# Language Planning and Policy in Pacific, Vol.1

**LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY**
**Series Editors:** Dr Richard B. Baldauf Jr., *University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia*
and Professor Robert B. Kaplan, *University of Southern California, USA*

**Other Books in the Series**
Language Planning and Policy in Africa, Vol.1: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa
    R*ichard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)*
Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol.1: Hungary, Finland and Sweden
    *Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. (eds)*
Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2: The Czech Republic, The European
    Union and Northern Ireland
    *Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)*

**Other Books of Interest**
Can Threatened Languages be Saved?
    *Joshua Fishman (ed.)*
Language and Society in a Changing Italy
    *Arturo Tosi*
Language Planning: From Practice to Theory
    *Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. (eds)*
The Other Languages of Europe
    *Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (eds)*
Multilingualism in Spain
    *M. Teresa Turell (ed.)*
Beyond Boundaries: Language and Identity in Contemporary Europe
    *Paul Gubbins and Mike Holt (eds)*
Ideology and Image: Britain and Language
    *Dennis Ager*
Where East Looks West: Success in English in Goa and on the Konkan Coast
    *Dennis Kurzon*
English in Africa: After the Cold War
    *Alamin M. Mazrui*
Politeness in Europe
    *Leo Hickey and Miranda Stewart (eds)*
Language in Jewish Society: Towards a New Understanding
    *John Myhill*
Urban Multilingualism in Europe
    *Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (eds)*
Cultural and Linguistic Policy Abroad: The Italian Experience
    *Mariella Totaro-Genevois*
Language Decline and Death in Africa: Causes, Consequences and Challenges
    *Herman M. Batibo*
In and Out of English: For Better for Worse
    *Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers (eds)*

**For more details of these or any other of our publications, please contact:**
**Multilingual Matters, Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall,**
**Victoria Road, Clevedon, BS21 7HH, England**
**http://www.multilingual-matters.com**

# Language Planning and Policy in the Pacific, Vol. 1

## Fiji, The Philippines and Vanuatu

Edited by

**Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan**

# Contents

# The Contributors

**Terry Crowley**, who unexpectedly passed away on 16 January 2005 at the age of 51, was an important voice in Pacific studies, in pidginisation and creolisation, and in the recording of some languages that have disappeared, and of some that have survived despite the tender ministrations of western languages, western missionaries, and western scholars. He taught linguistics at the University of Waikato after having taught at the University of the South Pacific. He has published extensively on Bislama – the English-lexifier pidgin national language of Vanuatu – and Oceanic languages since 1976, and has also published on the sociolinguistic situation. His major books on Vanuatu languages included *Ura: A disappearing Language of Southern Vanuatu* (1999), *An Erromangan (Sye) Grammar* (1998), *A New Bislama Dictionary* (1995), *A Dictionary of Paamese* (1992), *Beach-la-Mer to Bislama: The Emergence of a National Language in Vanuatu* (1990) and *The Paamese Language of Vanuatu* (1982).

**Andrew Gonzalez, FSC**, who passed away on 29 January 2006, was a former Secretary of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports in the Philippines, and was at the time President Emeritus of De La Salle University-Manila and President of the Manila Bulletin Publishing Corporation. He was President of De La Salle University from 1978 to 1991 and again from 1994 to 1998. Brother Andrew was a member of the National Academy of Science and Technology, Republic of the Philippines and an Academician. He earned his doctorate degree in Linguistics from the University of California, Berkeley. He received honorary degrees from Waseda University, Tokyo Japan; Soka University, Hachioji, Japan; St. Paul University, Ottawa, Canada; and St. Mary's College of California, Moraga, USA. He was bestowed prestigious awards such as *Officer de 'Ordre des Palmes Académiques* by the Government of France, St. Vincent de Paul Medal of Academic Excellence by Adamson University, the Fourth Degree of the Order by the Knight Grand Officer of Rizal, St. Bede Medal by San Beda College, and Ex Corde Ecclesiae by the International Federation of Catholic Universities, Paris, France. His activities include membership on Boards of Trustees of various educational institutions and professional organizations, local and international. At one time, he was President of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, and Chairman of the International Association of University Presidents for the Southeast Asian Region. He was Chair of the recently concluded Task Force to Evaluate Graduate Education in the Philippines. He was also a member of editorial advisory boards of various educational journals. He has written and published extensively in the field of language planning, language teaching, higher education, and sociolinguistics.

**Francis Mangubhai** worked in the South Pacific for many years in the area of language education. He worked with Professor Elley on the well-known Book Flood Project in Fiji, has written on literacy in the South Pacific and in 2002 published in the *Journal for Multilingual and Multicultural Development* various frameworks for language-in-education policies for South Pacific countries. He is currently A/Professor and the Director of the newly established Learning and Teaching Support Unit at the University of Southern Queensland, Australia.

**France Mugler** is Assistant Professor at the University of the South Pacific where she has taught linguistics for nearly 20 years. Her main research interests have been in the area of sociolinguistics, in particular the minority Indian languages of Fiji, especially the Dravidian languages, and Fiji English. With John Lynch, she edited the 1996 *Pacific Languages in Education*, and with Jan Tent, she has written several articles on Fiji English and conducted two surveys of language use and attitudes in Fiji, the most recent one in November 2005. She is currently also working on a dictionary of English for Fiji with Jan Tent and Paul Geraghty.

# Series Overview

Since 1998 and 1999 when the first six polity studies on Language Policy and Planning – addressing the language situation in a particular polity – were published in the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20 studies (from 2000 through the end of 2005) have been published in *Current Issues in Language Planning*. These studies have all addressed, to a greater or lesser extent, 22 common questions or issues (Appendix A), thus giving them some degree of consistency. However, we are keenly aware that these studies have been published in the order in which they were completed. While such an arrangement is reasonable for journal publication, the result does not serve the needs of area specialists nor are the various monographs easily accessible to the wider public. As the number of available polity studies has grown, we have planned to update (where necessary) and republish these studies in coherent areal volumes.

