

THE ROLE OF DE-ETHNISATION AND ATTITUDE IN THE USE OF PILIPINO: A FACTOR ANALYTIC STUDY¹

ALEJANDRINO Q. PEREZ²

INTRODUCTION

The Tagalog-based national language of the Philippines, Pilipino (Pil.), began formally to be taught in the schools on June 19, 1940. In the beginning it was taught as a subject in the secondary schools and in college education courses, then the teaching was gradually included at the elementary level.

The formal teaching of Pil. in the schools contributed much to the development and propagation of the language. The mass media, e.g. newspapers, magazines, radio, television, and movies, helped greatly in this development of Pil.

The National Board of Education (NBE) - formerly, Board of National Education - which is the highest policy-making body on education in the Philippines, signed a resolution on February 17, 1970, for the gradual implementation of the use of Pil. as a medium of instruction from Grade I at the elementary level up to college level (Resolution No.70-5, NBE, 1970). However, this resolution was not fully implemented. Then on August 18, 1970, the NBE approved Resolution No.70-21 which paved the way for the use of Pil. as a medium of instruction in the Rizal Course as well as in Philippine Government and Philippine History at the college and university level. This resolution also permitted the use of Pil. in the other courses with the qualification that there be competent teachers, available teaching materials, and readiness on the part of the students. In this connection, the NBE "believed that an educated Filipino should be bilingual in Pilipino and in English". (General Policies on Education, 1967-1972, Board of National Education.)

The recommendation of the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education (PCSPE) is inclined toward the use of two languages, Pilipino and English, as media of instruction in the schools. (PCSPE Education Survey Report, Dec. 1970.)

On August 7, 1973, the NBE approved the new language policy in the Philippines as stated in its Resolution No.73-7, quoted below:

Resolution No.73-7 of the National Board of Education

August 7, 1973

That English and Pilipino serve as media of instruction and be taught as subjects in the curriculum from Grade I to the university level in all schools, public and private; and

Resolved further, that the Department of Education and Culture be requested to prepare and submit for consideration and approval by the Board an implementing scheme or policy guidelines which should include:

- a. subject areas to be taught in English, Pilipino, or in both languages;
- b. schedule of implementation;
- c. preparation of instructional materials.

On the basis of the status of Pil. as described above, research on the role of de-ethnisation and attitude in the use of the language was conducted by the researcher which availed of the factor analytic approach.

PROBLEM OF THE STUDY

It is the purpose of this research to make a factor analytic study of the role of de-ethnisation and attitudes on the use of Pilipino (Pil.)³ in elementary education, which includes the role of language as a medium of instruction as well as a tool for writing textbooks and other social situations in the Philippines.

The study will attempt to answer the following specific questions:

1. What is the role of de-ethnisation in the use of Pil. at the elementary education level?
2. What is the attitude of de-ethnised non-Tagalog subjects (Ss) with respect to the use of Pil. at the elementary education level, in government and in business and trade?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research will try to give an appraisal of the role of de-ethnisation and attitude of non-Tagalog Ss toward the use of Pil. at the elementary education level and in other social situations related to the use of the language. The findings in this study will serve as guide to language planners, language scholars and administrators on the

course they will take regarding the development and propagation of the language and its role in nation building.

SS OF THE STUDY

A group of sixth grade pupils from the Philippine Normal College (PNC) and from other schools in the Division of City Schools of Manila were used as Ss of this research. The PNC is a state college and the Division of City Schools is a part of the Bureau of Public Schools (BPS).

The Ss were selected on the basis of their being children of non-Tagalog parents, e.g. the father/mother is a Bicolano, the mother/father is a Cebuano, or a member of any other ethno-linguistic group. In other words, the Ss were de-ethnised, and therefore were no longer speaking the language of their mother or of their father as a first language. Instead, they communicated with their parents in Pil.

The rationale for having chosen the sixth grade Ss is that the researcher assumed that these students had no illusion of travelling abroad. And the language used in the instrument of the research was English in order to minimise if not preclude any prejudice of the Ss themselves.

The male Ss numbered 114 and the female Ss, 235, or a total of 349.

MEASURING DEVICE

The Ss were asked to answer 23 items of an aptitude questionnaire with *yes-no-don't know* choices. This aspect of the questionnaire is the second part of the Language Inventory which the researcher prepared. (Please see Appendix A.) The qualification of the data is as follows: *yes* = 2, *no* = 1, and *don't know* = 0.

