

# THE LAW TEACHER IN PHILIPPINE SOCIETY\*

IRENE R. CORTES \*\*

The spoof about teachers was embellished a bit more in a conference of law deans<sup>1</sup> thus:

“Those who can, do  
Those who can't, teach  
Those who can't teach,  
become law deans.”<sup>2</sup>

The categories mentioned are not mutually exclusive, for in the Philippines a majority of law teachers are practicing lawyers or members of the judiciary and law deans teach even if not all of them are in law practice.

An accurate head count of law teachers has yet to be made and this is only possible if the exact number of law schools operating can be ascertained. In 1975 the Department of Education and Culture and the Supreme Court gave the number of law schools as 53. This includes one state supported school<sup>3</sup> and 52 privately run law schools. All of the latter are subject to the supervision of the Department of Education and Culture through its Bureau of Higher Education, and all 53 are bound by the rule-making power of the Supreme Court regarding admission to the practice of law. In the same year the University of the Philippines Law Center prepared a Directory of Law Professors in the Philippines.<sup>4</sup> 392 law teachers are listed representing 48 law schools.

At the beginning of the schoolyear in 1976-1977 the Department of Education and Culture announced that some law schools in the country were voluntarily terminating their law course.<sup>5</sup> Whether the country needed all of the remaining 40 or so law schools was another matter to determine. The estimated Philippine population was 42 million found in 1,200 populated islands among 7,100 islands of the archipelago. According to the Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP) which was established

---

\* Paper presented in the Conference on Law and Development held at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

\*\* *Professor of Law and Dean*, University of the Philippines, College of Law.

<sup>1</sup> April 22-24, 1976.

<sup>2</sup> By former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Jose B.L. Reyes.

<sup>3</sup> University of the Philippines College of Law more popularly known as U.P. College of Law.

<sup>4</sup> U.P. Law Center, *Directory of Law Professors*, 1975.

<sup>5</sup> *Philippine Daily Express*, Thursday, June 17, 1976.

in 1972 there were 27,003 lawyers in the country of whom 19,841 were registered with the various chapters. The activities indicated by those registered were as follows:<sup>6</sup>

<i>Activities</i>	<i>No. of Lawyers</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Private practice	4,644	23.4
Privately employed with some private practice	1,573	7.9
Lawyers in government service	6,398	32.2
Non-practicing lawyers	6,100	30.7
Did not indicate activity	1,126	5.7
	19,841	100.00

Rounding up the figures given, the proportion of practicing lawyers to the population would be one to 8,500.<sup>7</sup> The sufficiency of this number of practicing lawyers would depend very much on the needs of the society. Uneven distribution of the lawyer population would affect the effectiveness of the delivery of legal services. At this writing lawyers are highly concentrated in urban areas. Thus, Manila and Quezon City with about 5% of the country's population account for 34% of the lawyer population.<sup>8</sup> The number of lawyers in the provinces vary from 21 in Batanes to 773 in Pangasinan.<sup>9</sup>

The proliferation of law schools in almost every part of the Philippines occurred after World War II. Before 1946, to take the law course, a student had to go to one of a handful of law colleges usually in Manila. But during the period 1950 to 1960 government recognition was extended to no less than 37 private law colleges.<sup>10</sup>

By 1972 there was a total of 79 law schools in the country, only one supported by the state. Private law schools come under different categories. Some are part of schools run by religious orders, some by non-profit foundations, others are units of educational institutions established as stock corporations declaring dividends periodically.

The reason for the increase in law schools is attributable to a number of factors. *First*, it does not cost very much to establish a law school,

<sup>6</sup> Data obtained from IBP files.

<sup>7</sup> Kit Machado, Visiting Researcher, U.P. College of Public Administration, in a paper presented at the U.P. Law Center, 9 July 1976, cited a higher proportion: 6,500 persons to a practicing lawyer.

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix B.

<sup>9</sup> Data from the IBP as of June 1976.

<sup>10</sup> Data obtained from the Bureau of Higher Education, Department of Education and Culture.

No laboratories are required and a working library can be started with not too many titles. *Second*, whether in the big cities or provincial capitals, students are drawn from the ranks of the employees who take law because classes are usually held in the evening. *Third*, the establishment of a law school adds prestige to an educational institution and at the same time provides one of the easier ways to comply with one of the requirements set by the Department of Education and Culture that to become a university an institution must have at least four degree conferring units. *Finally*, there being no stringent qualification requirements for membership in the law faculty, the faculty can be recruited from among practicing lawyers, judges, etc.

Characteristic of law teaching in the country is that except in a very few schools, it is conducted in the evening to students who have usually put in a full eight-hour day of work before attending classes; law teachers are also engaged principally in other activities.