The first such volume published concerned Africa (i.e. Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa) (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004), both because a significant number of studies had become available and because Africa constituted an area that is significantly under-represented in the language planning literature and yet is marked by extremely interesting language policy and planning issues. The second and third volumes dealt with Europe (i.e. Hungary, Finland and Sweden, Kaplan & Baldauf (2005); and the Czech Republic, the European Union and Northern Ireland, Baldauf & Kaplan (2006)). This forth volume focuses on the Pacific, and includes, Fiji, The Philippines and Vanuatu, again examining two polities that have not been the subject of a lot of published language planning and policy activity, while drawing together the work on the Philippines, which is perhaps better known. These will shortly be followed by other areal volumes, focusing perhaps on Africa, Europe, Latin America, or Asia.

We hope that these areal volumes will better serve the needs of specialists. It is our intent to continue to publish other areal volumes subsequently as sufficient studies are completed. We will do so in the hope that such volumes will be of interest to areal scholars and others interested in language policies and language planning in geographically coherent regions. The areas in which we are planning to produce future volumes, and some of the polities that may be included are:

> **Africa** (2), including Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria, Tunisia;
> **Europe** (3 and 4), including the Baltic States, Cyprus, Luxembourg, Ireland, Italy and Malta;
> **Latin America** (1), including Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay; and
> **Asia** (1 and 2), including Bangladesh, Chinese Characters, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, and Taiwan.

In the mean time, we will continue to bring out *Current Issues in Language Planning*, adding to the list of polities available for inclusion in areal volumes. At this point, we cannot predict the intervals over which such volumes will appear, since those intervals will be defined by the ability of contributors to complete work on already contracted polity studies.

## Assumptions Relating to Polity Studies

There are a number of assumptions that we have made about the nature of language policy and planning that have influenced the nature of the studies presented. First, we do not believe that a broader and more coherent paradigm addressing the complex questions of language policy/planning development is yet available. On the other hand, we do believe that the collection of a large body of more or less comparable data and the careful analysis of that data will give rise to a better paradigm. Therefore, in soliciting the polity studies, we have asked each of the contributors to address some two-dozen questions (to the extent that such questions were pertinent to each particular polity); the questions were offered as suggestions of topics that might be covered. (See Appendix A.) Some contributors have followed the questions rather closely; others have been more independent in approaching the task. It should be obvious that, in framing those questions, we were moving from a perhaps inchoate notion of an underlying theory. The reality that our notion was inchoate becomes clear in each of the polity studies.

Second, we have sought to find authors who had an intimate involvement with the language planning and policy decisions made in the polity about which they were writing; i.e. we were looking for insider knowledge and perspectives about the polities. However, as insiders are part of the process, when developing their studies they may find it difficult to take the part of the 'other' – to be critical of that process. But it is not necessary, or even appropriate, that they should be – this can be left to others. As Pennycook (1998: 126) has argued:

> One of the lessons we need to draw from this account of colonial language policy [i.e. Hong Kong] is that, in order to make sense of language policies we need to understand both their location historically and their location contextually. What I mean by this is that we can not assume that the promotion of local languages instead of a dominant language, or the promotion of a dominant language at the expense of a local language, are in themselves good or bad. Too often we view these things through the lenses of liberalism, pluralism or anti-imperialism, without understanding the actual location of such policies.

While some authors do take a critical stance, or one based on a theoretical approach to the data, many of the studies presented in these volumes are primarily descriptive, bringing together and revealing, we hope, the nature of the language development experience in the particular polity. We believe this is a valuable contribution to the theory/paradigm development of the field. As interesting and challenging as it may be to provide theoretical a priori descriptions of the nature of the field [e.g. language management (Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003), language rights (May, 2003), continua of biliteracy (Hornberger, 2003)] based on partial data – nor have we been completely immune from this ourselves (e.g. Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003, Chapter 12) – we believe the development of a sufficient data base is an important prerequisite for paradigm development.

Of course, the author(s) of each volume also brings somewhat different methods (e.g. historical, ethnographic, sociolinguistic, linguistic) and issues (e.g. minority rights, education of linguistic minorities, national identity) to their studies and this adds to the richness of our understanding of language

planning as we are shown that there are different ways of approaching this field of study and that particular issues are important to specific contexts. An edited volume by Ricento (2006) also provides a brief introduction to some of these relevant theories, methods and issues in language policy (and planning).

In 1945, Vannevar Bush (Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development in the administration of President Franklin Roosevelt) published a report in which he established a clear distinction between pure research (basic science) and applied research (applied science). He did so in the belief that pure research had little chance of attracting government funding even though basic science constituted a public good that demanded government support. The dichotomy articulated by Bush has served as the guideline for federal funding in the United States, in Australia and elsewhere over the past 60 years.

More recently, Donald Stokes (1997) has argued that scientific research should be conceived as falling into quadrants. In this configuration, one quadrant contains scientists who conduct pure research but have no concern in the potential uses in the real world of the findings. Niels Bohr might be an example of a scholar-scientist who fits this category, as might Noam Chomsky in his theoretical linguistics research. A second quadrant contains scientists who have a primary concern for applied research and little interest in the scientific aspects of such work; Thomas Edison might serve as an example in this quadrant. A third quadrant would contain scholars whose work is neither overly theoretical nor overly applied. Work in this quadrant might contain taxonomic or classificatory studies – i.e. work which is worthwhile but is not driven by the desire either to advance knowledge or to develop practical solutions. A fourth quadrant contains work that might be described as 'use-inspired basic science', research that has potential for real-world utility without losing sight of the desire to advance scientific understanding. Stokes believed that the bulk of governmental funding should be addressed to this quadrant. Louis Pasteur might be the prototypical figure in this quadrant, and thus this quadrant Stokes labeled 'Pasteur's Quadrant.'

We insert this brief aside at this point in the explanation of our assumptions guiding the polity studies upon which we have chosen to focus because we are convinced that language policy studies fall squarely in Pasteur's Quadrant – studies marked by taxonomic description married to a desire to advance knowledge and to lead to a theory for language policy research. Regrettably, Stokes' suggestion that the bulk of government funding should be directed at this quadrant has not been taken seriously by governments around the world.