The rationale behind the three distractors/choices is that being in the sixth grade, the Ss could easily discriminate in their reactions to each of the variables or attitudes.

PROCEDURE

The Language Inventory which consists of an attitude list and situations in the use of Pil. as a medium of instruction and as a tool for writing textbooks in elementary education, as well as in the use of Pil. in Philippine social situations, was given to six elementary schools, utilising the grade six pupils. On the basis of the data gathered, 349 Ss were selected, 114 being male and 235 being female. These Ss were all children of non-Tagalog parents, e.g. the father or mother or both were Ilocanos or Pampangos, or came from other ethno-linguistic groups as the case may be. The pupils were all enrolled in the public schools,

that is, the schools were run by the government.

The language used in the instrument, the Language Inventory, was English in order to eliminate or minimise the possibility of bias in the use of Pil.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 presents the matrix of correlation among the measures of attitude on the use of the Pil. language by the Ss in the different areas, e.g. the role of the language in the different course subjects in elementary education, its role as a medium of instruction as well as its role in the different social situations in Philippine life. This matrix was factor analysed using a Principal Axis solution, with the highest absolute correlation serving as the communality estimate. Three factors were extracted and were rotated by means of a normalised varimax solution. Table 2 presents the rotated factor matrix.

Factor I obtained high loadings from nine measures based on the attitude on the use of Pil. in the schools, in the government and in other Philippine social situations. Two of them (Variables 10, 13) were measures on the use of Pil. in Social Studies and in school offices, respectively; three pertained to the use of the language in government (Variables 14, 15, 16), and four involved the use of the language as a symbolising factor to the country (Variables 17, 18, 19, 21).

This factor seems to suggest that the Ss who tend to prefer the use of Pil. as a medium of instruction in the teaching of Social Studies also desire that the language be used as a communication tool in school offices. This would imply that while the language is employed as a medium of instruction, its use should be extended to other aspects of school activities such as in the functions of school offices. This finding confirms the logical use of the language not only within the four walls of the classroom but also in the offices of the schools which even up to the present have not adapted Pil. in official communications possibly because of the effects of the disparity in the use of Pil. and English (Eng.) in the educational programme of the country, with Eng. still predominating.⁴

The factor suggests also that the Ss are inclined to use Pil. as a communication instrument in government transactions as well as in other occasions, e.g. marketing, in social gatherings, in transportation, etc. This finding confirms further the logical/natural use of the language not only in school offices but also outside the school.

Table 1
CORRELATION MATRIX*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1	x																						
2		x																					
3			x																				
4				x																			
5					x																		
6						x																	
7							x																
8								x															
9									x														
10										x													
11											x												
12												x											
13													x										
14														x									
15															x								
16																x							
17																	x						
18																		x					
19																			x				
20																				x			
21																					x		
22																						x	
23																							x

*The variables are presented in the same order as they are presented in Table 2. The decimal points have been omitted for convenience.

Table 2
ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

Variables/Factors		I	II	III	IV
1	Speaking Pil. is nationalistic	-.03	-.13	-.04	.02
2	Speaking Pil. is shameful	.01	.03	.47	.22
3	I can speak Pil.	-.09	-.05	-.16	.04
4	I am proud when I speak Pil.	-.04	-.10	.03	.01
5	I like the Pil. language	.04	-.12	.23	.07
6	The Pil. language is beautiful	-.02	.20	.34	.16
7	The Pil. language is rich	-.09	-.03	.34	.06
8	Speaking Pil. is likeable	-.28	.22	.35	.19
9	I will understand Science better if it will be taught in Pil.	-.14	-.03	.57	.34
10	I will understand Social Studies better if it will be taught in Pil.	-.33	.78	-.07	.73
11	I will understand Mathematics better if it will be taught in Pil.	-.19	.87	.07	.80
12	The books that I used should be written in Pil.	-.26	.80	.12	.72
13	Pil. should be used in school offices	-.37	.39	-.12	.31
14	Pil. should be used in government offices	-.68	-.02	-.00	.46
15	Pil. should be used on all occasions	-.73	-.05	-.01	.54
16	Pil. should be used in conducting meetings	-.57	.12	.19	.37
17	Pil. should be used in business and trade	-.45	.05	.23	.26
18	The Pil. language is a symbol for the Philippines	-.47	.06	.13	.24
19	The Pil. language should be used in teaching the Filipino children	-.15	.06	.13	.04
20	The Pil. language is an effective tool for national unity	-.47	.03	-.03	.22
21	The Pil. language is effective in understanding our fellow Filipinos	-.31	.05	-.10	.11
22	The Filipino leaders should speak Pil.	-.10	.16	.34	.09
23	We should change the name of the Pil. language	-.07	-.04	.11	.05

In addition, the Ss suggest that Pil. should be used in parliamentary procedures such as in conducting meetings. This implies a wider role or scope in the use of the language, a condition which may be gleaned from the popularity gained by, and the development and enrichment of,

the language brought about by the mass media, the schools, and most of all by the people themselves who use the language in their day to day contacts.

