

LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:
PERCEPTIONS OF A METRO-MANILA SAMPLE – IMPLICATIONS
FOR THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN and LORNA Z. SEGOVIA¹
Philippine Normal College

1. INTRODUCTION

Language as all of us know is very seldom learned for its own sake. Formally acquired, it is learned for its instrumental value. As laymen, we intuitively know that there is a relationship between the knowledge, especially the reading and writing skills, of a language that is used by the schools, the government, business and other domains of language with a person's socio-economic status and aspirations. Thus parents are wont to tell their children to go to school to learn in a certain language because of its value for socio-economic advancement.

We read in the literature that literacy is one of the most important requirements for socio-economic development (Myrdal 1968; Schramm in Pye 1963; Schramm 1964; Schumacher 1973; Philippine National Development Plan – 1978-82).² However, except for Myrdal, who mentions the value of the indigenous languages (1968: 81-2), no specific mention is made as to the language that one should be literate in. Yet it is true that if one is illiterate, it does not matter very much what language one is illiterate in, but it does matter very much what language one is literate in. For example, taking the realities of life today, it makes a difference if a person is literate only in Ilocano or only in English. It is obvious that, for socio-economic reasons, the latter is the better situation.

From the literature available to us, we find no study on the role of language in socio-economic development; most of the statements are general ones and in many cases the discussions are included under education and literacy. David C. McClelland (1961) attempts to explain economic growth from a psychological viewpoint which sounds very convincing and full of promise in its methodological dimensions. Myrdal (1968) emphasized the need in South Asia for developing the indigenous languages. He states:

¹Bonifacio P. Sibayan, the senior author, is former President of the Philippine Normal College and presently Consultant to the Language Study Center, which he founded in 1962. He represents Linguistics on the Executive Board of the Philippine Social Science Council. Lorna Z. Segovia is Associate Professor of Research and Statistics and Chairman of the Research Department of the Philippine Normal College. Her interests are in social psychology and statistics. The authors wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Dr. Edilberto P. Dagot, President of Philippine Normal College, for his critical comments and other suggestions; Prof. Rolando Galano, former Chairman, Department of Economics, De La Salle University, for furnishing the authors references in economics; and Prof. Alfonso O. Santiago, Chairman, Pilipino Specialization, PNC Graduate School, for translating one set of questionnaires into Pilipino.

The authors wish to acknowledge further the help of Rogelio G. Maconcil, Celestial S. Famatigan, Erlinda Lagundi, Christino S. Manansala, Jaime B. Montealegre, Lolita H. Nava, Jesus L. Nieves, Isabelita B. Solamo, Teresa F. Tejada of the Philippine Normal College Research Department and Florcelia Soriano Pro of the Personnel Department, Rizal Banking Corporation, for gathering and processing the data for the study: Alice Mallare, Norma T. Macalintal, Teresita G. Mejia, Perla A. Montemayor, Purificacion L. Tabigne, Antonio Kalijan, Jose Magsino, and Hermenigildo Cuasay for their good administrative support.

²While the Five-Year Philippine Development Plan 1978-82 does not mention language directly, we assume that it (language) is subsumed under education and culture or under the topic 'schools'. One of the nine social indicators identified by the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) is *Learning*, and its scholars explain: 'Our people desire greater and more equal opportunity and better quality in training and education toward more productive roles in society' (Development Academy, of the Philippines 1973: 3).

It should first be noted that furtherance of the modernization ideals require the extended use of the indigenous languages. No real 'emotional integration' of the new nations and therefore no secure national consolidation is possible as long as the members of the tiny upper class in charge of administration, law enforcement, and modernized business and industry communicate in a European language and the masses speak only their native tongue. . . (1968: 81-82)

Of the few Filipino economists with whose work we are acquainted, only Gerardo Sicat has given an extended discussion on language. We note that he advocates the development of a living national language, Pilipino, as an instrument for national development. He bewails the fact that the Pilipino of today 'will prove sorely inadequate and ineffective in the needs of development' (1976: 6). He also expresses the thought that bilingualism is a temporary dichotomy and that Pilipino can be developed 'so that it becomes a language of both authority and convenience, perhaps to displace English in its future acceptability'. He reminds us that we should not fear that it will be a vulgarized language, citing the case of Italian and Latin. In the mission to breathe life into Pilipino, he advocates patience (and this reminds the senior author of his 100 year plan which some may have heard about and even laughed at). Sicat thinks that his dream of a living Pilipino language capable of expressing precisely all the scientific and modern ideas needed can be attained by the year 2000. With this timetable, however, we are afraid that what students in the area of language planning have to tell Dr. Sicat regarding language development will disappoint him.³ But the important thing is that Sicat has expressed the view that an indigenous language (indigenous in the sense that it is not a western language although it will have to be learned by speakers of other Philippine languages) will be used for national and (because he is an economist) economic development.

The current interest in language and socio-economic development is very recent. To our knowledge, it was only at the IXth World Congress of Sociology held in Uppsala, Sweden in August 1978 that the subject of Language Planning and Socio-Economic Development was taken up for the first time. Linguists and those interested in language have studied language as if it did not involve man with all his economic needs. The senior author too, studied phones, morphemes, allophones, syntax and grammar as if these had nothing to do with human beings and society. Even now many linguists consider this specialized field of phonemics, morphemics, and grammar the only legitimate area of linguistics. But in just over a decade, many linguists, sociologists, and psychologists have shifted their interests to the study of language in the context of society. Today some of the most exciting areas for study are in sociolinguistics -- the study of language in society.

We note that there are a number of alternative ways to socio-economic development or specifically, economic development in third world countries. It might help us to understand the study reported in this paper if at the outset we make some definition of what a third world country is. Schramm (1964) distinguishes the underdeveloped lands from the others in the following quotation:

³For example, Israel has now taken approximately four generations (more than a hundred years) to make Israeli *koiné* a standard language; it is still not capable of expressing all the scientific and other modern ideas. Another nation is Norway, which got its independence in 1814 from Denmark. The Norwegians have not even solved their spelling problem satisfactorily and neither have they arrived at one common national language in spite of all their efforts. This is not to say that the Philippines cannot be an exception.

There is only one distinction that is universally applicable: The more highly developed states have experienced the Industrial Revolution, or their version of it; the underdeveloped ones have not, or have experienced it in a limited sector of their population. The remarkable collection of ingredients that helped Europe through its own Industrial Revolution have not been present anywhere. In Western Europe, the way was prepared by the Renaissance, widespread political freedom, swift advancement in literacy and education, development of commerce and capital, fairly high percentage of entrepreneurs and innovators in the population, and ideas favorable to the effort that had to be made. (13) (Underscoring supplied for the purpose of this essay.)

We shall now make the point that literacy and education are anchored on language. What people think about language is therefore important because it is what they will work for, assuming its instrumental value. People will want to learn a language because they are convinced that it is useful for something. If development is defined as '... the movement of the whole social system upwards' (Myrdal 1968: 1868) and that this development is brought about by a number of factors, one of them language, the study of what people's beliefs or valuations of the role of language in such development is an important activity of the linguistic scientist and other social scientists. 'As fuller knowledge modifies people's beliefs, valuations that do not accord with the new beliefs are deprived of support. Their opinions which are a blend of valuations and beliefs, and the implicit valuations change with them' (Myrdal 1968: 1882). The study of perceptions and beliefs is important because of the tremendous mobilization power of such perceptions and beliefs. (Cf. Fishman paraphrased in Sibayan and Segovia 1977.)

It is not possible, however, with our present knowledge, to assign an index or numerical value as to the share that language plays in development. Even literacy, which is considered one of the best measures of how advanced or developed a country is, cannot be assigned a 'definite share' or 'definite contribution' to development. Schramm (1964: 109) says on this point: 'There are no world wide comparable figures on literacy that would let us measure the rate of growth as we have measured the newsprint and electricity'. At best what is available is an index of relationship between literacy and development, upon which is based the generalization that the higher the literacy, the more progressive the country is (Lerner, Greenberg in Schramm 1964).