## An Invitation to Contribute

We welcome additional polity contributions. Our views on a number of the issues can be found in Kaplan and Baldauf (1997); sample polity monographs have appeared in the extant issues of *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Interested authors are invited to contact the editors, present a proposal for a monograph, and provide a sample list of references. It is also useful to provide a brief biographical note, indicating any personal involvement in language planning activities in the polity proposed for study as well as any relevant research/publication in LPP. All contributions should, of course, be original,

unpublished works. We expect to work with contributors during the preparation of monographs. All monographs will, of course, be reviewed for quality, completeness, accuracy and style. Experience suggests that co-authored contributions may be very successful, but we want to stress that we are seeking a unified monograph on the polity, not an edited compilation of various authors' efforts. Questions may be addressed to either of us.

Richard B. Baldauf, Jr.                              Robert B. Kaplan
rbaldauf4@bigpond.com                       rkaplan@olypen.com

## References

Baldauf, R.B., Jr. and Kaplan, R.B. (Eds) (2006) *Language Planning and Policy: Europe, Vol. 2: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northern Ireland*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R.B., Jr. and Kaplan, R.B. (Eds) (2004) *Language Planning and Policy: Africa, Vol. I: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N.H. (2003) Continua of biliteracy. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.) *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research and Practice in Multilingual Settings* (pp. 3–34). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B., Jr. (Eds) (2005) *Language Planning and Policy: Europe, Vol. I: Hungary, Finland and Sweden*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B., Jr. (2003) *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B., Jr. (1997) *Language Planning From Practice to Theory.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

May, S. (2003) Rearticulating the case for minority language rights. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4(2), 95–125.

Neustupný, J.V. and Nekvapil, J. (2003) Language management in the Czech Republic. In R.B. Baldauf Jr. and R.B. Kaplan (Eds) (2006) *Language Planning and Policy: Europe, Vol. 2: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northern Ireland* (pp. 16–201). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A. (1998) *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ricento, T. (2006) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Stokes, D. (1997) *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.

## Appendix A

### Part I: The Language Profile of . . .

1. Name and briefly describe the national/official language(s) (*de jure* or *de facto*).
2. Name and describe the major minority language(s).
3. *Name and describe the lesser minority language(s) (include 'dialects', pidgins, creoles and other important aspects of language variation)*; the definition of minority language/dialect/pidgin will need to be discussed in terms of the sociolinguistic context.
4. *Name and describe the major religious language(s)*; in some polities religious languages and/or missionary policies have had a major impact on the language situation and provide *de facto* language planning. In some

contexts religion has been a vehicle for introducing exogenous languages while in other cases it has served to promote indigenous languages.

5.  Name and describe the major language(s) of literacy, assuming that it is/ they are not one of those described above.
6.  Provide a table indicating the number of speakers of each of the above languages, what percentage of the population they constitute and whether those speakers are largely urban or rural.
7.  Where appropriate, provide a map(s) showing the distribution of speakers, key cities and other features referenced in the text.

## Part II: Language Spread

8.  Specify which languages are taught through the educational system, to whom they are taught, when they are taught and for how long they are taught.
9.  Discuss the objectives of language education and the methods of assessment to determine that the objectives are met.
10. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 8 and 9 (may be integrated with 8/9).
11. Name and discuss the major media language(s) and the distribution of media by socio-economic class, ethnic group, urban/rural distinction (including the historical context where possible). For minority language, note the extent that any literature is (has been) available in the language.
12. How has immigration effected language distribution and what measures are in place to cater for learning the national language(s) and/or to support the use of immigrant languages.

## Part III: Language Policy and Planning

13. Describe any language planning legislation, policy or implementation that is currently in place.
14. Describe any literacy planning legislation, policy or implementation that is currently in place.
15. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 13 and 14 (may be integrated with these items).
16. Describe and discuss any language planning agencies/organisations operating in the polity (both formal and informal).
17. Describe and discuss any regional/international influences affecting language planning and policy in the polity (include any external language promotion efforts).
18. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 16 and 17 (may be integrated with these items)**.**

## Part IV: Language Maintenance and Prospects

19. Describe and discuss intergenerational transmission of the major language(s); (is this changing over time?).
20. Describe and discuss the probabilities of language death among any of the

languages/language varieties in the polity, any language revival efforts as well as any emerging pidgins or creoles.

21.  Add anything you wish to clarify about the language situation and its probable direction of change over the next generation or two.

22.  Add pertinent references/bibliography and any necessary appendices (e.g. a general plan of the educational system to clarify the answers to questions 8, 9 and 14).

# Language Policy and Planning in Fiji, The Philippines and Vanuatu

*Richard B. Baldauf Jr.*
*Associate Professor of TESOL, School of Education, University of Queensland, QLD 4072 Australia <rbaldauf4@bigpond.com>*

*Robert B. Kaplan*
*Professor Emeritus, Applied Linguistics, University of Southern California Mailing Address: PO Box 577, Port Angeles, WA 98362 USA <rkaplan@ olypen.com>*

## Introduction

This volume brings together three language policy and planning studies related to the Pacific.[1] (See the 'Series Overview' in this volume for a more general discussion of the nature of the series, Appendix A for the 22 questions each study set out to address, and Kaplan *et al.* (2000) for a discussion of our underlying concepts for the studies themselves.) In this introductory paper, rather than trying to provide a summary of the material covered in these studies, we draw out and discuss some of the more general issues raised by them.

