

THE DISSEMINATION OF PILIPINO*

Andrew Gonzales, FSC and Leticia Postrado
De La Salle University

1. INTRODUCTION: Filipino and Pilipino

Einar Haugen (1972) has set down various aspects of language development: selection of the norm, codification of the form, elaboration of function, and acceptance (and propagation) of the norm.

First of all, selection of the norm. Most of us were hoping that this had been settled in 1937, when the then Commonwealth Government, following the mandate of the 1935 Constitution, by a presidential order *selected* Tagalog as the basis of the national language.

For legal purposes, the choice was made in 1937, based on the fundamental law of the land in 1935. However, as far as we can see the choice was unmade by the New Constitution, assuming that the ratification by the barangays of the Constitution of 1973 is a valid one. We are now supposed to convene the National Assembly, as yet not convoked, which is mandated to take steps towards the formation of a new national language to be called FILIPINO, which will be an amalgam of existing Philippine languages.

Elsewhere Gonzalez (1974) has cast doubt on the feasibility of such an enterprise.

For purposes of discussion, however, let us grant that one can select FILIPINO. The problem with this selection not by *sensus populi* but by *fiat* is that the language which has been selected is but a name without as yet any linguistic reality. It is still in the making. In effect, what we have done through approval of this provision of the Constitution is to place blind faith in the National Assembly, to tell them – give us this language to be called FILIPINO, an amalgam of the Philippine languages.

The work of the National Language Academy will be to codify such an amalgam, not by field work, not by elicitation techniques, not by interviewing the exponents of culture and of good linguistic usage in the culture, but by going through the dry-as-dust dissertations of linguists to discover common traits of the Philippine languages and to codify such into an artificially concocted language which will presumably be accepted once more through a referendum.

*An earlier version of this paper was read at the Second Conference on Asian Languages sponsored by the Asian Association of National Languages (ASANAL), the Samahang Linggwistikang Pilipino (SLP), and the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa on the theme 'National Language Policy and Language Development of Asian Countries' at the Garcia Hall of the National Science Development Board, Manila, on December 16-21, 1974.

We are deeply grateful to colleagues at De La Salle University for valuable help in obtaining references for this study: Narcissa Muñasque, Director of Libraries, and her staff, particularly Eleanor Gonzalez-Arreola; Professor Aurelio B. Calderon, then Chairman of the History-Political Science Department.

This step is a tremendous boost to the ego of linguists but hardly a realistic assessment of what is socially possible, since we do not know of any such artificially concocted language ever having taken life from the pages of a linguist's scholarly work.

Hence, language codification in this instance becomes the codification, prescriptive rather than descriptive, of a group of as-yet-to-be-named linguists of the National Language Academy rather than the standardization set by the influentials of the community, by usage and consensus.

The code's norms are those based on the investigations of linguists formalized in terms of phrase-structure rules based on a common grammatical base as well as a set of ordered transformations common to the Philippine languages. Presumably because of the relatedness of the Philippine languages, the semantic component will likewise be common. The phonology of such a language will presumably likewise be based on a common inventory of phonological segments and a set of process statements or generative phonological rules.

Historically, the standardization of a language has taken place within a living community of speakers who have been using the language and who in turn because of their social rank as well as situation in a geographical or commercial center of trade and influence are able to set the features of what will be accepted as the standard dialect.

This standard dialect must then be codified, elaborated and propagated among various communities of the same nation or political unit with more or less resistance or acceptance.

It becomes the property of a creative minority of intellectuals and leaders who proceed to use the standardized or language-in-process-of-standardization as a vehicle of thought and of social discourse in various domains till it becomes in effect 'elaborated'.

The present Philippine situation does not fit this paradigm: We have chosen a name, not yet a language; we are awaiting the formation and codification of this language; we cannot disseminate it until we have ratified it by a referendum; we cannot ratify it until it has been formed; once formed and ratified, we must disseminate it. Elaboration comes last. One cannot elaborate a language which has not yet come to be.

Rather than deal with the national language, Filipino, therefore, we would rather deal with one of the official languages of the Philippines, namely, Tagalog (renamed Pilipino since 1959), which has been designated by the 1973 Constitution as one of the official languages of the country and to see the factors contributing to its dissemination within the next generation.

This study will review major and minor studies done within the past 10 years which given an indication of the dissemination of Pilipino in the Philippines so as to be able to essay some predictions on its future as an official language.

Our sources therefore are not primary. We shall base ourselves on existing studies, to try to ferret out from sociological and demographic studies some trends on the dissemination of Pilipino, to focus on the elements in Philippine society which are presently contributing to the spread of Pilipino in the islands.

Pilipino (Tagalog) has been selected as an official language. It has been codified by many grammarians, it is presently being elaborated by a creative minority in some of our tertiary level institutions, and is presently undergoing rapid dissemination especially through the mass media.

2. REVIEW OF STUDIES

One of the instrumentalities, though certainly not the only one and not the main one, for the spread of a language is not only its teaching in the school system as a subject but above all its use as medium of instruction. With Department Order No. 25, series 1974, spelling out the bilingual education policy of the Department of Education and Culture, according to a set time-table, we can project the increased use of Pilipino (see Gonzalez 1974a, 1974b). However, we cannot really quantify this spread with hard data, since we do not know how well the policy will succeed and how well it will be implemented.

In connection with this, we would like to review the results of the 1968 Language Policy Survey of the Philippines done by the Philippine Normal College Language Center staff (which surveyed parents and teachers), compare the findings of this survey with a smaller survey of teachers in 1970 within the Department of Education, and finally compare further the results with the results of the SCOB (Survey Committee on Bilingual Education) survey of teachers done in 1974.

The comparisons will be loose since the instruments as well as questions posed and the respondents and purposes of the survey are not the same. Still we can ferret out data which might be of interest.

In addition to the school system, another factor in the dissemination of Pilipino is the migration of people. We do not have detailed and exhaustive studies of migration patterns in the Philippines, to give indices of the mobility of members of our society. However, we have data available on estimated inflow and outflow of people in each province of the country.

Perhaps more powerful than the school system in the spread of any language is the use of the mass media and the language in which the mass media carry on their task. Here, we can review some existing studies on the communication behavior of certain groups (notably the UP Manila Complex Study), some statistics from the Mass Media Yearbook, some data from the National Media Production Center and from the Philippine Mass Communication Research Society, as well as movies, again to see the dominance of Pilipino in these areas.

A recent Philippine Social Science Council Survey (1972) on ethnic stereotypes and attitudes gives some interesting insights into the attitudes of people all over the Philippines about language and interestingly enough from the language of the interviews some indication on the further spread of Pilipino.

