

The Filipino bilingual: Studies on Philippine bilingualism and bilingual education. Edited by EMY M. PASCASIO. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1977.

Reviewed by CASILDA E. LUZARES, De La Salle University

The Filipino Bilingual is a compilation of papers read at the First National Seminar on Bilingual Education held at the Ateneo de Manila University during the summer of 1974. It took three years for the book to finally come off the press, and it is worth all the waiting.

Going through the book is like taking a full course in multilingualism and it will not be surprising if the book becomes a standard text in multilingualism courses. This volume is significant not only because this is the first major book published on the subject but also because it provides a sampling of scholarship from people in the various fields related to language education. It seems that this volume includes practically all the names in Philippine linguistics and language teaching. The list of contributors included at the end of the volume is an almost complete Who's Who in the field of Philippine bilingualism.

The twenty-five articles in the book are divided into three parts: Part One includes articles that discuss the Rationale and General Approach to Bilingual Education; the articles in Part Two are classified as Research Studies and Strategies for Further Research, while the articles in Part Three fall under Ongoing Bilingual Education Programs. The classification is generally logical, except that Enriquez's 'Ang alamat ng bilinggwal na Pilipino' might have been better classified under Part One than under Part Two. Pascasio's 'Bilingual education research and its directions' could also have become a section of its own since this is the only article that tries to consolidate research that has been done in this area and to pinpoint the general direction of research in the future.

It is not possible for me to comment on each of the articles in this volume because of their number. Suffice it to say at this point that the book is a landmark for having appeared at a most propitious time. The rest of this paper will make a few comments on a few of the articles.

The following articles in Part One are highly informative and enlightening: 'Bilingualism in Philippine education' by Soriano, 'Bilingual education under the New Constitution' by Juco, 'Tentative typology of Philippine bilingualism' by Sibayan, and 'Manpower and materials resources for bilingual education' by Gonzalez. The article 'Cost-benefit analysis of bilingual education' by Valdepeñas is mistitled. The reader expects to find a cost-benefit analysis, as the title suggests; however, he reads only about why a cost-benefit analysis of bilingual education is difficult, presumably a justification for the absence of the cost-benefit analysis in the article. The least that the author or the editor could have done was to change the title into something more honest like 'Problems involved in a cost-benefit analysis of bilingual education'.

Part Two presents a lot of interesting and useful information about the Filipino bilingual as reported in the different surveys and experiments included in this section. Some of the results simply confirm what we already know; but this confirmation provides solid basis for future decisions and actions. One, however, notes some weaknesses in this section. For example, the article 'The Filipino bilingual's language orientation' by

Bautista *et al.* does not make a clear distinction between *fluency* and *dominance* both in their definition (p. 74) and in their discussion (pp. 78-9; 81-2). These notions are basic to their study and it is therefore surprising that they should leave the distinction blurred. It is only in their discussion of the methodology that one may infer the distinction. Could this be a case of 'Too many cooks spoil the broth' or were they following Macnamara's model (1967) too closely to bother with basic things like definitions?

Chan-Yap's 'Language loyalty and language assimilation among the Philippine Chinese' accepts a hypothesis without question and passes it on as a generalization. On page 93, she writes:

American sociologist Richard Collier (1960) has theorized that Filipinos' hatred for the Chinese stems not only from the role that the latter have historically played as shrewd middlemen in business but also from 'group self-hatred'. He says that Filipinos look upon the Chinese as a symbol of the Oriental elements in their own culture and physique and have displaced a hatred of their own 'Orientalness' to 'a convenient minority which is similar in culture and physique and yet definitely Oriental' (Collier 1960: 56). The colonial mentality Filipinos have developed from almost four centuries of Western rule have made them admire and appreciate anything Western and look down on anything Filipino or Oriental.

How true is this allegation? I agree that if an intelligent Filipino were to choose between Western culture (e.g. American) and Chinese culture, he would choose Western culture. However, if he were to choose between Western culture and his own, he would choose his own in spite of the fact that there might be aspects of Western culture that he wishes were in his own. My own feeling is that if a verification survey of this allegation is conducted the result would show that the Filipinos' negative feelings for the Chinese are rooted in their resentment of the economic superiority of the latter. The other cultural non-economic aspects of this resentment have been magnified merely as a consequence of this situation.

Pascasio's 'Bilingual education research and its directions' contains some inconsistencies. On page 123 she pushes for a program that will 'produce coordinate *bicultural* bilinguals' (underscoring mine). Yet, on page 124 she describes a plan which is not *bicultural* but *monocultural*. She says:

In this plan, Pilipino and English can be maintained for *different purposes*: culture-based subjects such as art, history, literature and geography *could be taught in Pilipino*, while *English remains the medium in subjects not limited to Philippine contexts* such as arithmetic and the physical sciences. (Underscoring mine.)

The other inconsistency has to do with coordinate bilingualism and the use of *mix-mix*. On page 125 she says:

Certain innovative approaches may be tried. A teacher may, for instance, use 'mix-mix' whenever necessary without losing track of the ultimate objective — to produce a bilingually coordinate Filipino competent in Pilipino and English.