E.F. Schumacher, an economist of the 'organic and decentralist economics' persuasion, in his book, *Small Is Beautiful*, argues that what the third world needs is not bigness but what he terms 'intermediate technology' and that what is important is that all people who need to work should have work. He says that 'the key factor of all economic development comes out of the mind of man' (1973: 79). He emphasizes education as the greatest resource, that 'the essence of education is the transmission of values, but values do not help us to pick our way through life unless they have become our own, a part so to say, of our mental make-up'. And in this mental make-up, he says, 'First of all there is language'. His view of language is similar to that of Benjamin Lee Whorf who advanced the theory of linguistic relativity which holds that we behave the way we do because of the language we speak.

In this paper, we take the position of Daniel Lerner (in Pye 1963: 331) who states that 'Only insofar as individual persons can change their places in the world, their position in society, their own self-image does social change occur'. As non-economists, we are attempting to connect the phenomena of socio-economic advancement and aspirations of people with the acquisition of a language that serves as their instrument; that personal advancements are associated with macro-development.

If it is true that the 'key factor of all economic development comes out of the mind of man' (Schumacher 1973: 79) and language is a dominant element in the mind, then it is the province, if not the obligation, of linguists and all those interested in language and language teaching to find out how language is related to socio-economic development. Hopefully, it is in studying the role of language in socio-economic development, and perhaps the eventual advancement of a theory on this subject, that the linguistic scientist or language teacher can contribute his share to economic development.

2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study tries to explore the extent to which language contributes to socio-economic development. The study focuses on perceptions regarding getting a job, job placement and classification, and advancement in position as these relate to language.

3. SUBJECTS

The sample for the study consisted of four groups of subjects – educators, employers/personnel/recruitment officers, employees and laborers – from various government and business institutions in Metro-Manila (Table 1). Since language is an indispensable tool in education, the responses of educators regarding the role of language in the socio-economic success (or lack of it) among their former students led to the inclusion of 45 teachers/professors from a state university, a state teachers college, and a private university. Only those who did not teach language courses and who were old enough to have had students in the work force were chosen.

Getting a job and being promoted in the job generally reflect some kind of mobility, some kind of change in the individual, usually a change in socio-economic status. The question whether language is considered in hiring and promoting employees was decided by getting the views of another group of respondents – 15 employers, personnel or recruitment officers from banks, a recruitment agency catering mainly to big business firms needing top level employees, companies engaged in food manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, insurance, construction, brokerage, refineries, and advertising and packaging.

From the same business agencies cited above and two government institutions were sampled the third group of 135 respondents, the salaried employee group, composed of 23 executives or top level employees, 32 middle level employees and 80 rank and file employees. This classification of the salaried employees was based upon their positions as defined by their respective offices.

The fourth group of 53 respondents were laborers, skilled and semi-skilled workers from electronic, paper, chemical, fiber, ceramic manufacturing firms, textile mills, and other industrial establishments in Metro Manila.

Since the third and fourth group represent some hierarchy in the work force, it is assumed that variations in socio-economic levels can be inferred from the respondents' positions. Whatever differences might show in their perceptions of the role of language in their own socio-economic advancement and those of their parents, relatives, and acquaintances can provide leads regarding the relationship between language and socio-economic development.

4. INSTRUMENTS AND DATA COLLECTION

Three different sets of questionnaires were prepared and administered to the various groups of respondents. Set A for teachers/professors tried to get their retrospective evaluation of how much proficiency in language contributed to the socio-economic

advancement of the very successful, moderately successful, and least successful among their former students. Set B for employers, and personnel/recruitment officers sought information on how much proficiency in language is considered in the hiring and promotion of employees. Set C for salaried employees and laborers was designed to yield data on the language background of respondents, advancement in their jobs, and their perceptions on the importance of language in their socio-economic advancement as well as those of their parents, relatives and acquaintances. A Filipino translation of Set C was available for some respondents among the laborers who had limited understanding of English.

5. RESULTS

5.1. GROUP I TEACHERS/PROFESSORS

The subjects and curricula levels taught by the 45 teachers/professors from the University of the Philippines, Philippine Normal College and De La Salle University ranged from mathematics to work education and from the primary grades to the graduate school, respectively (Tables 2, 3, 4).

Teachers/Professors retrospective estimate of the success of former students attributable to language

The teachers/professors were requested to recall three of their students: one very successful, one moderately successful, and one least successful socio-economically and to indicate how much of their socio-economic advancement would they (the professors/teachers) attribute to their student's proficiency in a language.

The majority of the respondents (85.7%) attributed 'very much' to proficiency in English as a factor in the socio-economic advancement of their very successful students (Table 5). The contribution of Filipino was only 'moderately' as indicated by about 50% of the respondents. To the moderately successful, English still contributed 'very much' and 'moderately' and Filipino 'moderately'. To the unsuccessful, it was not clear how much could be attributed to English as shown by the non-significant chi square (Table 5). However, Filipino was perceived to contribute 'moderately'.

The educators did not show any trend in their perception of how much of the socio-economic advancement of their students could be attributed to the native language. Chi square tests were all non-significant for the three levels. On the other hand, Spanish was judged to have 'little' contribution or was 'not related' to the very successful, and 'not related' to the moderately successful and least successful.

Not all of the teachers/professors indicated the specific jobs of the highly, moderately, and least successful among their students. But among those who responded, 'physician' was cited most often. The jobs of the very successful and moderately successful were the professions in the social service fields rather than in business. The jobs of the least successful cut across semi-skilled occupations to the professions (Table 6).

The data suggest that ability to command a language while in school is an important factor in socio-economic advancement. There seems to be a relationship between socio-economic success and proficiency in a language, i.e. English is very much a contributing factor to the highly successful, whereas Filipino contributes only moderately. The contribution of English to the moderately successful tends to be very much and moderate and the contribution of Filipino moderate. To the unsuccessful, the contribution of English is not known but that of Filipino is moderate. Spanish tends to contribute a little to the very successful but is not related to the moderately and least successful.

5.2. GROUP II EMPLOYERS/PERSONNEL/RECRUITMENT OFFICERS

What employers and personnel/recruitment officers think about language as a factor in hiring and promoting employees

All the employers/recruitment officers indicated that proficiency in language is an important consideration in hiring employees/workers (Table 7).

As to the importance of proficiency in certain languages, English was considered 'very important' for top level employers by all of the respondents, as well as for the middle level employers by 14 respondents. For the rank and file, only 6 reported English as 'very important'. The perception of the importance of Pilipino for three levels follow identical patterns of 6 respondents considering this language as 'very important' for the top, the middle, and the rank and file, and 8 as 'important' also for all the three levels. The native language was reported 'very important' for the rank and file by 2 respondents, 'important' for the top level by 3. Spanish was considered 'slightly important and 'not important' for all levels. Two respondents reported Chinese as 'very important' for the top and middle levels.

With regard to the promotion of employees, 13 respondents reported proficiency in English to contribute 'very much' at the top and middle levels. Pilipino was reported by 7 employees to contribute only 'moderately' to the promotion of the top level employees. For the promotion of the rank and file, 8 respondents indicated Pilipino to contribute 'moderately', 4 'very much', while 6 respondents reported 'very much' and 'moderately' on the contribution of English. Spanish seems to have a negligible contribution, if at all, to promotion on all levels. Most of the respondents did not indicate any response regarding the contribution of Chinese in the promotion of employees.

5.3. GROUP III AND IV SALARIED EMPLOYEES (TOP, MIDDLE LEVELS, RANK AND FILE) AND LABORERS

Demographic Characteristics and Language Background of Respondents

The classification of the respondents into Top Level (TL), Middle Level (ML), Rank and File (RF), and Laborers (L) was determined by their respective offices, presumably based on their salaries and relative responsibilities, although there is some overlapping in their specific occupational titles, as shown in Table 10.

