CONTRIBUTIONS OF FILIPINO LINGUISTS
TO INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP[1]

EMY M. PASCASIO
Ateneo de Manila University

0. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of Philippine linguistics, the area has been testing ground for new developments in theories and methods from abroad. The linguistic scene is a challenge to every linguist in search of new fields to investigate. While no new frontiers of linguistic ideologies have as yet developed, new insights have been gained on the descriptive and pedagogical levels especially during the past decade when Philippine linguistics progressed remarkably. Reflecting this growth are the many research studies in linguistics (completed and on-going), the establishment of scholarly journals, and several conferences that have been conducted. This rapid progress is largely due to three factors: 1) the increase of formally trained Filipino linguists who have set the pace and pattern of research, 2) the development and use of more sophisticated research designs and statistical procedures, and 3) the adoption of an interdisciplinary approach.

This paper will present some of the contributions of Filipino linguists to international scholarship in the fields of linguistics and language teaching. These are studies primarily conducted in the late sixties, seventies and eighties — the past 20 years inclusive.

1. HYPHENATED DISCIPLINES

The most vital section of current Philippine linguistics studies is applied linguistics and the hyphenated disciplines in linguistics because many of the Filipino linguists are greatly concerned with the problems of language learning and their effects upon aspects of instruction as well as better language planning. They reflect this concern in the number and quality of studies that have been accomplished as well as those that are ongoing. I quite agree with Andrew Gonzalez in his claim that it is in the field of applied linguistics that our country represents one of the most advanced in Asia and the World because we have had a lot experience in language teaching and in the process we have learned to judge what works and what does not work in the Philippine setting. We have thus become more critical of the latest trends in language approaches and pedagogy and we have learned to be quite skeptical of new proposals without being reactive or unduly conservative (Gonzalez 1980a).

The hyphenated disciplines such as ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics have gained increased attention and great interest among Filipino linguists for the past ten years because of their relation to the social sciences; hence the utilization of the interdisciplinary approach. The topics are on contemporary Philippine life and needs.

Sociolinguistics has been the most systematically explored so far among these hyphenated disciplines. Several studies have been conducted on topics relating to problems of language planning and implementation as well as problems concerning

the national language. The most important studies are those by Bonifacio Sibayan (1971a, b), Emma Bernabe (1978) and Andrew Gonzalez (1980b). Verbal behavior has been extensively studied with research focusing on bilingual proficiency, communicative efficiency, linguistic interference, language attitudes and motivations, patterns of multi-lingualism, language use, and preferences. We now have the necessary data base for language planning. In the area of ethnography of speaking: *who* speaks *what* to *whom*, *when* and *where*, there have been significant language surveys conducted in various parts of the Philippines (Greater Manila, Paniqui, Dagupan, Surigao) and surveys of different types, which provide us with baseline data to observe sociolinguistic change and for planning purposes. We also have studies on language standardization and language cultivation and elaboration. We have data on language domains and needs and the per-ceptions of people on which languages are needed for social mobility as well as studies on indicators of language welfare and their relation to socio-economic development.

In psycholinguistics we have barely begun our investigation. The first scientific attempt to record and analyze first language acquisition in the Philippine setting are the two longitudinal case studies of child language acquisition conducted by Gonzalez (1982). Research on language in the crib which utilizes language data from birth to twelve months has just been completed (Valladolid 1982). Studies on 'Filipino Psychology' have been conducted with their particular philosophical, historico-cultural and social underpinnings (Enriquez 1975). Along with these studies comes a critical analysis of Western concepts and methodology in research and their applicability in the Philippines. With these studies, a new wave seems to be fast catching up with us; we are no longer concerned with Pilipino as a language, but with the Filipino who uses it to express the richness of his own culture, identity and personality, thereby arriving through a methodology appropriate for us, at a deeper and richer, indigenous understanding of who and what the Filipino is.

Ethnolinguistics or anthropological linguistics has not received as much attention as sociolinguistics, although these two areas overlap in topics on value orientation, cultural behavior patterns, and ethnography of communication. One of the world view studies that have been done is that by Malicsi (1980). Malicsi's study is on the Sambal Ayta World view: the Sambal Ayta's concept of the nature of the universe, human and divine characters, his social relationships and values as reflected in his language folklore. Kinship systems have also been studied by Manuel (1948) and Chan-Yap (1974); the methodology used was componential analysis. Concerning studies on cross-cultural unerstanding and language learning, the context of situation model was developed and revised by McCarron and Pascasio (1967, 1969). While most of the language teaching methodologies make some provision for cultural appreciation, none gives culture the place of prominence it so rightly deserves. As a system, language can be studied and analyzed apart from the total cultural context; however, language interpenetrates most of the other aspects of culture such as value orientations which affect and are affected by culture. This context of situation model has been validated in a number of studies conducted at Ateneo de Manila University (Pandjiris 1962, Bunye 1964, Bacani 1965, Caparros 1968).

