


A Survey of the Language Situation in Selected Areas in Mindanao

NANCY FE M. PUNO

The Rationale:

The need to address the problem of language planning in Mindanao is one of the areas of concern for the Language Studies Program of the Mindanao Advanced Education Program of the Commission on Higher Education (MAEP-CHED). This survey, conducted in selected areas in Mindanao, seeks to provide the preliminary framework for wider applications in resolving pervasive intercultural language problems in multi-lingual and multi-ethnic situations in the Mindanao context considering that any language policy modification has to take into consideration vital issues such as the development of non-national/minority languages, the problem of de-ethnicization and minorization, language rights and ethnolinguistic vitality.

The bilingual educational policy adopted in 1974, has mandated the use of Filipino as the medium of instruction in schools for all subjects except natural science and mathematics for which English is used. The move to replace English with Filipino for teaching the two subjects, whereby English will be relegated to a foreign language in the curriculum, has spawned a new wave of controversy over Filipino, not only as medium of instruction, but also as the national language. Out-

 NANCY FE M. PUNO, former Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Social Sciences, holds an M.A. in Language Teaching from the University of the Philippines. She is presently pursuing her Ph.D. in Language Studies under the CHED-MAEP program.

side of the Tagalog-speaking regions, the problem of using Filipino as medium of instruction is often seen as a linguistic imposition from the center of power. For many non-Tagalogs, Filipino is, in addition to English, a second language. Resistance is very strong in some areas. The Cebuanos, for example, led a language revolt in 1988, preferring English to Filipino. How has Mindanao responded to the same controversy after ten years? What is the language situation in multi-ethnic, multi-lingual Mindanao?

The Objectives of the Study

This study is a preliminary language background survey in selected areas in Mindanao from three sets of informants: teachers, pupils, and parents of school children in grades 1 to 3 of one rural and one urban elementary public school. The objectives are to assess the language situation in selected areas in Mindanao in order to acquire a sound data base for language planning and to evaluate the gains or deficits of the national bilingual policy that is currently in effect.

The Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in five (5) purposively selected major cities in Mindanao namely; Marawi, Iligan, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos and Zamboanga, and the town of Malabang in Lanao del Sur. In each area, two schools were chosen, one urban and one rural. Only one section each of grades 1,2, and 3 was randomly chosen from each school.

In Marawi City two sample groups were surveyed, one in the town proper and the other in the Mindanao State University campus. In Iligan, three areas were chosen for their linguistic diversity; a mixed Sebuano and Maranao area, a predominantly Sebuano area, and a Higa-unon, Maranao, Sebuano area. In Cagayan de Oro, a predominantly Sebuano-speaking area, only one set each of rural and urban group was surveyed. A mixed T'boli-Sebuano group was sampled in General Santos City, whereas in Zamboanga City, a predominantly Chavacano-speaking area with mixed Sebuano/Muslim population was selected for both the rural and urban groups. The town of Malabang in Lanao del sur was selected for its unique position among Maranao-speaking areas: its reputation for being the only place in Mindanao where Christians and Muslims live relatively at peace with one another.

The Subjects of the Study

There were three sets of respondents for each section in grades 1,2, and 3 in each school; the pupils, the parents and the teachers. Each section from each grade level was chosen by simple random sampling with replacement. The parents of the selected group become automatically the parent-respondents. The teacher of the selected section also became one of the five teacher-respondents per grade level chosen by simple random sampling. In cases where the number of teachers did not reach five, all the teachers of that grade level were made respondents.

The data collection period was from October 15 to October 31, 1998. The collation and synthesis of the findings were finalized on November 15, 1998 by the paper presenter, Nancy Fe M. Puno.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents per school and the total number of respondents for each group. The total number of respondents was 3,533 broken down as follows: 1949 parents, 1315 pupils, 269 teachers. (Table 1)

Research Tools

This study used a Language Background Questionnaire (LBQ) adapted from the LBQ originally developed and used by Dr. Emy Pascacio of Ateneo de Manila University. The LBQ consisted of three sets: one each for the pupils, the parents and the teachers. They were color-coded for easy identification and administration.

The pupils' LBQ surveyed four dimensions: language use in interpersonal domains, language use in the macro-skills, self-evaluation of language proficiency, and mass media exposure.

The parents' LBQ elicited information regarding the following: SES; educational background; language use in the domains of: home, work, community, and government; self-evaluation of language proficiency; mass media exposure; and language preference for their children's education.

The teachers' LBQ consisted of seven areas: educational profile, language proficiency, mass media exposure, language use in: interpersonal communication; in the domains of home, community, school and place of worship.

In addition, a Classroom Observation Checklist was used in the assessment of: 1) the use of instructional materials, 2) classroom management, and 3) language use in classroom interaction.