This factor, moreover, seems to suggest that the Ss are inclined to believe/agree that Pil. is an effective tool in the promotion of business transactions and trade (Variable 17). It also reflects the significant use of the language as a symbolising factor to the country, i.e. the Pil. language is a symbol for the Filipino nation, implying that the national language is one of the symbols of the Philippines and it is an effective tool in fostering national unity and an effective instrument in understanding the Filipinos (Variables 18, 20, 21) for it eliminates or minimises the communication gap among the people regarding the dissemination of information on the various government programmes. This finding is in consonance with the finding of Otones and Sibayan (1969:143-53) that "Pilipino is necessary for good citizenship and participation in the nation's affairs which are expressed in such reasons as to be patriotic and to understand one's heritage".

It is significant to note that Pil. is in the process of modernisation. While this modernisation process is in the making, the language, as part of this process, is moving towards the direction of standardisation. And one of the functions of a standard language (Garvin, 1969) is the unifying function. This function is intricately tied up with nationalism. Such finding in this factor indicates that Pilipino is fulfilling its unifying function among the Filipinos.

This factor, therefore, seems to describe the use of the Pil. language in the schools as well as its role as a communication instrument for the promotion of understanding in government and non-government activities alike.

Four measures obtained high loadings on Factor II, all of which pertain to the attitude of the Ss on the use of Pil. in the schools in general (Variables 10, 11, 12, 13).

This factor seems to suggest that the Ss believe that they would understand the instruction in Social Studies better if it would be taught in Pil. (Variable 10), as in Factor I. It suggests further that they would comprehend better the teaching of Mathematics (Variable 11) if it would be done in the same language. At this point, it seems there is a complementary effect in the use of Pil. as a medium of instruction in such academic areas as Social Studies and Mathematics in the elementary level. This finding is divergent from the report of Otones and Sibayan (143-53) that "Pilipino is not yet good enough for the use in teaching the more rigorous and technical subjects like arithmetic and science". The issuance of the Policy on Bilingual Education (Dept.

Order No.25, s. 1974), mandates that Pil. should be used in teaching Social Studies/Social Science while English should be used in teaching Science and Mathematics.⁵ Such mandate in the teaching of the latter disciplines is incongruent with the finding of the present study.

The Ss would suggest further that Pil. be used in the writing of their books, that is, the books they used in the elementary school. And as in Factor I, they also prefer that the language should be used in the school offices (Variable 13), signalling a confirmation of the wider use of the national language in the school campus which was not practised before.

This factor, therefore, seems to suggest a dimension on the use of Pil. in the different academic disciplines in the school as well as in the writing of books for use in elementary education classes.

Factor III obtained appreciable loadings on six measures. One is about the attitude with respect to speaking Pil. (Variable 2), three are descriptions about Pil., and the remaining two pertain to the use of the language - one in the school and the other by Filipino leaders (Variables 9, 22).

This factor seems to suggest that the Ss believe at the moment that speaking Pil. is shameful (Variable 2), which may be attributed to some sort of paradoxical outlook on the use of the language as reported in Factors I and II. However, looking closely at this finding, it would mean that the other function of a standard language which is prestige as suggested by Garvin, has yet to be attained by the Pil. language. It could be inferred that such finding is still a part of that deep-rooted colonial mentality of the Filipino in using English. The aspect on how to develop in the Filipino a sense of pride in being able to speak his own language must be an interesting aspect of research (Sibayan, 1973).

This factor seems to suggest further that the Ss who believe that Pil. is a beautiful and rich language (Variables 6, 7) are inclined to believe also that speaking it is also likeable (Variable 8). Take note of the paradoxical reaction that speaking Pil. is shameful. It is interesting to remember at this juncture that the Ss are children of non-Tagalog parents and that they communicate with them in Pil., hence this would imply that they are already de-ethnicised as far as the use of language is concerned.