Pascasio's (1979) work, *Languages at Crossroads: English and Pilipino,* represents a pioneering study on the analysis of conversational exchanges of various types in a Philippine context. Apart from Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista's work on communication inter-changes in radio dramas, this study is the only work thus far on this interesting new area of investigation by ethnographers of communication. The section on the dynamics of code-switching is likewise significant in that it tries to account for the reasons behind code-switching in Philippine culture, again based on an analysis of real conversations. There have been several studies on the formal linguistic aspects of code-switching but few on the reasons why Filipinos of certain socio-economic level and educational background code-switch in certain domains and in certain situations. There have been surveys taken on perceptions regarding the reasons for the use of code switching (hence, self reports),

but this is the first time anyone has tried to infer the reasons behind code-switching based on actual conversational data within a situational context.

2 DESCRIPTIVE AND COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

In descriptive linguistics, since the bulk of linguists in the Philippines have been trained in the United States, much of the research work is derivative of American scholarship, using various grammatical models: American structuralist, tagmemicist, generative semanticist, and transformational generativist. There is an attempt, however, to explain and analyze certain features of Philippine linguistic structure which the existing theories have not satisfactorily accounted for, Eclecticisim rather than theoretical purity or partisanship is the general rule. There is close adherence to the guiding principle that language should be viewed as a 'device for reporting and defining experience' rather than merely as a system to be studied divorced from the experiencer's cultural world.

In historical and comparative linguistics a number of studies have been completed but only those done by Filipino linguists will be cited here. *Philippine Paleography* by Juan Francisco (1973) is a historico-paleographic study of the ancient and extant Philippine system(s) of writing. The findings show that the Philippine scripts belong to the same family as the Sumatra system. The syllabary is an index to the homogeneity of Philippine culture.

In the area of lexicography, Riego de Dios' *A Composite Dictionary of Philippine Creole* (1976) with 6,000 entries is concerned with placing Cotabato Chavacano on the Philippine linguistic map. One of her findings showed that the Cotabato variety is more of a consequence of languages in contact rather than a different genetic origin. Santiago's (1979) work, *The Elaboration of a Technical Lexicon of Pilipino,* seeks to find out how the intended users of Pilipino would react to the different possibilities in the development of scientific lexicon, while Constantino (1977) advocates a 'universal approach' for cultivating the lexicon of the language. In the area of dialectology very few studies have been conducted. Soberano's (1976) work on the dialects of Marinduque Tagalog tried to identify and describe the geographical variations and gain knowledge on the important elements causing variation.

On the topic of kinship the works of Manuel (1948) and Chan Yap (1974) will be cited here. In Manuel's word lists, he tried to show that there is some sort of relationship between Chinese, Tagalog, and original Austronesian. Chan-Yap's study using the generative phonology framework for the analysis of the loanwords in the domains of kinship and cookery, has shown that the model can provide valid and logical explanations for seemingly irregular forms, that is, sound correspondences. It is also evident that the use of distinctive features and binary notation has simplified phonological generalizations extensively.

In descriptive linguistics, a number of studies have been conducted on topics such as case grammar, topicalization, subjectivalization, negativization, predication, clitics, and adverbials. Gonzalez, in his recent article, 'Using Semantically Based Grammatical Models with the Philippine Languages: The Last Ten Years', extensively reviewed the literature on semantic based grammatical models. He has demonstrated that there are instances where the models are compatible because they work on similar assumptions; hence with such compatible models certain features can be combined without danger of theoretical contradiction (Gonzalez, forthcoming).

Rafael's (1976) describes negativization in fifteen Bisayan languages. The generative-semantics linguistic model is used. One of the more interesting insights that may be gleaned from this study is the use of predicate-raising rules within a generative semantic model which accounts for negativization neatly. In A. Hidalgo's (1970) study on 'The Semantics of Ivatan Predicative Stems', one of the findings shows that it is workable to categorize the semantic features of predicative stems in Ivatan with the root meaning of *event* into critical, corollary, and supplementary dimensions.

So far, the most complete reference grammar of Tagalog was done by Schachter and Otanes (1972). There are two reference grammars of Iloko that are being done separately (E. Cubar, forthcoming; and L. Reid, forthcoming). A pedagogical grammar of Pilipino by Chan-Yap and Martin-Palo (1973) has been done to provide teachers and students of Pilipino with grammar that will help them understand and appreciate the complexities of the Pilipino language.

Case grammar in the Philippine languages has been the topic of several recent linguistic studies. Ramos' (1974) study is a successful attempt to explain the case system of Tagalog verbs. She has shown that an analysis of the semantic features of the verb is necessary to a fuller understanding of the case system of a language. Ramos' typology is based on the analysis of the semantic feature-matrix of the verb. Luzares' (1975) typology, on the other hand, is based on the analysis of the case frames. While the Ramos study aims towards an ultimate explanation of the underlying case system and consequently of how this linguistic knowledge can help in the subcategorization of Tagalog verbs, the Luzares study is an attempt to explain how case and other semantic notions determine the morphology of the Cebuano verb. Although these two studies follow the same basic model (case-grammar), each has modified this model to be able to handle the problems that each has raised. The Ramos study has chosen to formalize the native Tagalog's intuition of verbal subcategorization while Luzares' study tried to answer the question, What semantic notions are responsible for the various surface morphological representations of the verb? (Ramos 1974, Luzares 1975). N. Cubar's (1978) study on the adverbials in Tagalog, Cebuano, and Ilocano, classifies all the adverbials and describes their syntactic relation to the rest of the sentence. It describes the semantics of adverbs in terms of orientation and attempts to provide a test for distinguishing complements from adverbials.

