

than the problems of community development. The company has met the challenges of increasing material productivity, changing technology, and shifting markets with significant success. Finding the solution to many of the community problems, however, appears somewhat less easy. As a corporation, for example, we are concerned with:

- (a) absentee landlordism and a growing detachment of the landowner from the production processes on the land;
- (b) structural unemployment as new agricultural techniques are developed or as the population expands more rapidly than employment opportunities;
- (c) an increasing tendency toward biculturalism which separates the agricultural worker from the industrial worker;

- (d) social and cultural instability with its increasing manifestations of individual and group irresponsibility;
- (e) uneven opportunities for individuals in the society to participate in the development processes or the fruits of development.

The papers that follow cover a wide gamut of subjects and display widely different approaches to the social and cultural problems of a developing society. These papers will not necessarily provide all or even any of the answers to the problems before us — nor will they ask all the questions that can be or should be asked concerning such problems. It is our hope and expectation, however, that they will provide increasing insights into the social transition now taking place and will provide more and more people with an awareness and an understanding of problems which can be ignored only with increasing harm to the large society in which we live.

Language in Relation to Social Change

EMY M. PASCASIO

*Ateneo de Manila University
Loyola Heights, Quezon City*

This paper is an attempt to show the interaction between language and social change. Firstly, we are faced with the task of understanding the nature of language and its functions, some of which are indispensable to human society. Secondly, since human society constantly undergoes changes, how do these affect language? Thirdly, what is the current language issue in the Philippines?

Nature and Functions of Language

There are several ways of looking at language. To many, language is the most

important form of human communication. To others, language is a form of order, a pattern, a code system. This means that each item is what it is by virtue of its place in the system. There is a coherent arrangement of interrelated parts into a unified whole that makes possible the repetition of the same events or actions. The code of language consists of phonetic sounds, e.g., /a/, /t/, /p/; combinations of these sounds to form the vocabulary, e.g., *at*, *pat*, *tap*; and syntactical elements which form constructions, e.g., *He drinks beer*; *I/We drink beer*. Every language operates

with a limited number of basic sounds and other phonetic features such as stress and intonation. In some languages, certain of these may appear only in the middle and at the end of a word, for example, in English, the sound /ng/ occurs only in the middle and at the end of the word (e.g., *sing*, *singing*) whereas in Tagalog it occurs at the beginning, middle, and end of the word (e.g., *ngayon*, *bangon*, *bayong*); certain combinations of sounds and sound sequences may occur, for example, in English, the consonant clusters found in the words, *lists*, *glimpse*, *qualms*, do not occur in Tagalog. Thus, this limited range of manipulative devices is characterized by a high degree of patterning which vary from one language to another.

Each system is a unique system. The system itself has nothing to do with any other system. English is not Tagalog and no part of English can function in the Tagalog system, e.g., the verb system, the use of Tagalog particles. The parts of any system of language exist simply because they are there in that system. Parts of one language system cannot be substituted with other parts of another system. Thus, the system of the Tagalog language and the system of the English language are unique and are not interchangeable even in parts.¹

Language, being the integrating mechanism of society, is a means of transmitting messages from one person to another. It is made up of messages that are produced in such a way as to be decoded in the easiest and most economical form. The length and arrangement of words and sentences, the nature and relation of speech sounds, and the lexicon, have evolved in such a way as to promote an economical but powerful means of communication.

¹ Emy M. Pascasio, "Code of Behavior: The Relations Between Linguistic and Nonlinguistic Behavioral Patterns," *Philippine Sociological Review*. XI: 3-4 (July-October 1963), 245.

We do not so much share thoughts as arouse similar thoughts or feelings, reactions or ideas in the mind of another by means of language. Henry Lee Smith, Jr. defines language "as a system of arbitrary symbols by means of which the members of a speech community or subcultural group interact and hence communicate with each other in terms of common values, attitudes, assumptions, and common experiences."²

Language is a form of social behavior. Members of a social group use language as a means for interaction. As social scientists, we are interested in man's behavior in so far as it affects or is affected by other human beings. We view social behavior as action-oriented toward others. Such behavior can be regarded as a stimulus with some expectancy on the part of the actor concerning the response he is likely to elicit. This response in turn becomes a stimulus capable of bringing forth a further response. This exchange of stimuli and responses among human actors viewed as the core of human existence may be applied to this phenomenon called *social interaction*.