Age and educational attainment

Excluding the 29 who failed to indicate their ages, this group had an age range from 16 to 57, with averages of 33 for the Top Level employees, 30 for Middle Level, 25 Rank and File and 22 for Laborers. Overall average for the entire group is 26 years. (Tables 11 and 12)

All those in the top level category had at least a bachelor's degree although 4 did not indicate their educational attainment. There is a wider range of educational attainment among the middle level, from 'some years of college' to the doctoral degree. There is a higher percentage of master's and doctor's degree holders in the middle than in the top level. Among the rank and file, 60% had bachelor's degrees, 20% some years of college, only 1 was a high school graduate, and 15% had some years of high school. Of the 53 laborers, the majority or 70% had some years of high school. Only 2 had some years of

college, no one was a high school graduate, and 15% were elementary graduates. These findings on the educational attainment of the various levels is consistent with what has been known to be a positive relationship between years of formal schooling and job positions, except that for this sample, the relationship breaks down beyond the middle level. (Table 13)

*Native language and language(s) spoken
to father, mother, brothers and sisters
(what may be presumed as the language of the home)*

The majority of the respondents (66%) consider Tagalog/Pilipino as their native language (Table 14). Thirteen languages (eleven Philippine and two foreign, Spanish and Chinese, but not English) are used monolingually in speaking to members of the family but there are twenty-nine combinations, i.e., bilingual and trilingual with English as the main foreign language used in the combinations. (Table 15)

Dominant language educated in/proficient in

Except for the laborers who said they were most dominantly educated in Pilipino, the other three groups indicated they were dominantly educated in English. (Table 16)

With regard to proficiency in language, the top level and middle level groups indicated that they were most proficient in speaking, writing, reading, and listening in English; the rank and file were most proficient in writing and reading in English but more proficient in speaking and listening in Pilipino. The laborers indicated that they were most proficient in Pilipino in all the skills. Surprisingly, when it came to combinations of two languages, the rank and file indicated they were proficient in the four skills in English and Pilipino. (Table 17)

Views on the use/value/importance of language(s)

All levels consider English and the combination of English and Pilipino as the most important language(s) for getting a job. (Table 18) (Cf. Otones and Sibayan 1969⁴ and Sibayan and Segovia 1977⁵.)

Of the languages mentioned, English comes first and Pilipino comes second as the languages used for official business transactions in the respondents, place of work; however, among the laborers, Pilipino or a combination of Pilipino and English come first. (Table 19)

The data suggest a number of interpretations but the most important is that no matter what language background the worker comes from, he must know English and Pilipino to succeed or hold his job in the Metro-Manila area. We are reminded here that these are the two important languages of the schools.

⁴In the study reported by Otones and Sibayan (1969) and the nationwide survey made of householders and teachers in 1968, the following findings are worth mentioning: In eleven of the twenty-one occupations investigated, the language combination English and Pilipino was felt by both householders and teachers to be most necessary for success, while for five other occupations, Pilipino alone was mentioned. In general, the occupations in which Pilipino alone was believed to be necessary or sufficient for success are also those for which formal academic training is not required. There was no occupation in which English alone was mentioned as being necessary for success (Otones and Sibayan 1969: 126).

⁵While the Sibayan and Segovia study, reported in 1977, is confined to the Metro Manila area, as is the present one, the sample includes a wider classification of subjects compared to that reported in Otones and Sibayan (1969). In the 1977 study, the workers reported that they had to know both English and Pilipino because the language of oral transaction was mainly Pilipino but the working language for written work was English.

Promotion in the job as an index of economic mobility

It is interesting to note that in job promotions within the last 2 years, there is a corresponding increase in the percentage of promotions with level of employment. As shown in Table 20, there were 19 out of 23 or 80% promotions among the top level; 20 out of 32 or 62% among the middle level; 45 out of 80 or 56% among the rank and file and 25 out of 53 or 47% among the laborers. The same pattern of proportions among the subgroups is found as regards increase in salary within the last 2 years (Table 21). This would seem to sustain the notion that the farther the individual has moved in his psychic life the faster or greater is his movement in his social and economic life. (Cf. Lerner in Pye 1963: 331 ff., on the three kinds of movement — physical or geographic, social, and psychic, the education of the mind which we repeat has language as one of its most important components. Lerner does not include economic but the writers of this paper subsume it under social.)

Respondents' perceived socio-economic advancement and contribution of language to their advancement

Only very few among the salaried employees think that they have not advanced socio-economically — 1 in the Top Level who did not give his answer, 2 in the middle who said 'no' for both Social and Economic, 7 in the rank and file who said 'no' to Social, 10 to Economic. Hence, as a group, the salaried employees have perceived an upward movement in their socio-economic status (Table 22). However, among the laborers their perception of their socio-economic advancement shows no definite trend, even if there were slightly more who said 'yes' than 'no'. (Table 22: X^2 , .16 for social status, 1.05 for economic status, are both non-significant.)

How do the respondents perceive their knowledge of certain language(s) as contributing to their own socio-economic advancement?

Those on the top level (21 out of 23) indicated that English contributed either 'very much' (19) and 'much' (2). Only two indicated 'little'. Of this group, 13 said 'much' with Pilipino but only six said 'very much' with the same language. The native language would seem to have contributed 'very much' to at least four and 'much' to another four of the top level executives. Of this group ten said that Spanish does not contribute any to their advancement. One interpretation of the data is that the top level executive is usually one who knows two or three languages well.

Surprisingly, the rank and file seem to perceive their knowledge of English and Pilipino as contributing to their socio-economic advancement much more than those in the middle level.

What may not be surprising is the fact that nine out of fifty-three laborers and seven of the same group indicated that English and Pilipino contributed very much to their socio-economic advancement. The great majority of the respondents, however, gave no response (Table 23). The data again sustain the notion that social (and economic) mobility is greatly affected (influenced) by the mobility in the psychic life which we consider in this paper as consisting at least of a large part of the mastery (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) of an important language.

The respondents were asked what native language contributed to their socio-economic advancement. The data indicate that the native (ethnic) language, unless it is Tagalog, does not make one advance very much in the Manila area (Table 24). This fact may indicate that eventually the ethnic language will be abandoned by those who settle in the Manila area or be used in a limited manner by certain families, clans or associations. (Cf. Sibayan and Segovia 1977).

Perceived socio-economic advancement of parents and the role of language

To the question whether their parents advanced socio-economically and, if so, how much they would attribute to what language, about 7 out of 10 said their parents did advance, with more parents of those in the higher levels having done so (Table 25). As to the role of language, however, the respondents were not so sure. Those who indicated that their parents advanced indicated English as the language contributing to the advancement, with Pilipino coming in second. Among the laborers, however, only two attributed to English as the language for the advancement of their mothers and six of their fathers. The great majority did not have any answer to the question. (Tables 26, 27)

Socio-economic advancement of relatives

Because of the well-known closely-knit characteristic of our kinship system, one of the most important characteristics of which is the fact that we are proud of successful relatives (even distant ones) and often hold them as models for our children to imitate,⁶ we included what the respondents thought they could ascribe or attribute to the success of very successful, moderately successful, and not so successful relatives in terms of the language dimension.

There are very interesting and consistent patterns that emerge from the perception/observation of the respondents on the contribution of the native language, Pilipino, English, and Spanish and other languages to the socio-economic advancement of very successful, moderately successful, and not so successful relatives.

The laborers consistently indicated that Pilipino contributed more than English to the advancement of their very successful relatives (Tables 28, 29). The middle level and rank and file groups also indicated that Pilipino was more valuable to their not so successful relatives (Table 32). On the other hand, the top level, middle level, and rank and file attributed the success of their most successful and moderately successful relatives to English more than Pilipino (Tables 28, 30). Consistently, all groups think that to the least successful relatives, Pilipino had done more for them than English. Put the other way, those who did not learn English were not so successful. The data would tend to sustain Myrdal's claim that unless the language of those who govern and the governed are the same, there is not much hope that the plans of those who govern can be carried out successfully (Myrdal 1968: 81-82).

The data can be interpreted in different ways by different people. To those who are pro-English, the conclusion would take the form of 'Let us continue and strengthen English and make it available to more people and let us not put too much emphasis on Pilipino'. To those who are pro-Pilipino, they might say, 'We should de-emphasize English and emphasize Pilipino so that it will be at par with English'. To the writers of this paper, the proper conclusion seems to be, 'Pay special attention to Pilipino so that it will not be made a mark of the less successful'.

⁶Cf. Winterbottom's study on the relationship of the rearing of children and *n* Achievement and the relationship to economic development (McClelland 1961: 46-47). McClelland views child-rearing as one of the most important activities in which *n* Achievement (which is related to economic development according to his studies) is embedded. He reiterates that 'The family is the social nucleus of the society, the main carrier of the basic motives and values of the culture' (1961: 403). The question is asked, 'Does the Pilipino extended family, which includes distant relatives, do this?'