3. LANGUAGE SURVEYS

Studies on the language behavior profile of the Filipino bilingual have dealt with various aspects such as: 1) language use patterns 2) language learning motivation and orientation, 3) language attitudes and aptitudes, 4) language fluency and dominance, 5) language acquisition.

The Language Policy Survey (Otanes and Sibayan 1969) served as the ground breaking exploration study on the Filipino bilingual's language behavior. The other studies that followed have shown that sociocultural variables such as domain, role and socio-economic status of participants, topic, and setting significantly affect language choice (Pascasio and Hidalgo 1973, Pascasio 1976, Bautista et al. 1974, Barrios et al. 1974, Castillo and Galang 1973, Fabregas 1981, Barcelona 1977).

Three language surveys (Dumaran 1980, Olonan 1978, Mendoza 1978) determine the correlation between reported and actual language use in their own communities of non-Tagalogs. These three studies show that there is an existing agreement between actual and reported language use. This means that the language(s) most commonly used in a particular transaction (e.g. marketing) as reported in the questionnaire are also the language(s) most commonly observed in actual use in that transaction.

4. CODE-SWITCHING

Code-switching in the Philippine setting has become a topic of interest recently so that a number of investigations have been done to describe its nature or dynamics as a communication strategy in different domains. The oral or spoken phase of code-switching has been explored by the following:

The first attempt to investigate language shifting in the Philippines was done by Azores (1967) using both oral and written data. Azores was more concerned, however,

with the phonology of what she called 'mix-mix' and a frequency count of structures involved in language shifts. One important result of the study in terms of phonology is the finding that when a Filipino shifts to English, he does not necessarily use with it English suprasegmental features. Basically, the suprasegmental pattern is Tagalog.

Pimentel (1972) describes and analyzes patterns of mixing English and Tagalog in radio broadcasts and establishments possible phrase structure rules from the analysis. The linguistic analysis reveals that most of the English section of the mixing are content words while most of the Tagalog structures are function words; mixing frequently occurred in the nominal phrases. The use of mixing in this particular domain and situation were for a) precision, b) comic effect (humor), c) atmosphere (friendly and informal), and d) emphasis or clarification.

Also, in the broadcast media, Bautista (1975) analyzes and typologizes Tagalog-English code-switching and goes further by constructing a model of bilingual linguistic competence on the basis of her typology. The study draws up a conceptual input-output model that shows the relationship among the different components of a grammar. Its theoretical orientation is transformational grammar. Another study by Bautista is an attempt to describe the patterns of speaking prevalent in social interaction of a Pilipino speech community. The patterns of speaking are grouped into six categories: address forms and five specific speech acts — greetings, apologies, compliments, directives, and probes. Radio dramas have been chosen as the data because they are conversational and authentic (Bautista 1979).

Exploring the domain of business, Pascasio (1978) does a preliminary analysis of the dynamics of Tagalog-English code-switching in business interactions in terms of functions and occurrences (based on Gumperz's model of social interaction) and linguistic patterns (utilizing Bautista's typology). An attempt at distinguishing borrowing from code-switching is also made.

Code-switching in the classroom domain has been described by Mogol, Tuy, Santos and Esclabanan (1977) also in terms of functions and linguistic patterns. This study is the first attempt that includes the ethnic language (aside from Tagalog and English) in the analysis since sources of data are gleaned from the classrooms of both Tagalog-speaking and non-Tagalog speaking communities. The data was particularly obtained from classroom interaction in subject areas such as Science, Mathematics and Social Studies (the curriculum areas where the Bilingual Education Policy seems to have its greatest impact). The linguistic analysis was also based on Bautista's typology while the description of functions was based on the reports given by the teachers.

The written or printed aspect of code-switching has been investigated by Marfil and Pasigna (1970) where their main interest is on the formulation of phrase structure rules out of the English loanwords that intrude in Tagalog sentences as used in the daily newspapers.

Pan (1975) makes use of Pilipino short stories in the magazine, *Liwayway*, for her analysis of code-switching. In particular, the types of English loanwords are determined and the extent to which English-Pilipino code-switching is resorted to is assessed. The findings show that, in general, English loan words are treated by either retaining the spelling of English or by writing them according to the Pilipino orthography system. As in the spoken medium code-switching in the printed medium also occurs mostly in the open categories (for English) and in the closed categories (for Tagalog). It is observed that code-switching frequently occurs among peer groups when speaking of informal topics on a friendly basis.

The short story writer employs code-switching for the following reasons: a) for ease in understanding, b) for brevity, c) for lack of indigenous terms in Tagalog, d) for precision and e) for emphasis and clarity.