Furthermore, this factor seems to suggest that the Ss prefer that the instruction in Science be done in Pil. because they feel they would understand it better (Variable 9) in this language. This would imply that comprehension in the learning process, in an academic subject like Science, would be more functional if the medium of instruction is the

very language to which the Ss are already oriented and with which they are more familiar because it is the language of their homes. In other words, learning is more functional if it goes side by side with understanding via the language. However, this is incongruent with the finding of Otones and Sibayan (143-53) whose Ss believed that Pil. could not yet handle the teaching of Science. This is also incongruent with the mandate of the Policy on Bilingual Education that Science and Mathematics should be taught in English (Department Order No.25, s. 1974).

In addition, the Ss suggest that the Pil. language should be used by Filipino leaders in the exercise of their official functions, to eliminate or minimise the communication gap between these leaders and the people whom they serve. This would imply further a wider role of Pil. in the state of affairs in the Philippines. Such expansion of the role of Pil. was vividly expressed by President Ferdinand E. Marcos when he said:

"The Philippines, under the New Society, is reaffirming more strongly than before our commitment to national unity through a national language. It is my desire that the national language now known as Pilipino, but which will develop further to become Filipino, should now be firmly incorporated in all the college entrance examinations and in all civil examinations, as well as in the management development courses of the Development Academy of the Philippines. It is also my desire that the important documents of the States, from now on, should be published in two languages - both English and Pilipino. And it is my desire to see Pilipino rapidly established as a medium of instruction together with English in appropriate courses in our higher institutions of learning. I direct the Department of Education and Culture and the Institute of National Language to take strong and immediate measures to implement these policies." (Ferdinand E. Marcos, 'National Language Unity')

Therefore, this factor seems to describe a dimension on the description of Pil. and its role among Filipino leaders.

This generality on the subordination of the ethnic language in favour of Pil., bringing about the de-ethnisation process, has been reported in other studies (see Balagot, 1972; Barrios, 1972; Galang, 1972; Racho, 1972). This would indicate that one index to the wider acceptance as well as faster development and propagation of Pil. is the process of de-ethnisation.

A general study (Villamin, *et al.*, 1971) on the attitudes on the use of Pil. as a medium of instruction by the undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty at the Philippine Normal College, revealed that the undergraduate students had a positive attitude towards the use of the language as a communication tool for instruction. But

the graduate students considered it laborious to learn and use Pil. and the faculty members considered it not useful to learn Pil. because most of them had not been oriented to it. Having finished their education through English, they were indifferent to Pil. At this point, this phenomenon gives justification to Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana's pinning hopes on the schools and the young in the development of Bahasa Indonesia, a condition which is taking place with respect to Pil.

In another study (Castillo and Yap, 1971) which aimed to determine the attitudes of the elite, as represented by the students of the Ateneo de Manila University, towards the use of Pil. as a medium of instruction, it was found that the Ss favoured Pil. instead of English. The expectation that the Ss would favour English because they belonged to the elite group was rejected. The researchers concluded that "On the whole, the Ateneo sample expressed a desire for a change which is probably inspired by nationalism...". I would add that if the Atenean Ss had not expressed a desire for change in favour of Pil., they would be left behind clinging to that deep-rooted colonial mentality.

In general, de-ethnisation and attitudes are playing important roles for a wider and faster development and propagation of Pil. Hence, they are also significant indices to the faster acceptance of the language as a tool for national affairs, thereby fulfilling the function of a national standard language.

Biographical Sketch

ALEJANDRINO Q. PEREZ (b. 1937, Concepcion, Tarlac, Philippines) is an assistant professor at the Philippine Normal College teaching language and literature courses in Pilipino in the Graduate School Department. He is concurrent Head of the Language and Literature Specialization in Pilipino of the same Department. He obtained his college education, undergraduate and graduate, at the PNC: B.S.E.Ed. (1960), M.A. (1964). He finished his Ph.D. at the University of Sto. Tomas, the oldest institution of higher learning not only in the Philippines but also in Asia.

AQP is the founder-president of the **Pambansang Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino, Ink. (PSLP)** (National Association for Pilipino Linguistics, Inc.). He is also the founder-president of the **Asian Association on National Languages (ASANAL)** which was organised on December 20, 1972 during the First Conference on Asian Languages held in Manila, Philippines. He has been the conference director of the First and Second Conferences on Asian Languages (Dec. 18-22, 1972; Dec. 16-21, 1974, respectively). He is also a member of the Board of the Institute of National Language, representing the Pampango Language.

