GLOBAL FILIPINO IN MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

0. Introduction

GLOBAL FILIPINO has been introduced to society during its linguistic debut at the 1st International Conference on Filipino as a Global Language held on 17-19 March 2008 at the University of Hawaii-Manoa. Do you know that Global Filipino was on the summit of the highest mountain in the world – Mt. Everest, seen and conquered by the three daring women dubbed as Filipino “heroes,” where they triumphantly exclaimed “Mabuhay! Narito na tayo!” (Long live! Here we are!) So, Global Filipino reached the top of the world!

And now, roads lead to the 2nd International Conference on Filipino as a Global Language, on January 15-18, 2010, at the Hilton Hotel, Mission Valley – San Diego, California. From all directions, delegates come to participate and contribute something on the conference theme: “Transformation Through Empowerment in Filipino Language and Culture.”

How? Language advocates who strongly support and speak in favor of Global Filipino don’t need to be in power to be empowered in using and teaching Filipino language and culture for transformation – to have self-esteem, self-confidence, and trust in the national language of the Filipino people. There are advocates for social and language reform in multilingual education in the Philippines and elsewhere in the world.

The Philippine National Language has been introduced as Global Filipino, and the overseas Filipino workers, popularly known as OFW are now called Global Filipinos speaking Global Filipino in different parts of the global village. This new name for OFW was made official on 11 August 2009, when Secretary of Foreign Affairs Alberto G. Romulo launched the “DFA’s ePassport Modernizing the Philippine Passport for the Global Filipino,” with President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo receiving her first ePassport. (Manila Bulletin, 20 September 2009).

The UNESCO commitment to Education for All in the multilingual world is linguistic diversity and multilingualism. The Summer Institute of Linguistics - SIL Philippines has recommended “The ‘First Language’ Bridge to Filipino and English Program” in all schools.

In Congress, several bills have been introduced and pending for deliberation and enactment into law. The House and Senate Bills aim to change or modify the current Bilingual Education Policy (BEP) in operation since 1974.

This paper presents an overview of Global Filipino in multilingual education nationwide and worldwide. In the sociology of language, what is the status of Global Filipino in the community of nations in the globalized world?

1. The Tongues of the Philippines

Our country is richly blessed with over 170 languages and dialects spoken by about 90,000,000 population in the archipelago of over 7,100 islands. The Linguistic Map of the Philippines reproduced for the Commission on the Filipino Language (CFL) from the SIL
International Ethnologue 2005 – serves as a tour guide to the world of languages & dialects with amazing linguistic powers. (The Linguistic Map of the Philippines in the Appendix).

The mother tongues in the regions play an important role in the Philippine educational system. We Filipinos have strong ethnic loyalty and pride in using our own native tongues in all occasions. We have the human rights and language rights to use, develop and preserve our mother tongues, especially the dialects in the brink of extinction. All these languages and dialects contribute to the development and enrichment of our evolving national language: Global Filipino. The growth, development and spread of Global Filipino is unstoppable. It has been gaining acceptance and popularity, especially among language organizations, linguistic circles, and in the academes here and abroad. But this Global Filipino is still “in limbo” in the present educational system of our country.

2. Language & Language-in-Education Policy

On the national language and language-in-education question, what is the answer in the Philippine setting? The answers to the question were read and discussed in a separate paper presented at the 10th Philippine Linguistics Congress in December 2008 at the University of the Philippines – Quezon City, Philippines. This conference paper (manuscript for publication), with the given abstract in the Appendix, supplements and complements this topic on Global Filipino in Multilingual Education nationwide and worldwide.

2.1 DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009 on Basic Education

For more information and guidance of multilingual educators, reproduced here are helpful guidelines on language-in-education policy issued by Department of Education Secretary Jesli A. Lapus, on 14 July 2009.

