



The language profile and the language attitudes of the administrators, faculty members, personnel, and students of a Philippine state university: Implications for language policy formulation

Bonifacio T. Cunanan

Published: December 2013

Corresponding author

Bonifacio T. Cunanan
Bulacan State University
btc.947@gmail.com

©2013 The Author(s).
Published by the UST
Department of English,
University of Santo Tomas
Manila, The Philippines

Abstract

This paper discusses the coexistence of Filipino, English, some Philippine regional languages, and foreign languages in a multilingual academic setting, the Bulacan State University. To date, more than 35,000 students and 1,000 faculty members and personnel from different ethnolinguistic groups converge on the five campuses of this institution of higher learning. This multilingual environment poses some challenges in determining the status of English and Filipino in the formulation of a university-wide language policy (LP). Given the situation that the University articulates its position in the intellectualization, modernization, and globalization of Filipino along with the inclusion of some foreign languages across the curriculum, this paper locates the places of English and Filipino in a multilingual academic environment by describing the language profile and attitudes of administrators, faculty members, students, and personnel. As this paper presents the diversified perspectives of the subject-respondents on the status of the two languages in the curriculum, it aims to identify some issues that need to be addressed in formulating a university-wide LP.

Keywords: Language attitude, multilingualism, language policy formulation

1. Introduction

Linguistic diversity in a school environment, among other issues, is a growing concern of the Department of Education (DepEd) and the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) with the adoption of a multilingual education policy in the Philippines. To Cenoz and Genesee (1988), multilingualism is the capacity to use many languages to effectively communicate in speech and in writing. Multilingualism results in the coexistence of different languages brought by the need to maintain one's ethnolinguistic identity in the midst of

continuous economic activities, migration, language contact, and educational reforms. Further, the adoption of multilingualism in an academic environment helps in encouraging language diversity (Crystal, 1997; Fishman, 1996; Lasimbang, Miller, & Otigil, 1992). Also, multilingualism provides for language ecology in which the members of a multilingual community coexist and interact (Haugen, 1972). It entails the analysis of a complex, adaptive system to the social environment and language variation in two perspectives: macro- and micro-ecological (Mufwene, 2001; Fill & Mühlhäusler, 2001; Mühlhäusler, 1996, 2003). While the former deals with the ethnographic, sociocultural, and economic environment, the latter deals with linguistic factors, language contact, and structural features. In this diversified language environment, Baker (2001) acknowledges that adaptability is crucial for survival and success; hence, language policy (LP) formulation is needed.

The Philippines is a multilingual country because of several factors. It is an archipelagic country of 7,107 islands with 172 coexisting living languages, was under the Spanish rule for 333 years (Gonzalez, 1997; Fonacier-Bernabe, 1987), and was subject to about half a century of American rule. Presently, it is also facing the challenges of globalization and borderless communication, a condition experienced in most countries across the globe. Similar to countries once under the colonial rule, the Philippines places national efforts on cultural and language re-engineering (Faenar & Soriano, 2003) which, to Bautista (1996), needs to be understood in terms of ethnicity, nationalism, and modernization. In contextualizing LP formulation, Tupas (2003) stresses the roles of ideology and language politics. Confronted with the challenges brought in by multilingualism, LP formulation has become of paramount importance to Filipinos in general and academicians in particular. Hence, in the process of cultural reconstruction, the Philippines has adopted a national language while it maintains English in the curriculum for much wider communication and sustains the use of the regional languages for ethnolinguistic identity.

Five among the legal bases of LP formulation in the Philippines are Sec. 3, Art. XIV of the 1935 Constitution; Sec. 2 and 3 of Art. XV of the 1972 Constitution; Sec. 6 and 7 of Art. XIV of the 1987 Constitution; Dept. Order No. 25, s. 1974; and Dept. Order No. 74, s. 2009.

It was in the 1935 Constitution that a National Language was developed and adopted based on one of the existing Philippine native languages. It was also in the 1935 Constitution that English was designated to be used continuously as an official language. In the 1972 Constitution, English and Pilipino were maintained as official languages. It also mandated the National Assembly to take steps toward the development and formal adoption of a common National Language to be known as Filipino. In the 1987 Constitution, Pilipino was renamed Filipino, and it was declared as the National Language of the Philippines that shall be developed and enriched on the basis of the existing Philippine and other languages. The 1987 Constitution guarantees the use of Filipino as the medium of official communication and the language of instruction in the educational system while English remains as an official language. The same provision of the 1987 Constitution acknowledges regional languages as auxiliary official languages and auxiliary media of instruction in the different regions in the Philippines. Because the 1972 Constitution deemed the Filipino people to be bilinguals,

Dept. Order No. 25, s. 1974 was promulgated providing the implementing guidelines of the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP) which aimed at improving the quality of instruction in both Filipino and English at the national level. With the BEP, the regional languages were declared to be auxiliary languages in Grades I and II. Also, English was maintained in the curriculum for practical reasons and Filipino for linguistic identity. Through the BEP, mathematics and natural sciences were taught in English, and all other courses, especially the social sciences, were taught in Filipino. Recently, Dept. Order No. 74, s. 2009 was implemented institutionalizing the mother-tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE). This new policy provides for the use of the learner's first language (L1) as the primary medium of instruction (MOI) from preschool until, at least, grade three. MTB-MLE also provides for the use of L1 to develop language and literacy for Grades 1 to 3 and the use Filipino and English after Grade 3 (K to 12 Toolkit, 2012).

As a former colony of Spain and the United States, the Philippines has been confronted with problems other than those that are political or socioeconomic in nature. Among others, language planning has been a century-old problem in the country. Similar to the experiences of countries once under the colonial rule, the Philippines has been on the process of cultural re-engineering and language planning. Language planning and LP formulation in the Philippines, like in other Asian countries, require serious attention from sociolinguists, language planners, and LP formulation experts.

Sociolinguists view LP formulation in terms of two broad activities: formulating policies and getting the policies adopted and implemented to penetrate many sectors of the society, particularly the education sector (Ho & Wong, 2001; Halliday, 1990; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997).

Like the Philippines, many Asian countries are now confronted with the challenges brought by bilingualism, multilingualism, and cultural reconstruction. In Burma, bilingualism and multilingualism have some implications for the place of identity, language maintenance, and solidarity (Mishra & Dutta, 1999). In Malaysia, language planning has evolved through nationalism and pragmatism using a top-down approach in which a constituted organization (the government) dictates its policies to its constituents (Fishman et al., 1971). In 1957, the government of Malaysia established Bahasa Melayu as the official language to be used in all functions of the government and as the medium of instruction, a program that gave way to the cultivation and modernization of the national language for 40 years until the Malaysian government announced in 2002 a reversal policy calling for a switch to English as the medium of instruction at all levels (Gill, 2005). However, on July 8, 2009, the *Memperkasa Bahasa Malaysia*, *Memperkukuh Bahasa Inggeris* or MBMMBI policy was implemented, and it set Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of teaching and learning mathematics and science subjects in all national schools, Chinese at Chinese national-type schools, and the Tamil languages at Indian national-type schools. This policy ensures the usage of Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of communication in all national schools and secondary schools for mastery as well as fluency in English (MBMMBI, 2012). The Malaysian language policy can be described two-fold: corpus planning (internal planning about creating new forms, modifying the old ones and old forms) and status planning (external functions about decisions to maintain, extend, and restrict the range of use) (Haugen, 1983; Rajandran, 2008).

Language planning strikes the balance between modernization and maintaining ethnic identity. In a 633-sq.-km. strategically located island state of Singapore, just at the tip of the Malaysian peninsula, English was designated both as the compulsory language of education and the working and administrative language to plug into world economic trends (Pakir, 1991, 1994) at the expense of the traditional cultural values of some ethnic groups like the Chinese. This policy implies that cultural heritage and historical association have to be considered in language planning to avoid interethnic conflict (Wee, 2002) that is also detrimental to economic and sociopolitical development (Kuo & Jernudd, 1994).

