

Editors' Note

When Facebook came up with its advice to its engineers to “move fast and break things”, none of us probably realized how much would end up broken as a consequence. Or how this attitude, when applied to many things in public life, would move us pretty fast indeed to a place where we may not actually want to be. And where we are now is a place that feels in flux, where conspiracy theories are shared as news. Levels of trust in institutions across many countries seem to be at a low point. Electorates, at least in places where voting actually matters, are embracing promises of radical, sometimes violent, change. Anger at the elite “one percent” rises with every revelation of misconduct. The pot is reaching a boil.

On the one hand, the ideas and sentiments being expressed are not new. Neither is the sense of either crisis or anticipation. As many weary-eyed social scientists would say, we have seen this before and it will take a long time before we really understand the significance of the events playing out today. But we do not live in the long run, and persons are not arcs of history. Aside from taking the dispassionate long-view, social scientists should also dip their fingers into the soup.

But science, as an institution, has not escaped the insurgent tide. A major attempt at replicating 100 of the major quantitative results in psychology left a significant death-toll, with more than half of the studies missing the mark (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). This has resulted in much introspection about a research culture that could produce so much shoddy work. Academia has its own “move fast” ethos, built around those who publish the most and ask questions the least. With the current public mood of distrust in experts, it does not help that much of our products as scientists are neither immediately useful, nor of great interest to our fellow citizens.

This special issue is our attempt at putting together a psychological “testimony” documenting our troubling/ interesting times in our troubling/interesting corner of the world. It is motivated by two possibly dissonant themes: the universalizing tendency of scientific rigor, and the fluid, parochial nature of real lives. Each of the papers addresses an issue that is of deliberately limited scope in terms of time, place, and population. As such, they are precisely the kinds of results that might prove difficult, if not impossible, to replicate. But at the same time, we intend these articles to participate in a global discussion on the nature of personality and social psychological research, and to benefit from the zeal for better methodology that is sweeping the discipline, and which knows no borders. At the same time, this special issue means to assert the distinct identity of our twin disciplines within Philippine psychology, standing beside (not under) our professionalized peers.

Bernardo’s article connects very neatly with our two themes, exploring both methodology and current social concerns. By applying a suite of modeling techniques from factor analysis to cluster analysis, he presents data that lay the groundwork for the investigation of core political values in the Philippines. Given that a picture of four very distinct value systems emerges, it is very tempting to consider this result in light of very polarized debates playing out around dining tables, halls of Congress, and social media. Additionally, in explicitly taking an etic approach, Bernardo seems to be weighing in on another debate, calling for a multiplicity of perspectives to be brought to bear alongside, and complementary to, the dominant emic conversations of Filipino values.

The two reports that follow after describe the territory of Philippine political psychology beyond values, but their results are a nice fit with Bernardo’s, hinting at how such values might make their way to political decisions, attitudes, emotions, and behavior. Nerona demonstrates how at least part of the support for President Rodrigo Duterte’s anti-drug campaign might spring from deep moral concerns about crime and deviance, and ultimately from an overriding

preference for punitive authoritarian rule. These broad moral and social preoccupations quite possibly embrace more particular beliefs and affective responses toward groups who are seen as threatening the social order, which is exactly what the findings from Labor and Gastardo-Conaco's article suggest. An appetite for retributive justice and a steady diet of anger and hate can take a political agenda quite far, so it seems.

As the studies above show, the gaze of self-appointed moral guardians is often drawn to those on the margins. This gaze is one of censure rather than inquiry, which means that when we actually take a closer look, what we find can often confound expectations. Batara, Cubil, Dy, Mapili, and Balderas report on risky sex among men who have sex with other men and, contrary to what we might predict, self-efficacy in condom use was positively associated with self-reported risky sex. This is definitely a very tentative result, but it should at least remind us that our prejudgments can sometimes outstrip the reality on the ground.

Morales, in exploring the concept of *diskarte*, offers us a way to think about the kind of facility and virtuosity that we might associate with those who operate on the edges of any kind of orthodoxy. While it remains to be seen how this will be approached empirically, she makes a compelling argument that it is a potentially useful construct that allows for the study of a very socially situated form of creativity and problem solving, at the intersection of social psychology and personality science.

The first article in the issue gestures toward concerns around etic and emic sensibilities in psychology. While taking a turn toward the emic was necessary for the development of a socio-historically sensitive and independent-minded Filipino psychology, this move did not clearly establish the boundary conditions of Western theories, methods, and effects vis-à-vis the realities of actual behaviors, folkways, and lives lived. The original critique was rightly aimed at the blind adoption of external claims and standards (see Pe-Pua and

Protacio-Marcelino, 2000, for a review), but we could also view this as an issue of replicability. Some findings do not work as intended when transplanted across cultures (see Savani and Job, 2017, for an excellent example), while some are clearly replicable (see Katigbak, et al., 2002, for another excellent example). We have not really had a thorough accounting of which important effects from the personality and social psychology literature do and do not replicate in the Philippines, even though such an agenda would be of great service to both Filipino psychology and to global psychology. In this special issue, Nalipay's article describing a replication of the classic correspondence bias experiment can be seen as a signal that Filipino psychologists should take replications more seriously, that this can add to our knowledge of Filipino psychology, and that, if done well, such studies are publishable.

As a way of pressing further the point just made, we see in the contribution from Retuya, Ceniza, Tare, Lara, and Quinain how a hypothesis generated from an intimate understanding of the value that Filipinos place on family can be tested in a way that simultaneously validates social cognitive research techniques in a Filipino sample. We learn from their paper that priming cognitions related to family obligation generates a measurable improvement in an actual school assessment. This finding might seem unsurprising, but given the current doubts surrounding priming research in social psychology, it is also methodologically significant.

Finally, we conclude with an essay from someone steeped in the practice of human resources and management. The challenge was to articulate what the research agenda for personality and social psychology would look like if framed by the concerns that businesses and organizations have. Maramba gives us an insider's view that would probably prick a few bubbles made of ivory-tower lather.

Aside from thanking all of the contributors, we could not have done without the support and leadership of Ferdinand Piñgul along with the members of the Social Psychology Division of the PAP. We of

course would like to thank Margaret Alvarez and the rest of the editorial staff of the PJP for helping us realize this special issue. Thank you to our copy editor Connie Maraán for polishing our prose, and to our layout artist Maria Catherine Dacillo-Domingo for turning chaos into composition. Finally, we acknowledge the selfless work of our reviewers, who lent their expertise and time despite clearly having better things to do. Many cooks might spoil the broth, but maybe science and publishing is more like brewing bitter medicine: It can get awful before it gets better.

Adrienne John R. Galang
Diwa Malaya A. Quiñones
John Manuel R. Kliatchko

REFERENCES

- Katigbak, M. S., Church, A. T., Guanzon-Lapeña, M. A., Carlota, A. J., & del Pilar, G. H. (2002). Are indigenous personality dimensions culture specific? Philippine inventories and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 89.
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science, 349*, aac4716.
- Pe-Pua, R., & Protacio-Marcelino, E. A. (2000). Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino psychology): A legacy of Virgilio G. Enriquez. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 3*, 49-71.
- Savani, K., & Job, V. (2017). Reverse ego-depletion: Acts of self-control can improve subsequent performance in Indian cultural contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*, 589-607.