Finally, we shall deal with data from the 1970 census on the number of speakers of Pilipino, whether as a mother tongue or as a second language. We shall compare the figures with previous censuses of 1939, 1948, and 1960. And on the basis of the figures, we shall try to project the future spread of Pilipino, using a technique in statistics, simple regression analysis, to project what will happen in 1980, 1990, and the year 2000.

2.1. Data from School System Surveys

2.1.1. Language Policy Survey of the Philippines

The Language Study Center of PNC conducted the survey in 1968 with the purpose of gathering data that could serve as the basis for making decisions on the language of the schools and for planning and directing language growth (see Otones and Sibayan 1969). The general aim of the study was to determine the language use and language attitudes of Filipinos in certain domains.

A total of 2379 householders and 2342 teachers participated in the survey. These respondents came from a combined number of 254 communities representing 21 regions of the country. The findings of the survey were as follows:

1. Native language

Two percent (2%) of the householders and 3% of the teachers indicated having learned more than one language simultaneously during childhood. Tagalog was the language first learned by 23% of the householders and 20% of the teachers; it ranked first in frequency for both groups with Cebuano a second (19%) for the householders and Ilocano a second (18%) for the teachers.

2. Language of contact with absent family members

Writing is the most frequent means of contact with absent family members. The leading languages of contact in the householders' and teachers' lists are Tagalog (Pilipino) and English respectively.

3. Language used for speaking with certain types of people

- a. Philippine Language 1 (first Philippine language mentioned by respondent) is the language most frequently used by both the householders and the teachers in talking to almost all categories of people, which include spouse, children, neighbor, policeman, priests, teacher, doctor, *tindera* (female vendor), and stranger. The two groups of respondents, however, differed in the fact that whereas the householders mentioned Philippine Language 1 most frequently, the teachers mentioned Language Combination 2 (combination other than English and Pilipino) as language most preferred when speaking to teachers and doctors. Hence, the vernaculars or first languages (including Pilipino or Tagalog) are the languages ordinarily used for the above categories of people. Among the householders, the second most frequent choice for all categories is Pilipino; among teachers, the second most frequent choice is Pilipino for speaking to neighbors, policemen, and *tinderas*.
- b. The use of English is associated with certain special purposes as indicated by the fact that categories among whom English gets the greatest percentage of use are priests, teachers, and doctors.

4. Language usually spoken

There is more bilingualism in Philippine languages among the teachers and the teachers' spouses than among the householders and the householders' spouses as indicated by their use of Language Combination 2 (language combination's not Pilipino and English).

5. Language preferred for reading

- a. The language most preferred by both groups of respondents in reading books on eight subjects was English. The teachers' preference for English books is signifi-

cantly higher (71% to 83%) than the householders' (26% to 28%).

- b. The next language most frequently mentioned by the householders was Philippine Language 1, while in the case of the teachers, it was Language Combination 1 (English and Pilipino) in all 8 subjects.
- c. Pilipino is the third preference of the two groups of respondents in all subjects except technology and religion.

6. Tagalog vs. Pilipino

To the question: 'Is Tagalog different from Pilipino?' 61% of the householders and 70% of the teachers answered that they were the same.

7. Form of Pilipino preferred for school use

Most of the respondents (44% of the householders and 74% of the teachers) favor the 'puristic' type of Pilipino as the variety that should be used in the classroom.

8. Form of Pilipino acceptable for journalism

Nineteen percent of householders and 25% of the teachers who read *Taliba* favor the Pilipino used in this daily. This indicates that there is some acceptance among those who read the paper, at least for the journalistic type of reading, of the variety of written Pilipino used in the daily, which closely reflects spoken Manila Tagalog as opposed to the formal Tagalog-based Pilipino used in the schools.

9. Language needed to be successful in 21 occupations

In 11 out of 21 occupations investigated, the language combination English and Pilipino was felt by both the householders and the teachers to be most necessary for success, while for five other occupations, Pilipino alone was mentioned.

10. Reasons for wanting children to use certain languages

Both householders and the teachers believe that English will be used by their children for personal advancement or personal goals. Both also agree that the use of Pilipino is for purely nationalistic goals.

11. Preferences for medium of instruction

Most of the respondents prefer English to any other language as medium of instruction at all three levels, primary, intermediate, and high school, and more prefer Philippine Language 1 (presumably referring to the Philippine language spoken in the community) to Pilipino at all levels.

12. Languages best suited for teaching certain subjects

Arithmetic and science were most frequently mentioned as the subjects best taught in English by both groups of respondents. Good Manners and Right Conduct and Work Education were the subjects most frequently mentioned by both respondents as the

subjects best taught in the local vernacular of the region.

13. Determining language policy

Both the householders and the teachers believe that the persons and the entities most directly concerned, particularly the parents and local teachers, should have an important role in the determination of language policy.

14. Language and non-attendance in school

Language difficulty does not appear to be an important reason for children being out of school.

15. Language used for radio listening

- a. Of the 2248 householders who listened to *five or less radio stations*, 527 or 23% gave the combination Pilipino and English and other Philippine language(s) as their most frequent reply for the languages used in the radio programs listened to. Among the teachers, the same combination was the frequent response (713 or 32%).
- b. Of the householders who listened to *six or more radio stations*, 152 or 7% gave the combination Pilipino and English as their most frequent reply. The same language combination occurred most frequently in the teachers' responses (198 or 9%).

16. Languages listened to for five types of radio programs

The program choices of the householders were programs in Philippine languages (Pilipino and vernaculars) while the language predominantly listened to by the teachers was English.

2.1.2. A Study on Teacher Preferences on the Use of Pilipino as Medium of Instruction

The objective of the survey (Bureau of Public Schools Bulletin No. 1, series 1973, reporting a survey conducted in 1970) was to determine how well administrators and teachers could use Pilipino as a medium of instruction.

The findings of the survey were:

1. The total number of respondents was 7230 superintendents, supervisors, principals, and classroom teachers. Approximately 25% of the respondents were from the Tagalog regions.
2. A majority of the respondents (62%) stated that they could use Pilipino as a medium of instruction either very well, well or fairly well. Thirty-two percent (32%) could use it but with difficulty and only 3% could not teach at all in the language.
3. The number of teachers who said 'no' to the use of Pilipino in the elementary grades almost equalled those who said 'yes'. Of the 'yes' responses more were conditional—they could teach using Pilipino as medium of instruction but only in certain subjects and grades.
4. The teachers did not favor the use of Pilipino as medium of instruction in high

school.

5. A strong preference for the use of Pilipino as medium of instruction was indicated by those in the elementary grades (23.13%) and in high school (24.88%). However, these groups indicated that Pilipino should be used only in certain subjects. Proficiency and literacy in the language was the reason most frequently mentioned for this choice.