Republic of the Philippines
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DepED Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City

July 14, 2009

DepEd ORDER
No. 74, s. 2009

INSTITUTIONALIZING MOTHER TONGUE-BASED
MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION (MLE)

To: Undersecretaries
Assistant Secretaries
Bureau Directors
Directors of Services, Centers and Heads of Units
Regional Directors
Schools Division/City Superintendents
Heads, Public and Private Elementary and Secondary Schools

1. The lessons and findings of various local initiatives and international studies in basic education have validated the superiority of the use of the learner’s mother tongue or first language in improving learning outcomes and promoting Education for All (EFA).
2. **Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education**, hereinafter referred to as MLE, is the effective use of more than two languages for literacy and instruction. Henceforth, it shall be institutionalized as a fundamental education policy and program in this Department in the whole stretch of formal education including preschool and in the Alternative Learning System (ALS).

3. The preponderance of local and international research consistent with the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) recommendations and affirms the benefits and relevance of MLE. Notable empirical studies like the Lingua Franca Project and Lubuagan First Language Component show that:
   
   a. First, learners learn to read more quickly when in their first language (L1);
   
   b. Second, pupils who have learned to read and write in their first language learn to speak, read, and write in a second language (L2) and third language (L3) more quickly than those who are taught in a second or third language first; and
   
   c. Third, in terms of cognitive development and its effects in other academic areas, pupils taught to read and write in their first language acquire such competencies more quickly.

4. Relatedly, the study of the Department of Education Region IV-B (MIMAROPA) entitled “Double Exposure in Mathematics: a Glimpse of Mother Tongue First” has provided the local validation of the fundamental observation that top performing countries in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) are those that teach and test students in science and math in their own languages.

5. All Regional Directors and Superintendents are hereby enjoined to promote and encourage local participation in the following essential support systems of the MLE within the framework of School-Based Management (SBM) with the support of the local government units:
   
   a. Formulation of region-specific schemes to recognize and institutionalize the initiatives of schools and localities through appropriate incentives or policy support in bringing about and developing MLE towards financial and instructional self-reliance and excellence;
   
   b. Provisions of orientation and training opportunities along with exposure to successful models of MLE that have been developed. The gradual integration of MLE in all subject areas and at all grade levels (beginning in preschool and continuing by adding a grade level per year) in the school improvement plans (SIPs) and district ALS program is likewise enjoined effective immediately;
   
   c. The utilization of Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE), school board funds, and other education improvement funds is hereby authorized for the planning and implementation of MLE programs in the following sequence of priority: (1) advocacy work and community mobilization; (2) development of a working orthography of the local language; (3) MLE orientation and teachers training; (4) developing, printing and distributing teachers’/facilitators’ guides; (5) reading
materials and other instructional materials; (6) development of assessment tools; and (7) evaluation and monitoring of learning outcomes; and

d. An MLE technical working group at the regional and division levels shall be established to facilitate MLE planning, monitoring and evaluation.

6. During the first three years of implementation, the enclosed “MLE Bridging Plan” may be used for reference for both teaching and curriculum development. For the ensuing years, adjustments may be made based on monitoring and evaluation results.

7. For all learning programs of the Alternative Learning System (ALS), the learners’ first language shall be used as primary medium and thereafter, depending upon the previous level of functional literacy and pedagogical requirements of accreditation and equivalency, the Bureau of Alternative Learning System (BALS) shall determine the suitable second and third languages that will maximize the education benefits and competencies of the ALS clients. Enclosed is the FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A STRONG MOTHER TONGUE-BASED MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION (MLE).

8. This Department with the help of MLE specialists shall incorporate an MLE certification process and retain the privilege of establishing MLE certification procedures in order to maintain quality MLE programs wherever they may be implemented.

9. All orders, memoranda, issuances, rules and regulations or parts thereof inconsistent with the provisions of this Order are hereby rescinded, amended, or modified accordingly.

10. Immediate dissemination of and compliance with this Order is directed.

(Sgd.) JESLI A. LAPUS
Secretary

2.1.1 Enclosure No. 1 to DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009

FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A STRONG MOTHER TONGUE-BASED MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION (MLE)

For the long-term methodological, substantive and curricular guidance of teachers, school managers, instructional quality assurance staff and other education officials, an MLE Framework has already been prepared. The Framework establishes that MLE is not merely changing the medium of instruction. It is not about code switching or translation of materials. Strong MLE entails the following 10 fundamental requirements.