Table 1. Number of respondents

AREAS Rural (R)/Urban (U)	Pupils	Parents	Teachers	Total
I. Marawi City				
A. (U) Marawi Central Elem. Sch	228	210	30	468
(R) Mapandi Primary Sch.	43	42	7	92
B. (U) MSU-Integ. Lab. Sch.	143	90	16	249
(R) Sultan Conding Elem. Sch.	35	50	5	90
II. Malabang, Lanao del Sur				
(U) Jose A. Santos Elem. Sch.	78	15	15	108
(R) Ansaio Elem. Sch.	90	10	15	115
III. Iligan City				
A. (U) Tambacan Elem. Sch.	108	94	14	216
(R) Guevarra Mem. Elem. Sch.	95	38	12	145
B. (U) Iligan City Central Sch.	151	142	18	311
(R) Upper Hinaplanon Elem. Sch.	80	74	6	160
C. (U) Doña Juana Mem. Elem. Sch.	116	91	21	228
(R) Tubaran Elem. Sch.	42	30	12	84
IV. Cagayan de Oro City				
(U) Cagayan de Oro City Central	132		15	147
(R) Lumbia Central Sch.	125		12	137
V. Gen. Santos City				
(U) Pedro Acharon Sr. Elem Sch.	122	118	15	255
(R) New Society Elem. Sch.	100	99	15	214
VI. Zamboanga City				
(U) Sta. Maria Central Sch.	124	95	27	246
(R) Mercedes Elementary Sch.	137	117	14	268
Totals	1949	1315	269	3533

The Findings

I. Marawi City – Dalomabi Lao Bula conducted the survey in Marawi Central Elementary School, an urban school in the heart of Marawi, and in Mapandi Primary School, a rural school about three kilometers from the city. Her findings are:

Pupils: The predominant language of the home and community is Maranao. In school, Filipino is preferred over English but even then, the language used most of the time in interactions with classmates and teachers is Maranao. There is considerable use of the mixed code, mostly with siblings, teachers and friends. As for the language used in the four macro-skills, Maranao is used the most for understanding while the mixed code is preferred for speaking, reading and writing. Some use of Filipino and English is made for reading and writing; very minimal for speaking. Regarding mass media exposure, the data show that exposure to TV and radio is rather extensive, a high of about 80% for both. In comparison, very few read newspaper, comics or magazines. Their choices of TV programs are almost all in Filipino; for radio, programs in Maranao are favored.

The Parents: The data show that most of the parents live below the poverty line; their educational attainment, mostly at the college level, the fathers having attained higher levels than the mothers. The language used by both father and mother is predominantly Maranao in all the domains excepts at work and in government where they sometimes use English and Filipino. Nonetheless, most Maranao parents consider Filipino as their second language. Next to Filipino is Arabic. Fathers rate themselves better in Filipino than in English in all the four macro-skills and poorest in Sebuano. In Maranao, they rate themselves very good. The pattern is the same for the mothers. Mass media exposure is about the same for both TV and radio but considerably less for print media. As for their choice of language for medium of instruction, there seems to be a conflict. While fathers prefer English over Filipino, most mothers want Filipino over English. The highest preferred language, however, for both parents is the mixed code. Some choose Maranao but nobody approves of Sebuano.

The Teachers: Out of 37 teacher-respondents, 30 are bachelor's degree holders; seven have a master's degree; and not one has a PhD. Almost all of them rate themselves good in English as well as in Filipino and only fair in Sebuano. All of them are very good in Maranao. There are more of them who listen to the radio

than watch TV and only about half read newspapers often. The rest seldom do. The mixed code is more often used than either English or Filipino even in the subjects where English or Filipino is mandated as the language of instruction. Only about half follow the bilingual policy. In interpersonal communication, very rarely is English used even with superiors. Most of the time, Maranao is used, most especially with co-teachers, pupils and parents. The native language of all the teachers is Maranao; most of them consider Filipino as their second language and a few, Sebuano or Arabic. The language of the home, neighborhood and the place of worship is Maranao; at work and in school, the mixed code is used.

The Classroom: Almost all of the classrooms observed have books and reference materials, but are sorely lacking in visual aids. Overall classroom management is only 'fair'; discipline, class participation and time management being the poorest. Teacher presentation, explanation and questions are usually in the mixed code while follow-up and wrap-up is in Maranao. Pupils almost always use Maranao, except sometimes in answering teacher's questions when they use a mixed code of English/Filipino/Maranao.

Rebekah M. Alawi, the other researcher assigned in Marawi City, chose the Elementary Department of the Mindanao State University (MSU) – Integrated Laboratory School to present an urban-based school, and the Sultan Condong Elementary School to represent a rural setting. The data from the three sets of respondents yielded the following findings:

The Pupils: In both the rural and urban samples, the dominant language is Maranao, the minority language is Sebuano and the language more often used in classroom interaction is Filipino. English is hardly used in Grade 1 but increase in use as the pupils go up the grade levels, albeit limited to formal, academic use. Filipino/Tagalog is often used in lieu of English in classes requiring the use of English. English is used more often for reading but hardly for speaking. The urban sample rate themselves higher in the four macro-skills in Filipino than the rural sample; higher also in Filipino than English. Proficiency in English and Sebuano is only satisfactory in both sample populations. Mass media exposure is highest for TV followed by radio and very minimal exposure to print media. It is however noted that there is an increase in print media exposure as they go up to the higher grades. Filipino medium programs are more popular for both the urban and rural samples.