The University of the Philippines law school,<sup>11</sup> is a category by itself not only because it is the only state supported school, but also for a number of other reasons. It maintains a corps of regular full-time faculty members whose main functions are teaching, research and extension work. A majority of its studentry take law courses in day classes. A special curriculum which take a year longer is prescribed for evening classes intended for employed students.

Law is a four-year course requiring for admission a baccalaureat degree. In all schools, English is the medium of instruction.<sup>12</sup> While English together with Spanish and Filipino are official languages, the bar examinations are in English and this continues to be the language of the courts and of legislation.

#### *Methodology, Sources*

Data for this paper were obtained from (1) papers and proceedings of a conference of law deans held in April, 1976; (2) The Directory of Philippine Law Teachers, The Supreme Court, the Department of Education and Culture; and (3) A study of law teachers and legal influentials.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Officially known as the University of the Philippines College of Law (U.P. College of Law).

<sup>12</sup> Although the first classes in law conducted in English were not started till 1910, today no instruction is given in Spanish and rarely in the vernacular.

<sup>13</sup> Attached as Appendix "A" are tables prepared from data gathered in the survey. The able assistance of Misses Theresa Alma F. Malinis and Ma. Terecita C. Sison, research assistants of the U.P. Law Center made possible the gathering of the data in this paper.

The study consists of two parts. The first part is a random sampling of law schools in different parts of the country.<sup>14</sup> Of 133 law teachers in seven law schools to whom questionnaires were sent, 88 responded. A purposive list was also prepared of influentials in government for interview. Of 59 listed 28 are or have been law teachers.

### *Recruitment of Law Teachers*

There is no uniform recruitment policy followed by law schools. Different factors come into play to affect the choice of law teachers.

It is an unusual law school in the country that is able to support itself. Law schools are generally subsidized by other units of the university or from other sources, and the recruitment of faculty is influenced by the source of support, availability of faculty material, rates of compensation as well as the type and location of the school.

At the conference of law deans held recently, one law dean in Manila said in all seriousness that the cause of his school's recruitment problem of law faculty members was the lack of parking space on campus; another said that his school appointed whoever was assigned as district judge and a third had a problem of how to discontinue the appointment of one such judge. It was also stated that appointment to the faculty was made on the basis of reputation. The practice or policy of private schools to offer teaching positions to their graduates who place among the first ten in the bar examinations was also mentioned. Merit and fitness as relevant factors in the choice of faculty were assumed.

From discussions and information given it is possible to view recruitment on the basis of whether it is for full-time or part-time law teaching in the State University or a private law school, in the Metropolitan Manila area or in the provinces.

Where there is a large concentration of lawyers, there is a correspondingly large pool from which to draw law teachers. Where there are many law schools in the same area, it is possible to share law teachers among several schools. However, this is not an unmitigated advantage, for as surveys<sup>15</sup> and the conference of law deans reveal, there are among law teachers paid on the hourly rate, those who during the same semester go from one school to another, teaching in as many as five schools as many different subjects for as much as 24 hours a week in addition to practicing law full-scale.

---

<sup>14</sup> Three in Greater Manila, two in Visayas, two in Mindanao. Except for the University of the Philippines College of Law (referred to in the text as State University law school) which belongs to a category by itself, the private law schools will not be identified. In the tables they will be referred to as schools A, B, C, D, E, and F.

<sup>15</sup> See Appendix "A", Tables 5-9.

Law teachers fall into different categories. There is a small group, most of them in the state university who have made law teaching a career and devote their time principally to law teaching and its related activities: research and extension work. This corps of teachers is usually referred to as the full-time law teachers. They receive annual compensation, are entitled to certain fringe benefits and they may occasionally be engaged in consultation work. A variation of this, again in the state university is the part-time faculty member who does essentially what the full-time faculty member does except that it is for half the time of service required, and at the proportional rate of compensation. These two groups enjoy professorial rank and tenure.

They are to be distinguished from the various classes of lecturers who are appointed every school year and are compensated for every hour of teaching and final examination each semester.

In the private schools the information is that there are a few full-time law teachers in a few schools compensated on the monthly basis or a twelve-month period. Generally, law teachers' compensation is on the hourly rate, rather nominal in the provincial schools and varying according to size of enrollment in the larger ones in the cities. For the law teacher who is a judge, a practicing lawyer, or employee in government or private enterprise, teaching is an auxiliary activity.

With respect to the U.P. College of Law, it has been aptly observed that for its law graduate to embrace teaching as a life career is to embrace the vow of poverty.

Poverty, of course, is a relative term. But a bright young law graduate when considering a choice of careers will most likely have teaching quite low in the list of preferences as against offers of law firms, government agencies and private enterprise. Only a few who are strongly inclined towards intellectual pursuits will prefer to remain in the University. The state law school may now be able to match the starting salary offered elsewhere in the country, but in five years the same graduate whom the school would consider at all because of outstanding academic performance would normally be making two or three times more in basic compensation from law practice or other employment.