Socio-economic advancement of a non-relative

Regarding the value or contribution of language to the socio-economic advancement of a non-relative, the same pattern as that of relatives seems to emerge. The laborers indicate that the socio-economically successful non-relative can attribute his success first to Pilipino and second to English. On the other hand, the top level, middle level, and rank and file categories all attribute 'very much' to English and indicate Pilipino as contributing moderately to their non-relatives' success (Table 34). It is quite clear from the data that both English and Pilipino are needed even if in disproportionate amounts.

Lack of success or advancement and language

The question was asked: 'Try to think of someone whom you consider not having improved socio-economically. Do you think his lack of knowledge of the following languages (1) Pilipino (2) English (3) Spanish, (4) others (specify) contributed to his lack of success?' All the groups indicated that lack of knowledge of English first and that of Pilipino was responsible for the person's lack of advancement as far as language is concerned. The rank and file group and the laborers compared with the top and middle level categories of respondents (Table 35) attributed to Pilipino a more prominent 'shortcoming'.

Mastery of two languages

The respondents, especially the top level group, indicated that the mastery of two languages contributes to the socio-economic advancement of a person. So did the middle level and rank and file. Among the laborers, however, only twelve said 'very much', ten said 'moderately', four said 'little' and fourteen think there is no relation of the mastery of two languages to socio-economic advancement; four did not know and nine had no answer (Table 36). One conclusion that we are tempted to make out of these data is that to the less successful people such as laborers, there does not seem to be much value in bilingual education. It would seem that the value of a bilingual education is realized only after a longer exposure to the two languages and one has acquired certain advantages from the resulting bilingualism.

Language and the country's economic development

To the question 'Do you believe that our country would advance socio-economically if more and more people possess a great degree of knowledge and mastery of the (1) native language (specify), (2) Pilipino, (3) English, (4) Spanish, (5) Others (specify)?', the top and middle levels and rank and file indicated 'very much' to English, placing Pilipino second, while the laborers placed Pilipino first (very much) and put English second. Of the four groups, the rank and file indicated that the native language should be important for socio-economic development (Table 36). This view tends to support the regionalization scheme of economic development in which more and more of the native (ethnic) language will be used. (Cf. Schumacher 1973 on the subject of development by regions.)

Another interesting observation from the data is that the top level, the middle level, and the rank and file indicated that other languages such as Japanese, Chinese, German, and French should be learned.

Of the native languages other than Tagalog, the two languages specified as being necessary for socio-economic development of the entire country are Cebuano/Visayan and Ilocano (Table 38). This supports the view of Ernesto Constantino (personal conversation) that three regional lingua francas should be developed and taught in the schools -- Ilocano, Tagalog, and Cebuano. (Cf. Sibayan in Pascasio 1977: 27-33.)

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE PLANNING IN THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

The implications for language planning in third world countries would seem to be the following: Third world countries have to compromise with certain uncomfortable decisions regarding the colonial language. A vigorous program to bring the national language to do the job has to be pursued not only in the school but in every sector of the society.

It also seems to us that bilingual education must be much more mass-oriented. It is possible that the fact that science and mathematics are taught in English in the Philippines will further promote the distance between the elite and the mass of the people. The role allocation of languages tends to promote socio-economic stratification because the most technological culture encourages and, in fact, promotes it.

There is possibility of conflict or resentment among the laborers who do not have the facility in the language of wider communication and language of access to higher paying jobs. The message for third world countries is clear: The national language, if it is not the former colonial language, needs a program to hasten its prestige status and this will depend on how much it will be needed in the economy.

One interpretation of the data which has serious implications for third world countries is the great possibility of conflict among various segments of the population brought about by what they perceive language can do for their socio-economic status. The fact that the native language is at the bottom of the usefulness scale may frustrate so many whose mastery of the dominant language, i.e., the language(s) of access to power, prestige, and higher socio-economic status, is practically nil. To the non-Tagalog (or in third world countries, the citizen whose native language is not the chosen national language) the fact that Pilipino is catching up in its value or usefulness for socio-economic advancement may either give comfort or frustration — comfort, if he realizes that mastery of Pilipino is not as difficult as the mastery of English and that at least there is this avenue that is open to him, an avenue not available during the period of the exclusive use of English as the linguistic vehicle for upward mobility; frustration, if he dwells on the thought that he has to learn and master another second language in addition to English. The situation becomes even worse if he realizes that he needs to devote some years of schooling with corresponding investment in effort, money, and time to increase his chances for socio-economic advancement.

The data also strongly suggest that the language used as medium of instruction in the schools and encouraged officially in other domains especially in the administration of government will easily be propagated and become the language of access to the 'better life'.

What gives hope to third world countries, however, is the fact that an indigenous national language can be developed and used as a means for upward mobility with the support of the government and other sectors of the society. Pilipino, which was taught only as a subject from 1940 (for 34 years) until just nine years ago (the respondents were not beneficiaries of the use of Pilipino as a medium of instruction) has attained a status higher than what its proponents in 1937 ever dreamed of.

7. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The results of this study suggest that language is an important factor in economic development. Most third world countries 'suffer' from three conditions: first, the memory and the difficulties that a 'colonial' language, usually a European one which very few can master, continues to evoke; second, the existence of many local languages, none of which is developed enough for modernization purposes but several of which can be 'abandoned' in favor of the more important language for economic development (at least in the Metro

Manila area in the case of the Philippines); and third, the problem of building a national language which may be used by both those who govern and the governed. These three conditions raise a number of problems, most important of which is how the great majority of the population can rise socio-economically via language at the same time that the national language is being developed. This problem is made difficult by the fact that the foreign language which is the language of 'access' to socio-economic advancement must be learned. This study does not answer that question but it furnishes some data for policy makers to be able to make that decision.⁷

REFERENCES

- DEVELOPMENT ACADEMY OF THE PHILIPPINES. 1973. *Measuring quality of life: Philippine social indicators*. Tagaytay City: Development Academy of the Philippines.
- FISHMAN, JOSHUA A., ed. 1968. *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____, ed. 1974. *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____, CHARLES A. FERGUSON and JYOTIRINDRA DAS GUPTA, eds. 1968. *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- KINDELEBERGER, CHARLES P. 1965. *Economic development*. New York: McGraw Hill. (Second Edition; International Student Edition. Tokyo: Kogakusha Co. Ltd.)
- LERNER, DANIEL. 1958. *The passing of traditional society*. New York: The Free Press.
- _____. 1963. Toward a communication theory of modernization: a set of considerations. In *Communications and political development*, ed. by Lucian W. Pye, 327-50. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- McCLELLAND, DAVID C. 1961. *The achieving society*. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co.
- MYRDAL, GUNNAR. 1968. *Asian drama: An inquiry into the poverty of nations*. Vols. I, II, III. Hermondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- OTANES, FE T. and BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN. 1969. *Language policy survey of the Philippines*. Manila: Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.
- PASCASIO, EMY M., ed. 1977. *The Filipino bilingual*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press.
- PHILIPPINES, REPUBLIC OF THE. 1978. *Five-year Philippine development plan (1978-1982)*. *Philippine development*. Vol. V (Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23) Jan. Feb., March, and April 1973.
- PYE, LUCIAN W., ed. 1963. *Communications and political development*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- RAY, PUNYA SLOKA. 1963. *Language standardization: studies in prescriptive linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

⁷How then would the linguist or the person interested in language or its teaching help accelerate economic development, assuming that his findings are valid for helping in the formulation of valuable policy? The answer would seem to lie in larger and more sophisticated studies that furnish data for the development of a workable theory which can be the basis for intelligent decisions. Once this is attained, it might be a good idea to include linguists in planning bodies such as the National Economic Development Authority.