In the midst of globalization, modernization, cultural reengineering, and rediscovering one's identity in the 21st century, some institutions of higher learning remain searching for ways on how to respond to these recent challenges. These institutions do not have their respective language policies even after more than a century of existence. One of these institutions is the Bulacan State University (BulSU).

BulSU was established as an intermediate school in 1901 by Act 74 of the Philippine Commission and was granted university status in 1993 by RA 7665. BulSU is one of the largest state universities in Central Luzon in terms of enrollment, and it has become a convergence of students, employees, and personnel of different language backgrounds (cf. Table 1). Given the said condition, the academic and language environment in BulSU has evolved a language ecology, which, to Haugen (1972 as cited in Splosky, 2005), is characterized by the interactions between or among several languages. Yet, the University seems to remain complacent to address the need for a language policy. Being an institution of higher learning, BulSU needs to formally adopt a policy that will regulate the domains of English for global competency, the use of Filipino for national identity, the maintenance of the regional languages for ethnolinguistic pride, and other applicable languages for the emerging results of globalization. For the said reasons, this paper surveys the language profile and language attitudes of the administrators, faculty members, personnel, and students of BulSU to outline a framework for LP formulation. In the process, the stakeholders in the BulSU academic community are given their representation.

Being in a multilingual academic community, the administrators, faculty members, personnel, and students of BulSU are aware of the need to determine the status of English, Filipino, regional languages, and foreign languages not only in terms of their legal appropriations but also in the everyday affairs of the academic community.

While the 1987 Constitution declares Filipino as the national language, the English language remains as an official language for purposes of communication and instruction. The maintenance of English in the curriculum in the Philippines can be understood in the perspectives of Kachru (1995) and Tupas (2009). The two language scholars acknowledge the power of English as seen through its range and depth, spread across cultures, access to scientific and cultural domains, neutrality, liberalism, progressivism, accessibility and assimilation across cultures, economic gains, and social status. Related to the said reasons, English, according to Sugbo (2003), has been favored in the formulation of language policies in the Philippines. However, though many Filipinos recognize the importance of English in the curriculum and in the job market, it cannot be the main language for the Filipino people (Sibayan, 1996).

In discussing the crucial role of language planning in the Philippines, Bernardo (2007, p. 19) argues about “the need for educational systems in multicultural globalizing environments to understand and explore the intellectualization of bilingual language skills.” The use of languages other than the speaker’s own language has become common in the world in which there are almost no monolingual territories in the age of globalization (Donnelly, 2003). The coexistence of multiple languages creates a condition requiring careful language planning that influences literary practices within a society (Fishman, 1968 as cited in Rubin & Jernudd, 1971; Fox, 1975). Furthermore, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) clarified that language planning is an attempt to modify the linguistic behavior of a certain group for some reasons resulting in ethical, political, and legal importance (Patten, 2001).

1.1 Conceptual Framework

The present study takes off from a 2x4 Matrix LP Model of Baldauf (2005) which is described in Figure 1. This model is more detailed than Haugen’s (1983) since the latter consists only of two areas: policy and cultivation planning; while the former has four: status planning, corpus planning, language in education planning, and prestige planning.

These four components are defined below:

- 1) Status Planning, as van Elst (as cited in Hinkel, 2005) succinctly puts it, examines what aspect of which language ought to be taught to which learner under what circumstances and parameters?
- 2) Corpus Planning, to Liddicoat (2005), entails codification (graphization, grammatication, and lexication), elaboration (lexical and stylistic modernization and renovation), development of teaching materials with reference to the cultural norms of L1 communities (Kirkpatrick, 2002), and the use of canonical literature and local texts as vehicles for teaching (Xu, 2002).
- 3) Language-in-Education Planning refers to the adoption of teaching methods, use of instructional materials, and community involvement (Baldauf & Ingram, 2003; Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005; Corson, 1999; Ingram, 1990; Tollefson, 2002).
- 4) Prestige Planning recognizes ethnic identity, method of implementing LP, and motives and activities of language planners (Ager, 2001 & 2005; Ingram, 2004).

In addition to the said components, the rights of minority languages need to be observed. If minority languages are neglected because of the greater importance given to major languages, complacent and dismissive attitudes will be promoted by an elite monolingual class who will widen the gap between the rich and the poor and push the disappearance of other languages (Crystal, 2003).

The present article follows Baldauf’s 2x4 Matrix LP Model because it recognizes the importance of the language profile and language attitude of the members of an academic community in LP formulation and implementation. The locally constructed instrument was drafted based on the four areas cited above, and the 2x4 areas were considered in drafting the proposed LP framework (cf. Appendix A).

Figure 1 shows the different components of the said conceptual framework.

Approaches to Goals	1. Policy Planning (on form)	2. Cultivation Planning (on Function)	
Productive Goals	1. Status Planning (about society)	<i>Status standardization</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officialization • Nationalization • Prescription 	
	2. Corpus Planning (about language)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revival • Revitalization • Reversal • Maintenance • Interlingual Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International • Intra-national • Spread 	
	3. Language-in-Education Planning (about learning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardization • Corpus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graphization • Grammatication • Lexication Auxiliary Code • Graphization • Grammatication • Lexication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Corpus Elaboration</i> • Lexical Modernization • Stylistic Modernization • Renovation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purification • Reform • Stylistic simplification • Terminological unification • Internationalization
Receptive Goal	4. Prestige Planning (about image)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy Development</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Policy • Personnel Policy • Curriculum Policy • Methods & Materials Policy • Resourcing Policy • Community Policy • Evaluation Policy • <i>Language Promotion</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official/Government • Institutional • Pressure group • Individual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Acquisition Planning</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reacquisition • Maintenance • Foreign/ Second Language Shift • <i>Intellectualization</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language of Science • Language of Professions • Language of High Culture

Figure 1. Baldauf’s 2x4 matrix (2005)

Baldauf’s 2x4 Matrix LP Model consists of two planning policies (for form and function) and four planning goals (about society, language, learning, and image). The different components of Baldauf’s Matrix are realized in the locally constructed questionnaire because the latter deals with the status of standardization (items 7 and 8), status planning (items 12 and 18), policy development (items 11, 13, 14, 15, and 19), acquisition planning (items 2 and

3), language promotion (items 1, 4, 5.1 to 5.15, 9, 10, 16, 17, and 20), and intellectualization (item 6).

1.2 Objectives

This paper surveys the language profile and language attitudes of administrators, faculty members, personnel, and students toward the coexistence of English, Filipino, regional languages, and other applicable languages in order to draw some important data in drafting a language-policy framework.

The following are the specific research questions:

- (1) What is the language profile of the administrators, faculty members, personnel, and students of Bulacan State University?
- (2) What are their attitudes and perceptions toward language ecology, LP formulation, and its implementation?
- (3) What is the status of Filipino, English, and regional languages in the LP of Bulacan State University?

The empirical data were used to determine the level of awareness and attitudes of the BulSU academic community. The present writer argues that they need to be consulted for proper representation in the drafting of the LP framework.

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This study used the survey questionnaire method. Singh (2006, p. 102) describes descriptive studies as “helpful in planning various programmes, school census... conducted to help, solve the problems of various aspects of school.” In using this method “the information of what we want, is obtained by clarifying the goals, and objectives possibly through a study of the conditions existing elsewhere or what experts consider to be desirable” [sic] (Singh, 2006, p. 103).

Two sets of questionnaires were prepared and validated by the chairs of the three departments of the College of Arts and Letters: English Language Department, Mass Communication and Performing Arts Department, and Kagawaran ng Wikang Filipino (Filipino Language Department). The validated instruments were floated to the randomly selected and purposively stratified respondents at BulSU: administrators, faculty members,

personnel (AF&Ps) and student-respondents (SRs). The questionnaires had three parts: five items for the respondents' personal, demographic, and language profiles (language/s spoken, school campus, curriculum level, course, and major/specialization), awareness of the existence of a LP of BulSU, preferred languages for writing and speaking purposes, and importance given to English and Filipino in the academe; 15 items about their preferences in using English and Filipino; and 15 items about their attitude toward modernization and standardization of Filipino; the status of regional languages; code mixing; the use of English and Filipino in writing memoranda, school policies, regulations and correspondences; naming of halls and offices; language policy and nationalism; preservation of indigenous languages; providing grants and scholarships to push for the modernization of Filipino; and determining which academic unit should lead the formulation of a university-wide LP.