Gonzalez (1982a) includes a note on code-switching in his study of stylistic under-differentiation of written Philippine English of the mass media. He contends that 'the

code-switching variety is used by well-educated Filipinos who have mastered both English (in its formal style) and Pilipino (in its formal, informal and familiar styles) and it is used in the mass media (spoken and written) for a very distinct purpose: to establish rapport with an interlocutor or audience and to establish an atmosphere of informality, perhaps unconsciously excluding a native speaker of English who is familiar with only one code and likewise perhaps, unconsciously establishing one's credentials as a nationalist, albeit Westernized. It is now widely used in talk-shows in the mass media and even in class, when the teacher wishes to establish his credentials as being "with it" and in order to "break the ice" in his class' (1982a:217).

5.   ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION

Most studies on language learning motivation have indicated an instrumental motive for learning English and an integrative one for learning Pilipino (Otanes and Sibayan 1969; Feenstra and Castillo 1970, Gaston 1978, Bangalan 1979). Respondents want to study English in order to communicate better, to show that they are educated and to attain socio-economic success. They want to learn Pilipino in order to show that they are patriotic and to understand the Filipino heritage. One interesting variation of the above findings reveals that parents may be instrumentally or integratively motivated or both in choosing English for their children (Castillo 1972). It is also noted that the desire to learn English does not necessarily mean an identification with Americans or their way of life but rather with educated Filipinos.

With the implementation of the Bilingual Education Policy, a change in language learning motivation has been noted. College students, both Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs, are now instrumentally motivated to learn both Pilipino and English. The use of Pilipino as a medium of instruction in certain school subjects at all academic levels has perhaps instilled in the minds of the students the idea that Pilipino has now become a tool for understanding and expressing ideas inside the classroom and that learning this tool and further sharpening it is necessary in order to be able to participate in classroom discussions (Pascasio 1979).

Meanwhile, learning a lingua franca or a common language of a community (e.g. Tagalog in Tarlac; Cebuano in Surigao del Sur) is generally instrumental in nature (Mendoza 1978) or it may be both instrumental and integrative (Dumaran 1980). It is evident, however, that instrumental motivation is stronger than integrative motivation in learning the language (Olonan 1978, Nang 1977).

Motivation is a necessary factor for successfully acquiring a second language and it is related to second language learning achievement (Castillo 1969, 1972) as well as to attitude (Samonte 1981). Specifically, instrumental motivation correlates with Pilipino proficiency (Nang 1977); its correlation with English, however, is negligible (Pastrana 1979). Moreover, instrumental motivation cannot reliably predict attitude to English (Samonte 1981). Integrative motivation has significant correspondence with English performance (Pastrana 1979) and can reliably predict attitude to English (Samonte 1981), but it does not necessarily include a positive attitude towards members of other language groups (Castillo 1972, Castillo and Chan-Yap 1977).

Birthplace or language background influences the degree of motivation to learn a particular language. Understandably, the non-Tagalogs have a stronger motivation to study Pilipino than English compared with the Tagalogs (Pascasio 1979). On the one hand, the Tagalogs do not show indication of a strong motivational intensity to further improve their Pilipino, since they are already native speakers of it (Castillo and Chan-Yap 1977).

Social and political events seem to play a vital role in the changing attitudes of the Filipino bilingual towards the different languages being used in his milieu. A trend seems to be noticeable in the attitudes to English, Pilipino and the local vernacular as media

of instruction. For instance, in the late sixties (Otanes and Sibayan 1969), the preference for English as the language of instruction at all academic levels — primary, secondary and tertiary — was reported. The early seventies, marked by activism and nationalistic fervor among the youth, sparked a change among the younger generation (even the young elites) as shown by the findings of an attitude survey (Castillo and Chan-Yap 1977) where there was a desire to replace English with Pilipino as medium of instruction. However, the promulgation and implementation of the Bilingual Education Policy in 1974 led to another attitudinal direction. As a result of the problems and limitations encountered in actual classroom interactions, the college students, although supportive of the policy, do not favor the replacement of English with Pilipino in those subjects where English was used as the language of instruction (Pascasio 1979). Parents of varied socio-economic classes and language background in Metro Manila prefer to delimit the use of Pilipino to the elementary level as medium of instruction. At the secondary and the tertiary levels, English is preferred as the medium of instruction. Interestingly, parents with higher educational attainment (at least 'college graduate') are more liberal in accepting Pilipino as a language of instruction while those with the least educational background trace the deterioration of education to the inclusion of Pilipino as a medium of instruction in the schools (Cruz 1980).

Among non-Tagalog respondents residing in non-Tagalog speaking communities, the desire to maintain English and Pilipino as languages of instruction but with certain concessions is indicated. There is a desire for Pilipino and English as media of instruction for courses like law, medicine, etc. but for vocational courses, the local vernacular is preferred (Mendoza 1978). In a Chinese high school in Bacolod where the students are predominantly Chinese speakers who also speak the local vernacular (which is Hiligaynon), the use of English and Pilipino as the media of instruction is highly endorsed. Their teachers are the ones who are resistant to the use of Pilipino as the medium of instruction in the subjects specified by the Bilingual Policy (Gaston 1977).