- SCHRAMM, WILBUR. 1964. Mass media and national development. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.
- _____. 1963. Communications development and the development process. In Communications and political development, ed. by Lucian W. Pye. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- SCHUMACHER, E. F. 1973. Small is beautiful. New York: Harper and Row. (Reprinted in the Philippines by National Book Store, Inc., in newsprint.)
- SIBAYAN, BONIFACIO P. 1974. Language policy, language engineering and literacy in the Philippines. In Readings in the sociology of language, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, 221-54. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1977. Language planning theory and practice in the Philippines. Paper delivered at the East-West Center, Honolulu. 1977 Summer Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America and the University of Hawaii. August 16, 1977.
- _____. 1978. The influence of nationalism in language planning. In Spectrum Essays presented to Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana on his 70th birthday, ed. by S. Udin, 496-8. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.
- _____ and ANDREW B. GONZALEZ, eds. 1977. Language planning and the building of a national language: essays in honor of Santiago A. Fonacier on his 92nd birthday. Manila: Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College and Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- _____ and LORNA Z. SEGOVIA. 1977. Views on language and identity: Limited Metro Manila example. Mimeographed. Manila. Original version read at the Regional Seminar on Language Education in Multilingual Societies: Its Challenges and Potentials. Singapore, 18-22 April 1977.
- SICAT, GERARDO P. 1976. A living Pilipino language: A challenge to social scientists. Social Science Information 4.3.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Subjects

GROUPS	f
I. Teachers/Professors	45
II. Employers, Personnel/Recruitment Officers	15
III. Salaried Employees	135
Executives (23)	
Middle Level Employees (32)	
Rank and File (80)	
IV. Laborers	53
TOTAL	248

TABLE 2
Distribution of Teachers/Professors by Schools

SCHOOLS	f
University of the Philippines	22
Philippine Normal College	14
De La Salle University	<u>9</u>
TOTAL	45

TABLE 3
Distribution of Teachers/Professors
by Subjects Taught

SUBJECTS TAUGHT	f
Natural Sciences	8
Education/Guidance/Psychology	6
Mathematics	6
Social Sciences	6
Humanities	4
Communication Arts	4
Health	3
Administration/Supervision	2
Integrated Arts	2
Work Education	1
Professional Education	1
Engineering Graphics	1
No Answer	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	45

TABLE 4
Distribution of Teachers/Professors
by Year Level Taught

YEAR LEVEL	f
Primary	8
Intermediate	5
High School	9
College	18
Graduate	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	45

TABLE 5

Distribution of Teachers'/Professors' Judgments
Regarding Socio-Economic Advancement as
Attributable to Proficiency in a Language

Level of Advance- ment	Language	Degree to which Socio-Economic Advancement Attributed to Proficiency in Language				T O T A L	CHI SQUARE
		Very Much	Mode- rately	Lit- tle	Not Re- la- ted		
Very Successful	Native Language	11	14	8	5	38	4.78N.S.
	Pilipino	10	23	4	2	39	27.56**
	English	35	7	3	0	45	60.05**
	Spanish	3	3	18	13	37	18.24**
Moderately Successful	Native Language	14	13	5	6	38	6.84N.S.
	Pilipino	10	23	4	2	39	27.56**
	English	18	22	0	1	41	37.93**
	Spanish	2	2	13	17	34	19.91**
Least Successful	Native Language	11	11	6	11	39	1.92N.S.
	Pilipino	10	17	8	3	38	10.69*
	English	10	13	15	4	42	5.43N.S.
	Spanish	0	1	7	15	23	24.77**

*p < .05, df 3 = 7.815

**p < .01, df 3 = 11.341

TABLE 6

Jobs Considered Very Successful, Moderately Successful and Least Successful by Teachers/Professors

Very Successful	f	Moderately Successful	f	Least Successful	f
Physician	5	Teacher (H.S.-Coll)	10	Teaching (Elem.)	3
High Gov't. Official	2	Practicing Physician	2	Clerk	3
Teaching	1	Clerk	2	Sales Promotion	2
Restaurant Owner	1	Businessman	2	Housewife	2
Asst. Reg. Director	1	Gov't. Employee	2	Practicing Lawyer	1
Educ'l. Administrator	1	Hotel Receptionist	1	Mun. Gov't. Employee	1
Marine Engineer	1	Lawyer	1	Secretary	1
College Professor	1	Scholar's Coordinator	1	Security Guard	1
Bank Executive	1	Biochemist	1	Vendor	1
C P A	1	Accountant	1	Gov't. Employee	1
Statistical Analyst	1	Engineer	1	Carpenter	1
Consultant (Environmental Planning)	1	TOTAL	24	Foreman	1
Nuclear Physicist	1			Technician	1
Commercial Pilot	1			Businessman	1
Accountant	1			Janitor	1
Opera Singer	1			Sewer	1
Researcher DAP	1			TOTAL	22
Researcher Analyst	1				
Director NETC	1				
TOTAL	24				

TABLE 7

Distribution of Employer/Personnel Officer Responses to the Question Whether or Not Proficiency in Language Is Considered in Hiring Employees

RESPONSES	f
Yes	15
No	0
TOTAL	15

TABLE 8

Distribution of Employer Responses on the Importance of Language Proficiency in Hiring Employees at Different Levels

LEVELS	LANGUAGES	I M P O R T A N C E				No Answer	T O T A L
		Very Impt.	Impt.	Slightly Impt.	Not Impt.		
Top Level (Executive Mgrs.)	Native Language		3	6	2	4	15
	Pilipino	6	8	1			15
	English	15					15
	Spanish			5	6	4	15
	Chinese	2	2			11	15
Middle Level (Supervisors, Secretary)	Native Language		6	4	2	3	15
	Pilipino	6	8	1			15
	English	14	1				15
	Spanish			4	6	5	15
	Chinese	2		1		12	15
Rank and File (Security Guards, Messengers, Janitors)	Native Language	2		4	4	5	15
	Pilipino	6	8	1			15
	English	6	4	4	1		15
	Spanish			3	7	5	15
	Chinese				1	14	15

TABLE 9

**Distribution of Employer Responses on the Extent
to which Language Proficiency Contributes to
Promotion of Employees at Different Levels**

LEVELS	LANGUAGES	EXTENT OF CONTRIBUTION				No An swer	TO TAL
		Very Much	Mode- rately	Lit- tle	Not Related		
Top Level (Execu- tive Mgrs.)	Native Language	1	1	7	1	5	15
	Pilipino	4	7	3		1	15
	English	13	2				15
	Spanish		1	3	4	7	15
	Chinese			1		14	15
Middle Level (Super- visors, Secretary)	Native Language	2	3	4	1	5	15
	Pilipino	6	5	3		1	15
	English	13	1	1			15
	Spanish		1	2	5	7	15
	Chinese		1	1		13	15
Rank and File (Security Guards, Messengers, Janitors)	Native Language		3	4	2	6	15
	Pilipino	4	8	2		1	15
	English	6	6	3			15
	Spanish			3	6	6	15
	Chinese				1	14	15

TABLE 10

Distribution of Respondents (Salaried Employees and Laborers)
by Occupation

OCCUPATION	EMPLOYEE LEVEL			
	TL	ML	RF	L
Vice-President	1			
Asst. Vice-President	1			
Training Officer/Senior Coor.	1	3		
Manager	6			
Asst. Manager	5	1		
Chief Accountant	2			
Lawyer/Legal Officer	3			
Account Supervisor	2	5		
Production/Technical Sales Supervisor	1	5		
Mechanical/Electrical/Civil Engineer	1	3		
Physician/Surgeon		3		
Researcher		1	2	
Acct. Asst./Bookkeeper		1	2	
Administrative Asst.		2		
Employee (not specified)		7	28	3
Gov't. Official		1	5	
Bank Teller			5	
Clerk			24	
Credit Analyst			3	
Secretary			4	
Mechanic/Telephone Operator			2	
Messenger			2	
Casino dealer			1	
Driver			1	1
Dressmaker				1
Laborer/Worker/Carpenter/Helper			1	39
Weaver				8
No answer				1
TOTAL	23	32	80	53

Note: The respondents cited in Tables 10 to 38 are Salaried Employees and Laborers.