2.2 Participants and Study Locale

Two groups of respondents were randomly selected: AF&Ps and SRs. One hundred five (105) AF&Ps participated in the present study, mostly were female (53.3%), with a mean age of 40.46 (SD=11.143): faculty members (74.3%), school administrators (17.1%), and nonacademic personnel (8.6%). The AF&Ps and SRs were drawn through assigned random numbers from the five campuses of BulSU: City of Malolos, Bustos, Hagonoy, Bulakan (Meneses), and San Jose del Monte (Sarmiento).

Also, 422 SRs, selected through the purposive sampling technique across the five curriculum levels, participated in this study. Their mean age was 17.62 years old (SD=2.30), and majority of them were female (56.2%) from BA in Legal Management, BA in Mass Communication, BS in Architecture, BS Biology, BS in Business Administration, BS in General Education, BS in Engineering (Civil, Mechanical, and Mechatronics), BS in Home Economics, BS in Information Technology, BS in Nursing, BS in Psychology, BS in Physical Education, and BS in Secondary Education.

2.3 Statistical Treatment

A five-point Likert scale was used in quantifying the language profile and language attitudes of the AF&Ps and SRs. The demographics of the respondents and their language perceptions and preferences were measured using the said scale. Several studies (Coombs, 1960; Vigderhous, 1977; Jakobson, 2004; Jamieson, 2004; Knapp, 1990; Kuzon, Urbancheck, & McCabe; 1996; Brown, 2011) argue that Likert items do not form an interval scale; hence, they should be considered and analyzed as ordinal scales. For this reason, modal scores were used as measures of central tendency in accounting for the answers of the respondents.

3. Results and Discussion

The surveyed and empirical data on the language profile and attitudes of the respondents are presented in the following tables. These tables show the language condition in BulSU and provide baseline information in making informed decisions. These data help in scanning the language environment, setting the rationale of the framework of the proposed LP, information dissemination, and LP adoption. The author believes that the empirical data are crucial and indispensable in planning the status, the corpus, the place and role of language in education, and language prestige.

Table 1
Percentage distribution of the respondents according to language familiarity and use

	Fil & Eng	Fil	Fre	Regional language	English, Filipino, Regional & other language
<i>For the administrators, faculty, and personnel (AF&Ps)</i>					
Language familiarity	88.57	4.76	1.90	0.0	0.95 (+Ceb), 00.95 (Kap) 0.95 (+Iloc), 00.95 (Ita)
Language often used in writing	82.52	11.65	3.88	0.0	1.95 (+Ceb)
Language often used in speaking	80.55	10.0	2.22	2.22 (Ceb) 1.11 (Kap) 1.11 (Ita)	
<i>For the student-respondents (SRs)</i>					
Language familiarity	59.00	25.83	1.42	1.42 (Kap)	9.48 (+Kap) 1.18+(Kap&Ceb) 0.47(Nih), 0.24 (+Cha) 0.24 (+Fre), 0.24 (+Ilo)
For writing	71.20	19.00	5.50	0.0	0.0
For speaking	70.10	24.75	1.73	0.25 (Kap)	0.0
For reading	79.57	6.59	13.46	0.0	0.0
For studying	78.18	14.15	7.43	0.24 (Kap)	0.0
For online information	64.70	23.77	9.31	0.0	0.0
Language used:	Ceb: Cebuano Cha: Chavacano Eng: English		Fil: Filipino Fre: French Ita: Iawis		Kap: Kapampangan Ilo: Ilocano Nih: Nihongo

Table 1 reveals that the respondents, both AF&Ps and SRs, are either bilinguals in English and Filipino or multilinguals in English, Filipino, and one or more Philippine languages. Among the AF&Ps, very few believe that they are exclusively familiar with Filipino (4.76%) or English (1.90%). None of them can speak only a regional language; thus, all of them are either bilinguals or multilinguals. The respondents, who are native speakers of Tagalog, Cebuano, Kapampangan, Itawis, and Ilocano, can mostly write well in English and Filipino (82.52%). Among them, 11.65% can write only in English, 3.38% in Filipino, and 1.90% in Cebuano. Their being bilinguals is also observed in their ability to speak well in English and Filipino (83.33%). Few of them believe they can speak only one language: Filipino (10.00%), English (2.22%), Cebuano (2.22%), Itawis (1.11%), or Kapampangan (1.11%).

Furthermore, the SRs are familiar with more languages in comparison with the AF&Ps. However, the AF&Ps believe that they can use two languages (88.57%) more functionally than the SRs (59.00%). Table 1 further suggests that the SRs have more varied language orientation. The figures show that 25.83% are familiar only with Filipino, and 1.42% are familiar with English. Aside from English and Filipino, the SRs are also familiar with regional languages, like Cebuano, Chavacano, Itawis, Kapampangan, and Ilocano and foreign languages, like French and Nihongo. For writing purposes, 74.20% can write well in English and Filipino, 19.00% in Filipino, 5.50% in English, and none in any of the regional languages.

The SRs' bilingual abilities also manifest in other macro skills: 70.10% for speaking and 77.30% for reading. The SRs also prefer to use English and Filipino for studying (78.18%) and getting online information (64.70%). Among other regional languages, only Kapampangan is preferred for speaking (0.25%) and studying (0.24%). None of the regional languages is used in getting online materials because of the scarcity or unavailability of materials in the said languages.

Using 15 criteria, Table 2 presents the language preferences of the AF&Ps. Often, they use Filipino more frequently than English in the following instances: asking favors from their colleagues or coworkers or school administrators; talking to their subordinates in social gatherings, parties, or extracurricular activities; talking to students outside the class when they are asking for help; addressing the crowd during sports fests; and reprimanding students. On the other hand, English is used more often when writing memoranda and short notices. English and Filipino are used in these situations: participating in organizational meetings, giving tasks to students, addressing the crowd to discuss matters affecting the interests of teachers and students, speaking to a crowd during cultural presentations, and participating in religious activities. Furthermore, English is often used when admonishing and encouraging colleagues to achieve the goals of the organization; conducting meetings, seminars, and workshops; and reading scholarly or academic papers.

Table 2
Modal scores for the AF&Ps' frequency of use of English and of Filipino (n=105)

Language task	English		Filipino	
	Mode	Freq.	Mode	Freq.
1. Asking favors from colleagues or coworkers	3	Sometimes	4	Often
2. Asking favors from superiors or administrators	3	Sometimes	4	Often
3. Participating in organizational meetings	4	Often	4	Often
4. Talking to subordinates when having parties and extracurricular programs	3	Sometimes	4	Often
5. Talking to students when giving tasks	4	Often	4	Often
6. Talking to students outside the class when they are asking for help	3	Sometimes	4	Often
7. Addressing a crowd to discuss matters affecting the interests of teachers and students	4	Often	4	Often
8. Speaking to a crowd during cultural presentations	4	Often	4	Often
9. Participating in religious activities	4	Often	4	Often
10. Addressing a crowd during sports fests	3	Sometimes	4	Often
11. Writing memos and short notices to subordinates	5	Very Often	2	Rarely
12. Reprimanding and disciplining students	3	Sometimes	4	Often
13. Admonishing and encouraging colleagues to achieve the goals of the organization	4	Often	3	Sometimes
14. Conducting meetings, seminars, and workshops	4	Often	3	Sometimes
15. Reading scholarly or academic papers in scientific or technical gatherings	4	Often	3	Sometimes

Table 3 further shows how the SRs use Filipino and English in different contexts. There are occasions when they use any of the two or both. When using both languages in one context, they use Filipino more often than English, e.g., talking to their instructors or professors; having official transactions with school administrators and any other school personnel (e.g., librarian, nurse, registrar, cashier, guidance counselor, security personnel); discussing lessons with friends, classmates, and peers inside and outside the class; brainstorming with classmates when doing research; participating in sports, cocurricular, literary, or cultural activities. For the SRs, English is used more often than Filipino when writing academic papers, course requirements, and excuse letters to their professors. In

addition, English is used as often as Filipino when discussing technical or scientific matters with friends and when disseminating information or announcements through social networks and weblogs.