The Parents: Most MSU-ILS parents are of the middle class while SCES parents mostly belong to the lower class. Moreover, the majority of the MSU-ILS respondents are at least college graduates while more parents in the rural

group have only reached elementary or high school. The majority language in both areas is Maranao, used both at home and in the neighborhood. Sebuano is also used, almost gaining an equal footing with the dominant Maranao. The mixed code is also used by some in the same domains, in fact, it is observed to have gained greater currency in the neighborhood than it had before. The turf of English is clearly defined: at work, among professionals and in transactions made with the government. However, more prefer the use of the mixed variety as medium of communication. As for language proficiency, urban parents generally rate their English and Filipino as 'very good' especially for the receptive skills, speaking and understanding, although the productive skills do not exactly fall behind. The Sebuano proficiency of those who speak the language can pass muster. The majority credit themselves with a 'very good' proficiency in the ethnic language, in this case, Maranao. In the rural group, over half rated their English only 'fair' and about the same number, 'poor'. Fewer respondents grade their Filipino 'very good'. The rest rate their Sebuano proficiency as 'good'. The mixed variety, a combination of Maranao and Tagalog or Maranao and Sebuano is prevalent.

The Teachers: The teachers in the MSU campus are academically better prepared than those in the rural schools, most of them having post-graduate degrees. Both groups rate themselves 'good' to 'very good' in English but generally consider themselves more proficient in Filipino than in English in all four macro-skills. Access to mass media for both groups is ample, with a marked preference for TV and broadcast media than for print media. The most predominantly used medium of instruction is the mixed code (i.e. English and Filipino with Maranao or Sebuano). Even in the teaching of English-mandated subjects, teachers used the mixed code. In contrast, there is a higher percentage of Filipino used in Filipino-mandated subjects. In interpersonal communication in school, the mixed code is prevalent. Teachers in the rural schools are all Maranao first language speakers and consider Tagalog as their second language; a few report Sebuano as their L2. In the urban sample, however, though dominantly Maranao first language speakers, there are few Filipino and Sebuano L1 speakers. The three languages considered by them as their L2 are: Tagalog, English, and Sebuano. Finally, for both samples, Maranao is dominant at home and in the neighborhood, but in school and at worship, they generally used the mixed code.

The Classroom: The mixed code is the most commonly used medium in class. Even in English, as a subject area, majority of the teacher-respondents in both schools use a mixed code. Only less than half of the teachers stick to an all-English instruction in their English courses. In the case of Filipino subjects, how-

ever, more than half of the teachers use all-Filipino, while the rest use the mixed code. In the teaching of Mathematics and Science, the majority depend on a mixed code. Only a small minority conduct their Math and Science classes in English. For instruction in Social Studies, both the rural and urban samples are divided between using unadulterated Filipino and a mixed code as medium. In interpersonal communication, the use of the mixed code is the prevalent practice in both schools. Communication with parents, however, is mostly done in the mother tongue; a few using the mixed code. Teacher-respondents in the rural school find the mixed code the most efficient means of communication with all co-interactants. In both groups, Maranao is pre-eminently the most common native language, most especially among the rural respondents. The most commonly identified second language in both schools are Tagalog (Filipino), followed by Sebuano. Five of them, notwithstanding, count English among their second languages. Maranao is the home language of the majority; a few identified Sebuano, presumably their mother tongue. At school, a mixed code is spoken by all. In the neighborhood, Maranao is prevalent but in the place of workship, the mixed code predominates, with Arabic as one of the languages used with Maranao or English. Except for the language of worship which is predominantly Maranao in the rural sample, there is no difference between the two groups in the use of language in the domains reported above. Teaching in general has not been weaned from rote learning. Pupils in classes observed by the researcher memorize whole lessons and answer questions like unthinking robots. There is no follow-up. The language in both locales is characterized by mixing, code-switching, and translation.

II. Malabang, Lanao del Sur

The researcher for this area is **Amina Domato Sarip**. Malabang is one of the oldest towns in the Philippines located on the southern rim of the province of Lanao del Sur. A mixed community of about 60% Muslims and 40% Christians, it is the only place in Mindanao where the Muslims and Christians are deemed to have a good relationship and respect each other's culture. The data from this study, therefore, would serve as a counterpoint to the two previous ones done in a similarly predominantly Maranao area. From the three sets of respondents, the following analysis has been culled:

The Pupils: The predominant language in the area is Maranao; the sec-

ond most spoken language is Sebuano, followed by Filipino. In the urban sample, Sebuano and Maranao are spoken equally frequently; in the rural area, more Maranao is spoken than Sebuano but the difference is not so great. Maranao and Sebuano are both the languages of the home and community with Maranao enjoying the edge in the rural sample than in the urban sample where Sebuano and Maranao are almost equally spoken. In class, English is spoken then most followed by Sebuano. This is true for both the rural and urban samples and is likewise true for reading, writing and understanding. However, pupils rate themselves as better in the use of Filipino than in English or Sebuano. Exposure to broadcast media is very high followed by print media.

The Parents: The majority of the parents in both the rural and urban groups belong to the low-income bracket, although most of the fathers have reached collegiate level. At home and in the neighborhood, Maranao is the dominant language; at work it is English. They also rate themselves as most proficient in their own mother tongue when it comes to speaking. But in reading, writing and understanding, urban mothers rate themselves high in English while rural mothers rate themselves highest in the ethnic language. For mass media exposure the highest percentage for the parents of both groups is watching television followed by listening to the radio. Exposure to print media is much lesser. Lastly, for the language preference of parents for their children's education, the highest is given to Filipino followed by English.