However, it is the unusual graduate fresh out of law school whom the school will recruit. A young graduate will often need more training to adequately discharge the responsibilities of law teaching. The policy of the school is to invite those who by reason of their academic background, professional experience, or achievement and availability have in the judgment of the dean and the academic personnel committee of the school qualified for membership in the full-time law faculty. These are even harder to

recruit. To compound the problem it is not only how to attract but also how to retain its faculty that the state law school perennially faces. Appointments in the judiciary, private practice, and more attractive offers in other offices account for the frequent turn over in faculty ranks.

While it is not as difficult to invite lecturers on the hourly basis, there are some areas of law such as jurisprudence, legal history and legal philosophy in which fewer law teachers are available.

### *Career Structures, Social Origins*

From the responses in the survey, the modal law teacher is 51-55 years old, male, married, has an LL.B. as highest degree, has been teaching law for less than ten years, teaches an average of 10-12 hours a week, in one school, in the field of civil law, deriving less than 5% of annual income from this activity, is principally engaged in law practice and has not published.

However, of 941 law books examined 526 or 59.7% are written by law teachers. Practically all of these, however, are instructional aids, e.g., textbooks, annotations, references, quizzers, etc.<sup>16</sup>

What then is the career structure and social origins of law teachers? It would seem that generally, law teachers are drawn from lawyers established in the profession, as law practitioners, or members of the judiciary, or holding positions in government or private enterprise (Table 10). They are relatively advanced in age (Table 1) and do not depend on law teaching as principal source of income (Table 19). Decidedly of the elite.

The composite picture that emerges from these data is that of the part-time law teacher who comes to the law school on the hour he is scheduled to teach, has no more obligation to the school than attending occasional meetings of the faculty and giving examinations, and rating his students.

But the full-time teachers who make of academic life a career constitute such a small segment that in the statistics gathered they do not affect the total picture very much. It is only when a school is taken individually that a different pattern emerges.

For instance, at the state university, 24% of the law-teacher respondents are women (Table 2), 20% are single (Table 3), 43.3% have graduate degrees in law (LL.M. and S.J.D. in Table 4). The law teaching experience is more evenly spread (Table 5), 52% of the respondents

<sup>16</sup> Among the influentials the modal is one who has published, the most frequent type of publication being the legal article.

derive more than 30% of their income from law teaching (Table 4), and 84% have published (Table 11).

*Methods of Instruction, Course Materials, Examinations*<sup>17</sup>

Since all but a small number of teachers are engaged principally in some activity other than law teaching, and, except in a few schools, law students are enrolled in evening classes while holding daytime jobs, teaching methods and materials are chosen to suit these circumstances. A study on the subject reveals that 60% of law teaching is done through lectures. Recitation (euphemistically dubbed a modified Socratic method) is also used.

According to responses to a questionnaire, the case method is extensively used and even occasionally over-used (some law teachers claimed they assign 11-20 cases to be read in a day where there may be two or more classes scheduled on the same day). This does not seem to tally with the responses of 91.3% of the students who said they were expected in their classes to answer questions by reciting assigned texts.

Again, as to teaching methods or course materials it would not be safe to generalize. Some law teachers use casebooks, textbooks, outlines, etc. Others utilize commentaries or quizzers. Examinations are ordinarily given twice a semester, usually written. According to respondents in the questionnaire the most usual examination given was the problem type, followed by the essay type. Clinical education is part of the curriculum only in the state university law school.

The main preoccupation of most law teachers, however, as frequently admitted in the conference of law deans, is to get the students of law to pass the bar examinations. This dominates law teaching and the operation of most law schools. On the other hand, the state university law school has for years considered passing the the bar examinations an incident to a student's training and urges that these examinations be de-emphasized. So far, there have been no tangible results.

But the dissatisfaction over legal education in the country, from which law teaching cannot escape is manifested by current moves from the Supreme Court to take over the direct supervision of law schools. An earlier plan to abolish the bar examinations has as yet to make a headway, for the reason that the alternative of giving an examination at the end of each year of law school work would be even more cumbersome.

---

<sup>17</sup> This topic could be the subject of a separate paper and another research. It so happens that in the conference of law deans referred to earlier, this writer prepared a study on the same subject by conducting a twin survey of law teachers and law students. The papers and proceedings will be published separately by the Law Center.

*Research Function*

The essentiality of a competent faculty to a sound legal education structure cannot be overemphasized. It is important not only to bring together qualified persons, as faculty members in a law school but also to see that optimum benefit is drawn from law teachers by the students, the school and the community.

The function of the law teaching arm of the legal profession is not done when classes of aspiring future lawyers are met, lectures given, examinations administered, and reports rendered. The teacher's responsibility includes the preparation of students for the varied roles of a lawyer in society.

In a university the law school participates in the grand adventure of advancing the frontiers of knowledge through research and in bringing to society the results of such research.