Table 3
Modal scores for the SRs' use of English and of Filipino (n=422)

Language task	English		Filipino	
	Mode	Freq.	Mode	Freq.
1. Talking to instructors/professors	3	Sometimes	4	Often
2. Having official transactions with school administrators	3	Sometimes	4	Often
3. Discussing lessons with friends, classmates, and peers in the class	3	Sometimes	5	Very Often
4. Talking to friends, classmates, and peers outside the class	3	Sometimes	5	Very Often
5. Participating in sports and other cocurricular activities	3	Sometimes	5	Very Often
6. Participating in literary or cultural activities	3	Sometimes	5	Very Often
7. Writing academic papers or course requirements	4	Often	3	Sometimes
8. Discussing technical or scientific matters with peers or friends	3	Sometimes	3	Sometimes
9. Surfing the net for relevant information	5	Very Often	3	Sometimes
10. Addressing the crowd or huge audience on matters affecting the rights of students	3	Sometimes	3	Sometimes
11. Brainstorming with classmates when doing research or group activities	3	Sometimes	4	Often
12. Talking to school personnel, like librarian, nurse, registrar, cashier, or guidance counselor	3	Sometimes	4	Often
13. Asking assistance or help from security personnel	3	Sometimes	5	Very Often
14. Disseminating information or announcements through social networks and weblogs	3	Sometimes	3	Sometimes
15. Writing excuse letters to professors	5	Very Often	3	Sometimes

With respect to time allotment, quality, and frequency of use, Table 4 indicates that the school AF&Ps favor Filipino more than English, with 70.19% and 25.96%, respectively. Only 3.85% of the AF&Ps prefer to code-mix English and Filipino. Furthermore, the SRs

want to prioritize Filipino (79.95%) over English (14.08%). Also, 5.97% of them code-mix English and Filipino. This finding affirms the results of Borlongan's (2009, p. 40) study in which the respondents, who were mostly English language teachers (11 out of 14), "code-switched in around less than five to almost 50 utterances or a little less than 15, at the average, in the entire class session" on some occasions in the duration of the study.

Table 4

Percentage distribution of prioritization in time allotment, quality, and frequency of use for the language preferences

Group of respondents	Degree of prioritization for the language preferences			
	Filipino	English	Code-mix of English and Filipino	Total
AF&Ps	70.19	25.96	3.85	100.00
SRs	79.95	14.08	5.97	100.00

Code mixing and code switching are hardly distinguished from each other. According to Cárdenas-Claros (2009, p. 68), "the distinction between code switching and code mixing is one of the most puzzling debates in the study of code alternation." Also, Clyne (1991, p. 161) argues that code switching and code mixing refer to the same phenomena in "which the speaker stops using language 'A' and employs language 'B'." This language phenomenon is believed to be common among bilinguals or multilinguals although both groups of the respondents admitted that code mixing is not prioritized. Arifin and Husin (2011, p.22) reported: "empirical studies have demonstrated that it is quite difficult to find classroom discourse fully in a single language." Code mixing or code switching is a language behavior characterized by "an active, creative process of incorporating materials into communicative activities; it involves the rapid and momentary shifting from one language to another, which may occur several times within a single conversation and frequently within a single sentence" (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982 as cited in Inductivo, 1994, pp. 114-115). Even though the respondents unfavorably viewed the efficacy of code mixing or code switching in the classroom, some studies show that these benefit both students and teachers. Inductivo (1994) cited some of the benefits of code mixing and code switching. For example, Braganza (1988 as cited in Inductivo, 1994) reported that Taglish was the preferred language for discussion of a majority of students and teachers in a Biology class resulting in improved class participation. Furthermore, Abad (2005) proved that code switching helped lower the affective filter once rapport and atmosphere of informality was created. Lee (2006) also found out that code switching in a Math class allowed the students to participate more regardless of social and cultural gaps. Hence, code mixing and code switching need to be understood in light of emerging empirical studies inasmuch as cases of code switching are interpreted as adjustments made even by competent bilinguals (Poplack, 1980). This

observation is confirmed in the work of Samida and Takahasi (n.d., p.76) who argued that “code-mixing English and Tagalog is a characteristic way for educated people to vary style.” “Philippine education in general and classroom teachers,” according to Bernardo (2005, 2007 as cited in Lim, 2013, p. 66), “totally prohibits the use of Tagalog-English code-switching without looking at the benefits it has on bilingual cognition, learning, and communication.” He, therefore, suggests that “Filipino educators must reconsider this stance on Tagalog-English code-switching.” Conventionally, code mixing or the use of the vernaculars in the Philippines has been branded informal, unlike the use of English, according to Gonzalez (1982 as cited in Bautista, 2011). This language behavior, Smedley (2006, p. 120) noted, “is an all-pervasive reality for many Filipinos who display with patent clarity an undoubted facility in both Tagalog and English. Often the switching is for convenience and expediency.” In fact, Bautista (1977, p.15), articulated that code-switching behavior in Tagalog-English “should be incorporated into the psycholinguistic model of bilingual competence.”

More recent studies concur with the place of code mixing and code switching in the classroom. For example, Valdez (2010, pp. 14-15) reported that studies in Philippine sociolinguistics show that “code-switching serves as [a] purposeful tool for teaching and learning because it accomplishes several communicative functions intended for both the teachers and students (Martin, 1999; Cruz, 1993; Bernardo, 2005). Furthermore, Valdez stressed that studies on code switching in the Philippines can be attributed to globalization and that code switching can be used as a resource for teaching and learning since it is drawn from the linguistic resources of a bilingual’s competence in two (or more) languages (Bernardo, 2005; Bautista, 1999; Tupas, 1998; Lin & Martin, 2005; Luke, 2005). Furthermore, code-switching is used by teachers and students to clarify, interpret, differentiate, and explicate topics (Cruz, 1993); to signal topic shifts and communicate affective and repetitive functions in the classroom (Sert, 2005); and to facilitate comprehension of the lesson (Nivera, 2001). Therefore, code mixing and code switching should be considered not only inside the classroom but also in the framework of the LP formulation.

Table 5
Level of awareness on the need for a language policy

Level of awareness	Percentage distribution	
	AF&Ps	SRs
Aware	34.34	16.63
Not aware	26.26	39.45
Uncertain	39.40	43.92
Total	100.00	100.00

As regards the level of awareness on the existence of a LP in BulSU, Table 5 shows that most of the AF&Ps and SRs are uncertain (39.40%) or do not seem to care at all (43.92%). The fact that there has been no existing document on LP formulation after more than 100 years of existence, it appears that the BulSU community has not been prioritizing its LP.

Table 6
Perceptions on modernization and possibility of using Filipino in teaching science and technology

Perception	Percentage distribution	
	AF&Ps	SRs
Filipino is modernized and it can be used.	41.75	37.20
Not sure if Filipino is modernized	33.01	44.55
Filipino is not yet modernized and it cannot be used.	25.24	18.25
Total	100.00	100.00

Table 6 indicates that the respondents have varied perceptions on the possibility of using Filipino as the medium of instruction in teaching science and technology. While 41.75% of the AF&Ps believe that Filipino can be used in teaching science and technology, 44.55% of the SRs are uncertain if it can be used for the said purpose. These figures suggest that the stakeholders of BulSU view Filipino more favorably than English, but the students seem uncertain if Filipino can be used in teaching science and technology subjects for lack of pedagogical idioms or technical terms.

Furthermore, the respondents differ on how they view LP formulation in the context of nationalism. A majority of the SRs believe that LP formulation and nationalism are separate issues, with the first being important to ensure global competitiveness. In the same way, the AF&Ps view LP and nationalism as distinct entities. Table 7 further shows that the AF&Ps believe that the LP can succeed through political will and long-range planning. For the SRs, the LP's sustainability is a crucial factor. The SRs, however, are not as optimistic as the AF&Ps in light of the many factors that need to be considered to ensure the success of LP. Moreover, they view language modernization as a source of pride for their school and province as well, which to the AF&Ps can only be made possible by establishing linkages with other institutions.