The Teachers: All of the teacher-respondents in the rural sample are Bachelor's degree holders while in the urban sample there are two masteral degree holders; the rest are bachelor's degree holders. The first language for both groups is Maranao with English and Filipino as second languages. They also rate themselves as more proficient in English than in Filipino, the urban group showing a higher proficiency in English than the rural group. As for mass media exposure, the rural teachers have almost equal exposure to both broadcast and print media while the urban group is more exposed to print media than to radio or TV; the difference, however, is slight. The majority of the teachers in both the rural and urban samples use the mandated media of instruction in the subjects they are supposed to use; i.e., English for English, Science, and Mathematics and Filipino for Filipino and the social sciences. A few use the mixed code and the vernacular. There is more use of English in communicating with superiors than Filipino, the mixed code or the ethnic language. Among themselves, however, the teachers invariably use English, the mixed code and Maranao. With pupils, they often use English, Filipino and the mixed code. With parents, it is mostly Maranao or the

mixed code; sometimes English and Filipino are used in the urban sample, but this is rare in the rural sample. For both groups the language of the home, in the place of worship, and in the neighborhood is Maranao; in school, it is mostly English, followed by Maranao among the rural teachers while among the urban teachers, it is Filipino and Maranao.

The Classroom: Due to the unwillingness of the teachers to be observed, the classroom observation checklist was not used. The observation was limited only to the use of instructional materials; no classroom interaction was observed. The researcher pointed out, however, that there was ample use of charts and maps, some in English, the others in Filipino. Class participation was very good. There was, moreover, an assigned coordinator for every grade who assisted in the administration of the questionnaires.

III. Iligan City

Iligan City, often called the Industrial Center of Mindanao and home of Ma. Cristina Falls, is well known for its language and cultural mix: Sebuano, Maranao, Higaonon, and other migrant groups which were drawn to the city because of its industries. In order to get a fair sampling of the ethnolinguistic mix, three separate surveys by three researchers were conducted in this area.

For the predominantly Sebuano-speaking group, **Flora C. Alima** conducted the study in Tambacan Elementary School (urban) and in Guevara Memorial Elementary School (rural). These are her findings:

The Pupils: Sebuano is the language used by first graders, urban and rural alike, when speaking to anyone. Sebuano is the language used in class, say rural 1st graders, while 'mix-mix' is the answer of the urban group. All first graders claim that they are good in Sebuano. Of the six classes, only Grade 3 rural pupils claim they are also good in English and Filipino. Grade 2 and 3 pupils claim they are using Sebuano when speaking to all, except that when the interlocutors are teachers, urban pupils use Sebuano, Filipino and English, while rurals cited only two (2), Sebuano and English. Sebuano, however, has not been reported as having figured in Grade 2 in actual classes, unlike in grade 3. All first graders agree that they have been most exposed to TV watching and radio listening; Grade 2 pupils enumerated three top choices in mass media: TV, radio, and newspapers.

The third favorite (after TV and radio) of 3rd graders is comics reading.

The Parents: Majority of grades 1-3 parents have reached the high school level; are still in their thirties; and are in the monthly income bracket of Php5,000 or less. Sebuano is the mother tongue of a large majority of these parents. Thus, Sebuano is claimed to be the most predominantly used in all domains. Their language preferences for their children's education are generally the same, with a slight variation in the ordering: Filipino, English, Sebuano in two of the urban samples; one urban group preferred Sebuano, Filipino, English. In the rural sample, one preferred Filipino over Sebuano and English while the other, English over Filipino, listing Sebuano last.

The Teachers: Of the total 21 teachers, only one has a master's degree. Their highest proficiency is in Sebuano, in all modalities. A very close second is English. English, Filipino and the mixed code are the languages they use in teaching. Their choices appear to be grounded on official policies assigning Filipino to the culture subjects, and English to the sciences. Although they admit using the mixed code, many times they feel that Sebuano (their first language) could have been a better medium of instruction, but since it is only auxiliary, they have been obliged to favor Filipino and/or English, which ironically are both second languages to them all. As for mass media choices, the most popular form for the teachers is television, regardless of age or school category, rural or urban. Home and neighborhood (in that order) are top Sebuano domains.

The Classroom: Different instructional materials are available in both schools. Classroom management generally is superior, a marvel especially when the class is composed of nearly 40 pupils put together in a room ideally for 20 or 25 only.

The second survey was conducted by **Darwisa A. Baguio** in Iligan City Central School (for the urban) and in the Upper Hinaplanon Elementary School (for the rural). The following analysis has been gleaned from the data gathered.

The Pupils: The dominant language in the urban school is Sebuano which is also the language spoken in the community and in the home. When speaking to teachers, pupils claim they use Filipino or Sebuano. On the other hand, the rural pupils claim when interacting with classmates, they use either Sebuano or Maranao, just as they do with their teachers except that a few use English and Sebuano. Most of them, however, use Maranao at home with their parents and siblings. Some of them, who come from Sebuano-speaking homes, use Sebuano at home. The data show a higher percentage of use for Maranao overall. As to the language they are good in, the urban pupils claim Sebuano as first, followed by Filipino and

English. Among the rural pupils, they claim Sebuano as first, followed by Filipino and English. Among the rural pupils, they claim to be better in Filipino and their parents' language than they are in English. When it comes to mass media exposure, the urban group claims are all very much higher than the rural group, although they follow the same pattern: TV, radio, newspapers, comics, and magazines, in that order.