6. A strong preference for the use of Pilipino in Grades One and Two was indicated by 20.73% of those who preferred its use only in certain grades. To make the children literate and proficient in the national language was the reason most frequently mentioned for this choice.

7. According to the respondents, lack of instructional materials and inadequate preparation of teachers were the two problems most likely to be encountered in the use of Pilipino as a medium of instruction. The least problems are lack of interest by children and opposition from parents.

2.1.3. Assessing Resources for Bilingual Education: A Report

The most recent survey on the attitudes of teachers toward readiness to teach in Pilipino was conducted by the Survey Committee on Bilingual Education (SCOBE) in 1974 (see Gonzalez and Postrado 1974) to constitute a data base for preparing guidelines for the implementation of the National Board of Education policy on the use of Pilipino and English as media of instruction. The questions answered in the survey were:

1. How widely used is Pilipino as a medium of instruction in various areas and regions?
2. What kinds of materials in Pilipino are available?
3. How ready are our teachers to begin using Pilipino as a medium of instruction?
4. What manpower resources are available in retraining teachers to use Pilipino as a medium of instruction?
5. What kind of programs for teachers should be instituted to enable them to use Pilipino as a medium of instruction?

The five main problems were dealt with and presented in sectional reports. However, we will review only the section of the report which deals with the ability of teachers to teach in Pilipino.

Using a stratified sampling procedure (with random sampling for each subset), with schools stratified as either central or barrio, mother high school or pilot barrio high school, urban and rural private school, a target sampling of 5% of the teacher population was aimed for. Responses were obtained from 15,989 content subject teacher-respondents (private, public, and vocational), teachers who were teaching subjects other than English language and Pilipino language, representing 11 regions of the country with a combined total of 98 divisions. Southern Tagalog (Region IV) had the biggest representation of 4020 teachers or 25.14%, followed by Central Luzon (Region III) with 3186 teachers or 19.93%. Regarding personal and educational background and teaching experience of the teachers, the survey yielded the following findings:

1. Of the total respondents, 85.81% or 13,672 are females; 7291 or 45.60% are within the 25-34 age bracket and only 1,159 or 7.25% are below 25 years of age. In terms of teaching experience: 31.12% or 4976 have had 5-9 years; 19.68% or 3146 have had 10-14 years; and 17.84% or 2852 have had less than five years of teaching experience.

2. A total of 7311 or 45.73% of the respondents hold BSEE degrees; 2909 or

18.19% have BSE degrees; 2460 or 15.39% have BSE (inverted) degrees; and 2051 or 12.83% are ETC graduates.

3. Only 458 or 2.86% of the respondents majored in Pilipino; another 503 or 3.15% minored in Pilipino; while 2402 have not taken any course in Pilipino at all.

4. Only 423 or 2.65% of the sample from all schools have a master's degree, of which only a marginal number earned graduate units in Pilipino, while 15,147 or 94.78% have no graduate units in Pilipino at all.

5. 11,350 teachers or 70.98% have taken no in-service training in Pilipino.

On their self-rated ability to teach in Pilipino and English:

1. Teachers from all systems perceive their ability to teach in English as 'good' regardless of grade and region.

2. Understandably, teachers from the Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog areas regardless of grade and system, except private elementary schools in the Southern Tagalog region, consider their ability to teach in Pilipino as 'good'. Others who rate their ability to teach in Pilipino as 'good' are: public elementary school teachers from Southern Mindanao and private elementary school teachers from the Ilocos region.

3. Those who perceive their ability to teach in Pilipino as 'fair' are: public elementary school teachers from Ilocos, Cagayan Valley, Central and Eastern Visayas, and Western and Northern Mindanao; public secondary school teachers from the Ilocos region; private elementary school teachers from the Southern Tagalog region; vocational school teachers from the Southern Mindanao region; and some private secondary school teachers.

4. Those who believe they have 'no ability' or 'little ability' to teach in Pilipino are: Grade V teachers of Eastern Visayas public elementary schools; public high school teachers from the Cagayan Valley, Visayas and Mindanao regions; vocational school teachers from the Western Visayas, Ilocos, Central Visayas and Western Mindanao regions; and some private secondary school teachers.

5. Mathematics and science subjects are perceived as most difficult to teach in Pilipino by all respondents, regardless of region or type of school. Included in mathematics are algebra, geometry, and physics; included in science are general science, chemistry, and biology.

6. On the teachers' self-perceived ability to teach in Pilipino, there exist significant differences according to region, subject, and grade for public elementary school teachers and according to region and subject for public and private secondary as well as private elementary school teachers.

7. No significant correlation was established between the public elementary, private elementary, and vocational school teachers' self-perceived ability to teach all subjects in Pilipino and the three variables: M.A. units, number of courses in Pilipino taken, and length of in-service training, except in the ability of public elementary school teachers' to teach character education in Pilipino, which was found to have positive and significant correlation with the number of M.A. units in Pilipino these teachers had taken.

8. A positive and significant correlation between the public and private secondary school teachers' self-perceived ability to teach all subjects in Pilipino and the M.A. units they have earned is evident.

With regard to teachers' attitudes toward training designed to improve their ability to teach in Pilipino:

1. Teachers from all systems favor training to improve their ability to teach in Pilipino in the following rank ordering of favorable attitudes: private elementary teachers, public elementary teachers, private secondary teachers, public secondary teachers, and vocational teachers.

2. Generally, teachers from the Ilocos regions, in all levels and systems, except those in public elementary schools, lead the rest in registering favorable attitudes toward training, while teachers from the various Visayan regions generally end up on the tail end.

3. 59.79% or 8271 of the teacher respondents recommended formal course work and seminars for training.

On the preference for Pilipino as medium of instruction:

1. Although most of respondents are willing to try using Pilipino while English as presently used would still be employed, the general trend is toward the use of Pilipino as auxiliary to English, except in public elementary schools, where Pilipino is already used extensively.

2. Aside from the expected strong preference of the Southern Tagalog respondents for Pilipino, other significant differences in the degree of preference for either English or Pilipino exist in each school system, level, and region.

2.1.4. Summary of Surveys

From the results of the three surveys, a noticeable change in attitudes among teachers on the use of Pilipino as medium of instruction can be noted from 1968, when the first survey was conducted by the PNC group, to the year 1974, when the last survey was conducted by SCOB. Although the samples used in the three surveys were not the same respondents and were unequal in size, we can still take note of the significant trend whereby Pilipino is becoming more acceptable among teachers as the language of instruction in subjects other than Pilipino. However, it is likewise apparent that teachers would still prefer to teach subjects such as Math and Science in English. Hence, while the use of Pilipino as the medium of instruction for all subjects is not acceptable, its use as the medium of instruction for certain subjects is feasible. Even among householders (in the first survey), 27.03% indicated that content subjects such as Good Manners and Right Conduct and Health Education, Art Education and Work Education could best be taught in Pilipino.