Proficiency affects attitude to both English and Pilipino. Although both the fluent and the non-fluent speakers of English and Pilipino exhibit positive attitude to English, those who are more proficient in English have stronger favorable attitude to English and Pilipino than those who are less proficient; on the other hand, those who are less proficient in Pilipino have stronger favorable attitude to English and Pilipino than those who are more proficient. Among the non-Tagalogs, those who are not proficient in Pilipino have favorable attitude to Pilipino (Pascasio 1979).

Mass media exposure also influences attitude to both languages. Those who watch Pilipino and English TV programs have a more favorable attitude to Pilipino than those who do not (Pascasio 1979).

In Metro Manila, parents feel that the native or ethnic language is very important and should be the first language that should be learned by children. Parents with higher educational attainment tend to be more accepting of the ethnic language (Cruz 1980).

Three studies that aim to assess the language performance of the Filipino bilingual's fluency and dominance have been conducted in a Metro Manila setting by exposing the respondents to certain performance tasks or through indirect measures such as questionnaires and self-rating scales (Pascasio 1972, Bautista et al., 1974, Mangulabnan 1971).

Performance in the different learning tasks reveals that the respondents perform significantly better in English than in Pilipino in the dominance test. In the verbal fluency test, English structures are more frequently used than Pilipino structures. Although there appears to be an equal fluency in both English and Pilipino in word production or semantic richness, there is a slight marginal advantage in the use of English in the optional tasks. In general, however, the respondents are found to be equally fluent in English and Pilipino, but slightly dominant in English (Pascasio 1972).

The dominance of the Filipino bilingual in English is further verified in Bautista

et al.'s study (1974). Respondents in this study are more dominant in English in the domains of home, school, neighborhood and recreation. In terms of fluency, however, the subjects are more fluent in Pilipino in similar domains. The study concludes that the language in which one is fluent is not necessarily the language in which he is dominant.

Reported or perceived language competence of non-Tagalog Filipino bilinguals has been the subject of inquiry of some studies. The findings reveal that one does not necessarily understand or speak the language used where he was born. Differences in degree of proficiency in understanding and fluency of use occur between natives and migrants; thus, migrants perceive themselves better in English while natives perceive themselves better speakers of Tagalog, English and other languages in the community (Dumaran 1980).

6. LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Perhaps the first scientific attempt to record and analyze first language acquisition in the Philippine setting are the two longitudinal case studies of child language acquisition conducted by Gonzalez (1982b).

Another study by Gonzalez (1980c) focuses on second language acquisition (English) in school. In his findings, a comparison between entry years (the first time a particular structure is introduced and formally taught in the grade) and acquisition years reveals that there is a time lag of one or more years before a structure is acquired. A replication of this study was done by L. Saranglao (1981) varying the sampling sample by using a high SES group. The findings confirm the results of Gonzalez' study.

In the area of common strategies in learning a second language and evidence of interlanguage, there have been very few studies. The areas of learning difficulties have been identified by a number of contrastive analyses that were done on English and some of the Philippine languages (Pascasio 1960, Sibayan 1961). With the latest developments in linguistics research, however, these learning difficulties are not only caused by similarities and differences of the two languages of the learner, which are classified as interlingual errors, but also by intralingual errors that may be caused by other factors such as developmental or faulty learning strategies.

7. LANGUAGE TESTING

It was only towards the latter part of the seventies that language testing in the Philippines was given its rightful place in the field. Serious attention and interest have increased after the felt need for more sophisticated, reliable and valid measures for language behavior. Comparative studies on the relative merits of the discrete point test and the tests of integrative skills have been conducted. Initial findings indicate that in terms of assessing global competence, the integrative type is superior to the discrete-point type. However, both types of tests are valid measures for language competence (Castro 1979).

With the current interest in communicative competence using a psychosociolinguistic framework and the non-discrete point testing approach, Castillo's 1978 study, although exploratory in nature, is a significant contribution since it is the first attempt to test communicative competence in Pilipino. She developed a test of communicative competence in Pilipino for prospective elementary school teachers. The test battery if administered to prospective teachers can serve as basis for determining whether they are ready to use Pilipino in their teaching jobs.

8. PHILIPPINE ENGLISH

The existence of a Philippine English variety has been demonstrated by Llamzon (1969), who focused on the spoken variety of Philippine English as used by the educated

Filipino elite; he called this variety Standard Filipino English. Gonzalez and Alberca (1978), on the other hand, would rather use the term *Philippine English* rather than *Filipino English,* in view of the possiblity of evolving a standard form of English spoken in the Philippines which is comparable to that of American, British, Australian, or Canadian English.