The Parents: Almost 90% of the parent-respondents belong to the low, to very-low income bracket; the majority have finished only elementary education and the rest reached the high school level. In the urban group, Sebuano is the preferred language use at home, at work, in the neighborhood and in government. In the rural group, both Maranao and Sebuano are spoken in the community, but the language of the home is mostly Maranao. Urban parents rate themselves as generally good in reading, writing, and understanding English, but not in speaking for which they rate themselves only as fair. On the other hand, their proficiency in Filipino is claimed to be "good" in all the macro-skills. The same is true for their mother tongue. Among the rural parent-respondents, proficiency in English is rated 'fair' to 'good' just as they rated themselves for Filipino. The highest rating is for understanding for all three languages: English, Filipino and Sebuano. As for mass media exposure, both groups indicated that the majority are exposed to mass media, in particular radio, TV, and newspapers (in that order). As for the language they prefer for their children's education, the majority of both the rural and urban groups prefer English and Filipino, with English enjoying a slight edge over Filipino.

The Teachers: There are twenty-four teacher-respondents, twenty-two of whom are bachelor's degree holders and two are master's degree holders. These two are in the urban school. The majority rate themselves 'good' in English, Filipino, Sebuano and ethnic languages in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding. In media exposure, both urban and rural teachers always listen to radio, watch TV and read newspapers, With regard to language used in teaching, majority prefer the mixed code, except for Mathematics, Science and English in which English is required. The language used in communicating with superiors is English, while with co-teachers, parents and pupils, the preferred language is Sebuano for the urban group and Maranao for the rural group. The language used at home and in the neighborhood is Sebuano; at school and in the place of worship, it is English. For the rural respondents, the language used at home, neighborhood and place of worship is Maranao.

The Classroom: In the urban school, in terms of instructional materials,

the evaluation is 'very good', while in the rural school, there is a discernible lack of these material, giving them a rating of 'poor'. Classroom management in the urban school is likewise 'very good' while for the rural school, it is only 'fair'. Generally, in the urban school, the language used is English for Science, Mathematics and English and Filipino for Filipino mandated subjects. However, in a brief interaction with some of the teachers, they admitted that they cannot avoid switching to Sebuano, because some of the pupils do not understand some of the English terms. This is the reason why the mixed code is often used in class. Classroom interaction in the urban school is generally very good; in the rural school, it is poor.

The third survey was conducted by **Nancy Fe M. Puno** in Doña Juana Actub Lluch Memorial school located in Pala-o, an urban barangay. For the rural school, Tubaran Elementary School in Mandulog was chosen. About six kilometers from the Iligan-Cagayan Highway, Mandulog is a mixed ethnolinguistic community of Maranaos, Higaunons, and Christians who are Sebuano speakers. The data gathered from these two schools are the bases for the following analysis.

The Pupils: In the urban school, almost 100% of the pupils are Sebuano speakers. Sebuano is the language used in the home, in school, with friends and family members. In class they use Sebuano for speaking and understanding; Filipino is read, written and understood but just like English, hardly spoken. In the first grade, some sight words in English are memorized and understood but English is not spoken in a stream of speech. Writing in English is limited to copying the sight words. Compared with English, Filipino is better read, written, and understood. This trend is followed even by the grade two and three pupils; but by grade two, there is a marked increase in the use and understanding of Filipino and English, with Filipino taking the lead over English. There is, however, a noticeable increase in the use of the mixed code as they go up the higher grades. Mass media exposure is lesser in the lower grades but increase as they go up the rungs. Furthermore, the radio and TV are the most popular forms of mass media; there is very little exposure to print media. In the rural sample, although it is a mixed ethnolinguistic community, the language of the school is predominantly Sebuano. A few use Maranao in school but to a certain extent, Maranao speakers accommodate Sebuano speakers when they are in mixed groups. In the home and in their own turf, however, Maranao is the predominant language. For the Sebuano speakers, the language of the home, school and community is Sebuano. Higaunons speak Sebuano when they are outside their homes. In fact, many of the children no longer speak Higaunon. In the beginning grades, less than half can use Filipino

in reading, writing and understanding. No one uses it for speaking. The same is true for English which is least used in all four skills. As they move up to the higher grades, their language proficiency increases, especially in Filipino. In grade 3, they are more fluent in Filipino but they can already read in English, albeit understanding is limited to the memorized meanings. With regard to media exposure, since the place has no electricity, only the battery-powered radios are often heard. Television sets in a few homes are powered by truck batteries. By the third grade, more pupils report watching TV and listening to the radio. However, exposure to print media is very limited, almost nil. Both Maranao and Sebuano pupils choose Filipino over English as the easier language to learn.

The Parents: In the urban sample, majority of the parents belong to the low income group; most have reached only the elementary level, some finished high school, while a very small percentage reached the post graduate level. The predominant language of the community is Sebuano. A few report English, Tagalog and Filipino as second languages. Their language proficiency follows the pattern: best in Sebuano followed by Filipino and last in English. Highest media exposure is to radio, next is to TV. Exposure to print media is very slight. Many favor the use of English, Filipino and Sebuano as the languages of instruction for their children. But most of them favor using the mixed code.