2.2. Migration Patterns Study

Migration is another factor in language dissemination. Thus, knowledge of the number of people migrating to Tagalog-speaking areas would give us an idea of how many will learn to speak Tagalog in the future. Table 1 shows estimates of net-internal migration in the country during the 10 year period from 1960 to 1970.

Table 1: ESTIMATES OF NET INTER-PROVINCIAL MIGRATION FOR EACH PROVINCE OF THE PHILIPPINES: 1960-1970

<u>REGION & PROVINCE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>		
Region I – Manila & Suburbs		Region VI – Bicol & Masbate	
Manila	-85,708	Albay	-37,035
Region II – Ilocos & Mt. Province		Camarines Norte	- 4,392
Abra	- 1,352	Camarines Sur	-164,363
Ilocos Norte	-14,028	Catanduanes	-45,162
Ilocos Sur	-34,453	Masbate	7,740
La Union	- 7,527	Sorsogon	-57,556
Mountain Province	-11,100	Region VII – Western Visayas	
Region III – Cagayan Valley & Batanes		Aklan	-30,351
Batanes	- 1,849	Antique	-21,833
Cagayan	-19,025	Capiz	-25,817
Isabela	-24,590	Iloilo	-89,249
Nueva Vizcaya	28,619	Negros Occidental	-258,396
		Romblon	-12,738
Region IV – Central Luzon		<u>REGION & PROVINCE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
Bataan	14,693	Region VIII – Eastern Visayas	
Bulacan	88,787	Bohol	-69,965
Nueva Ecija	13,261	Cebu	-97,243
Pampanga	38,097	Leyte	-200,428
Pangasinan	-92,787	Negros Oriental	-72,609
Tarlac	-14,398	Samar	-157,545
Zambales	49,980	Region IX – Northern Mindanao	
<u>REGION & PROVINCE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	Agusan	60,291
Region V – Southern Luzon & Islands		Bukidnon	106,100
Batangas	31,740	Lanao del Norte	-21,899
Cavite	23,045	Lanao del Sur	-80,128
Laguna	60,355	Misamis Occidental	-13,178
Marinduque	-11,262	Misamis Oriental	-6,814
Occidental Mindoro	-20,615	Surigao	- 188
Oriental Mindoro	8,938	Region X – Southern Mindanao & Sulu	
Palawan	7,179	Cotabato	127,533
Quezon	77,412	Davao	191,088
Rizal	784,662	Sulu	-16,098
		Zamboanga del Norte	9,739
		Zamboanga del Sur	2,009

Data were obtained from Yun Kim 1972.

Unmarked numbers indicate net in-migration; negative numbers indicate out-migration.

As can be seen from Table 1, four predominantly Tagalog-speaking provinces in Region IV (Central Luzon) and eight Tagalog provinces from Region V (Southern Luzon and Islands) gained population (mostly in thousands) through internal migration during the period 1960-1970. In Bicol and Masbate (Region VI), only one province gained population; in Northern Mindanao (Region IX), only two provinces increased in population owing to internal migration. All of the Visayan provinces lost thousands of their people, while in Southern Mindanao and Sulu (Region X), four out of five provinces received migrants from other places.

Manila lost 85,708 of its population, while there was a trend of people migrating to provinces surrounding Manila and nearby provinces. For instance, Rizal gained 784,662 persons while Bulacan, Laguna, Cavite, Bataan, Batangas, and Nueva Ecija gained a total of 231,881. On the whole, the population movement in the country was toward the vicinity of a large city, particularly to the Greater Manila Metropolitan area, and also to the frontiers of Mindanao. Most of the migrants were from the Ilocos and Mt. Province and the Visayan regions.

We are not prepared at this time to make categorical statements on the linguistic implications of such migrations, except to make the observation that in general, because of the other factors making for the spread of Pilipino, Tagalog speakers who migrate to non-Tagalog speaking areas usually retain the Tagalog language. Usually, such Tagalogs migrating to other provinces stay in the urban areas. On the other hand, non-Tagalogs migrating to other areas, again usually urban areas in Tagalog-speaking regions, while retaining their vernaculars at home, soon acquire Tagalog (Pilipino) for survival. Usually the second generation does not speak the vernacular. The whole process is part of de-ethnicization, a phenomenon arising from mobility and urbanization.

2.3. Mass Media Studies

2.3.1. The Manila Complex Study

First, we would like to review one of the studies done by the University of the Philippines team submitted to the Social Science Research Council of the University of the Philippines on July 1, 1971. The study is commonly referred to as The Manila Complex Study; it is an in-depth analysis of several subcommunities in Greater Manila with regard to sociological, anthropological, and communication factors related to urban social change.

The samples, roughly estimated to constitute 10 to 30% of the total population of the three communities studied, were drawn from: Broadway, 203 or 32.5%, a squatter settlement; Project 7, 173 or 10.3%, a government housing area; and San Miguel, 453 or 20.5%, a commercial-residential district. A simple random sampling procedure was used in the study of Broadway and Project 7 communities while stratified random sampling based on socio-economic criteria was employed in the study of San Miguel community. The choice of the three communities as study locales was based on the socio-economic levels of the resident samples. Each community was covered for a year corresponding to one phase: the first, Broadway, from 1967-1968; the second, Project 7, from 1968-1969; and the third, San Miguel, from 1969-1970.

The findings of this study were:

1. In general, there was a high level of ownership of the mass media—radio and newspapers—in the three communities surveyed. However, there was a very low level of

ownership of television sets in Broadway because this medium was financially beyond the reach of the people in this area. Newspapers had the highest ownership among the print media, followed by general-interest magazines. Comics scored lowest in Project 7 and San Miguel, while in Broadway comics had the highest ownership.

2. Factors such as income and educational levels had significant relationship with media ownership.

3. In the readership of print media, newspapers were found to be the most read by respondents in Project 7 and San Miguel, followed by magazines and comics, while illustrated comics in Pilipino were the most read in Broadway.

4. Radio listenership data showed bias in favor of entertainment and at definitely regular and preferred listening times—early morning between 4 and 10 and early evening from 6 to 9.

5. With regard to purpose of listening, the respondents' reasons for patronizing specific programs cluster around two of the radio's better known functions—for information and for entertainment. This finding gives support to the common observation that the radio in the Philippines is still primarily an entertainment rather than an educational medium. Programs listened to by the respondents were mostly Pilipino (Tagalog) programs.