Social interaction ceases to be a hit-or-miss proposition only when mutual expectations have proven reasonably accurate. This is much more likely to happen between two members of the same social group than between two strangers, the principal reason being the fact that fellow members of the same group can communicate through a common system of symbols. Linguistic phenomena are conditioned by the social group, by circumstances which are socially determined — both the linguistic patterns of the community and non-

² Henry Lee Smith, Jr. "Language and Culture," *Culture in Language Learning* Supplementary Report of the 1960 Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, G. Reginald Bishop, Jr. and Jack Undank (eds.), (New Brunswick, N.J.: The State University, 1960), p. 21.

linguistic group habits, e.g., customs such as taboo or courtesy or the like.

Previous to the invention of printing, most social interaction was direct and unmediated. The exchange of verbal stimuli and responses between two or more members of a social group called for a face-to-face confrontation. With the appearance of graphic symbols, the possibilities of communication multiplied in every direction. Today, we communicate by mail over enormous distances. Libraries, archives, bookstores are built for preservation and dissemination of recorded words. The many inventions for the recording and transmission of sounds have further amplified the already vast area of communication created by graphic symbols. The telephone, the radio, the movies, TV, the tape, wire, and plastic recordings — all of these have done away with, or at least reduced, the incidence of individual isolation, and at the same time weakened the habit of more direct and intimate forms of interpersonal communication.

Modern man under the impact of such processes as increased social mobility, the breakdown of kinship ties, and the growing instrumental character of human relations is being drawn increasingly into an ever-widening circle of less direct and less intimate contacts. The cocktail party, where one may meet two or three dozens of people and exchange fragments of communication with a few, is typical of the growing impersonality of social life.

Language as a Component of Culture

The functioning of human societies is not founded on a set of innate, instinctive, and inherited abilities and skills, sufficient for human survival. Individuals and societies are fundamentally dependent on technological devices for facing the physical world and on social conventions in solving the problems of life in social groups.

Both these devices and conventions vary from one society to another, keep changing from generation to generation, diffuse among human groups through borrowing and imitation, and form a collective possession which every new member of a group has to learn to understand and use. These technical and social inventions are attributes of culture. As defined by Kluckhohn and Kelly, culture is a "historically derived system of explicit and implicit designs for living, which tends to be shared by all or specially designated by members of a group." What man learns during acculturation is an organized set of behavioral patterns which he abstracts from and applies to situations of his daily experience as these arise. When new situations arise there emerge in the social group new patterns of living and modification of old patterns, abstracted consciously or unconsciously, from the situations and faced by the members of the group. It is this feature of cumulated patterns of living that characterizes human culture.³

Language is one of the major components of culture in that it enables men not only to make their own experiences in learning continuous but also to participate vicariously in the past and present experiences and learning of others who are or who have been members of the group. This process does not occur haphazardly or erratically, but within the framework of culturally and linguistically circumscribed possibilities.

Language in Relation to Social Change

Since change is inherent in every society and language is one of its indispensable tools some of the issues raised are as follows:

³ Clyde Kluckhohn and William Kelly, "The Concept of Culture," *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, Ralph Linton (ed.), (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), p. 98.

1. What are the things in language that change?
2. Where do these changes occur?
3. What are the social factors that underlie such changes?

Everything changes — sounds and other phonetic features, morphology, syntactic patterns, and semantic consensus. Changes take place everywhere and nowhere in particular. Every native speaker of a given language may at some time quite unconsciously experience the need to modify any one of the features of his speech in some manner. This may be imitated and thus perpetuated or it may be ignored and become eventually forgotten. However, most changes within a specific speech community appear to follow a recognizable trend. Usually, enough survives of the past in a modern language to establish the continuity of its identity.