A system attempt to demonstrate the reality of the Philippine English variety was done by Gonzalez and Alberca (1978) by focusing on a definite corpus of spoken and written Philippine English (the mass media). The study aims to make a contribution not only to content (the features themselves) but to methodology in investigation. It also hopes to draw out some of the theoretical problems connected with inquiries such as the time when an error becomes acceptable enough to consider it a feature of the standard language. The findings of the study, by and large, confirm earlier studies on Philippine English with an additional list of features on the phonological and grammatical levels. As a follow-up study, Gonzalez (1979) did an error analysis of written English in the Philippine mass media. He came up with a typology of these errors (sometimes referred to as distinctive features of Philippine English) and the corresponding decision on what to do about them. The typology and tentative guidelines are specifically meant to give language planners, curricula and syllabi makers, administrators and teachers a principled basis on which to determine teaching priorities.

The existence of a Philippine English variety has been demonstrated (although its legitimization is still in the process of development), but the possibility of having other varieties of Philippine English (according to social level and parameters of solidarity and power) has been barely explored.

Studies on language needs for occupations have also been conducted (Fabregas 1981). The macro-survey findings (Otanes and Sibayan 1969) indicate that English and Pilipino are both necessary for success in occupations of high prestige (e.g. lawyers, doctors, businessmen, etc.) while Pilipino is the language most frequently cited as contributor to success in occupations that are sometimes referred to as blue collar jobs; a Philippine language (the local vernacular) is necessary for success in all occupations while knowledge of English alone is not associated with success in any occupation. In another study (Sibayan and Segovia 1978), it is shown that both English and Pilipino contribute to one's socio-economic advancement while the ethnic language, unless it is Pilipino, does not contribute to one's socio-economic success in the Metro Manila setting. The study has also been able to gauge certain relationships between socio-economic success and proficiency in a language. It appears that English still occupies high prestige in terms of socio-economic advancement. Other studies have similar findings (Cruz 1980, Samonte 1981).

9. OTHER NEEDS

The Philippine setting with its very complex linguistic situation offers the linguist a very rich field for investigation. Theoreticians can continue testing foreign models or they can evolve their own linguistic models. What we need in the area of descriptive linguistics are in-depth analyses of features of the Philippine languages which can be theoretically model-enriching or model-verifying. Findings of linguistic researches can be utilized by practitioners such as language teachers, policymakers, language planners, materials writers and administrators of language programs.

In applied linguistics we need to test our theories on methods, for although we have an intuitive feeling regarding what works and what does not work in the classroom, we have to be able to document the process and control the teaching variables to give teaching a scientific basis. Likewise, we need to develop better instruments or tests for measuring communicative competence in Pilipino and English.

More studies on cultural patternings of speech behavior among the various ethnic

groups as well as their cultural value orientations should be conducted. There should be more worldview studies using the Philippine socio-cultural framework. The collection of linguistic and ethnographic data on the different Philippine languages especially those that are fast disappearing is likewise needed.

We have come a long way in Philippine linguistics research, yet we still have an even longer way to go for there are several gaps and we can accelerate the necessary research only with sufficient and proper funding.

REFERENCES

AZORES, FORTUNATA. 1967. A preliminary investigation of the phenomenon of language change in the Philippines. M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

BACANI, LYDIA. 1965. A study of cross-cultural differences based on the analysis and comparison of Thai, American, and Filipino contexts of situation. M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

BANGALAN, NORA. 1979. Factors that facilitate the acceptance of Pilipino. Term paper. Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

BARRIOS, ANGELA et al. 1974. The greater Manila speech community: Bilingual or diglossic? Manuscript, Ateneo de Manila University.

BARCELONA, HERMINIA. 1977. Language usage and preference patterns of Filipino bilingual: An NMPC survey. In The Filipino bilingual, ed. by Emy M. Pascasio, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

BAUTISTA, MA. LOURDES S. et al. 1972. The Filipino bilingual's language orientation. In The Filipino bilingual, ed. by Emy M. Pascasio, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press.

──────────────. 1979. Patterns of speaking in Pilipino radio dramas: A socio-linguistic analysis. Tokyo: Institute for the study of language and culture of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (Monograph Series No. 13).

──────────────. 1980. The Filipino bilingual's competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code switching. Pacific Linguistics Series C-No. 59. Department of Linguistics, School of Pacific Studies. Canberra: The Australian University.

BERNABE, EMMA. 1978. Language planning in Philippine education 1565-1975. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Philippines.

BUNYE, V. 1964. A descriptive study of the implementation of the 'context of situation approach' in the teaching of English as a second language. M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

CAPARROS, TERESITA. 1968. An application of the context of situation theory to the teaching of Philippine short stories in English. M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

CARREON, NOEMI. 1980. A comparison of the performance in English proficiency tests of Ateneo High School examinees/enrolees and the non-Ateneans (schoolyear 1975-76; 1979-80). M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de manila University.

CASTILLO, EMMA. 1969. A study of the roles of aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language acquisition. M.A. Thesis, Philippine Normal College.

──────────────. 1972. Motivational variables in second language acquisition. Philippine Journal of Linguistics. 3.2.95-124.

──────────────. 1978. A test of communicative competence in Pilipino for prospective elementary school teachers   A first approximation. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo-PNC Consortium.