The *Pacific* has long held a fascination for linguists because of its linguistic and cultural diversity. Laycock (1969, cited in Mühlhäusler, 1996: 10) estimates 'that up to 4,000 languages are spoken in the region, most of them in Melanesia where 2 million people speak one-quarter of the world's languages.' This diversity is perhaps best illustrated by Vanuatu, where Crowley (this volume) estimates that the 80 actively spoken languages are spoken by about 195,000 people – a population about the size of a provincial city in many countries. Although the Philippines has a much larger population (more than 81 million), it also has a large number of languages (about 120). Fiji on the other hand, which lies on the border between Melanesia and Polynesia, with a population of about 800,000, has only three predominant languages (i.e. Fijian, Hindustani and English), although Fijian is dialectalised. Many linguists have argued that this diversity is threatened in the globalising world in which we live (Crocombe, 1989; Dixon, 1991; Mühlhäusler, 1996; cf. Crowley, this volume). Given the linguistic heterogeneity in the region, this diversity also raises the emergent questions about which research model(s) would be most likely to produce reliable, valid, and objective information about the role of language in society.

The social science research community has been engaged, for nearly three decades, in discussions about the 'correct' role of academic research. In Europe and North America this has lead to the emergence of major theoretical shifts, which, when taken together with the growing number of indigenous voices out of post-colonial societies, has generated new models to reconsider the primacy of positivist and post-positivist research. These discussions, at least to some extent, have sought ways in which positivist and post-positivist method-

ologies might coexist. Collectively, post-positivist research, phenomenological studies and critical theory have stimulated some contribution to a more precise understanding of language in society and have contributed to the growth of robustness and subtlety applicable to social policy development. This is evident in recent work which has produced an increasing change in focus in the discipline of language planning from an almost exclusive examination of the macro to a greater interest in the micro (see, e.g. Canagarajah, 2005). However, as far back as the end of the 70s, some scholars believed that détente was emerging. The question demanding an answer was whether experimentalism was the single best model for providing reliable, valid, and objective knowledge about the role of language in society. Scientists and researchers began to discuss the possible contributions of various models – not exclusively the experimentalist model – to understanding the complexity of differing social and educational structures.

The chapters in this volume show that détente may be possible. Indeed, the chapters in this volume demonstrate that positivist and post-positivist models can in fact coexist. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, however, does not favor any particular research model; on the contrary, much of the work on polity studies is descriptive rather than experimental. Some scholars might argue that the description of language situations is not really 'scientific,' but, as we have said elsewhere, thick policy description represents an effort to build a robust data source from which theoretical model building might be approached with greater subtlety.

## Fiji

In Fiji, different from the heavy linguistic heterogeneity characteristic of much of the region, there are only three dominant languages – Fijian, Hindustani and English – if the small numbers of speakers of immigrant languages are not considered. However, as a result of the checkerboard patterns of colonial settlement, both Fijian and Hindustani are marked by the co-existence of a number of varieties. Among the complex questions facing language planners in Fiji is the question of which of the several varieties will be privileged. There is, however, an emerging call for greater attention to the vernaculars. The emerging concern results from: (i) the loss of vernacular language fluency to English among the youth, particularly in urban settings, (ii) the evident concern that a significant portion of the population, lacking fluency in formal English, cannot access important texts – political, social, indeed in every area of life, (iii) the concern about language in the educational system and (iv) the absence of a coherent national language policy as well as a national language-in-education policy, the latter having wash back effects on teacher training, materials development, assessment of student progress, and – ultimately – funding for language-in-education activity.

While some would interpret the Fijian situation as a reaction against English, it is likely that poorly thought out language practices privileging English have played a role. The issues are not really about the usefulness of English but rather about the failure to recognise the role of vernacular languages in the communication needs of the polity.

## The Philippines

The situation in the Philippines is vastly more complex simply because of the linguistic diversity of the polity – c. 120 languages – and the much larger population. Since well before independence (1946), there has been a desire to identify a 'national' language; indeed, while the Philippines were still a dependency of Spain (before 1900), the spirit of rebellion and the thrust to independence were being expressed in Tagalog. From the time of the Spanish-American War (1898) and the entry of the United States onto the stage, English has been an important linguistic element. (Despite the 300-year Spanish domination, the Spanish language has not been a significant linguistic factor except in the preponderance of Spanish names.) Japan occupied the Philippines from late 1941 until 1945, though the occupation was too brief to have any significant effect from Japanese language. In short, despite the internal workings of its 120 languages, the major external linguistic influence has come from English. Both the geographic distribution of the Philippine languages and the disparity in population weight have played a role in the emergence of a small number of languages as having greatest importance. Out of that smaller number of languages, Tagalog has emerged as the most important language, in part at least because it is the language of the capital city (Manila). In the more recent past, significant efforts have been made to have Tagalog, variously renamed over the past 70 years – referred to as *Wikang Pambansa* ('national language') after 1939, renamed as Pilipino in 1959, and presently called Filipino by the 1987 Constitution of the Republic – become the official national language. While the historical emergence of Tagalog is more complex and more convoluted than this oversimplified chronology would suggest, it clearly shows the attention devoted to Tagalog and the importance of the idea of a national language through the modern history of the Philippines.

Despite the attention and effort dedicated to the issue of a national language, there really has never been a national language policy in the Philippines; there is evidence of discussion and debate, but little evidence of a clear plan to achieve the objectives implied in the debate. A major issue that has emerged in the most recent decades has been the need to 'intellectualise' Tagalog so that it may indeed serve the linguistic needs of all registers. This chapter illustrates why it is necessary to describe in chronological sequence the on-going development of Tagalog-based Pilipino, now Filipino, the national language of the Republic of the Philippines, as a language of intellectual discourse, and to offer some generalisations that may contribute to the articulation of a theory of the process of intellectualisation of a language through language planning.

## Vanuatu

Vanuatu is an independent republic located in the south western Pacific between Fiji (qv), the Solomon Islands and New Caledonia – an archipelago of 13 large islands and 70 smaller ones, in a Y-shape that extends over a north-south distance of approximately 850 km – lying to the south of the Solomons and having an area of 14,760 sq km (5,699 sq miles) and a population of about 195,000, spread throughout this large number of islands of varying size. Formerly known as the New Hebrides, Vanuatu gained its independence from

joint Anglo-French colonial control in 1980. Given that this political 'condominium' was not established until 1906, it is possible that Vanuatu is the last part of the pre-colonial world ever to have been colonised by a European power.