Table 7
Distribution of respondents' language attitudes on language and nationalism, and modernization and standardization of Filipino

Language attitude	Percentage distribution	
	AF&Ps	SRs
A. LP and Nationalism		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becoming globally competitive and nationalistic should be well-balanced considering who we are and what we want to be. 	56.73	27.62
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationalism has nothing to do with language policy, but the latter is important for our people to become globally competitive. 	24.04	65.00
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A LP is part and parcel of nation building, cultural reconstruction, and national pride. 	19.23	7.38
B. Modernization and standardization of Filipino		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political will is needed to modernize and standardize it. 	49.04	22.17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very long period of time is needed to modernize and standardize it. 	49.04	66.02
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language standardization is a too complex issue. 	1.92	11.81
C. BulSU for modernization of Filipino		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a great honor for BulSU and the Province. 	55.77	83.20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BulSU should establish linkages with other institutions. 	38.46	0.26
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BulSU needs more time and resources. 	5.77	16.54

The prevalence of Filipino and English in the academic community has been an ideal breeding ground for bilingualism which, unfortunately or otherwise, resulted in code mixing. In Table 8, it can be gleaned that both groups agree that code mixing should be allowed in class because it is more student-friendly and easier to understand. Nevertheless, the AF&Ps are more cautious believing that code mixing has to be regulated, and one way to regulate it is to introduce some concepts first in Filipino and then in English (33.98%). Again, AF&Ps and SRs agree that regional languages can be used as long as the Tagalog speakers do not get offended (61.96% and 56.06%, respectively). In the same way, the non-Tagalogs feel not bothered even if the vernacular is used anytime because Bulacan is Tagalog-dominant. This observation also suggests that the respondents mutually respect every person's linguistic rights. The publication of materials in the regional languages is also approved by AF&Ps and SRs as long as it observes school policies and regulations (52.88% and 53.32%, respectively). On the preservation of minority and indigenous languages, both groups of respondents agree that the University has to include in its research and extension services the protection and preservation of indigenous languages, with BulSU cooperating with public and nongovernmental agencies, like the National Commission for Culture and the Arts (NCCA). The SRs, in addition, are more apprehensive to this plan because such will

entail financial constraints. However, this problem can be addressed if the University will work in partnership with other government and private institutions that can help finance the project.

Table 8
Respondents' attitudes on code mixing, rights to regional and minority languages

Language attitude	Percentage distribution	
	AF&Ps	SRs
A. Code-mixing English and Filipino in class		
• Code mixing should be allowed because it is more student-friendly and easier to understand.	54.37	62.32
• Code mixing should be regulated; that is, concepts should be taught first in Filipino and then in English.	33.98	24.41
• A code mixing should be prohibited because it will delay the development of competence in English or Filipino.	11.65	13.27
B. The right to speak the regional languages		
• The regional languages can be used, provided that the Tagalogs will not be offended.	61.76	56.06
• It is one's linguistic right to speak his regional language.	21.57	23.99
• Only the language used by the majority should be used.	16.67	19.95
C. Publication of materials in the regional languages		
• It should be permitted with respect to the school policies.	52.88	53.32
• It is one's right to self-expression.	27.88	33.41
• The minority has to submit to the majority.	19.34	13.27
D. Preservation and protection of the minority and indigenous languages		
• The University needs to reach out.	56.19	49.76
• The University needs to tie up with other institutions.	41.90	37.97
• The University lacks financial means and logistics.	1.91	13.27

Table 9 shows that both respondents are more comfortable in using both English and Filipino whenever there are special occasions. If only one language is to be used, they prefer to use English more than Filipino during commencement exercises, celebrations of founding anniversary, recognition day, and other similar occasions (63.81% and 57.82%, respectively). As regards the use of an official language for correspondence, the AF&Ps prefer English more than Filipino (50.48%), but the SRs want to use both languages on the condition that technical terms in Filipino have to be standardized (58.43%). Although ideas could be expressed more easily in Filipino, both groups of respondents find using Filipino alone unfavorable (4.76% and 3.80%, respectively).

Table 9***Respondents' attitudes on language use, university correspondence, and naming of halls and offices***

Language attitude	Percentage distribution	
	AF&Ps	SRs
A. Language use during special occasions (commencement exercises, founding anniversary, and recognition day)		
• English and Filipino	63.81	57.82
• Exclusively English	32.38	39.57
• Exclusively Filipino	3.81	2.61
B. Language of university correspondence		
• English should be used because the technical terms are easier to use if written in English.	50.48	37.77
• Either English or Filipino may be used, but technical terms in Filipino should be standardized.	44.76	58.43
• Only Filipino should be used because it is easier to express one's ideas or concepts in Filipino.	4.76	3.80
C. Naming of halls, offices, and academic units		
• Both should be used, with Filipino over English equivalent/transition.	48.57	65.24
• English alone is enough; it is cost-efficient because most of the halls and offices are labelled in English.	46.67	22.86
• Filipino alone should be used, but there should be standard usage, like in the case of <i>kagarawan</i> or <i>departamento</i> .	4.76	11.90

More so, the students feel that if ever halls, offices, and academic units have to be named in English and Filipino, the names have to be in Filipino over the English translations (65.24%). The AF&Ps are more conservative in this regard believing that while it may be important to have the halls, offices, and academic units named in Filipino and English (46.67%), the process could be costly on the part of the University; hence, the use of English should be retained instead. The SRs, in addition, want to have the Filipino translations standardized (11.90%), like *kagawaran* or *departamento*, *pamantasan* or *unibersidad*, *tanggapan* or *opisina*, *dalubhasaan* or *kolehiyo*.

Table 10 shows that the AF&Ps and SRs agree that the key factors in the success of the ongoing LP formulation of the University rests on the right attitude, vision, and mindset of the stakeholders, i.e., administrators, faculty members, personnel, students, and the whole academic community (77.88% and 70.26%, respectively). Again, the SRs express their worries about the financial and logistic components of the program (13.27%), thinking perhaps that it could be an additional burden on their part. Not expecting immediate results, both groups believe that the success of the LP formulation and planning should be evaluated

based on empirical and realistic data (78.10% and 61.19%, respectively). As to giving grants and research incentives to teachers, Table 10 further indicates that the AF&Ps are more receptive than the SRs (67.62% and 49.76%, respectively). Finally, there was no consensus which academic unit should spearhead LP formulation and planning. The AF&Ps opt either for the College of Arts and Letters or for all the colleges and academic units; on the other hand, the SRs prefer to have all the colleges and academic units, especially those in the field of humanities.

Table 10

Respondents' perceptions on success indicators of the policy formulation: stakeholders, research grants, and incentives

Language attitude	Percentage distribution	
	AF&Ps	SRs
A. Key factors for the success of a university-wide LP formulation		
• The right attitude, vision, and mind-set of the people	77.88	70.26
• Financial constraints and resources	9.62	26.86
• Man power and expertise	12.501	2.88
B. Academic unit to spearhead a university-wide LP formulation		
• The College of Art and Letters	39.05	14.05
• All colleges and academic units handling the humanities	21.90	36.67
• All colleges and academic units	39.05	49.28
C. Success indicators		
• There should be immediate results.	11.43	20.95
• Changes should be based on realistic data research.	78.10	61.19
• It will take time to see the changes in the University.	10.47	17.86
D. Research grants and incentives		
• LP implementing needs funding.	67.62	49.76
• Grants and subsidies should come from outside sources.	27.62	36.96
• The University lacks financial means and logistics.	4.76	13.27

The foregoing tables revealed the diverse language background of the respondents. Both groups, the AF&Ps and the SRs, indicate their desire to continue using Filipino and English. Their desire to continue using Filipino can be explained by some reasons, like ethnic pride, cultural heritage, and sense of nationalism:

- English is required in getting a job, but Filipino is our National Language
- Filipino ang ating wika kaya dapat itong pag-aralan (Filipino is our language and we need to study it).
- Using Filipino is a sign of nationalism.
- We should love and not forget our own language.