The Teachers: Most of the teachers in the urban school are experienced mentors. All are BS degree holders; some have MA units but none has earned an MA yet. The average language proficiency mean shows that they are as proficient in English as they are in Filipino; and highest in Sebuano, their native tongue. Mass media exposure is highest for TV, followed by radio and print media. The languages used in teaching follow in descending order, English, Filipino, Sebuano. The mixed code is resorted to when trying to explain difficult concepts in Math or Science. Otherwise, they are closely following the bilingual policy. English, Sebuano, and the mixed code is used with superiors; Sebuano and the mixed code with co-teachers; English, Filipino and Sebuano with pupils. In the rural group, all of the teacher-respondents are bachelor's degree holders; not one has an MA or a PhD. In language proficiency, they rate themselves highest in their mother tongue, Sebuano or Maranao; in English and Filipino, they rate themselves as 'good' but between the two, they are better in Filipino than English. Language use in the classroom as reported in the LBQ closely follow the Bilingual Policy but in an informal conversation with them, they admit using Sebuano to explain the concepts. Moreover, actual classroom interaction reveals more use of Sebuano or the mixed code. As for the four Maranao teacher-respondent,

they prefer to use Filipino instead of Sebuano in class but they do use Sebuano in informal situations in school.

The Classroom: The data from the urban and rural samples show that teachers use more Sebuano and the mixed code than they had reported in the LBQ. The classroom observation checklist confirms the use of the mixed code in teaching. Students use Sebuano in class for asking questions and making requests. Maximum use of instructional materials is made in the urban school. In the rural school there are adequate instructional materials but the number of textbooks is sorely inadequate. Classroom management ranges from fair to good in the rural school and very good in the urban school.

IV. Cagayan de Oro City

Herber Glenn P. Reyes conducted the survey in Cagayan de Oro City. The urban school was City Central School located in the heart of the city; the rural school was Lumbia Central School located in Upper Lumbia, approximately 20 kilometers from the city proper. The results of the survey are summarized as follows:

The Pupils: The dominant language in both the rural and urban school is Sebuano, but in the urban school, more English is used than Filipino or Sebuano in interaction with classmates and teachers. In the rural school, there is more use of Sebuano than English and Filipino in all roles. The language of the home and neighborhood is Sebuano for both samples. The city pupils use English most often in the classroom in all four macro-skills and rate themselves very highly in English proficiency. Moreover, they prefer using the mixed code and Sebuano than Filipino. In the rural school, there is more use of Sebuano than English and Filipino in the four macro-skills and more use of English and the mixed code than Filipino. When asked what language they were good in, the pattern of responses from the urban pupils was: English, Sebuano, and Filipino; among the rural pupils, the pattern was Sebuano, Filipino and English (in that order). Regarding mass media exposure, the data show a high percentage of exposure to TV and radio for both groups, followed by comics and magazines for the urban pupils and the newspapers for the rural pupils.

The Teachers: The majority of the teacher-respondents in both schools are BS degree holders, a few have MA and one has a PhD. The rural teachers are

relatively new in the service while most of the urban teachers have been teaching for a long time. On the matter of their language proficiency, urban teachers rate themselves as very proficient in English, Filipino and Sebuano in all four skills, while the rural teachers rate themselves only as "good" in English and Filipino, but most of the time in the subjects requiring their use. Rural teachers use the mandated languages but more often than not, use the mixed code with English and Filipino. In interpersonal communication, urban teachers use more English than the mixed code when speaking to superiors; otherwise, the mixed code is used. Among the rural teachers, it is the mixed code that predominates in all role relationships. The majority report Sebuano as their first language and English and Filipino as their second language. There are a few Tagalog first language speakers; their second language is invariably English or Sebuano. For both groups, the language of the home and neighborhood is Sebuano and the mixed code; at school and at work, urban teachers use English and the mixed code, rural teachers use the mixed code most of the time.

V. General Santos City

Considered as the newest growth area in Southeastern Mindanao, General Santos City is part of the so-called growth corridor, an investor-friendly and ecologically sound business environment. **Jules U. Jumalon** reports the findings from a rural school, the New Society Elementary School about 10 kilometers from the city proper, and an urban school, the Pedro Acharon Sr. Elementary School, in the heart of the city.

The Pupils: Generally, the pupils in both the urban and rural areas use Sebuano when speaking with classmates, siblings and neighbors; Tagalog is used only when speaking with the teacher. It appears that while Sebuano is associated with values of spontaneity, friendship and intimacy, Tagalog is associated with social distance. In the classroom, whether urban or rural, the pupils indicated their use of mix-mix language, which could be due to the highly multilingual nature of the speech community. Most of the pupils in the rural area indicate that they are most proficient in the use of Sebuano than in any other languages; the urban pupils, however, differ in their proficiency: grade 1 pupils think they are proficient in Sebuano, grade 2 in mix-mix, and grade 3, in Sebuano. These differences may be because in the

urban area, the pupils are more or less heterogenous in terms of socio-economic status, especially with pupils enrolled in public schools. Finally, based on the responses, the urban pupils are more exposed to more forms of mass media communication, while the pupils in the rural area have a limited exposure of the same, e.g., magazines and newspapers.