In the same volume Enriquez (pp. 128-9) discusses the differing contexts that produce the compound and the coordinate bilingual. If it is true that context is a significant influence on the kind of bilingual that a person becomes, isn't using 'mix-mix' in the classroom a sure way of producing a compound rather than a coordinate bilingual? Or is

the distinction between coordinate and compound bilingualism not at all pertinent, as Enriquez heretically suggests?

I admit I had an initial difficulty reading and understanding Enriquez's 'Ang alamat ng bilingwal na Pilipino', but the article displays a refreshing style. Enriquez seems to delight in demolishing the notions sacred to the sociolinguist.

Part Three describes some bilingual education programs: the De La Salle Grade School program, the Ateneo Grade School program, the Philippine Normal College programs, the University of the Philippines program, the Bureau of Secondary Education program, and to a certain extent, the Ateneo program in literature. The articles in this section are healthy indications that something *is* going on.

It is interesting to note that while Enriquez and Constantino both belong to U.P., which is supposedly using Filipino, not Pilipino, their writing styles vary. Enriquez writes in the formal style while Constantino writes in the non-formal style. So what is Filipino? Or is this a demonstration of what they call 'malayang bilinggwalismo' (Constantino spells it as 'bilingguwalismo')?

Constantino argues the case for Filipino by employing an exaggeration. On page 169, Constantino writes:

. . . dahil sa kahinaan natin sa Ingles, madalas na hindi natin nalalaman kung mayroon tayong naiintindihan o natutuhan sa mga binabasa natin sa wikang ito. Basta memorays na lang tayo nang memorays, at ang ating namemorays ay nireresayt natin nang eksaktong-eksakto hanggang sa period at comma. Tunay na hindi tayo natututong mag-isip sa wikang Ingles, at nagiging parasitiko na lamang tayo sa 'western scholarship and thinking'. Ang ating 'bookishness' at 'paste-and-scissors scholarship' ay manipestasyon ng ating pagiging parasitiko sa 'western scholarship and thinking'.

Is the problem which Constantino is raising a linguistic problem or a methodological one? Can a person be taught to think and to be critical by simply giving him a language? If we look around us we find native speakers of Tagalog (or Filipino) who cannot think critically in Tagalog (or Filipino) not because they do not have the language to think in but because they have not been trained to think seriously and critically at all.

Tinio, in his 'Pilipino as a medium for higher learning', thinks along the same lines as Constantino. On pages 159-60 we read the following sweeping generalization:

I suppose that I am suggesting that a native Tagalog who cannot express complicated thinking in Tagalog has not really been doing complicated thinking, but has merely been remembering and reciting English statements which convey complicated thought. In other words, if he cannot express his philosophy of social science, his chemistry or mathematics, in Tagalog, he is giving evidence not of his inadequacy in Tagalog, or the inadequacy of Tagalog, but the inadequacy of his grasp of philosophy, social science, chemistry, or mathematics. Conversely, anyone with a real grasp of his subject, if he is a native Tagalog, can give full evidence of it by expressing the subject in Tagalog.

I find that the above generalization is a convenient way of copping out of the language problem. Language and thought are inextricably linked but the problem of the Filipino bilingual is that he has been trained to do this 'complicated thinking' in one language (a foreign language) rather than the other (his native language). A person who has learned to write with his right hand all his life cannot all at once write with the same facility with his left.

Tinio ends his article by drawing an analogy between the ability of Pilipino to become a medium in higher education and the ability of bats to see at night. It should interest Tinio to know that bats have very poor eyesight and cannot see very well during the day, much less at night. Rather, bats have a built-in radar system that directs their movements.

On the whole, the book is a significant milestone in the documentation and study of Philippine bilingualism. There is no doubt that the literature in this area in the future will include numerous references to this volume. The references and the bibliography at the end of the book will prove of tremendous value to students of multilingualism.

This volume is of interest not only to linguists in general and sociolinguists in particular, and to teachers of Pilipino and the culture-loaded subjects, but also to teachers of English. This book has been able to clarify, among other things, the differentiating roles of English and Pilipino. This has provided a conducive support atmosphere for English for Special Purposes, particularly its sub-branch English for Science and Technology. Bautista (1977) pinpoints the following as the implications of the Bilingual Education Policy for teachers of English:

Our students will have less exposure to English in their other classes and the English they will be exposed to will be the special register of English for science and mathematics; consequently, we must make better use of our class time and be more discerning in our choice of what and how to teach.

There is no way to be absolutely sure about the direction the language problem is going to take. One thing that is certain, though, is that educators and language planners will be consulting this book to find out what the people who have the most to say on the problem think.

REFERENCES

- BAUTISTA, MA. LOURDES S. 1977. The bilingual education policy and English for special purposes. Paper read at the First National Seminar on the Teaching of English for Special Purposes (Tertiary Level), April 13 – May 6, 1977. De La Salle University.
- MACNAMARA, JOHN. 1967. The bilingual's linguistic performance – a psychological overview. *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2). 58-77.