- There are things that are best expressed in Filipino.
- We use Filipino more often than English.
- There is a need to prioritize our language.
- Mas nakakapagbahagi ng ideya kapag gamit ang Filipino (Ideas are better expressed in Filipino).

While the groups of respondents desire to maintain Filipino, they also recognize the importance of English for practical reasons, like:

- English helps us to be globally competitive.
- English is a universal language.
- English is more widely used and more appropriate in teaching many subjects.
- English gives us more advantages in getting a job.
- English is important, but we need to give importance to both English and Filipino.
- English is needed to compete globally.
- English should be learned in addition to Filipino.
- English and Filipino should be given equal importance because the Philippines is a bilingual country
- English is more difficult than Filipino.
- English is our medium of instruction.
- English competency needs to be promoted.
- Most students are already comfortable with Filipino.
- Many of the graduates of BulSU are not fluent in English.
- Most BulSU students cannot speak well in English.
- There are foreign students in BulSU.

4. Conclusion

While this paper has achieved its objectives in setting the parameters to initiate, formulate, and propose an LP framework for the University, the researcher stresses that the data and findings are based primarily on the perceptions of the respondents. Hence, there is still the need to anchor the proposed LP on other methods, principles, and procedures that were not used in the study to bring more substantial results. The author believes that the gathered empirical data in this study have provided the drive to steer the discourses to elaborate the scope and range of LP formulation and to raise the level of awareness of the BulSU community for the said purpose. Moreover, the author concludes that the language ecology in BulSU is not unique but a microcosm of the language scenario in the Philippines. Hence, the present study, though local in scope, may have some insights to offer to a wide range of readers. Based on the empirical data on the language profile and language attitudes of the members of the

BulSU academic community, reviewed literature and studies, and legal mandates and statutes on language policy in the Philippines and applicable universal declarations, the framework for LP formulation consists of (a) Preliminaries, (b) Preamble, (c) Article I: Linguistic Rights, (d) Article II: The Filipino Language, (e) Article III: The English Language, (f) Article IV: The Philippine Regional Languages, and (g) Article V: Foreign Languages and Foreign Students.

In a much wider perspective, the study affirms that while on the road of cultural reconstruction, the Philippines, being a former colony of the Western powers, is facing the challenges of cultural reconstruction that includes LP formulation.

Many of the findings in the present study also conform to the results of language surveys and studies in the past (Otanés, 1969; Gonzalez & Sibayan, 1988; Castillo, 2000 as cited in Tupas, 2003). One characteristic of the language situation in BulSU is the coexistence of English, Filipino, regional, and some foreign languages. This multilingual condition is not new; in fact, a similar condition had been reported in a national survey of Otanes (1969). Also, the respondents believe that language planning and nationalism are distinct from each other, an observation reported much earlier by Gonzalez and Sibayan (1988) in their evaluation of the BEP in the Philippines and by Castillo (2000 as cited in Tupas, 2003) in her discussion of language education and language planning in the country.

The data in the present study also warrant the need for corpus planning so that Filipino can be used in intellectual discourses. Similar to the advocacy of Gonzalez (2003), corpus planning remains timely and relevant in the Philippines. The dilemma on the status of Filipino as an intellectualized language echoes the advocacy of Sibayan (1988); thus, there is a need to review the level of the intellectualization of Filipino. The growing importance given to the regional languages is also parallel to the provision of the K+12 Program on Mother-Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE). Furthermore, the need to use English in teaching science and technology and Filipino in teaching the soft sciences like social studies and the humanities remains consistent with the provisions of Department Order No. 25, s. 1974; DECS Order No.52, s. 1987; DECS Order No. 54, s. 1987; and DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009.

After having presented the different language policies in Burma, Malaysia, and Singapore, the author acknowledges that the language policies in the Philippines, as reflected by constitutional provisions and statutes, are legitimate actions to chart its course on the road of cultural reconstruction. Hence, there are no reasons for the institutions of higher learning, especially state universities, to remain complacent and unresponsive to these emerging needs of national importance.

While this paper does not endorse the attached framework (cf. Appendix A) to be the Official Language Policy of the Bulacan State University, it proposes that the same document be considered for the said purpose, for it reflects and articulates the language profile and attitudes of the stakeholders in the University: the administrators, faculty members, personnel, and students.

In its 109th year of existence, the Bulacan State University cannot afford to delay the formulation of its language policy if it truly desires to be one of the leading institutions of higher learning in the country.

References

- Abad, L. (2005). Code-switching in the classroom: A clash of two languages. *Faculty Research Journal of Miriam College*, 30(1), 36-52.
- Ager, D. (2001). *Motivation in language planning and policy*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ager, D. (2005). Prestige and image planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1035-1054). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ariffin, K. & Husin, M. S.(2011). Code-switching and code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in content-based classrooms: Frequency and attitudes. *The Linguistics Journal*, 5(1), 220-247.
- Baker, C. (2001). Review of Tove Skutnabb-Kangas: Linguistic genocide in education – or worldwide diversity and human rights? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(2), 279-283.
- Baldauf, R., & Ingram, D. (2003). Language-in-education planning. In W. Frawley (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics* (pp. 412-416). Oxford University Press.
- Baldauf, R., & Kaplan, R. (2003). Language policy decisions and power: Who are the actors? In P. M. Ryan and R. Terborg (Eds.), *Language: Issues of inequality* (pp. 19-37). Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico.
- Baldauf, R. (2005). Language planning and policy: Recent trends, future directions. Retrieved on from <http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/eserv.php?pid=UQ:24518&dsID=LPPCoPap1AAAL04.pdf>
- Bautista, M.L.S. (1977). The noun phrase in Tagalog English code switching. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-16.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (1999). An analysis of the functions of Tagalog-English code-switching: Data from one case. In M.L. Bautista, & G. Chan (Eds.), *The Filipino bilingual: A multidisciplinary perspective: Festschrift in honor of Emy Pascasio* (pp. 19-31). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Bernardo, A.B.I. (2007). Language in Philippine education: Rethinking old fallacies, exploring new alternatives amidst globalization. In T.R.F.Tupas (Ed.), *(Re)Making society: The politics of language, discourse, and identity in the Philippines* (pp. 1-26). University of the Philippines Press.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2011). Studies of Philippine English: Implications for English language teaching in the Philippines. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 2(2), 271-295.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (Ed.). (1996). *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics*. DLSU Press.

-
- Bernardo, A.B.I. (2005). Bilingual code switching as a resource for learning and teaching: Alternative reflections on the language and education issue in the Philippines. In D. Dayag, & S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in Philippines and beyond: A festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes Bautista* (pp. 151-170). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Borlongan, A. (2009). Tagalog-English code-switching in English language classes: Frequency and forms. *TESOL Journal*, 1, 28-42., J.D. (2011). Likert items and scales of measurement? SHIKEN: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter. March 2011. 15(1), 10-14.
- Cárdenas-Claros, M.S. (2009). Code switching and code mixing in Internet chatting: Between 'yes', 'ya', and 'si': A case study. *JALT CALL Journal*, 5(3), 67-78.
- Cenoz, J., & Genesee, F. (Eds.). (1998). *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Clyne, M.G. (1991). *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Cambridge University Press.
- Coombs, C. H. (1960). A theory of data. *Psychological Review*, 67, 143-159.
- Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cruz, C. (1993). Spoken discourse on the campus: A context for language intellectualization. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Philippine Normal University.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- DECS Order No. 52, s. 1987. The 1987 policy on bilingual education.
- DECS Order No. 54, s. 1987. Implementing guidelines for the 1987 policy on bilingual education.
- Department Order No. 25, s. 1974. Implementing guidelines for the policy on bilingual education.
- DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009. Institutionalizing Mother-Tongue-based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE).
- Donnelly, S. (2003). Letter to mail and guardian. Retrieved from <http://englishacademy.co.za/pansalb/multilingualism.pdf>
- Faelnar, M.L.G., & Soriano, J.P. (2003). The impact of government policies on the indigenous languages of the Philippines. Retrieved from <http://www.dila.ph/policiesonlanguages.pdf>
- Fill, A., & Mühlhäusler, P. (Eds.). 2001. *The ecolinguistic reader: Language, ecology and environment*. Continuum.