The need for study, reflection, discovery of new methods, formulation of new theories or principles and their communication to others are as necessary in the legal profession as in other fields of human activity.

The practicing lawyer is too busy with his clients' concern to devote time for study and inter-disciplinary activities. The members of the judiciary, especially in the highest levels, have not only their own cases to deal with but as a rule are reluctant to take on controversial matters which may eventually come before them. Research on current social problems, their ramifications and feasible solutions is left largely to the teaching arm of the legal profession. Since law teachers in the country are generally also law practitioners or members of the judiciary, the task is further narrowed down to those in the full-time academic staffs of the universities.

The law schools cannot avoid responsibility for the training of students in research skills. However, this aspect of legal training even of the doctrinal type, according to the last conference of law deans, is largely neglected. The main concern of preparing for the bar examinations has crowded out other activities. In the state university law school, however, legal research is emphasized on three levels: (1) on an institutional basis in the U.P. Law Center, (2) in the training of students in subjects specifically designed to equip them the skill in doctrinal and critical research, and (3) as an essential part of the law teacher's function in the course of teaching any subject. Heretofore, research has been mainly doctrinal. But the beginnings have since been made in the use of social science methods of research and the undertaking of inter-disciplinary research projects.



### *Law Teachers' Contribution*

To determine the law teachers' perception of their most important contribution, an open ended question was asked: "What do you consider the most important contribution to Philippine society that you have made or are making as law teacher?" The most common answers can be reduced to three: (1) To encourage, develop, train and sharpen as well as mold the minds of potential members of the legal profession; (2) To acquaint the students with legal concepts, and with substantive and procedural law; and (3) To imbue law students with the importance of discipline, professional ethics, and the social as well as moral qualities of the legal profession.

It would seem then that the law teacher not only expounds on law but also stresses ethics and morals. Some stated that they approach their task with a sense of mission.

### *Law Teachers in the Society*

Law teachers in the Philippine setting have moved on to other areas of government service. Thus, of 92 lawyers who have achieved the distinction of becoming members of the Supreme Court, 54.34% were at one time or other law teachers.<sup>18</sup> Of five lawyers in the cabinet today, four were law teachers.<sup>19</sup> In the Court of Appeals, of 29 members, 18 have teaching experience, some still in the active teaching force.

In interviews with influentials in the legal profession<sup>20</sup> as well as in the questionnaire administered among law teachers, this question was asked: "In what way has law teaching contributed to your professional growth?" These are the answers most frequently given by the law teachers: (1) It has enabled them to keep up with the latest developments in law and jurisprudence; (2) lent breadth and depth to their understanding of law; and (3) gave them prestige and honor. Influentials in the legal profession who were interviewed also gave these answers but in different order.<sup>21</sup>

### *Extension Work, Participation in Reform*

The Philippine Supreme Court includes law teachers in the membership of its committees, such as those on bar integration, the revision of the Judiciary Act as well as the Rules of Court, and the supervision and accreditation of law schools.

Through the U.P. Law Center some law teachers are involved directly in the process of formulating proposals for law reform, others participate

---

<sup>18</sup> Two of the ten members of the present court were former full-time faculty members of the State University law school.

<sup>19</sup> Again three of them were former full-time members of the faculty of the same law school.

<sup>20</sup> A listing was made at the start identifying those to be interviewed.

<sup>21</sup> Nos. 1 and 2 being interchanged.

indirectly. Because of the variety and number of activities in continuing legal education, research and law reform law teachers from other schools have been impressed into some projects. Inquiry into problem areas of the society sparks interest in new legislation or revision of existing ones to remedy demonstrated defects.

#### *Continuing Legal Education*

Continuing legal education programs for members of the bar and the bench come in the form of institutes, workshops, seminars, short courses, summer programs or conferences, usually under the auspices of the U.P. Law Center. Lecturers are drawn from members of the law faculty of the state university as well as of private law schools, from members of the judiciary and practitioners.

#### *R e s u m é*

To speak of the law teachers in the Philippine society is to speak of many different categories of persons engaged in law teaching. But some general characteristics can be drawn: *First*, they teach law in English. *Second*, except for a small number, law teachers teach after office hours, their principal work being as law practitioners, members of the judiciary, or as employees in government or private enterprise. *Third*, a majority of law teachers have not published but a substantial percentage of legal writing in the country is done by law teachers as teaching aids. *Fourth*, law teaching not only enables members of the profession to contribute in the training of future members of the bar but also helps the law teacher to rise professionally. *Fifth*, some law teachers have opportunity to influence law reform and to lecture in continuing legal education programs. *Finally*, the beginnings have been made to introduce a larger dimension in law teaching and research, approaching law not just as a set of norms but as an important institution that must be viewed in its social context.