AQP was a lecturer at the University of the Philippines for three academic years in 1971-4.

Books written and edited: *Mga A! Ng Panahon* (The Ah's of Time), 1970; *Pilipinyana*, a modest project towards the direction of encyclopedia-making in Pilipino produced in mimeoscript. The first four volumes are: Tomo I *Wika* (Language), Tomo II *Edukasyon* (Education), Tomo III *Panunuring Pampanitikan* (Literary Criticism), and Tomo IV *Panitikan* (Literature); *Language Policy and Language Development of Asian Countries* (co-editor with Alfonso O. Santiago).

NOTES

1. I would like to express my thanks to my friends and colleagues who helped me in the preparation of this paper: Professor Emma S. Castillo for making and running the computer programme, Att. Benjamin M. Pascual for editing, and Professor Alfonso O. Santiago for his comments and suggestions.
2. Head, Language and Literature Specialization in Pilipino, Graduate School, Philippine Normal College; Member, Board of the Institute of National Language, representing the Pampango language which is one of eight major languages of the country; President, Pambansang Samahan Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino, Ink. (National Association for Pilipino Linguistics, Inc.) and Asian Association on National Languages (ASANAL).
3. The term Pilipino refers to the National Language of the Philippines, while Filipino refers to the people.
4. For a long time since the teaching of Tagalog-based national language called Pilipino in June, 1940, the teaching of Pil. in the schools had been confined only to the teaching of Pil. as a content subject. It was only in the later part of the sixties that Pil. was allowed to be used as medium of instruction in other subjects, such as Social Studies, Mathematics, etc. In 1974, the issuance of Dept. of Education and Culture Order No.24, s. 1974, known as the Implementation Guidelines of the Education Bilingual Policy, which states that Pil. should be used in the teaching of Social Studies/Social Science, Health Education, Work Education, and Physical Education, while English should be used in teaching the English course, science, and mathematics.
5. For further information about the implementation of the bilingual policy on education, see Dept. Order No.25, s. 1974 of the Department of Education and Culture.

APPENDIX "A"

Form No. 1

Leave this blank

LANGUAGE INVENTORY

DIRECTION: Please read this form carefully. Then kindly fill up every blank on this sheet. If you have any question, ask the teacher.

Name Grade Section Sex

School Date of birth Place of birth

Place where you are living: _____
 Town Province City

Birthplace of father: _____
 Town Province City

Birthplace of mother: _____
 Town Province City

The following are some of the languages of the Philippines. Select among these languages the answer which you should give to the questions below. If the language that you should answer is not in this list, write it on the blank provided for.

Aklanon	Cuyunon	Ilocano	Kinaray-a	Pangasinan
Antiqueno	Gadaang	Ifugao	Magindanao	Romblonon
Bicol	Hiligaynon	Isinay	Masbateño	Sambal
Bolinao	Ibaloy	Isneg	Pampango	Tagalog
Cebuano	Ibanag	Itawes	Maranao	Waray
Chavacano	Igorot	Ivatan		

Here are the questions. Answer them carefully.

1. The language of your father is: _____.
2. The language of your mother is: _____.
3. Language used by father and mother when conversing: _____.
4. Language used at home: _____.
5. Language used by father when talking to you: _____.
6. Language used by mother when talking to you: _____.
7. Language used when talking to your brother/sister: _____.
8. Language used in talking with your neighbours: _____.
9. Language used in talking with your friends: _____.
10. Language used in expressing yourself: _____.
11. Language used in buying things in the market: _____.
12. Language used in the school campus, that is outside the school room: _____.
13. Language used in playing: _____.
14. Language used in answering the telephone: _____.
15. Language used in taking a jeep/bus/taxi ride: _____.