- Fishman, J. (1996). What do you lose when you lose your language? In Gina Cantoni (Ed.) *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 186-196). Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.
- Fishman, J., Gupta, J., Jernudd, B., & Rubin, J. (1971). Research outline for comparative studies of language planning. In Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. (Eds.) *Can language be planned?* (pp. 293-305). University Press of Hawaii.
- Fonacier-Bernabe, E.J. (1987). *Language policy formulation, programming, implementation and evaluation in the Philippine education (1565-1974)*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Fox, M.J. (1975). *Language and development: A retrospective survey of Ford Foundation language projects, 1952-1974*. The Ford Foundation.
- Gill, S.K. (2008). Shift in language policy in Malaysia: Unravelling reasons for change, conflict and compromise in mother-tongue education In A. Carli and U. Ammon (Eds.), *Linguistic inequality in scientific communication today: What can future applied linguistics do to mitigate disadvantages for non-Anglophones?* *AILA Review*, 20 (pp. 106–122).
- Gonzalez, A. (1997). The Philippine experience in language: The limits of science in language teaching. In E.S. Castillo (Ed.), *Alay sa wika: Essays in honor of Dr. Fe T. Otones on her 67th birthday* (pp. 139-152). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Gonzalez, A., & Sibayan, B. (1988). *Evaluating bilingual education in the Philippines (1974-1985)*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1990). New ways of meaning: A challenge to applied linguistics. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(7), 36.
- Haugen, E. (1983). The Implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In Cobarrubias J., & J. Fishman, *Progress in language planning: International perspectives* (pp. 82-89). Berlin: Mouton.
- Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford University Press.
- Hinkel, E. (Ed.) (2005), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Erlbaum.
- Ho, W.K., & Wong, R.Y. L. (2000). *Language policies and language education: The impact in East Asian countries in the next decade*. Times Academic Press.
- Inductivo, M.B.S. (1994). Code-switching communication strategy on pupil's achievement, attitude and class participation. Unpublished master's thesis, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Ingram, D.E. (1990). Language-in-education planning. In R.B. Kaplan, et al. (Eds.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10 (pp. 53-78). Cambridge University Press.

- Ingram, D.E. (2004). Looking back – Looking forward: A personal perspective. The Keith Horwood Memorial Lecture 2003. *Babel*, 4(15), 28.
- Jakobson, U. (2004). Statistical presentation and analysis of ordinal data in nursing research. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 18, 437-440.
- Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: How to (ab)use them. *Medical Education*, 38, 1212-1218.
- K to 12 toolkit: Resource guide for teacher educators, school administrators and teachers. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.ph/downloads/2012/201209-K-to-12-Toolkit.pdf>
- Kachru, B. (1995). World Englishes: Approaches, issues, and resources. In H.D. Brown, & S.T. Gonzo (Eds.), *Readings on second language acquisition* (pp. 229-261). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Kaplan, R., & Baldauf, R. (1997). Language planning: From practice to theory. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2002). ASEAN and Asian cultures and models: Implications for ELT curriculum and for teacher selection. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *Englishes in Asia: Communication, identity, power and curriculum* (pp. 213-224). Language Australia.
- Knapp, T.R. (1990). Treating ordinal scales as interval scales: An attempt to resolve the controversy. *Nursing Research*, 39, 121-123.
- Kuo, C., & Jernudd, B. (1994). Balancing macro- and micro-sociolinguistic perspectives in language management: The case of Singapore". In Kandiah, T., & Kwan-Terry, J. (Eds.), *English and language planning: A South-East Asian contribution* (pp. 70-89). Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Kuzon, W.M. Jr., Urbanek, M. G., & McCabe, S. (1996). The seven deadly sins of statistical analysis. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, 37, 265-272.
- Lasimbang, R., Miller, C., & Otigil, F. (1992). Language competence and use among Coastal Kadazan children: A survey report. In F. Willem, J. Koen, & S. Kroon (Eds), *Maintenance and loss of minority languages* (pp. 333-55). Benjamins.
- Lee, C. (2006). *Language for learning Mathematics: Assessment for learning in practice*. Open University Press, McGraw Hill.
- Liddicoat, A. (2005). Corpus planning: Syllabus and materials development. Retrieved from <http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/eserv.php?pid=UQ:24518&dsID=LPPCoPap1AAAL04.pdf>
- Lim, J.H. (2013). The changing bilingual grammar: A quasi-diachronic investigation of the syntactic constraints of Tagalog-English code-switching using a grammaticality judgment test. *TESOL Journal*, 7, 58-69.

- Lin, A., & Martin, P. (2005). From a critical deconstruction paradigm to a critical construction paradigm: An introduction to decolonization, globalization and language-in-education policy in practice. In P. Martin, & A. Lin (Eds.), *Decolonisation and globalisation: Language in education policy and practice* (pp. 1-20). Multilingual Matters.
- Luke, A. (2005). Foreword: On the possibilities of a post-colonial language education. In P. Maranan, R. (1999). A description of the instructors' utterances with code-switching and code-mixing in teaching courses taught in English at the University of Batangas, Batangas City. Unpublished Certificate Project, Philippine Normal University.
- Martin, P. (1999). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: Interactional practices in the primary classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(2), 127-40. MBMMB. (2012). MBMMBI: New offer for the Malaysian education system. Retrieved from <http://edufomania.edublogs.org/2012/05/08/mbmmbi-new-offer-for-the-malaysian-education-system/>
- Mishra, A., & Dutta, R. (1999). The Manipuris in the Barak Valley: A case study of language maintenance. *Linguistics of Tibeto-Burman Area*, 22(1), 129-137.
- Mufwene, S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (1996). *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region*. Routledge.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2003). *Language of environment - environment of language: A course in ecolinguistics*. Battlebridge.
- Nivera, G. (2001). Spoken discourse in the tertiary mathematics classroom. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Philippine Normal University.
- Otanes, F. (1969). *Language policy survey of the Philippines*. Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.
- Pakir, A. (1991). Education and invisible language planning: The case of English in Singapore. In Candiah, T., & Kwan-Terry, J. (Eds.), *English and language planning: A South East Asian contribution* (pp. 158-179). Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Pakir, A. (1991). The range and depth of English-knowing bilingualism in Singapore. *World Englishes*, 10, 167-179.
- Patten, A. (2001). Political theory and language policy. *Political Theory*, 29(5), 691-715.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7-8), 581-618.
- Rajandran, K. (2008). Language planning for the Malay language in Malaysia since independence. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, 2(2), 237-248.

- Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. (Eds.). (1971). *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. University Press Hawaii.
- Samida, D.K., & Takahashi, J. (n.d.). World Englishes (3): Malaysian and Philippine English. Retrieved from <http://libro.do-bunkyo.ac.jp/research/pdf/treatises12/05-samida.pdf>
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in the ELT classroom. *The ITESL Journal*, 9(8). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>
- Sibayan, B. (1988). The intellectualization of Filipino. Retrieved from <http://www.ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/articles-on-c-na/articlephp?igm=3&i=210>
- Sibayan, B. (1996). The intellectualization of Filipino. In M.L.S. Bautista (Ed.), *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics* (pp. 240-253). De La Salle University Press.
- Singh, Y.K. (2006). *Fundamentals of research methodology and statistics*. New Age International Publishers.
- Smedley, F.P. (2006). Code-switching and identity on the blogs: An analysis of Taglish in computer mediated communication. Unpublished Thesis, AUT University, Auckland.
- Spolsky, B. (2005). Language policy. In J. Cohen, K.T. McAlister, K. Rolstad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (pp. 2152-2164). Cascadilla Press.
- Sugbo, V. (2003). Language policy and local literature in the Philippines. Retrieved from http://www.sil.org/asia/ldc/parallel_papers/victor_n_sugbo.pdf
- The 1987 Philippine Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.ph/the-philippine-constitutions/the-1987-constitution-of-the-republic-of-the-philippines/>
- The 1935 Philippine Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. Retrieved from <http://www.lawphil.net/consti/cons1935.html>
- Tollefson, J. (2002). (Ed.) *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tupas, T.R.F. (1998). Code switching as resistance: A Philippine experience. Paper presented at the LEDCO-LSRCI International Conference on Language Education. Manila Midtown Hotel, Philippines.
- Tupas, T.R.F. (2003). History, language planners, and strategies of forgetting: The problem of consciousness in the Philippines. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 27(1), 1-25.
- Tupas, T.R.F. (2009). World Englishes or worlds of English? Pitfalls of a postcolonial discourse in Philippine English. In M.L.S. Bautista, & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 67-86). Anvil.