G E N E R A L T A B L E

LAW SCHOOLS	LAW TEACHERS			STUDENT
	Total Number	Resp.	%	ENROLLMENT Total Number
A	24	13	54.2	336
B	21	10	47.6	422
C	20	13	65.0	75
D	13	12	92.3	104
E	6	6	100.0	80
F	12	9	75.0	139
State U.	37	25	67.6	489
T o t a l	133	88	66.2	1,645

NOTE: U.P. Faculty with teaching loads, 1st Semester,  
1976-1977.

TABLE I - AGE OF LAW TEACHERS

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	A		B		C		D		E		F		STATE U.		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16.7	1	16.6	1	11.1	0	0	4	4.5
30-35	2	15.4	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	2	22.2	5	20.0	10	11.4
36-40	2	15.4	1	10	1	7.7	2	16.7	0	0	1	11.1	2	8.0	9	10.2
41-45	1	7.7	3	30	0	0	1	8.3	0	0	2	22.2	4	16.0	11	12.5
46-50	1	7.7	1	10	3	23.0	4	33.3	0	0	1	11.1	4	16.0	14	15.9
51-55	2	15.4	3	30	3	23.0	1	8.3	3	50.0	1	11.1	4	16.0	17	19.3
56-60	1	7.7	0	0	2	15.4	2	16.7	1	16.6	0	0	5	20.0	11	12.5
61-65	1	7.7	0	0	2	15.4	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	4	4.5
66-70	2	15.4	1	10	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	5	5.7
71 & above	1	7.7	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	0	0	3	3.4
N. A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T o t a l	13	100.0	10	100	13	100.0	12	100.0	6	100.0	9	100.0	25	100.0	88	100.0

TABLE 2 - SEX OF LAW TEACHERS

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS															
	: A		: B		: C		: D		: E		: F		: STATE U.		TOTAL
Sex	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	%
Male	: 13	: 100	: 9	: 90	: 12	: 92.3	: 10	: 88.3	: 6	: 100	: 9	: 100	: 19	: 76.0	: 78 : 88.6
Female	: 0	: 0	: 1	: 10	: 1	: 7.7	: 2	: 16.7	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 6	: 24.0	: 10 : 11.4
Total	: 13	: 100	: 10	: 100	: 13	: 100.0	: 12	: 100.0	: 6	: 100	: 9	: 100	: 25	: 100.0	: 88 : 100.0

TABLE 3 - STATUS OF LAW TEACHERS

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS															
	: A		: B		: C		: D		: E		: F		: STATE U.		TOTAL
Status	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	%
Single	: 0	: 0	: 1	: 10	: 0	: 0	: 2	: 16.7	: 1	: 16.7	: 1	: 11.1	: 5	: 20.0	: 10 : 11.4
Married	: 13	: 100	: 9	: 90	: 13	: 100	: 10	: 83.3	: 5	: 83.3	: 8	: 88.9	: 20	: 80.0	: 78 : 86.6
Widowed	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0
Total	: 13	: 100	: 10	: 100	: 13	: 100	: 12	: 100.0	: 6	: 100.0	: 9	: 100.0	: 25	: 100.0	: 88 : 100.0

\* TABLE 4 - HIGHEST DEGREE OBTAINED

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	: A		: B		: C		: D		: E		: F		: STATE U.		: TOTAL	
Degree	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%
LL.B.	: 8	: 53.3:	9	: 75	: 12	: 80.0:	11	: 64.7:	6	: 60	: 9	: 69.2:	12	: 40.0:	67	: 59.8
LL.M.	: 4	: 26.7:	0	: 0	: 1	: 6.7:	1	: 5.9:	0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 10	: 33.3:	16	: 14.3
S.J.D.	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 3	: 10.0:	3	: 2.7
Others	: 3	: 20.0:	3	: 25	: 2	: 13.3:	5	: 29.4:	4	: 40	: 4	: 30.8:	5	: 16.7:	26	: 23.2
Total	: 15	:100.0:	12	:100	: 15	:100.0:	17	:100.0:	10	:100	: 13	:100.0:	30	:100.0:	112	:100.0

NOTE: Others refer to respondents giving baccalaureate degree in addition to the LL.B.

\* Multiple Responses

TABLE 5 - NUMBER OF YEARS OF LAW TEACHING

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	A		B		C		D		E		F		STATE U.		TOTAL	
No. of Years Law Teaching	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%
Less than 10 years	3	23.0	4	40	7	53.8	9	75.0	2	33.3	6	66.7	7	28.0	38	43.2
10-15	4	30.8	3	30	1	7.7	1	8.3	1	16.7	2	22.2	6	24.0	18	20.4
16-20	2	15.4	1	10	2	15.4	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	5	20.0	11	12.5
21-25	2	15.4	0	0	2	15.4	1	8.3	2	33.3	0	0	5	20.0	12	13.6
26-30	1	7.7	1	10	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	1	4.0	5	5.7
More than 30 years	1	7.7	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	3	3.4
N. A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.1
T o t a l	13	100.0	10	100	13	100.0	12	100.0	6	100.0	9	100.0	25	100.0	88	100.0