──────────────and GLORIA CHAN-YAP. 1977. Attitudinal survey on Pilipino as medium of instruction. In The Filipino bilingual, ed. by Emy M. Pascasio, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

CASTRO, CORABELLA. 1979. The comparative validities of discrete point and integrative tests of English proficiency. MAT-ESL Thesis, University of the Philippines.

CHAN-YAP, GLORIA. 1974. Hokkien Chinese borrowings. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo-PNC Consortium.

_____ . 1976. The semantics of Tagalog kinship terms of Hokkien Chinese origin. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 7.1 & 2.1-17.

_____ and TERESITA MARTIN-PALO. 1979. A modern Pilipino grammar for teachers. Manuscript, Ateneo de Manila University.

CONSTANTINO, ERNESTO. 1973. The sentence patterns of twenty-six Philippine language. In Readings in Philippine linguistics, ed. by Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, et al., 288-333. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

_____ . 1977. Ang 'universal approach' at ang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas, In Filipino or Pilipino? ed. by E. Constantino, Rogelio Sikat, Pamela Cruz, 17-31. Manila: Rex Publishing Co.

CRUZ, CARMEN. 1980. Sociolinguistic features of a slected Manila community. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 11.2. 64-74.

CUBAR, ERNESTO. Forthcoming. Iloko reference grammar. Department of Linguistics, University of the Philippines.

CUBAR, NELLY. 1978. Adverbials in Tagalog, Cebuano and Ilokano. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Philippines.

_____ . 1974. The Philippine linguistic landscape: 16th-19th centuries. Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review, Vol. 39.

DUMARAN, CRISTETA. 1980. A linguistic profile of Dagupan City. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pangasinan.

ENRIQUEZ, VIRGILIO. 1975. Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Perspektibo at direksiyon. Papel na binasa sa unang pambansang kumperensiya sa sikolohiyang Pilipino. University of the Philippines.

FABREGAS, ROMANA. 1981. Language use, needs and attitudes of people of certain occupations in a Pangasinan setting. Ph.D. dissertation, PNC-Ateneo-De La Salle University Consortium.

FEENSTRA, H. and EMMA CASTILLO. 1970. Aptitude, attitude and motivation: A look at two cultures. Occasional Paper No. 5. Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.

FRANCISCO, JUAN. 1973. Philippine paleography. Special Monograph Issue No. 3. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

GASTON, IRENE. 1978. A descriptive study of the language behavior profile of selected Hiligaynon speakers in terms of proficiency, usage, attitudes, and motivations towards Pilipino and English. M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

GONZALEZ, ANDREW B., FSC. 1980a. Some research priorities for linguistics in the Philippines. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 11.1.99-103.

_____ . 1980b. Language and nationalism: The Philippine experience thus far. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

_____ . 1980c. Becoming bilingual in English in a Philippine setting A partial report of a Manila sample. In Bilingual education, RELC anthology series No. 7, ed. by Lim Kiat Boey, 177-206. Singapore: Regional Language Centre.

_____ . 1982a. English in the Philippine mass media. In New Englishes, ed. by John B. Pride. 211-26. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

_____ . 1982b. Child language acquisition. Manuscript.

_____ . Forthcoming. Using semantically-based grammatical models with the Philippine languages: The last ten years. Paper read at the Second International Philippine Studies Conference, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, June 27-30, 1981.

GONZALEZ, ANDREW B., FSC.and WILFREDO ALBERCA. 1978. Philippine English of the mass media. Manila: De La Salle University.

HIDALGO, CESAR A. and ARACELI C. HIDALGO. 1970. Ivatan morphology: The predicatives. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 1.2.9-51.

LLAMZON, TEODORO. 1969. Standard Filipino English. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

LUZARES, CASILDA. 1975. The morphology of selected Cebuano verbs: A case analysis. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo-PNC Consortium.

MALICSI, JONATHAN. 1980. Lexico-semantic approaches to the Sambal Ayta world view. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Philippines.

MANGULABNAN, LITO A. 1981. Thematic responses and language usage among Filipino bilinguals. In Building bridges across cultures, ed. by Nobleza C. Asuncion- Landé and Emy M. Pascasio, 217-223. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House.

MANUEL, ARSENIO. 1948. Chinese elements in the Tagalog language. Manila: Filipiniana Publishing.

MARFIL, ALICE and AIDA L. PASIGNA. 1970. An analysis of shifts from Tagalog to English in printed materials. M.A. thesis, Philippine Normal College.

MENDOZA, JUANITA. 1978. Language use and language attitude in interaction with social setting: A sociolinguistic survey. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Santo Tomas.

MOGOL, MARTHA, ESTER E. TUY, LUIS R. SANTOS, JR., and CORAZON G. ESCLABANAN. 1977. Verbal interaction in English and Filipino: A study of classroom discourse in Science and Social Studies in four grade levels. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Philippines.

NANG, ANTONIO. 1977. Relationships of some attitudinal aspects of second language learning to proficiency in Pilipino MAT-ESL Thesis, University of the Philippines.

OLONAN, ZENAIDA. 1978. Language use in a multilingual community. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Santo Tomas.