- Valdez, P.N.M. (2010). Powerless in policy, powerful in practice: Critical insights on pedagogical code switching in Philippine context. In Watzke, J., M. Mantero, & Chamness-Miller, P. (Eds.), *Readings in language studies volume 2: Language and power* (pp. 7-21). Florida: International Society for Language Studies.
- Vigderhous, G. (1977). The level of measurement and 'permissible' statistical analysis in social research. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 20(1), 61-72.
- Wee, L. 2002. Linguistic instrumentalism in Singapore. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(4), 282-295.
- Xu, Z. (2002) From TEFL to TEIL: Changes in perceptions and practices: Teaching English as in international language in Chinese universities in P.R. China. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *Englishes in Asia: Communication, identity, power and curriculum* (pp. 225-244). Language Australia.
- 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/events/human rights/2007/hrphotos/declaration%20_eng.pdf
- 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Retrieved from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>
- 1990 Universal Declaration of the Collective Rights of Peoples. Retrieved from http://www.slmc.uottawa.ca/?q=int_rights_cesn

Appendix A

The proposed language policy of Bulacan State University

Preliminaries

Having regard to the preamble and second article of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights which expresses its “faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women”; and that “everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms” regardless of “race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status”;

Having regard to Article 27 of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights which, in their preambles, state that human beings cannot be free unless conditions are created which enable them to enjoy both their civil and political rights and their economic, social, and cultural rights;

Having regard to the 1990 Universal Declaration of the Collective Rights of Peoples, which declares that all peoples have the right to express and develop their culture, language, and rules of organization and, to this end, to adopt political, educational, communications, and governmental structures of their own, within different political frameworks;

Having regard to the Final Declaration adopted in 1991 by the General Assembly of the International Federation of Modern Language Teachers, which recommended that linguistic rights be considered as fundamental rights of the individual;

Considering that, in order to ensure peaceful coexistence between language communities, overall principles must be found so as to guarantee the promotion and respect of all languages and their social use in public and in private;

In view of the language provisions of the Philippine Constitution of 1987 in Article IX that declares:

“The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages. Subject to provisions of law and as the Congress may deem appropriate, the Government shall take steps to initiate and sustain the use of Filipino as a medium of official communication and as language of instruction in the educational system.”

“For purposes of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, until otherwise provided by law, English. The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in the regions and shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction therein. Spanish and Arabic shall be promoted on a voluntary and optional basis.”

“The Congress shall establish a national language commission composed of representatives of

various regions and disciplines which shall undertake, coordinate, and promote researches for the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages.”

In view of Sec. 7 of RA 7665, the Charter of the Bulacan State University, states that, “The Board shall promulgate and implement policies in accordance with the declared state policies on education and other pertinent provisions of the Philippine Constitution on education, science and technology, arts, culture and sports.”

Preamble

The Bulacan State University, acknowledging that language is the most distinct human characteristic, the expression of the collective soul of a people, an indispensable instrument in nation building, and a tool for cultural advancement and economic progress, declares this language policy.

Article I. Linguistic Rights

- Section 1. The University shall welcome and embrace language diversity and differences as richness of the cultural heritage of the Philippines.
- Section 2. The University shall accord equal respect and importance to all languages.
- Section 3. The University shall encourage and support the publication of literary, scientific, and technical materials in Filipino, English, regional, and applicable foreign languages.
- Section 4. No school policy or regulation shall be proposed, approved, and implemented abridging the linguistic rights of any person in the University.
- Section 5. The University shall create an interim body to determine and decide on the domains and the corresponding status of English and Filipino as regards their functions and official correspondence in the University.
- Section 6. The University shall endeavor to promote an ideal breeding ground for the development of Filipino, English, and other applicable languages.
- Section 7. The University shall encourage every teacher to become a language teacher.
- Section 8. No person shall be denied the exercise of his linguistic rights.

Article II. The Filipino Language

- Section 1. The University shall require and promote proficiency in Filipino for national identity.
- Section 2. The University shall strive to be one of the leading institutions of higher learning known for excellence and scholarship in Filipino language and literature.
- Section 3. The University shall participate with regional and national institutions in the efforts and initiatives on the globalization of Filipino.
- Section 4. The University shall support research activities and the publication in Filipino of works in, but not limited to, the humanities, literature, performing arts, pure sciences, social sciences, visual arts, and technology.
- Section 5. The University shall encourage, initiate, and monitor the translation of relevant and important documents in the University and beyond.
- Section 6. The University shall encourage, monitor, and support the production of instructional materials in Filipino to provide the corpus of technical terms and pedagogical idioms for the arts, sciences, and technical courses.
- Section 7. A center for translation services shall be established by the University through the initiatives of and support from the departments of Filipino and English.
- Section 8. Initiatives in the modernization and intellectualization of Filipino shall be encouraged and supported by all the academic units of the University.

- Section 9. Research initiatives and activities for the standardization of Filipino shall be promoted and supported by the University.
- Section 10. Incentives and research grants shall be made available to encourage publication of scholarly materials in Filipino in the country and beyond.
- Section 11. Sharing of best practices, technology, and resources with institutions of higher learning and similar regional, national, and international agencies shall be pursued and promoted.
- Section 12. The extension services of the University shall be made accessible in Filipino and English, when applicable and necessary.
- Article III. The English Language
- Section 1. The use of English as a medium of instruction shall be maintained in teaching the sciences, mathematics, and technical subjects until such time that shifting to Filipino becomes possible because of its modernization and intellectualization.
- Section 2. The University shall have the option to continue using English in teaching the social sciences with a nationalistic fervor.
- Section 3. English proficiency shall be promoted for global competency without prejudice to Filipino and other Philippine languages.
- Section 4. The English language shall retain its status both as an international and intranational language in the University until such time that Filipino becomes the medium in the study of commerce, computer technology, education, engineering, governance, law, mass media, medicine, and other technical courses.
- Article IV. The Philippine Regional Languages
- Section 1. The University shall respect and value the use of regional languages as components and requisites for learning Filipino and English.
- Section 2. Regional languages shall be protected for their historical literary and cultural importance.
- Section 3. Research studies on regional languages shall be intensified with financial incentives from the University and any other relevant institutions in the country.
- Section 4. Regional and national seminars on Philippine languages and literature, like Bicol, Cebuano, Chavacano, Hiligaynon, Ilocano, Kapampangan, Kinaray-a, Samar-Leyte (Waray), Maguindanao, Maranao, Pangasinense, Tagalog, Tausug, and any other regional languages, shall be encouraged and participated in by the University.
- Section 5. Research studies on the importance of the linguistic and literary traditions of Bulacan to the development and advancement of Filipino shall be pursued and supported by the University.
- Article V. Foreign Languages and Foreign Students
- Section 1. The University shall support and continue the study, teaching, and use of foreign languages for wider communication.
- Section 2. Foreign students shall be given an option to study and learn the Filipino language as an elective subject.
- Section 3. Intercultural exchanges and understanding shall be promoted through cross-linguistic activities.
- Section 4. Appreciation of the linguistic and literary traditions of the ASEAN and beyond shall be integrated across relevant disciplines.