approach is based on the premise that the paradigm of qualitative research cannot be critically appraised in the same way as quantitative research, and that existing principles and rules for sampling do not apply (Mays and Pope 2000). For example, within ethnographic research the study sample comprises the community or culture under investigation, whose members demonstrate the membership of the cultural group being researched. Therefore this group or community form the sampling frame and this can be described as a purposive sample. In contrast, a grounded theory methodology demands concurrent data collection and analysis, so that more individuals who display the characteristics that warrant further investigation can be recruited to the study as the research progresses and preliminary findings emerge; this is known as ‘theoretical sampling’. It is worthy of note that some observers have concluded that all samples in qualitative research can be termed purposive (Coyne 1997), although within this broad term there may be considerable variation, and often terms are incorrectly used interchangeably. Murphy *et al* (1998) state that study samples in qualitative research are not necessarily static or shaped by the original conceptualisations in the research design, but are recurrent and emergent in nature. This is referred to as iteration or an iterative process. Within qualitative research the study sample is identified both at the start of the study and during the emergent research design; it may not be possible to fully specify the number of participants required at the start of the study. It is therefore essential to explore in some detail the principles of sampling in qualitative research, and the systematic approaches to generation of study samples. The following sections will explore the issues described and determine the limitations of the sampling techniques used in qualitative research.

Non-probability and probability sampling

In order to explore fully sampling issues within qualitative research, first it is essential to establish how this differs from sampling within positivism and quantitative research. Probability sampling is the process by which a selection of the population can be chosen by researchers as they have characteristics that can be viewed as representative of wider

society, albeit in smaller numbers. This enables generalisations to be made from a small population to the whole population. The issue of generalisability is the key distinguishing factor between qualitative and quantitative research. Quantitative research aspires to the gold standard of generalisability, and the techniques of sampling are rigidly prescribed (Crookes and Davies 1998). Generalisability is based on a number of statistical tests and mathematical formulae (Greenhalgh 1997), which provide indisputable evidence of the significance of various phenomena for the whole population; excluding the possibility that findings could occur by chance.

Qualitative research typically – although not exclusively – employs non-probability sampling techniques (Murphy *et al* 1998). This means that it is not usually intended that the findings of a particular study will be generalisable, but will apply only to the specific population under investigation.

Therefore the sample size is not determined by the need to ensure generalisability, but by a desire to investigate fully the chosen topic and provide information-rich data (Grbich 1999). Therefore, much smaller numbers may be involved than in probability sampling. However, non-probability sampling could be a drawback in commissioned of Indigenous people research. Clearly, commissioned research needs to result in benefits for the largest number of the population possible, although this principle cannot necessarily be applied equitably to minority ethnic communities who may be small in number, but have significant cultural practices.

The lack of generalisability in qualitative research has led to criticism of its usefulness (Giacomini 2001, Mays and Pope 2000), especially in health services research and health technology assessment (Murphy *et al* 1998).

Furthermore, the lack of transparency in sampling techniques (Coyne 1997) contributes to overall criticisms of qualitative research in relation to the opacity of guiding principles, systematic procedures employed, analytic frameworks used, and adherence to methodological frameworks (Mays and Pope 2000).

Coyne (1997) maps out the potential for confusion in the terminology used to describe qualitative research samples. Misuse of concepts and terms may indicate confusion of the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of methodologies, leading to what has been described earlier as ‘method slurring’ (Baker *et al* 1992); that is, the inappropriate synthesis of different qualitative methodologies that may compromise rigour, and may be at odds with the fundamental philosophical approaches. Within the qualitative literature (Coyne 1997, Miles and Huberman 1994, Murphy *et al* 1998) the most frequently referred to qualitative samples are as shown in Box 2.

Coyne (1997) asserts that the terms purposive and theoretical sampling are frequently used interchangeably and incorrectly. Theoretical sampling is a specific element of the methodology of grounded theory approach (Strauss and Corbin 1998), as stated earlier.