The patterns of change in the meaning of words and sentences are more directly related to our concern with the social aspects of language. Language is clearly a direct reflection of human affairs. Every change in beliefs, attitudes, or social institutions affects words and their meanings. Some of the social factors underlying changes in language include:

1. The movements of rural populations to the cities and of urban populations to the suburbs.
2. Conquest by a foreign-speaking group (for example, the Spaniards and Americans in the Philippines). There is incorporation of foreign linguistic elements under the influence of political, administrative, and economic factors.
3. The fluctuating status of regional, occupational, educational segments in the population of a nation or an

area affect their respective speech habits.

4. Social mobility promotes blending of regional or social speech patterns especially in industrial areas and in urban communities.
5. The diffusion of new systems of ideas with their specific terminologies and stylistic patterns brought about by the new mass media of communication, including the newspaper, radio and television.

Many societies in the Far East, Africa, and the Middle East are at present undergoing the process of urbanization and industrialization. The new way of life creates needs and demands for which the language of these societies has no provision. The language problem created by these developments is met, on the one hand, by translating foreign terms into native equivalents, and, on the other, by adopting foreign words with a minimum of phonetic adjustments.

The Language Situation in the Philippines

The language situation, which is rather complex, is one of the crucial issues the country faces at present. To support such claim the following elements are cited: (1) there exists no language common to the whole Archipelago; (2) the number of native languages may be estimated at anything from 40 to 90, depending on where one may care to draw the line between language and dialect; (3) most of these native languages are not mutually intelligible; (4) no single native is understood by more than 38 per cent of the population. This situation is complicated by the fact that in some regions two or more native languages are spoken side by side; (5) three languages are acknowledged as official languages — English, Spanish and Pilipino. After 350 years of Spa-

nish occupation, less than 10 per cent of the population spoke Spanish. After 50 years of American occupation less than 2 per cent speak Spanish, and 37 per cent speak English. Perhaps the national language called Pilipino, based on Tagalog, may succeed in becoming the language spoken by 80 to 90 per cent of the total population of the Philippines; but this is an open question.⁴

Most Filipinos are bilingual or multilingual, that is, they can speak one or more Philippine languages, English and perhaps Spanish or even Chinese. How do they use these languages in the present Philippine society?

When one seeks to use the facts concerning the publications, readings, and systematic studies to discover the best solutions to the language problem, the answers can only be tentative.

Today, in Manila and the adjacent cities where people flock for different purposes, English and Pilipino are preferred. In schools, particularly in higher institutions of learning, English is the medium of instruction. However, outside of school premises or even after classes, when local topics are discussed by the students, especially those who come from other linguistic groups such as Tagalog, Bisayan, Bikol, and Iloko, they use Pilipino and English interchangeably. It is true that the non-Tagalogs have to first undergo adjustments, some of which are:

1. A break through the regional attitude of language loyalty, i.e., the language they speak is the best, so why bother learning another Philippine language?
2. Pilipino, the national language, a required course in schools in the lower

levels is very different from the spoken form that is used for social interaction.

3. To be able to cope with the social pressures in the urban areas which may differ or not even exist in the rural areas.

This situation holds true for those who come to Manila looking for work. In the case of the employer-employee relationship, a common medium of communication is sought. When the system of operation is internationally oriented, then English is preferred, for instance, oil companies, banks, and business firms. On the other hand, where national orientation exists such as rural banks, local factories and stores, then the Philippine language spoken in the area is preferred.

English versus Pilipino

One of the controversial issues widely discussed among Filipinos in the newspapers, radio, and TV is the question on *English versus Pilipino*, the national language based on Tagalog.

It is not our function as social scientists to take sides on the issue but it is our job to observe and explain facts objectively. As a Filipino, as well as a social scientist, I would like to present here some cogent arguments from both sides as gathered from other Filipinos who hold sharply differing views on the subject.

Among the advantages which the Filipinos derive from their widespread knowledge of English are as follows:

1. Most Filipinos feel that on the whole, their country has gained tremendous progress by the ideas and institutions which they have absorbed from Western civilization. They attribute this primarily to their use of English since it is the *lingua*

⁴ Emy M. Pascasio, "The Language Situation in the Philippines," *Philippine Studies*, Special Issue. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University. (in press).