Vanuatu may be the world's most linguistically diverse nation in terms of the number of actively spoken indigenous languages per head of population; at least 81 local languages are spoken by an average of only about 2,500 speakers each. This extreme linguistic – and accompanying cultural – diversity is acknowledged in the preamble to the constitution of Vanuatu:

> *We the people of Vanuatu*
> *Proud of our struggle for freedom*
> *Determined to safeguard the achievement of this struggle*
> *Cherishing our ethnic, linguistic and cultural diversity*
> *Hereby proclaim the establishment of the united and free Republic of Vanuatu.*

That bilingual – English/French – constitution (Art 3; ¶ 1) declares Bislama, English and French to be 'official languages'; Bislama is declared the 'national language' and English and French are declared to be the 'principal languages of education'. There is a paragraph (Art 3; ¶ 2) protecting the indigenous vernaculars, and providing for the possible elevation of any of them to the status of 'national language' at some time in the future.

As was the case in many parts of Europe, a large number of languages in the Pacific Basin exist as dialect chains. Thus, diversity has been not only a matter of languages, but also of dialects and language boundaries – each small community having its own version of a language. As communities have become larger and more inclusive, there has been pressure on them to choose a language variety (or a variety has been chosen for them) to standardise for literacy and schooling purposes, and such a process can have the potential to reduce dialect variation and linguistic diversity. Is it better, then, not to introduce literacy for some indigenous languages, hoping that vibrant oral language communities will be more likely to sustain a language and its dialects (see e.g. Mühlhäusler 1991, 1995), or is vernacular literacy potentially a sustaining factor that will, in the long term, lead to better language maintenance at least for some languages (e.g. Crowley this volume)? While linguists may debate these issues, decisions are likely to be taken by governments, and to be implemented by development projects funded by UNESCO or the World Bank. This question is particularly relevant for Vanuatu where literacy has been introduced into primary education in the local vernaculars.

Up until the 1950s the Anglo-French 'condominium' government left education to the missions, which generally operated their schools in the vernaculars. Because their main objective was proselytising, school and literacy were narrowly conceived – a way of bringing the gospel to the people. Written materials were mainly religious – hymnals, catechisms and parts of the New Testament, providing only restricted, if any, access to information of a political, social or cultural nature. Many of these schools did not even divide students into classes, but taught basic skills – the alphabet, memorising the catechism, then reading and writing in the vernacular. The 'better' students (however defined) may have been taught some English or French. (Nearly half the languages in

Vanuatu are still not written so vernacular literacy was not available in those languages.)

In the 1960 first the British, then in the spirit of competition the French, set up their own school systems – English- or French-medium primary schools, with the British also providing a secondary school and teacher training college in Port Vila. English schools were fee paying while French schools charged no fees and tried to provide better facilities to attract more students to study in French. The vernacular languages and Bislama were not used in these schools and were even prohibited, since schools and parents saw education in the metropolitan language as a key to economic advancement (Thomas, 1990).

Vanuatu is currently involved in an effort to standardise its national language, Bislama – actually a pidgin. English and French are official languages and languages of education in Vanuatu, but despite this status, English and French have only become the first languages of a very small minority of the population. Echoing some of the fears to be found in Fiji, vernacular languages have acquired the focus of attention.

## Summary Comments

Thus, the discourse represented in these three studies varies from the more traditional descriptive to the more post-modern, and from the macro to issues of more micro consequence. Table 1 suggests the diversity of the polities represented in the areal volumes published to date in this series varies along virtually any scale one wishes to apply. The emergence of the EU created a platform from which the diversity of Europe can confront some common problems, but, as Van Els (2006) suggests, the EU has done relatively little about the language diversity among its member states, perhaps precisely because the organisation has insisted on the sanctity of its linguistic diversity. If, as the guiding documents of the EU suggest, 'The Union shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity,' that diversity, now locked into policy, creates both great expense (in the form of translation[2] into and out of all of the languages of the member states), and the impossibility of a solution both to the expense and the administrative complexity. While there is a functioning supraordinal entity in Europe, the situation in the Pacific Basin is more complex; there is no international organisation passing rules which apply to its member states; rather, independence is rampant.

It is interesting to note the extent to which the respective Ministries of Education are basically responsible for language policy. In all the polities listed, it is the Ministry of Education that is responsible for first language education. It is also of interest that the number of the minority languages that will be given serious consideration is defined by the Ministries of Education. It is apparent that smaller language communities do not have the resources for extensive language education. Thus, there is a need to provide language support for minorities, and a need to explore the difficulties this need poses for all the polities under discussion here.

It is interesting that all of the Pacific Basin polities under discussion are struggling with a number of issues. First, all have English as a world language; as a result, all are faced with the problem that no indigenous language is sufficiently

**Table 1** Basic facts pertaining to the polities (Expanded from Europe II, 2006)

| Country Name | Population | Area in Sq. Km. | GDP* in billions US$ | Type of Government |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Czech Republic | c. 10,272,179 | 78,703 | $116.7 | Parliamentary Democracy |
| Fiji | c. 832,494 | 7,078 | $5.4 | Republic |
| Finland | c.5,167,486 | 337,030 | $103.6 | Republic |
| Hungary | c. 10,000,000 | 93,000 | $75.4 | Republic |
| Northern Ireland | c. 1,688,600 | 14,121 | NA | Part of UK |
| Philippines | c.81,159,644 | 300,000 | $270.5 | Republic |
| Sweden | c. 9,000,000 | 449,000 | $175.0 | Constitutional Monarchy |
| Vanuatu | c.180,618 | 14,760 | $240.0 | Republic |

*GDP = Gross Domestic Product

elaborated to function in all possible ranges of discourse. That realisation brings two major issues to the fore:

(1) Is it essential to identify and develop one language as the national language for political unity and educational efficiency? and
(2) Which of the indigenous languages or dialects will be promoted to standardisation?