TABLE 11

Distribution of Respondents by Age

AGE	L E V E L S				TOTAL
	TL	ML	RF	L	
16-18				4	4
19-21		1	9	20	30
22-24		6	24	13	43
25-27	4	5	13	8	30
28-30	4	6	6	5	21
31-33	4	2	2	1	9
34-36	2	2	2	1	7
37-39	1				1
40-42	2	2			4
43-45	2				2
46-48			3		3
49-51		2			2
52-54			2		2
55-57			1		1
No Answer	4	6	18	1	29
TOTAL	23	32	80	53	188

Legend:

- TL - Top level employee
- ML - Middle Level employee
- RF - Rank and file
- L - Laborers

TABLE 12

**Ranges, Means and Standard Deviations
of Ages of Employees and Laborers**

GROUPS	RANGE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Top Levels	25-45	32.74	6.05
Middle Level	20-50	30.12	7.99
Rank and file	20-57	24.85	11.12
Laborers	16-34	21.79	5.99
Entire Group	16-57	25.88	8.22

TABLE 13

Distribution of Respondents by Educational Attainment

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	TYPE OF EMPLOYEE							
	TOP		MIDDLE		RANK & FILE		LABORER	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Elementary graduate							8	15
Some years of high school					12	15	37	70
High school graduate					1	1		
Some years of college			1	3	16	20	2	4
Bachelor's degree	16	70	19	59	48	60		
Masteral degree	3	13	8	25				
Doctoral degree			3	10				
No answer	4	17	1	3	3	4	6	11
TOTAL	23	100	32	100	80	100	53	100

TABLE 14

Language(s) Respondents Consider
as Native Language

Group Language	Top Level	Middle Level	Rank and File	Laborer	TOTAL
1. Tagalog/Pilipino	12	16	52	41	121
2. Bicol	1	1			2
3. Ilocano	1	5	8	5	19
4. Pangasinan		1			1
5. Chabacano	1				1
6. Cebuano	1	1	1		3
7. Pampango	1		3		4
8. Chinese	2	2	4		8
9. Ilonggo				1	1
10. Visayan	1		2	4	7
11. Aklanon				1	1
12. Visayan/Cebuano		2	1		3
13. English/Tagalog		1	1		2
14. Hiligaynon/Ilonggo			3		3
15. Tagalog/Pangasinan			1		1
16. Tagalog/Bicol			1		1
17. Tagalog/Ilocano	1		1		2
No Answer	2	3	3		6
TOTAL	21	32	80	53	188

TABLE 15
Language(s) Spoken by Respondents to Mother (M),
Father (F) and Brothers and Sisters (B&S)

Group Language	Top Level			Middle Level			Rank & File			Laborer		
	M	F	B&S	M	F	B&S	M	F	B&S	M	F	B&S
Filipino/Tagalog	3	2	3	5	7	8	28	25	26	38	37	39
English												
Spanish												1
Chinese	2	4	1	1			3	2	2			
Bicol		1	1	1	1	1	1			1	2	1
Pampango							1	1	1			
Ilocano	1	1		2	2	1	4	5	5	4	5	5
Pangasinan				2	2	2	1	1				
Chabacano	1	1	1									
Ilongo							2			1	1	1
Visayan							3	3	2	2	5	3
Aklanon										1	1	1
Waray							1	1				
Hiligaynon								2				
Tagalog/English	8	6	8	8	6	7	20	20	25	5	2	3
Ilocano/English				2	2		2					
Cebuano/English				2	1	1						
Cebuano/Tagalog				1								
English/Pampango							1	1	1			
English/Spanish								1				
Tagalog/Bicol							1	1				
Ilocano/Pangasinan							1					
Tagalog/Ilocano							1					
Chinese/English									1			
Waray/Tagalog									1	2		
Tagalog/Pangasinan	1	1	1									1
Chinese/Pilipino				1		1						
Tagalog/Chinese									1			
Ilongo/Hiligaynon												2
Eng./Tag./Ilocano	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	4			
Eng./Tag./Cebuano	1	1	1	1	2	2						
Eng./Spa./Tagalog		1	1	1	1	1	2	2				
Eng./Tag./Bicol												1
Eng./Tag./Pampango							1	1	1			
Eng./Tag./Chinese		1	1				1	1	4			
Eng./Tag./Visayan	1		1									
Waray/Tag./Eng.							1					
Pag./Cebuano/Waray							1					
Pag./Tag./Chabacano									1	1		
Pag./Chinese/Eng.												1
Pag./Tag./Ilo/Ceb.									1			
Pag./Ibanag/Tag.												
Eng./Spanish							1	1	1			
Pag./Eng/Ilo/Pam									1			
Pag./Tag./Waray/ Cebuano									1			
No Answer	1			4	7	5	1	3		1		
TOTAL	21	21	21	32	32	32	80	80	80	53	53	53

TABLE 16

Dominant Language(s) in the Education of the Respondents

Group Language	Top Level				Middle Level				Rank & File				Laborer				
	Ranking				Ranking				Ranking				Ranking				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
English	15	4			23	6	1		53	13	3		15	29			
Pilipino	3	12	3		3	19	4		21	51	8	1	31	18			
Spanish		1	8	1		1	12	4		4	21	6			6	2	
French				1			1	3						1			
Latin				1		1											
German				1								1					
Nippongo						1				1		2		1			
Italian								1									
Chinese		1	1		2	1		1	1	1	2	1					
Arabic															1		
Mexican																1	
Pangasinan					1			1									
Hiligaynon												1					
Bicol	1							1				1			2		
Ilocano			2					1	2	1	4	1		1	1		
Visayan									1					1	1		
Ibanag				1					1								
Pampango												1					
Fookien												1					
Cebuano						1									1		
Ilonggo									1								
Mandarin		1															
English & Pilipino													7				
No Answer	4	4	9	18	32	2	14	20	13			39	67		2	38	50

1, 2, 3, 4, – Ranking of the language from most dominant to least.

LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

TABLE 17

Language(s) Respondents Are Most Proficient In

Group Language	Top Level Skills				Middle Level Skills				Rank & File Skills				Laborer Skills			
	S	W	R	L	S	W	R	L	S	W	R	L	S	W	R	L
	English	6	13	12	10	8	17	18	10	12	31	33	13	3	1	1
Pilipino	3	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	27	12	9	17	32	27	24	29
Ilocano					1				1	1	1		6	2	4	2
Visayan	1										4					
Hiligaynon									1							
Fookien	1															
Cebuano				1	1								1	1		
Aklanon													1	1		
Ilongo																1
Chinese					2			2	2			1				
English/Pilipino	7	6	5	5	9	6	5	10	24	29	18	28	7	15	18	14
English/Bicol	1															
English/Nippongo											1					
Visayan/Pilipino									2		1	1			1	1
English/Chinese	1									1						
Pangasinan/Pilipino					1				1	1						
Eng/Pil/Bisaya				1	3	1	1	3	1	1		2			1	1
Eng/Pil/Ilocano					1	1	1	2	1							
Eng/Pil/Ilonggo									1	2	2	2				
Eng/Pil/Spanish		1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1		4	3				
Eng/Pil/Pampango									3		1	2				
Eng/Pil/Chinese									1			1				
Eng/Pil/Bicol					1	1	1	1								
Eng/Pil/Waray											1	1				
Eng/Pil/Pangasinan	1					1										
Eng/Pil/Fookien/ Mandarin										1	1	2				
Eng/Pil/Ilo/Chinese									1	1	1	1				
Eng/Pil/Spa/Ilonggo				1					1	1						
No Answer					2	1	3			3	3	6	3	6	4	5

S – Speaking

W – Writing

R – Reading

L – Listening

TABLE 18

**Language(s) Respondents Consider
Most Important for Getting a Job**

Language \ Group	Top Level	Middle Level	Rank & File	Laborer
English	16	23	49	14
Tagalog/Pilipino	3	1	2	9
Both English and Pilipino	3	2	22	23
Nipponngo				
English, Chinese		2	1	
English, Tagalog, Fookien			1	
English, Chinese, Nipponngo				1
English, Spanish, Nipponngo, Tagalog				1
English, Muslim				1
Fookien, Mandarin	1			
Tagalog, Chinese		1		
Chinese			1	
No Answer		3	4	4
TOTAL	23	32	80	53

TABLE 19

Language(s) Used in Official Business/Transaction
in Respondents' Place of Work Ranked in Importance

Group Language	Top Level				Middle Level				Rank & File				Laborer			
	Rank				Rank				Rank				Rank			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
English	16	5			23	2			55	9	1		13	11	2	
Filipino/Tagalog	3	10			5	18	2		10	35	4		22	8	1	
Spanish		1	1			1				1	1			1		
Chinese			2		2					6	1					
Ilocano											1	1			1	
Ilonggo														1		
Bisaya											1			1		
Niponggo												1				
English/Tagalog	2				1				10	2			15			
English/Chinese	1															
Filipino/Chinese	1					1										
No Answer		7	20	23	1	10	30	32	1	27	71	78	3	31	49	53
TOTAL	23	23	23	23	32	32	32	32	80	80	80	80	53	53	53	53

*1 Most Important
2 Next in importance, etc.