TABLE 6 - AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO LAW TEACHING PER WEEK

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	: A		: B		: C		: D		: E		: F		: STATE U.		TOTAL	
Hours	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%	: No.:	%
1-3	: 1 :	7.7:	0 :	0 :	2 :	15.4:	2 :	16.7:	0 :	0 :	2 :	22.2:	1 :	4.0:	8 :	9.1
4-6	: 4 :	30.7:	1 :	10 :	3 :	23.1:	4 :	33.3:	0 :	0 :	3 :	33.3:	7 :	28.0:	22 :	25.0
7-9	: 1 :	7.7:	2 :	20 :	3 :	23.1:	3 :	25.0:	0 :	0 :	2 :	22.2:	5 :	20.0:	16 :	18.2
10-12	: 1 :	7.7:	4 :	40 :	4 :	30.7:	1 :	8.3:	5 :	83.3:	2 :	22.2:	8 :	32.0:	25 :	28.4
13-15	: 1 :	7.7:	1 :	10 :	0 :	0 :	1 :	8.3:	1 :	16.7:	0 :	0 :	1 :	4.0:	5 :	5.7
More than 15	: 4 :	30.7:	1 :	10 :	1 :	7.7:	1 :	8.3:	0 :	0 :	0 :	0 :	1 :	4.0:	8 :	9.1
N. A.	: 1 :	7.7:	1 :	10 :	0 :	0 :	0 :	0 :	0 :	0 :	0 :	0 :	2 :	8.0:	4 :	4.5
T o t a l	: 13 :	100.0:	10 :	100 :	13 :	100.0:	12 :	100.0:	6 :	100.0:	9 :	100.0:	25 :	100.0:	88 :	100.0



TABLE 7 - NUMBER OF LAW SCHOOLS TAUGHT/ARE TEACHING

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	A		B		C		D		E		F		STATE U.		TOTAL	
Schools	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%
1	2	15.4	6	60	6	46.2	11	91.7	6	100	9	100	16	64.0	56	63.6
2	5	38.5	3	30	5	38.4	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	2	8.0	16	18.2
3	4	30.7	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16.0	9	10.2
4	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	2	2.3
5	0	0	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	2	2.3
6	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	2	2.3
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More than 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N. A.	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.1
Other Answers	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13	100.0	10	100	13	100.0	12	100.0	6	100	9	100	25	100.0	88	100.0

\*TABLE 8 - SUBJECTS TAUGHT/ARE TEACHING

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	A		B		C		D		E		F		STATE U.		TOTAL	
Subjects	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	
Criminal Law	4	9.8	3	9.7	5	11.6	2	5.3	3	12.0	2	8.0	3	3.3	22	7.5
Civil Law	8	19.5	6	19.4	6	13.9	5	13.1	4	16.0	4	16.0	15	15.6	47	16.0
Commercial Law	4	9.8	5	16.1	5	11.6	2	5.3	3	12.0	2	8.0	7	7.7	28	9.6
Remedial Law	5	12.2	1	3.2	5	11.6	3	7.9	3	12.0	1	4.0	10	11.0	28	9.6
Labor Law	5	12.2	1	3.2	2	4.7	1	2.6	2	8.0	1	4.0	8	8.9	20	6.8
Political Law	4	9.8	4	12.9	2	4.7	5	13.1	2	8.0	2	8.0	11	12.2	30	10.2
Taxation	1	2.4	1	3.2	4	9.3	2	5.3	1	4.0	2	8.0	4	4.4	15	5.1
Legal Ethics	3	7.3	1	3.2	3	7.0	1	2.6	1	4.0	0	0	6	6.7	15	5.1
Jurisprudence	1	2.4	0	0	1	2.3	2	5.3	1	4.0	0	0	6	6.7	11	3.8
Administrative Law	1	2.4	4	12.9	1	2.3	1	2.6	1	4.0	2	8.0	5	5.6	15	5.1
Private International Law	1	2.4	1	3.2	3	7.0	3	7.9	1	4.0	2	8.0	5	5.6	16	5.5
International Law	2	4.9	1	3.2	2	4.7	4	10.5	0	0	3	12.0	6	6.7	18	6.1
Others	2	4.9	3	9.7	4	9.3	7	18.4	3	12.0	4	16.0	5	5.6	28	9.6
Total	41	100.0	31	100.0	43	100.0	38	100.0	25	100.0	25	100.0	90	100.0	293	100.0

\* Multiple Responses.