1. A working orthography (spelling) for the chosen local language that is acceptable to the majority of stakeholders and promotes intellectualization of that language;

2. Development, production and distribution of inexpensive instructional materials in the designated language at the school, division, and regional levels with a special priority on beginning reading and children’s literature. These materials should be as much as possible, original, reflecting local people, events, realities; and appropriate to the language, age, and culture of the learners;
3. The use of the learner’s First Language (L₁) as the primary medium of instruction (MOI) from pre-school until, at least, grade three. During such period, L₁ shall be the main vehicle to teach understanding and mastery of all subject areas like Math, Science, Makabayan, and language subjects like Filipino and English;

4. Mother Tongue as a subject and as a language of teaching and learning will be introduced in grade one for conceptual understanding;

5. The inclusion of additional languages such as Filipino, English and other local or foreign languages shall be introduced as separate subjects in a carefully planned pacing program, or no earlier than Grade two.

6. In the secondary level, Filipino and English shall be the primary medium of instruction (MOI). The learner’s first language (L₁) shall still be utilized as an auxiliary medium of instruction.

7. Other than English, Filipino, or Arabic for Madaris schools, the choice of additional language shall be at the behest of parents and endorsed by local stakeholders and as resources permit. When the pupils are ready, Filipino and English shall be gradually used as MOI no earlier than grade three. However, L₁ shall be effectively used to scaffold learning.

8. The language of instruction shall also be the primary language for testing in all regular school-based and system-wide examinations and in all international benchmarking and assessment exercises. It shall be maintained that the focus of educational assessment shall be specifically on the learner’s understanding of the subject content and not be muddled by the language of testing;

9. There must be a continuing in-service training (INSET) in partnership with MLE specialists on the effective use of L₁ as language of instruction – to facilitate reading, Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, and the development of cognitive and higher order thinking skills (HOTS) of the learner. INSET shall likewise equip educators to develop cultural sensitivity and enhance appreciation for cultural and linguistic diversity; and

10. Ensuring critical awareness, maximum participation, and support from the LGU, parents, and community for the implementation of the language and literacy program strategy.

(Italic – boldface supplied for emphasis)

2.1.2 Enclosure No. 2 to DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009

Legend:

MLE – Multilingual Education
MT – Mother Tongue
LOLI – Language of Learning and Instruction
L₁ – Mother tongue (the language the child knows best/uses most)
TPR – Total Physical Response

Enclosure No. 2 presents in tabulated MLE Framework the MLE Bridging Plan A (L₁ MT, L₂ Filipino, L₃ English), and MLE Bridging Plan B (L₁ Filipino, L₂ English, L₃ Local Language, L₄ Foreign Language).

The summary and explanation of the MLE Framework: In MLE Bridging Plan A (L₁ Mother Tongue (MT), L₂ Filipino, L₃ English), the Mother Tongue (L₁) is used for all social and learning activities, critical thinking and creativity development – in Preschool, Kindergarten, and Grades 1-2-3-4.
In Grades 5-6 and High School, the Mother Tongue $L_1$ MT is used to scaffold learning in all subject areas and for remediation purposes. The $L_1$ MT is used to develop more complex and rhetorical use of oral and written language during Filipino language subject. Filipino ($L_2$) is used as a language subject using the Mother Tongue ($L_1$) as language of instruction (LOI).

In Grades 1-2-3, time allotment is used for Filipino ($L_2$) as a subject in the 1st semester to establish oral reading and writing in the Mother Tongue (MT). Beginning 2nd semester, oral Filipino is introduced through Total Physical Response (TPR) in songs, poems and games. The Filipino subject should draw content from Makabayan and the community and regional culture. Beginning 2nd semester, Filipino is used as language of instruction (LOI) for Makabayan. In Grade 4, Filipino is used as medium of instruction (MOI) for Makabayan, while continually aiming to develop independent literacy level in the Filipino language.