Two other forms of sampling are identified that are worthy of further consideration, as they deviate from accepted orthodoxies in both quantitative and qualitative research,

emphasising areas of commonality rather than polarity between positivism and naturalism. In their highly acclaimed and extensive review of qualitative research methods in health technology assessment.

Murphy *et al* (1998) identify probability sampling and non-probabilistic sampling for generalisation as important procedures for qualitative sampling. Non-probabilistic sampling for generalisation is also known as non-random sampling for representativeness (Murphy *et al* 1998). This approach might be more appropriately termed non-random sampling for typicality; the author of this paper is of the view that the term representativeness alludes to concepts associated with quantitative research, and may create further confusion. Typicality is similar but not the same as representativeness in quantitative research and more accurately describes the extension or application of findings to other populations which are similar to the original study sample, as opposed to the whole population. Murphy *et al* (1998) claim that there is no reason why probability samples cannot be used in qualitative research, but acknowledge that for some this concepts listed in Box 1

Box 2: Types of qualitative sample
1.) Convenience (accidental) samples – participants who are readily available and easy to contact.
2.) Purposive sample – participants who have specific characteristics or features.
3.) Theoretical samples – a component of grounded theory, that enables new or emerging domains to be explored during the process of the research.
4.) Selective sampling – the selection of cases prior to the conduct of research.
5.) Within case sampling – selection of participants within a specific group.

Would mean an unacceptable transgression of methodological principles. Furthermore, contradictions exist in relation to sample sizes associated with probability samples and the notion of an in-depth investigation, as is usual in qualitative research. In reality, the use of probability sampling in qualitative research would be fraught with difficulties and contrary to some of the methodological principles of qualitative research. For example, phenomenology is essentially concerned with the meaning of phenomena within the lived experience of an individual (Manen 2001), therefore a probability sample would be totally incompatible as the aim of a probability sample is to seek generalisability.

The concept of non-probabilistic sampling for generalisation is informed by the concept of empirical generalisability, which is based on the notion of purposive sampling in order to establish the typicality of settings or groups (Murphy *et al* 1998). This is an important consideration for ethnographic research, as empirical generalisation can provide the bedrock for assertions of the relevance of ethnographic studies to other populations. Therefore, ethnographic research can result in empirical generalisability. Murphy *et al* (1998) state that these generalisations can lead to theoretical propositions.

However, Hammersley and Atkinson (1992) point out that empirical generalisability certainly does have limitations in research that uses a purposive sample (non random sample for representativeness) in order to produce empirical generalisations: 'Empirical generalisations can only be to finite populations (though these do not necessarily have to specified very precisely).'

This may limit the usefulness of empirical generalisability in cultural and gender capital in the schooling of Etas' children in the Municipality of Janiway.

Maximum phenomena variation

While the study sample may be clearly defined at the outset of qualitative research, the technique of sampling within case, that is, ensuring that many different variations of the data in a given case are explored (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995; Mays and Pope 2000; Miles and Huberman 1994), must be carried out to ensure the full range and extent of a phenomena are represented.

As discussed, recurrent sampling is emblematic of the emergent nature of qualitative research. Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) focus on three major domains in ethnographic research associated with sampling within case: people, time and context.

People

For example, if you were investigating the educated citizen: Cultural and Gender capital in the schooling of Aetas' children in the Municipality of Janiway as individuals, it would be necessary to include both first- and second- generation of Aetas', as well ensuring a gender and age mix. Therefore, creating a heterogeneous sample of Aetas' children in the Municipality of Janiway. For example, if the original research design sought to access participants via general practice of cultural and gender capital in the schooling, there is no guarantee that all etas' people are primary educated citizen indeed known to their general culture and gender capital in the schooling. Therefore, study participants may need to be sought, as the research progresses, via community groups and associations.

Time

This is data collection as taken place over a time period, which provides variation in time and the different influences on participants' experience.