OTANES, FE T. and BONIFACIO SIBAYAN. 1969. Language policy survey of the Philippines: Initial report. Manila: Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.

PANDJIRIS, ROSEMARY. 1963. A suggested application of the theory of context of situation analysis to language learning. M.A. Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

PAN, GREGILDA S. 1975. An analysis of code-switching in Philippine short stories and some socio-linguistic implications for Pilipino and English language development. M.A. thesis, University of the Philippines.

PASCASIO, EMY M. 1960. A comparative study predicting interference and facilitation for Tagalog speakers in learning English noun-head modification patterns. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

————————————— . 1969. The context of situation approach to language teaching and language learning. Proceedings of the seminar on language teaching, ed. by T.A. Llamzon and G. Chan-Yap. Quezon City: Ateneo Language Center.

————————————— . 1972. The language behavior profile of selected Filipino bilinguals. Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Linguistics, ed. by Luigi Heilmann. (Reprint). Bologna, Italy.

————————————— . 1973a. Bilingual competence for the Filipinos: A realistic educational goal. Journal of English Language Teaching in Southeast Asia 4.1.

————————————— . 1973b. Language in its sociocultural context: A sociolinguistic approach. Monograph. Honolulu: The East-West Culture Learning Institute.

————————————— , ed. 1977a. The Filipino bilingual: Studies on Philippine bilingualism and bilingual education. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

————————————— . 1977b. Language and communication for national development.

In the Language planning and the building of a national language   Essays in honor of Santiago A. Fonacier on his ninety-second birthday, ed. by B.P. Sibayan and A.B. Gonzalez, FSC, 322-40. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and the Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.

PASCASIO, EMY M.   1978. Dynamics of code-switching in the business domain. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 9.1&2.40-50.

—————————————— . 1979. Languages at crossroads: English and Pilipino. Department of Language and Linguistics, Ateneo de Manila University.

—————————————— . 1980a. Language attitudes and motivations of Filipino bilinguals toward Pilipino and English: The Philippine context. Proceedings of the fourteenth regional seminar on Acquisition of bilingual ability and patterns of bilingualism with special reference to Southeast Asian contexts. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

—————————————— . 1980b. Language and communication in the third world: The Philippine sociocultural context. Proceedings of the Second Summer Speech Communication Association Conference on Intercultural Communication. Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

—————————————— . 1980c. Problem, issues, and prospects of language   teaching in the context of the bilingual policy, Educational Quarterly 26.3.

—————————————— . 1981. Bilingual policy in the Philippines: Theory and practice. Sanggunian Special Issue on Bilingualism. Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.

—————————————— and ARACELI HIDALGO. 1973. How value orientations affect social relationships through language use. In Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, FSC, 265-79. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

—————————————— and NOBELEZA C. ASUNCION-LANDÉ, eds. 1981. Building bridges across cultures: Perspectives on inter-cultural communication-theory and practice. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House.

PIMENTEL, SERAFIN V. 1972. A study of the patterns of mixing English and Tagalog in radio broadcast: a descriptive analysis. M.Ed. thesis, University of the Philippines.

RAFAEL, TERESITA C. 1976. Negativization in the Bisayan languages and dialects: A case study of the evolution of a subsystem. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo-PNC Consortium.

RAMOS, TERESITA. 1974. The case system of Tagalog verbs. Pacific Linguistics Series B-No. 27.

REID, LAWRENCE E. Forthcoming. Iloko reference grammar. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

RIEGO DE DIOS, MA. ISABELITA. 1976. A composite dictionary of Philippine Creole Spanish (PCS). Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo-PNC Consortium.

SAMONTE, JULIETA. 1981. Attitudes of college students towards English as a language. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Santo Tomas.

SANTIAGO, ALFONSO. 1979. The elaboration of a technical lexicon of Pilipino. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo-PNC Consortium.

SARANGLAO, LUCIA T. 1981. A study on the sequence of grade school students' mastery of English structures. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

SCHACHTER, PAUL and FE T. OTANES. 1972. Tagalog reference grammar. Berkeley: UCLA Press.

SIBAYAN, BONIFACIO. 1971a. Language planning processes and language policy survey in the Philippines. In Can language be planned? ed. by Joan Ruben and Bjorn Jernudd.

SIBAYAN BONIFACIO. 1971b. Language policy, language engineering and literacy in the Philippines. In Current trends in linguistics Vol. 8, ed. by Thomas Sebeok.
_____ . 1978. Bilingual education in the Philippines: Strategy and structure. Paper presented at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
_____ and L. SEGOVIA. 1979. Language and socio-economic development Resulting patterns of bilingualism/multilingualism. Paper presented at the SEAMEO RELC 14th Regional Seminar. RELC, Singapore. April.
SOBERANO, ROSA. 1976. The dialects of Marinduque Tagalog. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo de Manila-PNC Consortium.
VALLADOLID, ROSALINA. 1982. Communicative behavior in the crib in a Philippine setting: A case study. Ph.D. dissertation, PNC-Ateneo-De La Salle University Consortium.