In turn, the answer to the second question (assuming that the answer to the first question is 'Yes') gives rise to a new set of questions:

(3) What does 'standardisation' mean in lexical, grammatical and rhetorical terms?
(4) Who will do the standardising, over what amount of time, at what cost?
(5) How will the 'standard' version be promulgated through the population, over what time duration, starting when in relation to the learners' ages, through what societal mechanisms?

All of these Pacific polities report low rates of literacy. (The meaning of 'literacy' is not uniform across the polities, and the problem is simply augmented by the fact that the polities support different points of termination for formal schooling.) In sum, in all of the polities, basic long-term policies have been directed toward assimilation (perhaps an inevitable outcome of standardisation). While these polities share a number of common educational, social and economic problems, the approach to problem solution tends to be largely restricted within the polity; there is relatively little evidence of broader solutions. (For example, the languages spoken in Vanuatu are linguistically similar to Fijian, but Fiji and Vanuatu do not seek joint solutions or pool their resources to reduce overhead costs.)

At the same time, the environment (i.e. 'globalisation') has exacerbated problems relating to the role and reach of English as a language of wider communication. There is no question that English has assumed an important role

(as for that matter have Arabic, French and Mandarin). Not only has the role of English changed, but attempts at enriching vernacular languages have also created a significant terminological issue, since it is probably desirable that terminology should be consistent. These matters have placed great pressure of language policy practitioners with respect to language maintenance in the context of both inter-polity and intra-polity use.

More common issues will be apparent to the reader. We hope that this areal volume (and its companions) will better serve the needs of specialists. It is our intent to publish other areal volumes subsequently. We will do so in the hope that such volumes will be of interest to areal scholars and others interested in language policies and language planning in geographically coherent regions. (See the Series Overview elsewhere in this volume for more detail on our future plans.)

## Notes

1. The studies in this volume were previously published as follows: **Fiji**: *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4 (3&4), 367–456; **The Philippines:** *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19 (5&6): 487–525; and **Vanuatu:** *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1 (1), 47–132. Authors' updates to their studies for Fiji – taking into account major changes in the language planning and policy situations relevant to the subject of the study – follow that monograph as an addendum to the original article, while the Philippines monograph has been updated by the author.
2. The problem of translation is not just one of expense, but is also related to the fact that it is so massive an exercise because of the number of languages involved that translation into lesser used languages is often done via one of the major languages – often English. Tosi (2004) argues that this process, along with the use of language work-benches, translation tools which draw on already translated stock phrases, means that translations into, e.g., Italian, may often be hard to recognise as standard Italian, and in some cases may not be comprehensible. Eventually such translation problems will need to be addressed if the EU equality-of-languages policy is going to be anything more than symbolic. EU translation problems are small by comparison to those that would be needed to meet the needs of the Pacific. Perhaps for this reason, lingua franca pidgins and creoles have arisen, and English has spread to meet the interlingual communication needs. (See, e.g., Baldauf & Djité, 2002.)

## References

Baldauf, R.B., Jr. and Djité, P. (2002) Australasia and the South Pacific. In J. Maurais and M.A. Morris (eds) *Languages in a Globalising World* (pp. 217–27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2005) *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Crocombe, R.G. (1989) *The South Pacific: An Introduction*. Christchurch: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Crowley, T. (1989) Language issues and national development in Vanuatu. In István Fodor and Claude Hagège (eds.) *Language Reform: History and Future, Vol. IV* (pp. 111–39). Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Dixon, R.M.W. (1991) The endangered languages of Australia, Indonesia and Oceania. In R.H. Robins and E.M. Uhlenbeck (eds) *Endangered languages* (pp. 229–55). Oxford: BERG.

Kaplan, R.B., Baldauf, R.B., Jr., Liddicoat, A.J., Bryant, P., Barbaux, M.-T. and Pütz, M. (2000) Current issues in language planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1, 135–44.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2000) Kommunikationale Probleme der Anglikanischen Mission in Melanesien und deren Lösung. Paper presented at the Hagen Conference, Interd-

isziplinäres Kolloquium Kommunikation an Kulturellen Grenzen Akteure, Formen, Folgen, 11–12 January 2000, FernUniversität, Gesamthochschule in Hagen.

Mühlhäusler, P. (1996) *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. London: Routledge.

Mühlhäusler, P. (1995) The interdependence of linguistic and biological diversity. In D. Myers (ed.) *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 154–61). Darwin: University of the Northern Territory.

Mühlhäusler, P. (1991) Intercultural communication in the Pacific Area in precolonial days. Paper presented at the Fifth Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu.

Thomas, A. (1990) Language planning in Vanuatu. In R.B. Baldauf, Jr. and A. Luke (eds) *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp. 234–258). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Tosi, A. (2004) The language situation in Italy. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5 (3), 247–335.

van Els, T.J.M. (2006) The European Union, its institutions and its languages: Some political observations. In R.B. Baldauf, Jr. and R.B. Kaplan (eds) *Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northern Ireland* (pp. 202–56). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

## Further Reading

### Fiji

Calder, A. (1996) Language, empire and the 'home colonies'. *Span: Journal of the South Pacific Association for Commonwealth Literature & Language Studies* 42–43, 1–14.

Crowley, T. (1984) Pacific languages: Directions for the future. *Language Planning Newsletter* 10 (4), 1–2.

Geraghty, P. (1989) The reawakening of the Fijian language. *Ethnies: Droits de l'homme et peuples autochtones* 8/9/10, 91–5.

Hindson, C. (1985) Post-primary school non-academic alternatives: A south Pacific study. *Comparative Education* 21 (2), 135–56.

Mangubhai, F. (1987a) Literacy in Fiji: Its orgins and its development. *Interchange* 18 (1–2), 124–35.

Mangubhai, F. (1987b) Literacy in the South Pacific: Some multilingual and multiethnic issues. In D.A. Wagner (ed.) *The Future of Literacy in a Changing World* (pp. 186–206). Oxford: Pergamon.

Mugler, F. (2000) South-East Asia and the South Pacific. *Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 237–41). India: Sage.

Shameem, N. and Reed, J. (1996) Administering a performance test in Fiji Hindi. In G. Wigglesworth and C. Elder (eds) *The Language Testing Cycle: From Inception to Washback* (pp. 80–104). Canberra: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.