6. While only a few households reported having television sets in Broadway, a majority stated that they watched television programs in the homes of neighbors and friends, in places of work and turned-on television sets in gasoline and appliance stores. Television ownership and viewership were comparatively very high in Project 7 since those who did not own television sets also watched programs elsewhere. The more urban style of living in San Miguel inhibited those who did not own TV sets to go out of their homes to watch programs in the homes of relatives and friends; thus, the low level of viewership.

7. Peak television viewing hours coincided with the free hours of the respondents in the three communities, early evening and late evening, 9 to 12 midnight, as in radio listening.

8. With regard to the purpose of viewing, the respondents clearly tagged television as the 'entertainment medium'. Examples of entertaining programs respondents enjoyed watching were Tagalog variety programs such as *Buhay Artista*, *Tawag ng Tanghalan*, etc. While male viewers preferred sports, especially basketball and boxing, female respondents stated preference for full-length Pilipino movies. News programs were also viewed for their informational and at times educational value.

9. Generally a prevailing urban characteristic indicated that the respondents tend to regard the mass media highly as compared to interpersonal sources in meeting their specific and more sophisticated needs for more detailed information. Moreover, the relaxing qualities of audio-visual media and their immediacy make for ease of comprehension. Rural areas tend to give greater value to interpersonal media in terms of news and advice rather than to the mass media.

10. Of the various mass media, newspapers were reported as the most credible, followed by radio and television.

2.3.2. Mass Media Data

2.3.2.1. Radio

In the Philippines in 1973, seven out of 10 homes owned radio sets, with Greater Manila having the highest ownership (85%). Among the provinces, Greater Laoag was next to Manila, with 83.5% home radio owners, followed by Baguio City (83%) and Cagayan de Oro City (83%). Zamboanga City, the radio ownership of which was 83%, ranked fourth. For the other provinces, see Table 2.

Apparently, high radio ownership was not always associated with wide listenership, since some places which were almost saturated with radio sets registered lower listenership. For instance, Greater Manila showed only 32% average listenership during daytime and still lower in the evening (15%), while Iligan City, which has 73% home radio owners, had 40% listenership (Table 2). Perhaps, a more powerful mass medium, such as television, attracts more of the Greater Manila population.

TABLE 2: PERCENT RADIO OWNERSHIP AND AVERAGE LISTENERSHIP IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE PHILIPPINES

LOCATION	RANK	OWNERSHIP	LISTENERSHIP	
			DAYTIME	EVENING
Greater Manila	1	85	32	15
Greater Laoag	2	83.5	32	—
Cagayan de Oro City	3	83	26	32
Baguio City	3	83	40	—
Zamboanga City	4	82	34	—
Greater Bacolod	5	75	32	32
Cotabato City	6	74	37	—
Greater Naga	7	73	33	22
Iligan City	7	73	40	—
Dagupan City	8	72	20	—
Legaspi City	8	72	35	—
Butuan City	9	71	26	—
Greater Iloilo	10	70	34	40
Urdueta	11	69	22	—
Greater Davao	11	69	30	24
Greater Cebu	11	69	26.8	24.2
Greater Lucena	12	65.3	25	22
Surigao City	13	65	26	—
Bislig	13	65	26	—

Rank was based on % radio set ownership. Daytime listening time was 6 AM – 6 PM while evening listening time was 6 PM – 9 PM (Monday to Sunday). Source of Data: 1974 Media Factbook.

To find out the languages preferred by the listeners with different mother tongues, Table 3 is presented, which reveals the languages used in radio homes and languages preferred for programming in four non-Tagalog cities, namely Dagupan, Cotabato, Zamboanga, and Davao.

TABLE 3: MAJOR LANGUAGES USED IN RADIO HOMES AND LANGUAGE PREFERRED FOR PROGRAMMING

<u>MAJOR LANGUAGES USED IN RADIO HOMES</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>LANGUAGE PREFERRED FOR PROGRAMMING</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>DAGUPAN CITY</u>			
Pangasinan	88	Tagalog	74
Tagalog	7	Pangasinan	14
Ilocano	5	English	11
		Ilocano	7
TOTAL	100	TOTAL	**
<u>COTABATO CITY</u>			
Cebuano	39	Tagalog	83
Tagalog	31	English	10
Ilongo	15	Cebuano	5
Chabacano	10	Ilonggo	1
Ilocano	2	No preference	1
Moslem	1		
Others (Waray, Chinese and Pangasinan)	2		
TOTAL	100	TOTAL	00
<u>ZAMBOANGA CITY</u>			
Chabacano	71	Chabacano	43
Cebuano	18	Tagalog	28
Tagalog	5	English	21
English	1	Cebuano	15
Others (Ilonggo, Ilocano, Spanish, Chinese, Bicol, Joloano, Waray and Yakan)	5		
TOTAL	100	TOTAL	**
<u>DAVAO CITY</u>			
Cebuano	65.3	Tagalog	52
Tagalog	20	Cebuano	36.7
English	3.3	English	4.7
Other dialect related to Cebuano (Boholano)	1.3	Others	6.7
Others (Chinese, Waray, Ilonggo, Pampango, Ilocano, Chabacano, Bicolano and Manobo)	14.7		
TOTAL	**	TOTAL	**

Data were taken from 1974 Media Factbook.

**Total exceeds 100% because of multiple responses.

It is interesting to note that in three out of the four surveyed cities, Tagalog was the most highly preferred language for radio programming, even in homes where other major language were used. Cebuano was surpassed even in cities such as Cotabato, Zamboanga, and Davao, where native Cebuano speakers were significantly more numerous than native Tagalog speakers. Likewise, in Pangasinan, Tagalog radio programs were more highly preferred to Pangasinan.

2.3.2.2. Television

2.3.2.2.1. 1974 MEDIA FACTBOOK FINDINGS

Like radio, television is a primary factor for language dissemination, especially among middle and upper socio-economic class families, among whom television is a favorite form of entertainment. Table 4 presents ownership and average viewership in different parts of the Philippines in 1973 based on the 1974 Media Factbook. It shows that Greater Manila TV ownership is significantly highest (63%). In Greater Cebu more than one-fifth (22%) of the population owns a TV set, while Greater Naga has 20% homes with TV. In other parts, most TV ownership is less than 20%.

Regarding the number of viewers, Greater Manila and Cebu have the biggest audience (52%), while Greater Naga registered almost an equal percentage of viewership (51%) as indicated in Table 4.