In Grade 5-6, Filipino ($L_2$) is used as Language of learning and instruction (LOLI) for Makabayan, Edukasyong Pantahanan at Pangkabuhayan (EPP) and Filipino language subject. In High School, Filipino is used as LOLI for Makabayan, Technology and Livelihood Education and Filipino language subject.

In Grades 1-2, time allotment is used for English ($L_3$) as a subject for the 1st and 2nd semesters for oral fluency, reading and writing in the Mother Tongue (MT) to prepare pupils to learn English more effectively. English can be introduced in songs, poems, games, storytelling and other related activities. In Grade 3, the English subject should draw content from Math and Science. This will help transition to Grade 4 when English is used as LOLI for Math and Science. In Grade 4, English is used to develop oral fluency, reading and writing in this language.

In Grades 5-6 and High School, English ($L_3$) is used as LOLI for Math, Science and English language subject, while continually aiming to develop independent literacy levels in this language. In Grades 5-6 and High School, additional languages are also introduced, like literacy instruction in Arabic (Madaris Schools), and introduction of other local and foreign languages like Spanish and French in High School.

The three-language program is suitable for areas where $L_1$ is Mother Tongue, $L_2$ is Filipino and $L_3$ is English, according to DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009.

In MLE Bridging Plan B ($L_1$Filipino, $L_2$ English, $L_3$ Local Language, $L_4$ Foreign Language), FILIPINO ($L_1$) is used for social and learning activities, critical thinking and creativity development in Preschool, Kindergarten and Grades 1-2. In Grades 3-4, Filipino is used as medium of instruction (MOI) for all subject areas including English. It is used to develop more complex and rhetorical use of language – oral and written.

In Grades 5-6 and High School, Filipino is used to scaffold learning in English. It is used to develop more complex and rhetorical use of language – oral and written. Time allotment is used for Filipino as a subject to introduce another local language ($L_1$) determined by the Multilingual Education Technical Working Group (MLE TWG) to be useful in the area.
In this **MLE Bridging Plan B**, the time allotment is used for **ENGLISH** (L₂) as a subject for the 1st semester to establish oral reading and writing in the Mother Tongue (MT) in Grades 1-2. Beginning 2nd semester, oral English is introduced through Total Physical Response (TPR) in songs, poems and games. This continues in Grade 3, to develop oral fluency, reading and writing in English. The English subject should draw content from Math and Science. This will help transition to Grade 4 when English is used as language of instruction (LOI) for Math and Science.

In Grade 4-5-6 and High School, English is used as language of learning and instruction (LOLI) for Math, Science and English language subject while continually aiming to development independent literacy levels in the language. In Grades 5-6, another local language (L₃) is introduced during Filipino language subject. In High School, another local language (L₃) or foreign language (L₄) is introduced during Filipino language subject.

The Department of Education (DepEd) has announced the teaching of Spanish/Español in June 2010, in selected public high schools. The Spanish language is back to the Philippine educational system. And the French language will be taught in 13 pilot science high schools starting school year 2010-2011. This is part of DepEd efforts to prepare Filipino students “for their role as global citizens and to give our graduates the competitive advantage.”

**3. DepEd-LCC Basic Literacy Program**

For the initial implementation of the language and language-in-education policy of multilingualism, the DepEd Literacy Coordinating Council (LCC), with the support of the SEAMEO-Innotech, started in July 2009 the functional and basic literacy program/project with action language planning – towards universalizing literacy in our country.

With **English**, nine (9) major languages representing the regions were identified and selected as follows: **Bicol, Cebuano, Tagalog, Hiligaynon, Ilocano, Kapampangan, Pangasinan, Tausug and Waray** (in that order as listed by the LCC). From basic literacy in different languages, children’s literature is given importance to develop appreciation, skills and creativity in languages and cultural practices, continually aiming to develop independent literacy levels in the languages (L₁, L₂, L₃, L₄), as expected in DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009.

In the present language-in-education policy implementation, some important points have to be considered in the representation of languages. For instance, the Muslim ethnolinguistic groups in the Philippines speak three (3) major languages: Maranao, Maguindanao and Tausug, with 1,035,966, 1,008,424 and 918,069 speakers, respectively, according to the 2000 National Statistics Office (NSO) Census of Household, Population by Ethnicity and Region.