NOTE: Others refer to Criminal Procedure, Military Law, Legal Philosophy, Torts and Damages, Legal Forms, Legal Bibliography, Trial Technique and Practice Court, Insurance, Natural Resources, Roman Law, Legal Writing and Research, Sales Credit Transaction, Transportation, Legal Medicine and Medicinal Jurisprudence, Agency, Public Corporation, World Organization, Legal Accounting, Land Registration, Evidence, Property, Legal History, Conveyancy, Persons and Family Relations, Property and Constitutional Law.

TABLE 9 - PERCENTAGE OF ANNUAL INCOME DERIVED FROM  
LAW TEACHING

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	: A		: B		: C		: D		: E		: F		: STATE U.		: TOTAL	
Income	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%
Less than 5%	: 4	: 30.8	: 4	: 40	: 3	: 23.0	: 4	: 33.3	: 4	: 66.6	: 2	: 22.2	: 7	: 28.0	: 28	: 31.8
5-10%	: 3	: 23.0	: 1	: 10	: 5	: 38.5	: 3	: 25.0	: 0	: 0	: 4	: 44.4	: 3	: 12.0	: 19	: 21.6
11-15%	: 1	: 7.7	: 2	: 20	: 2	: 15.4	: 3	: 25.0	: 1	: 16.7	: 1	: 11.1	: 2	: 8.0	: 12	: 13.6
16-20%	: 2	: 15.4	: 2	: 20	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 1	: 16.7	: 1	: 11.1	: 0	: 0	: 6	: 6.8
21-30%	: 1	: 7.7	: 0	: 0	: 3	: 23.0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 1	: 11.1	: 0	: 0	: 5	: 5.7
More than 30%	: 2	: 15.4	: 1	: 10	: 0	: 0	: 2	: 16.6	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 0	: 13	: 52.0	: 18	: 20.5
Total	: 13	:100.0	: 10	:100	: 13	:100.0	: 12	:100.0	: 6	:100.0	: 9	:100.0	: 25	:100.0	: 88	:100.0

TABLE 10 - WORK OTHER THAN LAW TEACHING ENGAGED IN AT PRESENT

*PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	A		*B		*C		*D		*E		*F		STATE U.	TOTAL		
Work	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%		
Judicial	2	12.5	0	0	3	17.6	4	28.6	2	28.6	0	0	2	5.9	13	11.5
Law Practice	9	56.3	5	35.7	7	41.2	3	21.4	2	28.6	5	45.5	11	32.4	42	37.2
**Gov't. Employment	0	0	4	28.6	3	17.6	4	28.6	2	28.6	4	36.4	6	17.6	23	20.4
Private Employment	2	12.5	1	7.1	2	11.8	0	0	1	14.2	0	0	2	5.9	8	7.1
Business	2	12.5	2	14.3	1	5.9	0	0	0	0	1	9.0	4	11.8	10	8.8
***Others	1	6.2	1	7.1	1	5.9	2	14.3	0	0	1	9.0	6	17.6	12	10.6
****Comments	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8
N. A.	0	0	1	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8.8	4	3.5
Total	16	100.0	14	100.0	17	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0	11	100.0	34	100.0	113	100.0

\* Multiple Response

\*\* Government Employment: Assistant Fiscal, Chief Legal Officer-National Seamen Board, Military, Research DFI, Public Prosecutors, Clerk of Court, Department of Justice, Chief, Medico-Legal Officer N.B.I, Administrative duties and Legal Aid practice, Commission on Audit Legal Officer, Consultant, City Attorney, Judge, Sangguniang Panlalawigan, City Fiscal, 2nd Asst. City Fiscal, Regional Director-Region XI & XIII, National Manpower and Youth Council (NMYE) Legal Office I (Labor Attorney), Professor in Accounting

\*\*\* Others: Publisher and author of books, administrative duties, private medical practice, legal research, arbitrator lecturer, management of estate, consultant, tax practice (SGV & Co.) CPA Review, Accounting practice, farming

\*\*\*\* Comments: N o n e

TABLE 11 - PUBLISHED WORK IN LAW

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	A		B		C		D		E		F		STATE U.	TOTAL		
Published Work?	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%		
Yes	7	53.8	6	60	3	23.1	4	33.3	1	16.7	0	0	21	84.0	42	47.7
No	6	46.2	4	40	10	76.9	8	66.7	4	66.6	9	100	4	16.0	45	51.1
Comments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	1	1.1
Total	13	100.0	10	100	13	100.0	12	100.0	6	100.0	9	100.0	25	100.0	88	100.0

Comments: Not Yet

\*TABLE 12 - KIND OF PUBLISHED WORK

PRIVATE LAW SCHOOLS																
	A		B		C		D		E		F		STATE U.		TOTAL	
Published Work:	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%
Treatises	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	5	14.7	6	9.4
Articles	2	22.2	1	10	0	0	4	80	0	0	0	0	17	50.0	24	37.5
Textbook	6	66.6	3	30	1	25.0	0	0	2	100	0	0	7	20.6	19	20.7
Quizzers	0	0	2	20	1	25.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.7
Others	1	11.1	4	40	2	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	14.7	12	18.6
Total	9	100.0	10	100	4	100.0	5	100	2	100	0	0	34	100.0	64	100.0

\* Multiple Responses

NOTE: Others refer to: Law Journal, Outline of Taxation, Annotation, books on rural banking, U.P. Law Center lecture, Graduation thesis on Immigration Law of U.S. of 1924, casebook, compilation of Philippine Tab. Laws and Internal Revenue Regulations, Documentary collection and commentary, tax lectures,SGV seminars on taxation, lectures, contributions to U.P. Law Center publications.