The Parents: In both the rural and urban areas, the parents belong to the Php50000-below category in monthly income. Most of them have only reached secondary education, while some urban parents have reached the tertiary level of education. The urban parents generally assign language use depending on the domains of interaction: Sebuano is used at home and the neighborhood; Tagalog or Filipino is used in the workplace and in government transactions. The rural parents, however, use Sebuano in all domains of interaction. Sebuano is the dominant ethnolinguistic group, followed by Ilonggo, then Tagalog and Ilocano. The second languages of both groups are Sebuano and Tagalog. In terms of language fluency, the father-respondents are just 'good' in English and Filipino; 'very good' in Sebuano. The mother-respondents are 'good' in English but 'very good' in Filipino and Sebuano. Both rural and urban parents are generally exposed to the different mass media forms of communication. Finally, the parents prefer the use of the mixed code for their children's education, and place Tagalog as the second most preferred language.

The Teachers: The teachers are bachelor's degree holders only. There are no master's or doctor's degree holders. In terms of language fluency, the urban teachers claim that they are 'very good' in all three languages: Sebuano, English and Filipino; the rural teachers, however, rate themselves as just 'good' in English, 'very good' in Filipino and Sebuano. Most of the teachers in both rural and urban areas generally claim lack of exposure to mass media. Language use in the teaching of subject areas shows that the bilingual policy has been partially implemented, e.g. teaching of Social Studies in Filipino. Moreover, in the urban area, English, Math and Science are generally taught in English; in the rural area the teaching of English, Math and Science is through the mixed code, except Social studies which is taught in Filipino. In their interpersonal communication, the urban teachers used English when speaking with the school supervisor, but use Sebuano when speaking with the principal or co-teachers. In the rural area, teachers generally use the mixed code in their interpersonal communication. In the rural area, the teachers are predominantly Sebuano; in the urban area, teachers are predominantly Tagalog speakers. Their second languages are Sebuano and Tagalog. Teachers in the urban area generally use Sebuano at home and in the

neighborhood; Filipino in school and in church.

The Classroom: The urban teachers generally make use of more instructional materials than the rural teachers. Moreover, they have a fair knowledge of the appropriate instructional materials to be used in the different grade levels: e.g. blocks are for grade 1; maps are for grade 3. Generally, the teachers are rated as 'good' classroom managers. In classroom interaction between teacher and pupil, the mixed code is generally used.

VI. Zamboanga City

One of several places in Mindanao that speaks a Spanish-contact vernacular-Chavacano-Zamboanga City represents a totally different kind of ethnolinguistic mix not found outside the Zamboanga Peninsula (The other places are Basilan Province, Siocon and Margosatubig in Zamboanga del Sur). The Zamboanga data form the last part of the wider study. **Lojean V. Akil** collected and analyzed the data gathered from the urban school, Sta. Maria Central School; and the other, Mercedes Elementary School, for the rural sample.

The Pupils: The language used by most rural pupils is Chavacano; in the urban sample, Chavacano is used by only a little over half of the respondents, indicating the group's exposure to other languages such as Filipino and Sebuano. As for language use in class, for both groups, it is Filipino that rates the highest; followed by English and the vernacular, Chavacano. Both urban and rural pupils report that they are best in Chavacano, followed by Filipino. However, urban pupils report a higher proficiency in English than the rural pupils; Sebuano is a high third choice among urban pupils but insignificant among the rural group. With regard to mass media exposure, both rural and urban groups indicate a very high exposure to TV and radio, but less exposure to print media. It is also noted that the degree of exposure increases as the pupils go up the grade levels.

The Parents: Most of the parents in both the rural and urban groups fall under the bracket of P5 thousand and below monthly income. In the rural group, a good number have reached the elementary and high school levels and only a few have reached college. In the urban group, there are more who have reached the

high school and college levels. Chavacano is the predominant language among the rural parents, Filipino comes next and English is third. In the urban group, it is still Chavacano that ranks first, but far lesser than that of the rural group; Sebuano comes as a close second; Filipino and English are third. In the rural group, about 85% of the parents are native Chavacano speakers. Filipino and Sebuano speakers come second and third but at a very insignificant share as second languages, most parents report Filipino and some indicate English. In the urban group, compared with the rural group, there are less native speakers of Chavacano (71%). Sebuano speakers come second at almost 20%. As second languages, Chavacano, Filipino and Sebuano are reported in that order. As for their language proficiency, most parents say they are most proficient in Chavacano in all four skills. The pattern is the same for both groups: Chavacano, Filipino, English, and Sebuano. Mass media exposure is highest for radio in the rural group but it is television for the urban group. A close second is TV for the rural group and radio for the urban group. Exposure to print media is relatively adequate for both groups, but higher in the urban group. Both rural and urban parents prefer English as the language of instruction for their children. The pattern of choice for these two groups is: 1. English, 2. Filipino, 3. Mixed Code, 4. Vernacular.