- franca* for science, scholarship, regional and international cooperation and diplomacy; it has therefore served as their gateway to this achievement. The use of English has kept the Philippines in close contact with the rest of the world. Other developing nations are now going out of their way to learn English so it would be ironic if the Philippines should discard such a precious tool at this time. It would be like turning back the hands of time should we decide to replace English with one of the Philippine languages which is not adequately equipped to cope with the worldwide demands in most of the modern human societies. Without English the Philippines would not be in its present state of development in most fields of endeavor as compared to its neighboring countries.
2. English has given to a sufficiently large proportion of Filipinos a world language to serve the needs of business, higher education, and international relations, and one which gives them access to the resources of a vast and adequate literature. There is no Philippine language which has the technical vocabulary for treating more than the simplest scientific concepts. However appropriate the national language may be for expressing ideas about everyday affairs, it cannot yet serve as a language of higher instruction. It is not merely that essential words are lacking, for of course, words maybe adopted or created as fast as they are needed. The real difficulty is that the Filipinos are not numerous enough or wealthy enough to produce an adequate scientific and technological literature.
 3. Although there are grounds for believing that Pilipino, the national language, based upon Tagalog may eventually be widely acceptable by all Filipinos the difficulties of the task and the time required for its completion may easily be underestimated. The replacement of English by Pilipino as the medium of instruction would necessitate changes in the entire educational process. In the first place, the new idiom itself would have to be developed and taught to the teacher, a large proportion of whom are not proficient in Pilipino. Then the curriculum would have to be rewritten, new courses of study planned and made teachable by the preparation and publication of textbooks, supplementary reading and teachers' manuals. The technique of teaching in the new idiom would necessarily be different from that which the teachers have acquired for conducting their classes in English; and it would be different in the Tagalog and non-Tagalog areas. If the unifying influence exerted by the free transfer of teachers from one language area to another were to be continued, additional teacher training would be required. The use of Pilipino as the medium of school administration would present serious problems for both administrators and the teachers. One can think of other problems which would arise from a change-over from English to Pilipino, and doubtless in practice, others which are not anticipated would present themselves.
 4. English seems to appeal more to non-Tagalog speakers who strongly hold on to their own native language which, they claim, is as good or even better than Pilipino for communica-

tion purposes. English is therefore a more effective unifying force used by the different Philippine linguistic groups.

5. Those who advocate the permanent retention of English as the medium of instruction in the schools point to the progress that has been made in the diffusion of this tongue among the masses through the help of the new mass media of communication including radio, television, and newspapers. They interpret the growth of the native language press as a result of the established educational process, relying chiefly upon the generally accepted conclusion that literacy in English carries with it literacy in the native tongue. Their view is that the progress which is being made towards the goal of universal literacy in a common tongue, English, need only be continued through the improvement and extension of the public school system. The result, they believe, would be literacy in both English and the Philippine languages and a richer culture than would be attainable if the latter alone were available to the Filipinos.

On the other hand, the Filipinos who believe that Pilipino, the national language, based on Tagalog should become the language of instruction support their position with the following arguments:

1. They point to the undeniable fact that in over forty years, English has made relatively little progress towards becoming, in any real or vital sense, the common language of the masses. Few of the common people outside Manila and a number of the most advanced provinces use it from choice. When circumstances compel them to speak it,

most of the barrio folks who compose the provincial masses do so without confidence, clarity, or precision; when they listen to it, they hear it without complete comprehension. To those who have received only four years of schooling or less, it is a half-forgotten foreign tongue of which they never had any real command.

2. The advocates of primary instruction in Pilipino declare that perpetuation of the present system would accentuate the gap between the masses and the minority of the people who already exercise most of the economic and political power in the country. This, they believe, would prevent the development of genuine democracy.
3. Filipino children will achieve a better intellectual development if their primary schooling is in a native tongue. True, the vast majority who do not progress beyond the fourth grade will know no English, but the little English that they now acquire is of little use to them and will be of still less importance when they have a really good command of a native tongue which is a common, national, official language. As for those who pass through the elementary and secondary schools, their English will be as good as it is now. Perhaps it will even be better for their capacity for learning will be greater after a primary schooling in the language of their homes and they will be instructed by much better qualified teachers of English than can ever be put in the thousands of primary classrooms. Thus, most of the benefits flowing from the present way of teaching English will be retained and its disadvantages eliminated.