The following questions are about the use of PILIPINO, the national language of the Philippines. Please read them carefully and answer each item. Use a check mark (✓) on your answer. If you have any question, ask the teacher.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Speaking Pilipino is nationalistic. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| <hr/> | |
| 2. Speaking Pilipino is shameful. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| <hr/> | |
| 3. I can speak Pilipino. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| <hr/> | |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 4. I am proud when I speak Pilipino. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 5. I like the Pilipino language. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 6. The Pilipino language is beautiful. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 7. The Pilipino language is rich. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 8. Speaking Pilipino is likeable. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 9. I will understand Science better if it will be taught in Pilipino. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 10. I will understand Social Studies better if it will be taught in Pilipino. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 11. I will understand Mathematics better if it will be taught in Pilipino. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 12. The books that I used should be written in Pilipino. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 13. Pilipino should be used in the school offices. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 14. Pilipino should be used in government offices. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 15. Pilipino should be used on all occasions. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 16. Pilipino should be used in conducting meetings. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 17. Pilipino should be used in business and trade. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| 18. The Pilipino language is a symbol for the Philippines. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |

19. The Pilipino language should be used in teaching the Filipino children. ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
-
20. The Filipino leaders should speak Pilipino. ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
-
21. The Pilipino language is effective in understanding our fellow Filipinos. ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
-
22. The Pilipino language is an effective tool for national unity. ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
-
23. We should change the name of the Pilipino language. ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
- If your answer is yes, check the name of the language you want or you can suggest another one:
- Filipino ☐
Philippino ☐
Pfilipino ☐
Maharlika ☐
☐ Other name
-

REFERENCES

- BALAGOT, Lydia R.
1972 The Ilocano in Manila: His De-ethnization. Typescript.
25 pp.
- BARRIOS, Sister Mary Angela
1972 The De-ethnization of the Non-Tagalog Towards Tagalization.
Typescript. 27 pp.
- CASTILLO, Emma S. and Gloria YAP
1971 An Attitudinal Survey on the Use of Pilipino as Medium of
Instruction. Typescript. 23 pp.
- FISHMAN, Joshua A.
1971 'The Impact of Nationalism on Language Planning: Some Comparisons between Early Twentieth-Century Europe and More Recent Years in South and Southeast Asia'. In: Rubin and Jernudd, 1971:3-20.
- GALANG, Rosita G.
1972 De-ethnization of the Kapampangans. Typescript. 9 pp.
- GARVIN, Paul L.
1964 'The Standard Language Problem - Concepts and Methods'. In: Dell Hymes, ed. *Language in Culture and Society*, 521-6. New York: Harper and Row.
- MARCOS, Ferdinand E.
1974 National Language and Unity. Speech read at the Second Conference on Asian Language, held at the NSDB Conference Hall, December 16-21, 1974, jointly sponsored by the Pambansang Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino, Ink., Institute of National Language, and the Asian Association on National Languages (ASANAL).

MINDO, Dinnah F., Gemma P. Orquieza C. RAFAEL

- 1971 Factors Affecting the Acquisition of Pilipino. Manila: Philippine Normal College Language Study Center. Typescript.

OTANES, Fe T. and Bonifacio P. SIBAYAN

- 1969 *Language Policy Survey of the Philippines*. Manila: Philippine Normal College Language Study Center.

PHILIPPINES: BUREAU OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

- 1971 *Bureau of Public Schools Memorandum No.20, s. 1971: Pambansang Kalagayan ng Pilipino sa mga Paaralang Bayan*. Hunyo.

PHILIPPINES: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

- 1974 *Department Order No.25, s. 1974 (June 19, 1974). Implementing Guidelines for the Policy on Bilingual Education*.

PHILIPPINES: NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION

- 1970 *Resolution No.70-5, February 17, 1970*. Manila, Philippines.
1970 *Resolution No.70-21, August 18, 1970*. Manila, Philippines.

PHILIPPINES: PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION TO SURVEY PHILIPPINE EDUCATION (PCSPE)

- 1970 *Report*. December, 1970. Manila, Philippines.

PINEDA, Ponciano B.P.

- 1974 'The National Language Policy of the Philippines'. In: Al Q. Perez and A.O. Santiago, eds *Language Policy and Language Development of Asian Countries*, 1-10. Manila: Pambansang Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino, Ink.

RACHO, Albert L.

- 1972 *Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When? - A Pampango Example*. Typescript. 14 pp.

RAY, Punya Sloka

- 1963 *Language Standardization: Studies in Prescriptive Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

SIBAYAN, Bonifacio P.

- 1974 'The Development of Pilipino and Sociolinguistics'. In: Al Q. Perez and A.O. Santiago, eds *Language Policy and Language Development of Asian Countries*, 28-37. Manila: Pambansang Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino, Ink.

VILLAMIN, Araceli M., Paz M. BELVEZ, and Velinda A. SAMONTE

- 1972 *A Study of Attitudes Towards Language of the Philippine Normal College Faculty, Undergraduate, and Graduate Students*. Typescript.