Siegel, J. (1987) Language at the University of the South Pacific. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13 (1), 53–63.

### The Philippines

Alberca, W.L. (1990) The continuing controversy: Agreement or disagreement over the bilingual education policy. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 21 (1), 67–76.

Alberca, W.L. (1998) Language agenda for the Philippines in the third millennium: The case for English. In M. Bautista and S. Lourdes (eds) *Pagtanaw: Essays on Language in Honor of Teodoro A. Llamzon* (pp. 158–69). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Almario, V.S. (1988) Wika at kritisismo [Language and criticism]. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 19 (2), 75–81.

Anderson, B. (1996) Colonial language policies in Indonesia and the Philippines: A contrast in intended aims and unintended outcomes. In L. Garcia-Moreno and P.C. Pfeiffer (eds) *Text and Nation: Cross-Disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities* (pp. 17–27). Columbia, SC: Camden House.

Ang, G.R. (1978) The Filipino as a bilingual or multilingual: Some implications. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society* 6, 187–9.

Bajunid, I.A. (1996) Using two/three languages in Philippine classrooms: Implications for policies, strategies and practices. A response. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 17 (2–4), 220–24.

Bartens, A. (2001) The rocky road to education in Creole. *Estudios de Sociolinguistica* 2 (2), 27–56.

Baumgartner, J. (1977) The national language, bilingualism, and literacy: Some questions on the current policy. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society* 5, 266–70.

Baumgartner, J. (1989) The controversy about the National Language: Some Observations. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society* 17 (2), 168–72.

Bautista, M.L.S. (1988) The parameters of intellectualization-Applications to Filipino. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 19 (2), 35–44.

Bautista, M.L.S. (1990) The bilingual education policy: Its problems and promise for La Salle Schools. *De la Salle University Graduate Journal* 15 (2), 1–11.

Bautista, M.L.S. (2004) Researching English in the Philippines: Bibliographical resources. *World Englishes* 23 (1), 199–210.

Bauzon, L.E. (1991) Language planning and education in Philippine history. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 88, 101–19.

Benton, R.A. (1987) Language rights in a Philippine setting. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 18–19 (2–1), 73–90.

Bresnahan, M.J. (1978) Language policy in the Philippines. *The SECOL Bulletin: Southeastern Conference on Linguistics* 2 (2), 38–44.

Bresnahan, M.J. (1979) English in the Philippines. *Journal of Communication* 29 (2), 64–71.

Bumatay, R.T. (1988) The semiotics of written discourse in a new language. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 19 (2), 13–17.

Clements, R.J. (1977) The language dilemma in the literature of emerging countries (with particular emphasis on Asia and the South Pacific). *World Literature Today* 51 (4), 553–9.

Constantino, P.C. (1990) Pagpaplanong Pangwika tungo sa Modernisasyon: Karanasan ng Malaysia, Indonesia at Pilipinas. *Daluyan* 1 (2), 15–20.

Cristobal, A. (1987) Philippines' elite must learn the language of the poor. *Far Eastern Economic Review* 138 (44), 27–27.

Cruz, I.R. (1986) English and Tagalog in Philippine literature: A study of literacy bilingualism. *World Englishes* 5 (2/3), 163–76.

David, R.S. (1996) Politika ng Wika, Wika ng Politika. *Daluyan* 7 (1–2), 19–28.

De Quiros, C. (1996) Ang Kapangyarihan ng Wika, Ang Wika ng Kapangyarihan. *Daluyan* 7 (1–2), 29–35.

DeCicco, G. and Maring, J.M. (1983) Diglossia, Regionalism, and National Language Policy: A Comparison of Spain and the Philippines. In A.W. Miracle, Jr., R.L. Blakely and N.C. England (eds) *Bilingualism: Social Issues and Policy Implications* (pp. 38–53). Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Dominguez Moreno, E. (1999) El proceso de desaparicion del castellano en Filipinas. *Revista Filipina: a Quarterly Journal of Hispano-Philippine Literature & Linguistics* 2 (4), (no pagination).

Doronila, M.L.C. (1997) *A Research and Development Approach to the Delivery of Comprehensive Functional Education and Literacy in the Philippines*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED418217.

Dosio Rodriguez, M. (2003) The language policy of Spain in America and the Philippines [Sixteenth – Nineteenth Centuries]. *Moenia* 9, 522–4.

Dyen, I. (1972) The Philippine national language problem. In A.Q. Perez and A.O. Santiago (eds) *Proceedings of the Conference on Language Policy and Language Development of Asian Countries* (pp. 1–12). Manila: Pambansang Samahan Sa Linggwistikang Pilipino.

Elkins, R.E. (1990) Some comments on language enrichment. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 21 (1), 98–9.

Fernandez, M. (2001) Why Chabacano?; Por que el chabacano? *Estudios de Sociolinguistica* 2 (2), i–xii.

Florentino, A.S. (1986) What price Filipino writing in English. *English Today* 2 (2), 36–8.

Gaerlan, B.S. (1998) The politics and pedagogy of language use at the University of Philippines: The history of English as the medium of instruction and the challenge mounted by Filipino. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A (Humanities and Social Sciences)* 59 (2), 399.

Garcia, R.L. (1987) *Global Perspectives on Language Policy and Education*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED288357.

Gonzales, A. (1972) The future of English in Asia. In A.Q. Perez and A.O. Santiago (eds) *Proceedings of the Conference on Language Policy and Language Development of Asian Countries* (pp. 1–15). Manila: Pambansang Samahan Sa Linggwistikang Pilipino.

Gonzalez, A.B. (1974) The 1973 constitution and the bilingual education policy of the Department of Education and Culture. *Philippine Studies* 22 (3–4), 325–37.

Gonzalez, A., FSC (1980) Becoming bilingual in English in a Philippine setting: A partial report of a Manila sample. In L.K. Boey (ed.) *Bilingual Education* (pp. 177–206). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Gonzalez, A. (1983) Evaluating the Philippine bilingual education policy. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 14–15 (2–1), 46–65.