4. The "puristic approach" is now being abandoned in favor of one enriching the national language by extensive borrowing from English, Spanish, and other foreign languages. There is a movement at present to upgrade the use as well as the study of Pilipino. Instead of imposing it on the people it is now allowed to develop according to its usage. We should bear in mind that its development should not be hampered so that it will be able to serve as an adequate medium for communication among Filipinos whether they be Bisayan, Iloko, or Tagalog. Filipino writers and educators should help promote the enrichment of the national language. Instead of using English in the teaching of Philippine studies and character formation, Pilipino should be used because it codifies Philippine reality. Thus, distortion is eliminated.

It is a fact that we are faced with a dilemma. The proposed educational revolution would be difficult and costly. It might seriously reduce the efficiency of the school system at a time when the young Philippine Republic could ill afford confusion and dissatisfaction which would affect almost every home in the land. If the political branches of the Philippine Government decide that the national language, Pilipino, is to become the medium of instruction in the whole educational system, the educational authorities should also be prepared to make the required transition without permanently damaging the schools. Thus, they should be provided with the means and time which would be required for this tremendous task. The decision, however, would be a serious one and presumably it would be officially made only after the most mature deliberation and after consideration of expert advice

as to the expense involved, the time that would be required to prepare for and accomplish the change, and the immediate and permanent effects of such change upon the schools and the Filipinos.

At the present time, most Filipinos especially those in the suburban areas and industrial cities such as Manila, Cebu, Bacolod, and Davao, use English in business transactions in the courts, for documents, and in order to communicate among themselves as well as with foreigners. English is still the *lingua franca* in the Philippines for science, scholarship, regional and international cooperation, and diplomacy. Although it is true that one meets Filipinos who say "base" instead of "vase", "team" instead of "theme", and "pool" when they mean "pull", such type of substitutions where misunderstanding actually occurs is probably not crucial. This phonetic difficulty is partly due to the differences between the native language and English. The real issue which is rather crucial lies in the matter of Filipinos misunderstanding each other when they speak English. The problem is not so much that of a communication breakdown among Filipinos when English is used with Philippine reality as a common frame of reference, for instance, a Tagalog and a Bisayan using English as intermediary language for a local situation. But what happens when the communicator (the speaker) is a Tagalog, or an American, using an English frame of reference and the communicatee (the listener) is a Bisayan or a Tagalog using a Philippine frame of reference? If two frames of reference are unconsciously used, then there may not even be communication going on because there is no common set of structured mutual expectations. A frame of reference may be partly or wholly the product of the speakers' experiences. It also includes attitudes — attitude towards the subject, towards the sender, towards

the group if a group is involved, and towards communication itself.

The present situation in the Philippines regarding the use of English is rather interesting. English is used as the code to express Philippine reality. Often Filipino gestures, Filipino value judgments such as the use of time are expressed in English — a code which is supposed to express attitudes, values, and behavioral patterns other than Filipino.⁵ If we use English this way are we not creating another Philippine language to add to the more than seventy that we already have? Is this kind of English adequate for communication in international conferences, publications, appreciation of English literature, cross-cultural understanding? If not, are we trying to develop two forms of English, one that is understood only by Filipinos and the other that which can be used for international communication? If we do, which one should we choose? We should bear in mind, however, that certain questions continually come up:

1. Will the Filipino accept and adopt the attitude and values of English native speakers when he is using the English language? In other words, should he behave like an English native speaker?
2. Will the Filipino using English linguistic and non-linguistic patterns lose his own national identity?
3. Does Filipino society allow the use of English the way English native speakers use it?
4. Are the present methods in teaching English and the content chosen adequate so that Filipinos can use English as proficiently as its native speakers? What is the direction of

the present trend in the improvement of English instruction? How far will it achieve the goal of direct communication with the world?