## APPENDIX "B"

LAWYERS IN THE PHILIPPINESI. - Northern Luzon:-

<u>Areas</u>		<u>Total</u>
Abra	-	61
Baguio-Benguet	-	165
Batanes	-	21
Cagayan	-	148
Ifugao	-	16
Ilocos Norte	-	168
Ilocos Sur	-	110
Isabela	-	149
Kalinga-Apayao	-	36
La Union	-	143
Mt. Province	-	24
Nueva Viscaya	-	63
Quirino	-	<u>21</u>
T O T A L . . . . .		<u>.1125</u>

II. - Central Luzon:-

Bataan	-	89
Bulacan	-	271
Nueva Ecija	-	184
Pampanga	-	253
Pangasinan	-	773
Tarlac	-	160
Zambales	-	<u>141</u>
T O T A L . . . . .		<u>.1871</u>

III.- Southern Luzon:-

Aurora	-	29
Batangas	-	311
Cal.-Mal.-Nav.	-	<u>314</u>
TOTAL CARRIED FORWARD . . .		<u>654</u>

III.- Southern Luzon (Con't)

<u>Areas</u>	<u>Total</u>
TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD . . . . .	654
Cavite -	237
Laguna -	252
Marinduque -	52
Occidental Mindoro -	50
Oriental Mindoro -	83
Pasay-Makati- Mandaluyong -	796
Quezon -	266
Rizal -	<u>552</u>
T O T A L . . . . .	<u>2942</u>

IV. - Greater Manila:-

Manila I -	181
Manila II -	1026
Manila III -	541
Manila IV -	1393
Quezon City -	<u>3626</u>
T O T A L . . . . .	<u>6767</u>

V. - Bicolandia:-

Albay -	177
Camarines Norte -	54
Camarines Sur -	272
Catanduanes -	30
Masbate -	89
Sorsogon -	<u>96</u>
T O T A L . . . . .	<u>718</u>



VI. - Eastern Visayas:-

<u>Areas</u>	-	<u>Total</u>
Bohol	-	189
Cebu	-	259
Cebu City	-	492
Eastern Samar	-	121
Leyte	-	333
Northern Samar	-	80
Catbalogan Samar	-	103
Southern Leyte	-	<u>63</u>
T O T A L . . . . .		<u>1640</u>

VII. - Western Visayas:-

Ileilo	-	431
Negros Occidental	-	408
Negros Oriental	-	181
Palawan	-	53
Romblon	-	36
Siquinor	-	19
Aklan	-	144
Antique	-	68
Capiz	-	<u>148</u>
T O T A L . . . . .		<u>1488</u>

VIII. - Eastern Mindanao:-

Agusan del Norte	-	96
Agusan del Sur	-	31
Bukidnon	-	74
Camiguin	-	28
Davao del Norte	-	75
Davao del Sur	-	<u>382</u>

TOTAL CARRIED FORWARD . . . . . 686

. . . /

## VIII. - Eastern Mindanao (Con't.)

	<u>Areas</u>	<u>Total</u>
TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD . . . . .		686
	Davao Oriental -	46
	Misamis Oriental -	234
	Surigao del Norte -	66
	Surigao del Sur -	<u>62</u>
	T O T A L . . . . .	<u>1094</u>

IX. - Western Mindanao:-

Zamb.-Basilan	-	123
Cotabato	-	164
Lanao del Norte	-	100
Lanao del Sur	-	49
Misamis Occidental	-	135
South Cotabato	-	110
Sulu	-	54
Zamboanga del Norte	-	100
Zamboanga del Sur	-	<u>95</u>
T O T A L . . . . .		<u>930</u>

X. - Additional New Lawyers, 1974

Northern Luzon	-	48
Central Luzon	-	70
Southern Luzon	-	109
Greater Manila	-	168
Bicolandia	-	19
Eastern Visayas	-	50
Western Visayas	-	55
Eastern Mindanao	-	37
Western Mindanao	-	<u>30</u>
T O T A L . . . . .		<u>586</u>

Additional New Lawyers, 1975 . . . . . 680

G R A N D T O T A L . . . . . 19841

Source: Integrated Bar of the Philippines  
955 Quezon Boulevard Extension  
Quezon City