TABLE 4: PERCENT TV OWNERSHIP AND AVERAGE VIEWERSHIP IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE PHILIPPINES

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>OWNERSHIP</u>	<u>VIEWERSHIP</u>
Greater Manila	1	63	52
Greater Cebu	2	22	52
Greater Naga	3	20	51
Greater Davao	4	17	42
Cagayan de Oro	5	15	32
Greater Bacolod	6	14	38
Greater Dagupan	6	14	35
Greater Baguio	7	9	32
Greater Iloilo	8	7	38.4

Rank was based on % ownership

Viewership time is 6 PM to 9 PM (Monday to Sunday)

2.3.2.2.2. CONTENT ANALYSIS OF CURRENT TV PROGRAMS

To find out the languages used in current TV programs, a content analysis of one week's TV programs published in a daily newspaper was performed. The results are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: DAILY AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF TV PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO LANGUAGE USED IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE PHILIPPINES

LOCATION	LANGUAGE USED			
	TAGALOG	ENGLISH	TAGALOG & ENGLISH (BILINGUAL)	OTHERS
Greater Manila	30.68	66.36	2.46	0.64
Greater Cebu	26.36	67.29	5.24	1.33
Bacolod	28.02	69.23	2.63	0
Davao	15.66	83.13	1.19	0
Iriga and Naga	11.63	83.72	3.48	.84
Cagayan de Oro and Tacloban	21.05	73.68	5.71	0

Others include Chinese and Visayan. (Based on content analysis of TV Programs of *Bulletin Today* dated October 17 – October 23, 1974.)

It can be gleaned from Table 5 that most current TV programs are in English. In Manila, almost one third of the total daily programs are in Tagalog while 66.3% are in English. A small percentage use both English and Tagalog as media of communication (2.46%). In the provinces, Bacolod and Greater Cebu present even fewer Tagalog TV programs (26.36% in Greater Cebu and 28.02% in Bacolod). However, these provinces use Tagalog in TV programs more than other places in Bohol and the Visayan regions.

2.3.2.2.3. Philippine Mass Communication Research Society Survey Findings

In a survey conducted in 1973 by the Philippine Mass Communication Research Society, despite the bigger number of English TV programs, two Tagalog programs topped Greater Manila's once-a-week evening shows. However, differences in order of priority by economic class are apparent (see Table 6). Two English shows ranked third and fourth only, while another Tagalog presentation was rated fifth.

Among the evening programs shown more than once a week, more English shows were included in the list of top programs. Only one Tagalog program was included, which ranked third. Moreover, viewers seemed to have homogeneous preferences for the five top TV shows (see Table 7).

Similarly, in Greater Cebu, Tagalog programs were ranked second and third according to viewers of once-a-week evening TV shows (Table 8). For the more-than-once-a-week shows, Tagalog programs were placed in the fourth and fifth places (Table 9). Furthermore, responses of different economic class subjects were more uniform for the more-than-once-a-week evening TV programs and more varied for the once-a-week evening TV shows.

TABLE 6: TOP ONCE-A-WEEK EVENING TV PROGRAMS BY ECONOMIC CLASS IN GREATER MANILA

PROGRAM	MEDIUM	RANK	NUMBER OF TV HOMES CALLED	ECONOMIC CLASS			TOTAL
				Upper %	Middle %	Lower %	
Superstar Nora	Tagalog	1	467	7.7	34.0	8.6	50.3
Cinderella	Tagalog	2	413	4.6	33.2	10.4	48.2
Thursday Night at the Movies	English	3	240	2.9	35.0	8.3	46.2
Sunday Suspense Theater	English	4	360	2.8	27.2	12.2	42.2
Padre de Familia	Tagalog	5	110	10.0	30.9	0.9	41.8

TABLE 7: TOP MULTI-WEEKLY EVENING TV PROGRAMS BY ECONOMIC CLASS IN GREATER MANILA

PROGRAM	MEDIUM	RANK	NUMBER OF TV HOMES CALLED	ECONOMIC CLASS			TOTAL
				Upper %	Middle %	Lower %	
MICAA 73-74	English	1	3663	6.0	29.2	15.6	50.8
DPI Report	English	2	918	6.0	19.2	11.3	36.5
Tony Santos Presents	Tagalog	3	752	3.6	16.2	8.3	28.1
News Watch	English	4	583	2.9	13.6	11.1	27.6
The Samurai	English	5	499	0.4	7.0	2.0	9.4

TABLE 8: TOP ONCE-A-WEEK EVENING TV PROGRAMS BY ECONOMIC CLASS IN GREATER CEBU

PROGRAM	MEDIUM	RANK	NUMBER OF TV HOMES CALLED	ECONOMIC CLASS			TOTAL
				Upper %	Middle %	Lower %	
Hawaii							
Five-0	English	1	663	18.3	42.5	3.9	64.7
Superstar	Tagalog	2	265	5.7	45.3	3.0	54.0
Padre de Familia	Tagalog	3	326	7.0	35.9	3.4	46.3
Apache Rifles (Thursday Night at the Movies)	English	4	631	8.9	30.9	2.5	42.3
Nichols	English	5	315	13.3	25.1	2.6	41.0

TABLE 9: TOP MULTI-WEEKLY EVENING TV PROGRAMS BY ECONOMIC CLASS IN CEBU

PROGRAM	MEDIUM	RANK	NUMBER OF TV HOMES CALLED	ECONOMIC CLASS			TOTAL
				Upper %	Middle %	Lower %	
My Favorite Martian	English	1	535	8.2	24.9	0.9	34.0
MICAA 73-74	English	2	1011	5.7	23.1	2.9	31.7
The Samurai	English	3	349	2.9	8.0	1.7	12.6
Super J	Tagalog	4	1179	1.4	6.2	0.7	8.3
Sine Seben	Tagalog	5	993	1.0	6.7	0.5	8.2

2.3.3. MOVIES

Another entertainment medium and a factor responsible for the spread of Pilipino is the cinema. However, foreign films, especially American movies, have continuously dominated the movie business, as revealed by Table 10.

TABLE 10: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF LOCAL AND FOREIGN MOVIES RELEASED IN THE PAST YEARS

YEAR	FOREIGN		LOCAL		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1973	578	78.32	160	21.68	738	100
1972	508	71.95	198	28.05	706	100
1971	532	67.09	261	32.91	793	100
1970	475	65.34	252	34.66	727	100
1969	550	73.92	194	26.08	744	100
1968	549	76.25	171	23.75	720	100
1967	525	76.20	164	23.80	689	100
1966	357	64.56	196	35.44	553	100
1965	370	65.14	198	34.86	568	100

Data were gathered from the Board of Censors for Motion Pictures.

As of October, for 1974, ninety six (96) local films were previewed and approved by the Board of Censors for Motion Pictures. These were only 17.84% of the total number of 538 films; 442 foreign films or 82.16% were released.