Perhaps we should look more closely into the teaching of English here in the Philippines. Are we teaching it with a lot of compromises? The appropriate methods of teaching English differ markedly from country to country. In each situation, instruction must be grounded on well-defined objectives which will then determine the content, method, and techniques to be utilized. Any attempt to improve or change the method and techniques is futile if the objectives are not clearly and accurately formulated. Also, these objectives are of no use unless the problem is well described and fully understood.

Should the language used in the daily newspaper *The Sun* be further developed? This newspaper is a twelve-page, bi-weekly, published by the Kalayaan Publishing Company, Incorporated of Manila. It started publication on April 1, 1966 with an initial circulation of 10,000 copies. After four months the circulation increased to 140,000. By the end of December 1966 there were 160,000 copies distributed all over the country. According to the editorial of the first issue, *The Sun* is written by Filipinos for Filipinos. It uses a mixture of English and Tagalog. It is the first time that the common phenomenon of mixing English with Tagalog has been reduced to its written form.

A Master of Arts thesis⁶ has just been completed at the Ateneo de Manila University describing the state of mixture of English and Tagalog elements that appear in the data gathered from the issues of *The Sun*. The analysis consisted of: (1)

⁵ Emy M. Pascasio, *Codes of Behavior: The Relations Between Linguistic and Nonlinguistic Behavioral Patterns*, *op. cit.*, 249.

⁶ Fortunata Azores, "A Preliminary Investigation of the Phenomenon of Language Change in the Philippines," Master of Arts Thesis, Ateneo Graduate School, 1967.

identification of the elements involved in the mixture; (2) characteristics of the elements involved in the mixture; (3) a frequency count of the occurrence of similar elements that appear in the data studied. The findings indicated that this mixture is neither English nor Tagalog but a *third language*. English words outnumber Tagalog words, the proportion of which is three to one. English phrases outnumber Tagalog phrases — two to one. But the English words and phrases form sentences that follow Tagalog structural patterns as many times as they form sentences that follow English structural patterns.

This mixed form may be referred to as contact vernacular. It is a by-product of language and culture in contact. When an art, a science, a fashion, or a game comes to the Philippines from other places it usually brings with it its own vocabulary. To create new expressions for ideas and objects that have already been named is a difficult and unnecessary task. It takes less time and effort to adopt terms than invent them. However, this particular contact vernacular is restricted only to the individuals to whom English and Tagalog language and culture have come in contact which is the case here in the Philippines.

The *Taliba* experiment, on the other hand, attempts to incorporate foreign words and phrases in their original form into Pilipino, the national language. The *Taliba* newspaper is written in Pilipino which corresponds to the spoken form used in Manila and its nearby cities. It serves as the counterpart of the daily newspapers written in English such as *The Manila Times*, *The Chronicle*, *Bulletin*, etc. Congressional hearings are now being con-

ducted on the development of a common language acceptable to all Filipinos.

By its very nature and function language as we have discussed it in this paper, cannot be legislated. To direct the efforts in order to achieve worthwhile results, scholars, linguists, and other experts in the field of language and related fields should be invited to participate in the discussions on the language issue. With their insights and from their systematic studies in the field of language, they can enlighten those who only have an impressionistic view of the language problem. As a matter of fact, every Filipino should be challenged and must actively participate in the formulation of language policies instead of being complacent about it and leaving the whole task in the hands of only a few. Imposing a language upon others does not help solve the problem but complicates it further.

It is high time for us to make up our minds as to what we really want as Filipinos. Let us define clearly and precisely our goals so that every Filipino knows and understands what is expected of him and what he can expect as a member of a changing society. What are the factors blocking the realization of the goals that are set up?

This issue on language should no longer be postponed nor ignored. Functional bilingualism between Pilipino and English to promote both national and international communication should be looked into as a possible solution. Bilingualism is not such an impractical thing in this country where it is commonplace. Limiting ourselves to one language will not solve the graver national problem of achieving identity and nationhood.