Gonzalez, A. (1985) Language use surveys in the Philippines (1968–1983). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 55, 57–77.

Gonzalez, A. (1988a) The intellectualization of Filipino-Agenda for the twenty-first century. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 19 (2), 3–6.

Gonzalez, A. B. (1988b) Philippine language policy today. *New Language Planning Newsletter* 2 (3), 1–3.

Gonzalez, A. (1988c) The 1987 policy on bilingual education. *New Language Planning Newsletter* 2 (3), 3–5.

Gonzalez, A. (1988d) English language teaching and the new constitution: Problems and prospects. *Philippine Studies* 36, 485–93.

Gonzalez, A. (1989a) Sociolinguistics in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 20 (1), 57–8.

Gonzalez, A. (1989b) Language and nationalism in the Philippines: An update. *New Language Planning Newsletter* 4 (2), 1–3.

Gonzalez, A. (1990a) Evaluation bilingual education in the Philippines: Towards a multidimensional model of evaluation in language planning. In R.B. Baldauf, Jr. and A. Luke (eds) *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp. 319–34). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gonzalez, A. (1990b) Evaluating bilingual education in the Philippines: Towards a multidimensional model of evaluation in language planning. In M. Halliday, J. Gibbons and H. Nicholas (eds) *Learning, Keeping, and Using Language: Selected Papers from the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Sydney, 16–21 August 1987, I & II* (pp. 153–161). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gonzalez, A. (1991) Studies on language and society in the Philippines: State of the art. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 88, 5–17.

Gonzalez, A. (1993) An overview of language and development. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 14 (1–2), 5–23.

Gonzalez, A. (1994) Language standards and standardization. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 25 (1–2), 43–51.

Gonzalez, A. (2002) Language planning and intellectualisation. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 3 (1), 5–27.

Gonzalez, A. and Alberca, W.L. (1991) Language and politics in the Philippines: A bibliographical survey. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 22 (1–2), 61–70.

Gonzalez, A. and Bajunid, I.A. (1996) Using two/three languages in Philippine classrooms: Implications for policies, strategies, and practices [and] A Response. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 17 (2–4), 210–24.

Gonzalez, A. and Bautista, M.L.S. *Language Surveys in the Philippines (1966–1984).* Manilla: De La Salle University Press.

Gonzalez, A. and Cruz, I.R. (1988) The intellectualization of Filipino: A theoretical base for teaching training. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 19 (2), 113–14.

Gonzalez, A. and McHanghan, H.P. (1983) Panagani: Language planning, implementation and evaluation: Essays in honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his sixty-seventh birthday. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 14–15 (2–1).

Gonzalez, A. and Postrado, L. (1976) The dissemination of Pilipino. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 7 (1–2), 60–84.

Goulet, R.M. (1985) Language policies in the Philippines. *Social Education* 49 (2), 113–14.

Gupta, A.F. (1985) Language status planning in the ASEAN countries. In D. Bradley (ed.) *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics No. 9: Language Policy, Language Planning and Sociolinguistics in South-East Asia* (pp. 1–14). Canberra: Australian National University.

Hidalgo, C.A. (1970) Responsible nationalism through linguistics. *The Diliman Review* 18, 232–47.

Hidalgo, C.A. (1998) Language choice in a multilingual society: The case of the Philippines. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 130, 23–33.

Kapili, L.V. (1988) Requiem for English? *English Today* 4 (4), 30–35.

Kaplan, R.B. (1982) The language situation in the Philippines. *Linguistic Reporter* 24 (5), 1–4.

Kaplan, R.B. (1987) English in the language policy of the Pacific rim. *World Englishes* 6 (2), 137–48.

Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B., Jr. (2003) Language planning in the Philippines. In *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin* (pp. 63–82). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Kelz, H.P. (1981) Sprachplanung auf den Philippinen und die Entwicklung einer philippinischen Nationalsprache [Language planning in the Philippines and the development of a Philippine national language]. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 5 (2), 115–136.

Lansang, A.P. (1978) The problem met in the use of Pilipino in Northern Luzon. *Saint Louis University Research Journal* 9, 611–22.

Lent, J.A. (1990) The development of multicultural stability in ASEAN: The role of mass media. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 1, 45–59.

Lingan, A.H. (1985) The threshold level in Pilipino as a second language: A Region II sample. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 16–17 (2–1), 71–9.

Llamzon, T.A., S.J. (1972) The writing of the grammar of the national language. In A.Q. Perez and A.O. Santiago (eds) *Proceedings of the Conference on Language Policy and Language Development of Asian Countries* (pp. 1–19). Manila: Pambansang Samahan Sa Linggwistikang Pilipino.

Llamzon, T.A., S.J. (1973) The integrative function of language: Do we need a national language to unite us? *Philippine Studies* 21, 259–67.

Llamzon, T.A., S.J. (1979) English in Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines. *English Around the World* 21(Nov), 4,6.

Llamzon, T.A., S.J. (1983) The status of English in Metro Manila today. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 14–15 (2–1), 106–21.

Luzares, C. E. (1982) Languages-in-education in the Philippines. In R.B. Kaplan *et al.* (eds) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 2 (pp. 122–8). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Martin, D. (1968) Language, education, and literacy. *Silliman Journal* 15, 414–26.

Miller, J.R. (1981) The politics of Philippine national language policy. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 5 (2), 137–52.

Nical, I., Smolicz, J.J. and Secombe, M.J. (2004) Rural students and the Philippine bilingual education program on the island of Leyte. In J.W. Tollefson and A.B.M. Tsui (eds) *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* (pp. 153–76). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ortiz Armengol, P. (1988) La lengua espanola en las filipinas [The Spanish language in the Philippines]. *Boletin de la Academia Hondurena de la Lengua* 28 (30), 119–22.

Otanes, F.T. and Sibayan, B.P. (1968) *Language Policy Survey of the Philippines: Initial Report*. Manila: Philippine Normal College Language Study Center.