TABLE 20

Respondents' Last Job Promotion

Group Time of Last Promotion	Top Level	Middle Level	Rank & File	Laborers
1. Six months ago or less	9	11	24	13
2. 1 year ago	6	3	15	7
3. 2 years ago	4	6	6	5
4. more than 2 years ago	2	2	10	4
5. I have not been promoted yet	1	7	19	18
6. No Answer	1	3	5	6
TOTAL	23	32	80	53

TABLE 21

Respondents' Last Increase in Salary

Group Time of Last Increase in Salary	Top Level	Middle Level	Rank & File	Laborers
1. Six months ago or less	15	18	43	22
2. 1 year ago	4	6	12	8
3. 2 years ago	2	2	7	3
4. more than 2 years ago	1	1	1	3
5. No increase yet		2	1	1
6. No Answer	1	3	13	16
TOTAL	23	32	80	53

LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

TABLE 22
 Respondents' Perceived Advancement
 in Social and Economic Status

Type of Employee	Social Status			Economic Status		
	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
Top Level	22	0	1	22	0	1
Middle Level	28	2	2	28	2	2
Rank and File	70	7	3	69	10	1
Laborer	27	24	2	27	21	5

TABLE 23
 Respondents' Perceived Contribution of
 Language(s) to their Socio-
 Economic Advancement

Type of Employee	Language	Extent of Contribution*					
		VM	M	L	NR	DK	NA
Top Level N = 23	Native Language	4	4	2	3	—	10
	Pilipino	6	13	3	—	—	1
	English	19	2	2	—	—	—
	Spanish	—	—	2	10	1	10
	Others	—	—	—	—	—	—
Middle Level N = 32	Native Language	4	5	9	4	—	10
	Pilipino	7	12	4	1	—	8
	English	17	9	4	—	—	2
	Spanish	1	—	4	1	—	13
	Others (Ilocano, Nippongo)	—	1	3	—	—	—
Rank & File N = 80	Native Language	17	17	16	8	—	22
	Pilipino	27	33	5	1	1	13
	English	48	16	4	—	—	12
	Spanish	2	4	9	38	2	25
	Others	—	—	—	—	—	—
Laborer N = 53	Native Language	8	19	3	—	—	23
	Pilipino	7	12	2	—	—	32
	English	9	1	1	1	—	41
	Spanish	—	—	—	7	3	43
	Others	—	—	—	—	2	51

VM — Very much
 M — Moderately
 L — Little

NR — Not related
 DK — Don't know
 NA — No answer

TABLE 24
Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Native Language to Their Socio-Economic Advancement

Level of Employee Respondents	Native Language	Contribution of Language to Socio-Economic Advancement				
		Very Much	Mode- rately	Lit- tle	Not Related	Don't Know
Top Level	Pangasinan Ilocano					
	Tagalog	6	13	3		
	Bicol					
	Bisaya/Ilonggo					
	Not specified	5	4	3	3	
Middle Level	Pangasinan Ilocano	1	1			
	Tagalog	1			1	
	Bicol					
	Bisaya/Ilonggo					
	Not specified	3	4	7	3	
Rank and File	Pangasinan Ilocano		1			
	Tagalog	2	3		1	
	Bicol					
	Bisaya/Ilonggo	2			1	
	Not specified	13	13	10	6	
Laborers	Pangasinan Ilocano			1		
	Tagalog	3	7	1		
	Bicol					
	Bisaya/Ilonggo	2	1		1	
	Not specified	4	11	1		

TABLE 25
Respondents' Perceived Socio-Economic Advancement of their Parents

Type of Employee	Father			Mother		
	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
Top Level	16	4	3	18	2	3
Middle Level	21	5	6	23	5	4
Rank and File	58	5	17	56	8	16
Laborer	22	27	4	19	27	7

TABLE 26

Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Language
To Socio-Economic Advancement of Father

Type of Employee	Language	Extent to Which Knowledge of Language Helped in Socio-Economic Advancement					
		Very Much	Mode- rately	Lit- tle	Not Re- lated	Don't Know	No Ans- wer
Top Level N = 23	Native Language	3	5	1	1	1	12
	Pilipino	5	7	2	—	1	8
	English	11	5	1	1	1	4
	Spanish	1	3	3	4	1	11
	Others (Japanese, Chinese, Mandarin, French)	1	—	—	—	—	22
Middle Level N = 32	Native Language	9	2	3	—	—	18
	Pilipino	8	5	2	—	—	17
	English	13	3	2	—	—	14
	Spanish	2	—	3	5	—	22
	Others (Japanese, Chinese, Mandarin, French)	—	—	—	—	—	32
Rank and File N = 80	Native Language	25	9	6	3	4	33
	Pilipino	17	12	11	—	1	39
	English	36	10	3	1	1	29
	Spanish	4	1	7	19	2	47
	Others (Japanese, Chinese, Mandarin, French)	2	—	1	—	—	77
Laborer N = 53	Native Language	4	4	3	—	1	41
	Pilipino	8	6	1	—	—	38
	English	6	4	3	3	—	37
	Spanish	—	—	2	6	3	42
	Others (Japanese, Chinese, Mandarin, French)	—	—	—	—	—	53

TABLE 27

**Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Language
to Socio-Economic Advancement of Mother**

Type of Employee	Language	Extent to Which Knowledge of Language Helped in Socio-Economic Advancement					
		Very Much	Moderately	Little	Not Related	Don't Know	No Answer
Top Level N = 23	Native Language	4	3	—	1	—	15
	Pilipino	8	6	4	—	—	5
	English	11	6	1	—	—	6
	Spanish	1	3	1	4	1	15
	Others (Mandarin, Japanese)	—	—	—	—	—	32
Middle Level N = 32	Native Language	9	4	—	—	—	4
	Pilipino	7	6	2	2	—	10
	English	13	5	3	—	—	11
	Spanish	2	1	2	5	1	21
	Others (Mandarin, Japanese)	—	—	—	—	—	32
Rank and File N = 80	Native Language	22	13	6	1	—	38
	Pilipino	27	16	10	1	—	26
	English	23	15	12	1	—	29
	Spanish	1	2	8	18	1	50
	Others (Mandarin, Japanese)	—	1	1	—	—	78
Laborer N = 53	Native Language	4	4	2	1	2	40
	Pilipino	7	7	—	1	—	38
	English	2	1	5	3	1	41
	Spanish	—	—	1	3	8	41
	Others (Mandarin, Japanese)	—	—	—	—	—	53

LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

TABLE 28

Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Language to
the Socio-Economic Advancement of a
Very Successful Relative

Level of Employee Respondent	Language	Contribution of Language to Socio-Economic Advancement						TOTAL
		Very Much	Moderately	Little	Not Related	Don't Know	No Answer	
Top Level	Native Language	2	5	2	1	1	12	23
	Pilipino	7	12	1	1	—	2	23
	English	17	4	1	—	—	1	23
	Spanish	—	3	3	7	1	9	23
	Others (Chinese, French)	—	3	3	—	—	—	—
Middle Level	Native Language	3	6	3	1	2	17	32
	Pilipino	12	7	6	—	—	7	32
	English	23	4	—	—	—	5	32
	Spanish	2	1	4	7	—	18	32
	Others (Chinese, French)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rank and File	Native Language	21	11	11	3	2	32	80
	Pilipino	25	24	8	2	1	20	80
	English	55	11	1	—	—	13	80
	Spanish	6	1	15	20	4	34	80
	Others (Chinese, French)	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Laborers	Native Language	2	10	3	—	2	36	53
	Pilipino	24	7	4	—	—	18	53
	English	16	5	7	1	1	23	53
	Spanish	1	2	—	19	3	28	53
	Others (Chinese, French)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE 29

List of Jobs of Very Successful Relatives

Group Very Successful Job	Top Level	Middle Level	Rank & File	Laborers
1. Corp. President		1		
2. Vice President		1	2	
3. Exec. Vice President	1			
4. Manager/Hotel Manager	2	3	2	
5. CPA – Lawyer	1		1	
6. Newspaperman	1			
7. Salesman			1	
8. Engineer			2	
9. Businessman	2	4	5	12
10. C P A			3	1
11. Lieutenant Colonel			1	
12. Asst. Personnel			1	
13. Professor			1	
14. Supervisor			1	
15. Military Officer			2	
16. Senior Executive			1	