Context

The research may take place in different geographical locations in a variety of settings. Achievement of heterogeneity in purposive samples is also termed maximum variation sampling (Miles and Huberman 1994, Patton 1990) and phenomenal variation (Sandelowski 1995); regardless of the terminology adopted the goal is to add rigour to possible empirical generalisations that are derived from data arising from the fullest range of participants and settings.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The male and female aetas still believe in the traditional and stereotype roles of males and females. They are eager to study and learn in order to uplift their lives.

Government agencies especially NCIP, DepEd, TESDA and CHED should continue to help provide education to the Aetas so that they will be able to fulfil the desire of this tribal minority.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson P, Hammersley M, (1998) in Denzin K, Lincoln Y (eds) *Strategies of Qualitative Enquiry*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Baker C et al (1992) Method slurring: the grounded theory/phenomenology example. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 17, 11, 1355-1360.
- Coyne I (1997) Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling: merging or clear boundaries? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 26, 3, 623-630.
- Crookes P, Davies S (eds) (1998) *Research into Practice: Essential Skills for Reading and Applying Research*. London, Ballière Tindall, in association with the RCN.
- Emerson R (1981) *Observational fieldwork*. In Murphy E et al (1998) *Qualitative research methods in health technology assessment: a review of the literature*. *Health Technology Assessment*. 2, 16, iii-ix, 1-274.
- Fetterman DM (1998) *Ethnography: Step By Step*. Second edition. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Giacomini MK (2001) The rocky road: qualitative research as evidence. *ACP Journal Club*. 134, 1, A11-A13.
- Glaser BG (1978) *Theoretical Sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA, Sociology Press.
- Glaser BG (1992) *Emergence vs. Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA, Sociology Press.
- Glaser BG, Strauss AL (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York, Aldine.
- Grbich C (1999) *Qualitative Research in Health: an Introduction*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Greenhalgh T (1997) Papers that go beyond numbers (qualitative research). *British Medical Journal*. 315, 7107, 540-543.
- Hammersley, T. (1992) The generalisability of ethnography in Hammersley M (Ed) *What's Wrong with Ethnography*. London, Routledge.
- Hammersley M, Atkinson P (1995) *Ethnography: Principles and Practice*. London, Routledge.
- Heidegger M (1993) *Basic Writings*. In Krell DF (Ed) *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings*. San Francisco, Harper.
- Kitzinger J (1995) Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal*. 311, 7000, 299-302.
- Johnson M et al (1995) Arguments for 'British pluralism' in qualitative health research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 33, 2, 243-249.
- Mays N, Pope C (2000) Assessing quality in qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*. 320, 7226, 50-52.

- Miles MB, Huberman AM (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Morse, JM. (1987) *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue*. Newbury Park, Sage.
- Muecke M (1994) On the evaluation of ethnographics. In Morse J (Ed) *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Murphy E et al (1998) Qualitative research methods in health technology assessment: a review of the literature. *Health Technology Assessment*. 2,16, iii-ix, 1-274.
- Patton MQ (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. Newbury Park, Sage.
- Roper JM, Shapira J (2000) *Ethnography in Nursing Research*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Sandelowski M (1995) Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing and Health*.18, 2, 179-183.
- Silverman D (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London, Sage.
- Sorrell M, Redmond GM (1995) Interviews in qualitative nursing research: differing approaches for ethnographic and phenomenological studies. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 21, 6, 1117-1122.
- Spradley JP (1979) *The Ethnographic Interview*. Fort Worth, Harcourt Brace.
- Strauss A, Corbin J (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, Sage.
- Van Maanen J (1995) *Representations in Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Van Manen M (2001) 'Phenomenology' Course Handbook. QHR (2001) Post-Workshop B. Ewha Women's University, Seoul.
- Webb C, Kevern J (2000) Focus groups as a research method: a critique of some aspects of their use in nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 33, 6, 798-805.