The Teachers: Most of the teacher-respondents in both rural and urban groups are only bachelor's degree holders; only one has a MA. Rural teachers are all native speakers of Chavacano; in the urban group the majority is Chavacano but some are Sebuano speakers. Their second languages are either English or Filipino. The ethnic languages spoken in the community are Chavacano and Sebuano, Chavacano having a very high share of 92% and 85%. Teachers report a high proficiency for English and Filipino, with English being higher than radio and newspapers; but with the urban group, exposure to radio and newspapers is higher than TV. As for the language used in teaching, among the rural teachers, English and Filipino get an equal share of use in the classroom. English is particularly high in Mathematics and Science while Filipino is in Filipino and Social Studies subjects. The mixed code is insignificantly used. The same pattern is true for the urban group. In interpersonal communication, with their superior, colleagues, and pupils' parents regarding formal topics, the rural teacher-respondents used English most, followed by the mixed code and Chavacano. The pattern is repeated for the urban group. Language use in the different domains of home, work community and place of worship, is highest for Chavacano followed by English, Filipino and Sebuano. The mixed code is rarely used.

The Classroom: Data for this category could not be obtained because

there was no written consent/formal approval for classroom observation from the Division Office.

Conclusion

The survey aimed to obtain a sound data base for language planning in selected areas in Mindanao and to evaluate, in the process, the degree of implementation of the National Bilingual Policy mandating the use of English for Science, Mathematics and English, and Filipino for the Social Sciences and Filipino. In Mindanao, a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual area, English and Filipino are both second languages for the majority of the children in the first three years of their elementary schooling.

The results of the survey show that where a strongly dominant ethnic language prevails, as was shown in the Maranao data, the use, proficiency and preference for Filipino over English is high; Sebuano is least preferred and therefore, would not serve as auxiliary or bridge language. There is moreover, a very high shifting to a mixed code even in the formal domains of the school. It is, in fact, preferred over English in many instances. As for language proficiency, more Maranao respondents indicate higher proficiency and receptivity for Filipino. In Malabang town where Maranao and Sebuano are almost equally spoken in the community, there is more use of English than Filipino in both urban and rural classes, and less use of the mixed code.

In the Sebuano-dominant areas, minority language groups, which are not as ethnolinguistically vital and which do not exercise power and influence, tend to accommodate the stronger outgroup language, Sebuano, in the informal domains. This is the case for T'boli and Higaunon, ethnic languages which have, in fact, suffered language shift and loss. In the controlling domains of education and government, preference for Filipino among these groups is often much higher than that for Sebuano or English.

In the highly urbanized cities like Cagayan de Oro and Zamboanga City, the language of the majority prevails. In Zamboanga City, English as language of instruction enjoys a very high edge over Filipino and Sebuano and the use of the mixed code in class is negligible. Chavacano remains a strong lingua franca. In predominantly-Sebuano Cagayan de Oro, both English and Filipino are equally regarded but the preferred language of instruction is English. In other domains, the mixed code predominates in almost all of the samples, in both formal and

informal domains. In mixed language areas like Iligan, there is a high degree of accommodation to the predominant language, Sebuano, Higaunon, a minority language group is very marginalized.

As for classroom management and the use of instructional materials, the findings indicate above average utilization of instructional materials and fairly good classroom management, notwithstanding the general lack of budgetary appropriations for classrooms and books. Language use in class is generally characterized by honest attempts to implement the National Bilingual Policy. The use of the mixed code is often done to explain difficult concepts in science and mathematics. A disturbing observation, however, is that the teachers' proficiency in English is often reported as lower than or equal to that of Filipino.

The extent of influence of mass media over the changing language situation in Mindanao cannot be underestimated. Both rural and urban samples showed high exposure to broadcast media; in the urban areas, the highest is TV, while in the rural areas, it is radio. Print media exposure is higher in the urban areas than in the rural areas, but even then, among the samples surveyed the percentage of newspaper readers is generally the lowest of the three mass media forms. However, more newspaper are read than magazines and comic books. Preference for Filipino-medium TV and radio programs is very high, indicating a high degree of receptivity for the language. Favorite programs are mostly soap operas and variety shows in Taglish or Filipino.

The data on use of the mandated languages per the National Bilingual policy show some highs and some lows. In the case of Filipino, there is a clear picture of its being put to good use in the formal and even informal domains. As for English, most of the teacher-respondents report the use of an auxiliary language or the mixed code to explain the concepts. There is a very high percentage of use reported for the mixed code even in the formal domains of school for all the samples surveyed. This is seen by some as a negative effect while others consider the phenomenon as necessary. Teachers, in particular, assert that using the mixed code helps them to explain the difficult concepts in English and Filipino. As the language for interpersonal communication, the mixed code may serve some purposes, but its prevalent use in the classroom has many implications for language planning and development.

What these partial results tell us is that there is either only a partial implementation of the National Bilingual Policy or there has been a misunderstood application of its guidelines. Be that as it may, the welcome development, as far as the data show, is the favorable attitude to the use of Filipino.

Generally, parents prefer Filipino over English as the language of instruction in the lower grades but it is disturbing to note that there is also a high preference for the mixed code. Nonetheless, English is preferred over Filipino in the highly urbanized cities and in one Maranao-dominant sample, Malabang.

Moreover, whether the respondents' first language is Sebuano, Maranao, Lumad (Indigenous), or the Spanish Creole, Chabacano, most rate themselves as better in Filipino than in English; use a regional variety of a mixed code; have a relatively high receptivity for Filipino, maintain their first language for home and community; are highly exposed to broadcast media and are often ambivalent in their preference of instruction.

Hopefully, this study will provide a preliminary framework from which a more extensive Mindanao language survey can be generated. The need for a more rational and culture-fair language program for Mindanao cannot be ignored.