TABLE 30

Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Language to the Socio-Economic Advancement of a Moderately Successful Relative

Level of Employee Respondents	Language	Contribution of Language to Socio-Economic Advancement						TOTAL
		Very Much	Moderately	Little	Not Related	Don't Know	No Answer	
Top Level	Native Language	8	5	—	3	—	7	23
	Pilipino	11	10	1	—	—	1	23
	English	14	6	1	1	—	1	23
	Spanish	—	3	3	7	1	9	23
Middle Level	Native Language	6	5	5	3	4	9	32
	Pilipino	8	10	2	2	2	8	32
	English	16	5	3	1	1	6	32
	Spanish	—	3	5	6	3	15	32
Rank and File	Native Language	15	16	7	3	1	38	80
	Pilipino	22	31	1	1	—	25	80
	English	32	16	7	—	—	25	80
	Spanish	2	4	7	20	2	45	80
Laborers	Native Language	3	2	2	3	2	41	53
	Pilipino	23	7	1	1	5	16	53
	English	9	8	5	5	5	21	53
	Spanish	1	1	2	16	4	29	53

TABLE 31

List of Jobs of Moderately Successful Relative

Moderately Successful Job	Group	Top Level	Middle Level	Rank & File	Laborers
1. Truck operator		1			
2. Teacher		2	2	5	2
3. Businessman		3	3	3	
4. Administrator				1	
5. Nurse				2	3
6. Doctor				2	
7. Secretary				1	
8. Military				1	
9. Beautician				1	
10. Assistant Manager			1	2	
11. Bank Manager		1		1	
12. Drug/Salesman/Underwriter		2	2	3	
13. Mechanic		1		1	
14. Policeman		1		1	
15. Accountant		1			
16. Agent		1			

LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

TABLE 32
 Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Language
 to the Socio-Economic Advancement
 of a Not So Successful Relative

Level of Employee Respondent	Language	Contribution of Language to Socio-economic Advancement						TOTAL
		Very Much	Mod-erately	Lit-tle	Not Re-lated	Don't Know	No An-swer	
Top Level	Native Language	9	5	4	2	1	2	23
	Pilipino	7	8	4	1	1	2	23
	English	3	13	3	1	1	2	23
	Spanish	1	3	1	6	5	7	23
Middle Level	Native Language	7	3	6	1	1	14	32
	Pilipino	9	10	3	6	2	12	32
	English	5	10	6	—	2	9	32
	Spanish	—	—	4	7	4	17	32
Rank and File	Native Language	18	11	13	1	—	37	80
	Pilipino	14	23	8	—	2	33	80
	English	11	16	11	5	2	35	80
	Spanish	4	3	4	22	2	45	80
Laborers	Native Language	2	10	3	—	2	36	53
	Pilipino	24	7	4	—	—	18	53
	English	16	5	7	2	2	21	53
	Spanish	1	2	—	19	5	26	53

TABLE 33
 List of Jobs of a Not So Successful Relative

Group Not so successful Job	Top Level	Middle Level	Rank & File	Laborers
1. Factory worker		1		3
2. Foreman	2		1	
3. Messenger/Clerk	1	1	5	
4. Bus./Buy and Sell	1	2	2	1
5. Laborer		1	3	10
6. Mechanic		1	3	
7. Employee		1	1	2
8. Lawyer	1			
9. Detailman			1	
10. Government Employee		3		
11. Teacher		1	4	1
12. Technician		2		
13. Accounting Clerk		1		
14. Technical Supervisor			1	
15. Sales Representative		1		

TABLE 34

Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Language to the Socio-Economic Advancement of a Non-Relative

Level of Employee Respondent	Language	Contribution of Language to Socio-Economic Advancement					TOTAL	
		Very Much	Moderately	Little	Not Related	Don't Know		No Answer
Top Level	Native Language	4	9	2	1		7	23
	Pilipino	8	14	1				23
	English	20	3					23
	Spanish	2	4	6	5	3	3	23
	Others (Chinese, Japanese, German, French, Mandarin)	5			1		17	23
Middle Level	Native language	7	6	1	3		15	32
	Pilipino	8	11	2	1		10	32
	English	22	4	2			4	32
	Spanish	3	1	7	1		20	32
	Others (Chinese, Japanese, German, French, Mandarin)	2					30	32
Rank and File	Native Language	21	10	6		5	38	80
	Pilipino	30	21	3	2	1	23	80
	English	49	12	2			17	80
	Spanish	5	10	8	16	3	38	80
	Others (Chinese, Japanese, German, French, Mandarin)	5	2	1			72	80
Laborers	Native Language	5	6	1		2	39	53
	Pilipino	30	8	1		1	13	53
	English	14	10	4	5		20	53
	Spanish	1	3	3	24		21	53
	Others (Chinese, Japanese, German, French, Mandarin)					1	52	53

LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

TABLE 35

Respondents' Perceptions of How Lack of Proficiency in Language Contributes to Lack of Socio-Economic Success

Level of Employee Respondent	Language	Contribution of Lack of Language Proficiency to Lack of Success						TOTAL
		VM	M	L	NR	DK	NA	
Top Level	Pilipino	1	12	7	3	—	—	23
	English	15	5	3	—	—	—	23
	Spanish	—	1	4	10	1	7	23
	Others	—	—	—	—	—	23	23
Middle Level	Pilipino	3	7	9	4	1	8	32
	English	11	5	4	5	1	6	32
	Spanish	1	2	3	10	2	14	32
	Others	—	—	—	—	—	32	32
Rank and File	Pilipino	16	32	14	4	4	10	80
	English	39	17	9	3	2	10	80
	Spanish	—	10	6	30	4	30	80
	Others (Chinese Fookien)	—	—	4	—	—	76	80
Laborer	Pilipino	11	12	6	4	6	14	53
	English	13	12	5	4	4	15	53
	Spanish	3	—	—	19	7	24	53
	Others	—	—	—	—	—	53	53

TABLE 36

Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Mastery of Two or More Languages to Socio-Economic Advancement

Level of Employee Respondents	Contribution of Mastery of Two or More Languages						TOTAL
	Very Much	Moderately	Little	Not Related	Don't Know	No Answer	
Top Level	22	1					23
Middle Level	22	5				5	32
Rank and File	63	10		1		6	80
Laborer	12	10	4	14	4	9	53

TABLE 37

**Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Language
to the Socio-Economic Development of the Country**

Level of Employee Respondents	Language	Relationship						T O T A L
		Very Much	Moderately	Little	Not Related	Don't Know	No Answer	
Top Level	Native Language	3	6	4			10	23
	Pilipino	11	6	4			2	23
	English	18	4	1				23
	Spanish	3	4	9	4		3	23
	Others (Japanese, Chinese, German, French)	3	2	2			16	23
Middle Level	Native Language	5	3	3	1		20	32
	Pilipino	21	8	1	1		1	32
	English	26	6					32
	Spanish	7	3	9	7		6	32
	Others (Nippongo, French)	4	3	2			23	32
Rank and File	Native Language	20	20	1	1	1	37	80
	Pilipino	36	12	4			28	80
	English	42	12	4			22	80
	Spanish	10	4	16	23	2	25	80
	Others (Chinese, French)		1		1		78	80
Laborer	Native Language	4	4			1	44	53
	Pilipino	33	3		2	1	14	53
	English	20	10	3	2	1	17	53
	Spanish	5	3	7	16	1	21	53
	Others					1	52	53

TABLE 38

Respondents' Perceived Contribution of Native Languages to Socio-Economic Advancement of the Country

Level of Employee Respondent	Native Language	Contribution of Native Language to Country's Socio-Economic Advancement				
		Very Much	Mode- rately	Lit- tle	Not Related	Don't Know
Top Level	Tagalog	1				
	Ilocano Visayan/Cebuano Fookien/Mandarin Not Specified	1	6	4		
Middle Level	Tagalog	1	1			
	Ilocano Visayan/Cebuano Fookien/Mandarin Not Specified	1 2	1 1	1 1		
Rank and File	Tagalog	2	3			
	Ilocano Visayan/Cebuano Fookien/Mandarin Not Specified	1 1 2 5	2 1 1 4	1	1	2
Laborers	Tagalog	1				1
	Ilocano Visayan/Cebuano Fookien/Mandarin Not Specified		3 5			