As can be seen from Table 10, the local films comprised roughly one fifth of the total motion pictures viewed in the country in 1973. However, out of the total 738 films shown inclusive in 1973, six Tagalog motion pictures and five English films were included in the box office list of the Philippine Motion Pictures Producers Association. The list included the following:

Tagalog

Fefita Fofonggay
 Agila at ang Araw
 Dyesebel at ang Mahiwagang Kabibe
 Nueva Vizcaya
 Pepeng Agimat
 Panic

English

The Godfather
 Trinity is Still My Name
 Slaughter
 Crazy Boys at the Games
 Man of the East

2.3.4. PRINT MEDIA: NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, AND BOOKS

Of all the mass media, the kinds that reach people in the school, home, street, office, market, or almost any place are the print media, such as newspapers, magazines, and books. Hence, they contribute greatly to the spread of a language. Not all people from every part of the country have access to these media, however.

2.3.4.1. Newspapers

In 1974 there were 10 daily newspapers circulating in the country. Of these 10 dailies, eight were circulated at a national level, while two were circulated only in Cebu.

Out of the eight nationally circulated dailies, two were in Tagalog and the other six were in English. The two dailies circulating in Cebu likewise used English as medium (see Table 11).

TABLE 11: DAILY NEWSPAPERS CIRCULATING IN THE PHILIPPINES

<u>NEWSPAPER</u>	<u>AREA OF CIRCULATION</u>	<u>MEDIUM</u>
1. Balita ng Maynila	National	Tagalog
2. Pilipino Express	National	Tagalog
3. Bulletin Today	National	English
4. Philippine Daily Express	National	English
5. Times Journal	National	English
6. United Daily Express	National	English
7. Philippine Evening Express	National	English
8. Business Day	National	English
9. Cebu Advocate	Cebu City	English
10. Cebu Daily Times	Cebu	English

Source of Data: Report from the National Media Production Center

The leading dailies and their circulation in Greater Manila area and in the province as reported by the National Media Production Center (1974) are shown in the next table.

TABLE 12: LEADING DAILIES AND THEIR AVERAGE DAILY CIRCULATION

<u>Daily Newspaper</u>	<u>Greater Manila</u>		<u>Province</u>		<u>T o t a l</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
1. Daily Express	157,239	58.59	111,353	41.37	269,163 **
2. Bulletin Today	103,474	66.44	52,225	33.54	155,707 **
3. Pilipino Express	74,881	81.00	17,568	19.00	92,458 **
4. Evening Express	50,247	82.05	10,896	17.79	61,241 **
5. Times Journal	CIRCULATION NOT YET AVAILABLE				

**Circulation of leading dailies in Greater Manila and in the province did not total 100% due to the fact that a small number of the dailies were circulated abroad.

Clearly, Table 12 indicates that most of the leading dailies are widely circulated in the Greater Manila area, while less than half of the circulation of each one is in the provinces. Moreover, the *Pilipino Express*, which is the only Tagalog daily paper included in the list of leading dailies, has the least readership outside the Manila area, since only 19% of its total sales are circulated in the provinces.

An examination of the listings at the National Media Production Center indicates what other newspapers people in the provinces read and how often these papers reach

the readers. A total of 65 newspapers thrive in the provinces, as reported by the National Media Production Center. Furthermore, 54 or 83.08% of the provincial newspapers are weeklies and none except two (*Cebu Advocate* and *Cebu Daily Times*) are dailies that circulate in the Cebu area. Moreover, most of the papers use English as the medium while some use their respective vernaculars together with English. The provincial newspapers that use Pilipino and English as media are the *Cordillera Herald* of Nueva Vizcaya, *Mayon Times* of Legaspi City, *Peninsula News* of Camarines Norte, and *Tribune* of Cabanatuan. The *Courier* of Pangasinan is a weekly which uses three media, namely English, Pilipino, and Pangasinan, while *Dahong Palay* of Cabanatuan uses Pilipino.

2.3.4.2. Magazines

Among magazines published in Manila, the leading ones are *Women's Journal*, *Woman's*, *Expressweek*, and *Sports*. Their circulation in 1974 in the Greater Manila area and in the provinces is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13: CIRCULATION OF LEADING MAGAZINES IN THE PHILIPPINES

MAGAZINES	CIRCULATION					
	GREATER MANILA		PROVINCE		T O T A L	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Women's Journal	44,842	54.46	37,500	45.50	82,342	**
2. Woman's	41,191	63.90	23,266	36.10	64,457	100
3. Expressweek	34,547	56.41	26,249	43.43	61,241	**
4. Sports	27,248	85.35	4,677	14.65	31,925	100

Source: Data were taken from the report of National Media Production Center.

**Circulation of leading magazines did not total 100% because of a small number of them circulate abroad.

Clearly, Table 13 indicates that all leading magazines circulating in the country use English as medium. Moreover, less than 50% of the circulation of each one is outside the Greater Manila area.

2.3.4.3. Books

A total of 61 books written in Pilipino were published in 1973 as registered in the Copyright Division of the National Library. Unfortunately, the number of copies of each book was not obtained due to limited time. In the other Philippine languages, only six full-length books were registered.

2.4. Recent PSSC Survey 1972

This study (Bulatao 1973) was concerned with the ways different ethnic groups perceive and react toward each other. Of the ethnic groups concerned in the study, one

is distinguished by nationality or national origins and race (the Chinese in the Philippines), a second primarily by religion (the Filipino Muslims) and the rest by language, region and possibly sub-cultural themes and customs (Tagalogs, Ilocanos, Bicolanos, Waray, Cebuanos and Ilonggos). Residents of Greater Manila, Naga, Tacloban, Cebu, and Davao were queried about these groups.

Systematic random sampling of households within each area unit was performed; each area was assigned a quota of 300 interviews, except Greater Manila, which was assigned 500. One adult (18 or over) was chosen from each sampled household.

Some findings of the survey were:

1. For all respondents combined, more give Cebuano as the first language they learned than Tagalog (31% as against 27%). Tagalog and Ilocano are most prominent in Manila, though a large group (29%) first learned some other language(s); other languages first learned are: Bicol and Tagalog in Naga; Waray and Cebuano in Tacloban; Cebuano in Cebu and Cebuano, Ilonggo and Tagalog in Davao.

2. All respondents from Manila can speak Tagalog. The percentages speaking Tagalog are also high elsewhere. Cebuano by contrast is spoken by 69% in Tacloban and close to 100% in Cebu and 95% in Davao, but by only 8% and 3% in Manila and Naga. English is spoken by a relatively constant percentage (between 68% and 73% in each city).

3. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents considered themselves to belong to the ethnic group corresponding to the language they first learned.

4. Of the 91 respondents who considered themselves to belong to a different ethnic group (called 'switchers'), half explained that they did not grow up with others of the same mother tongue.

5. Regarding relationship between parents' ethnicity and language first learned, of those of pure parentage a relatively large 19% first learned some language other than that of their parents. Of those of mixed parentage more learned the mother's than the father's language first, but 24% first learned a third language (the most common alternate languages are Cebuano and Tagalog).

6. Of 12 ethnic communities, 3 are identified in Manila and Davao and 2 elsewhere. In each ethnic community the mean number of languages spoken is above two, with males usually having a slight edge. The Manila-Tagalog and Cebu-Cebuanos know the fewest languages, but their own languages are of course widely known. Davao-Ilongos, Cebu-minorities, Tacloban-Cebuanos and Davao-minorities know somewhat more languages than the other groups.

7. Tagalog and English both furnish media for inter-ethnic communication, with Tagalog having an edge, except in Cebu.

8. The percentages of respondents speaking each language by city (Manila, Naga, Tacloban, Cebu, Davao) are:

	Combined
Tagalog	86%
Cebuano	59%
English	72%
Waray	21%
Bicolano	20%
Ilocano	10%
Ilonggo	11%

Note that the above figures are based on 1705 respondents from five urban areas. No

distinction is made between a first language and a second language.

In Naga, 95% of the respondents speak both Bicolano and Tagalog. In Tacloban, 97% speak Waray, but Tagalog edges out Cebuano by 76% to 69%. In Davao, although 95% speak Cebuano, 87% speak Tagalog — which still shows a sizable number speaking Tagalog. Undoubtedly, many are bilingual. Only in Cebu is the difference quite significant and expectedly so: 100% Cebuano speakers to 63% Tagalog speakers.

What the above figures indicate is that in non-Tagalog speaking areas, although the local vernacular predominates, it is always Tagalog which comes as a close second, again another indicator of how rapidly Tagalog is spreading.

2.5 Census Results

The increase in the number of Tagalog speakers in the country during the last 31 years has been steady, as can be seen from Table 14. The average increase has been about 10% every 10 years; more than half (55.2%) of the population claimed being able to speak Tagalog in the year 1970.

TABLE 14: PAST AND PROJECTED PERCENT OF TAGALOG SPEAKERS
IN THE PHILIPPINES

<u>A. PAST</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
	1939	25.4
	1948	37.1
	1960	44.4
	1970	55.2
<u>B. PROJECTED</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
	1980	64.1
	1990	73.2
	2000	82.4

Source of Data on % Tagalog speakers in the past years:
Bureau of Census and Statistics.

Using linear regression analysis a projection of the population who will be able to speak Tagalog in the future was obtained. Hence in the year 1980 it was extrapolated that 64.1% would be Tagalog speakers while in 1990 and 2000, the predicted figures are 73.2% and 82.4% respectively.

3. CONCLUSIONS

We have tried to fit the findings of various studies reviewed into a pattern.

While the data are of uneven quality, of varying purposes, of differentiated types, we have felt it worthwhile compiling such results into one paper by way of review to show that Filipino, one of the official languages of the Philippines, is widely spread, it is currently in a rapid process of disseminating itself, and all the prognoses and projections

are that it will be disseminated even more rapidly the next few years because of its use as a medium of instruction in the school system and its extensive use in the mass media, which in turn are more extensively used as the level of education and the socio-economic level of a people increase. And the indications are that, even with massive inflation, the education of the Filipino and his socio-economic level are improving.

What the pro-Pilipino sectors of our society should do is to keep quiet and let things be—the inexorable societal laws of language dissemination will take care of spreading Pilipino, Constitution or no Constitution, whether or not there are universalists or not trying to forge a new language called Filipino. For administrators in government, for the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, the best posture to take is one of ‘benign neglect’.

We do not think it will take more than several decades to spread Pilipino. Given our modest extrapolations, we predict that by the year 2000, 82% of Filipinos will speak Pilipino.

In the process, as the language disseminates, we will standardize by getting a creative minority to use it as a vehicle for intellectual work—as we get some to elaborate it. And it will be from these intellectualizers and elaborators that ultimately the standards will be derived and set, and hopefully, some generations from now, a descriptive linguist can sit down and begin describing the Pilipino spoken by the elite of the Philippines, not in the prescriptive way of the pro-FILIPINO linguist but in the descriptive way of the linguist who will cull his data from living reality.

Where Filipino has been selected by the Constitutional Convention delegates, Pilipino will be selected by the growing numbers of Filipinos who use it in certain domains. Where Filipino will be codified by prescriptive linguists, Pilipino will be codified by the elites of Philippine society and recorded by descriptive linguists. Except among a few die-hards, of the cast of mind of Esperanto enthusiasts, we doubt if Filipino will ever be elaborated; but even now and more so in the future, Pilipino will be elaborated by an intellectual elite in centers of learning as well as by the more sophisticated creative artists of the mass media. Where Filipino might be accepted by a consensus in the barangays or even by a referendum sponsored by some future National Assembly, Pilipino has been accepted and is being propagated by both first-language (native speakers) and mobile non-Tagalogs who have accepted the realities of Philippine life.

REFERENCES

- BULATAO, RODOLFO A. 1973. Ethnic attitudes in five Philippine cities. A report submitted to the Philippine Social Science Council Research Committee. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Social Research Laboratory.
- 1970 Census. Bureau of the Census and Statistics. Manila.
- Bureau of Public Schools Bulletin No. 1, s. 1973, dated March 20, 1973. A study of teacher preferences on the use of Pilipino as a medium of instruction. (Mimeo).
- GONZALEZ, ANDREW B. 1974a. The Constitution and the language policy of the Department of Education and Culture. *Philippine Studies* 22.325-37.
- _____. 1974b. Organizing your own bilingual program in the elementary school. *The Catholic Teacher* 21(4). 22-31.

- GONZALEZ, ANDREW B. and POSTRADO, LETICIA 1974. Manpower and materials resources for bilingual education: A final report. Manila: United Publishing Company.
- HAUGEN, EINAR. 1972. Dialect, language, nation. The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen, selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil, 237-54. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- 1974 Media Census Factbook. (Mimeo)
- OTANES, FE T. and BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN. 1969. Language policy survey of the Philippines: Initial report (Prepublication Edition). Manila: Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.
- Philippine Mass Communication Research Society Survey. 1973. (Mimeo)
- YUN KIM. 1972. Net internal Migration in the Philippines, 1960-1970. Bureau of the Census and Statistics.