With Tausug selected as the official language representative of the Muslim regional languages in the DepEd-LCC list of nine (9) major languages for the functional and basic literacy program/project, is the choice of Tausug as the representative language, acceptable to the Maranao and Maguindanao Muslims with bigger number of speakers than Tausug? Or, would the three languages be used in Muslim Mindanao?

In DepEd Order No. 74, the **Lubuagan First Language Component** is the model showing the benefits and relevance of using the **First Language** or Mother Tongue (L₁) in
early education. This is the model of the MLE Bridging Plans A & B. If Lubuagan of Kalinga Province is used as the L₁ Mother Tongue – is this First Language as LOI or MOI acceptable to speakers of other languages in the Cordillera Administrative Region – composed of Abra, Apayao, Benguet with Baguio City, Ifugao, Kalinga and Mountain Province, with a total CAR population of over 1,520,743?

In the Ilocos Region – Region 1, composed of Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, La Union and Pangasinan – Ilocano is the major and dominant language. Pangasinan is a separate major language of Pangasinan Province. But the town of Bolinao has a separate language or dialect, and the Bolinao speakers of the same province and region want their own Mother Tongue (L₁) as LOI or MOI in the educational system.

Tagalog is the major language to be used as LOI and MOI in the Tagalog Region IV, which consists of Region IV-A, land provinces known as CALABARZON (Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal & Quezon Province), and Region IV-B, island provinces called MIMAROPA (Mindoro Occidental & Oriental, Marinduque, Romblon & Palawan). If Tagalog is the language for Tagalog Region IV, how about Region IV-B speaking different island languages in the same region? What would be the LOI and MOI in the schools of Region IV-B with different mother tongues (MT – L₁ in MLE Bridging Plan A)?

In the DepEd MT MLE Policy, English is given importance in the policy implementation, and in the functional and basic literacy programs and projects. In the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP) and in the Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education (MT MLE) English plays an important role. English is a language of the world, a language of Asia, a language of the Philippines. English is a language of the government, commerce, industry and trade, science and technology, tourism, cinema, and other fields. It is a prestige language, a language of progress and opportunities for a better life.

In world Englishes today, Philippine English as the English language used in the Philippines, is recognized, respected and accepted as a variety or “nativized” English. It is a powerful vehicle of communication and information. We acquire the wisdom and knowledge of the world through English. We read and learn more scientific researches and advanced knowledge about Filipino and other Philippine languages through English. English can enrich our national language and other languages, and cultures, and even strengthen rather than “engulf” our national identity as a people. And Philippine English is here and here to stay in education and other important domains of language.

Philippine Children’s Literature: production, writing and reading multilingual literature for young people, is a fundamental requirement in the DepEd Order No. 74 and in the basic literary programs of the Literacy Coordinating Council (DepEd-LCC). “Globalizing National Children’s Literature Through Global Filipino and Philippine English” can serve as a helpful resource and reference for this purpose. This article was read by this paper presenter at the 15th International Conference on World Englishes, held on 23 October 2009 in Cebu City. A model of meaning-based translation: cross-language equivalence, shows how the regional ethnic literature as source language, can be translated into Global Filipino and Philippine English as receptor or target languages – for globalization. This is a sharing of Philippine children’s literature with the children of other countries. How? Through children’s book distribution worldwide and through the powerful internet – “internetting” the globalized world today.
4. Higher Education Language Policy

The Commission on Higher Education issued CHED Order No. 30, s. 2004: Revised Policies and Standards for Undergraduate Teacher Education Curriculum and CHED Order No. 59, s. 1996: “The implementation of the new General Education Curriculum must be characterized by an interdisciplinary approach which would help the students see the human being as an integral person living in both national and global community. The aim of language and literature is to provide students with effective communication skills in both English and Filipino and to foster critical understanding and appreciation of how people give expression to their experience in the world.” (Italic – boldface supplied for emphasis)

The minimum requirements for the mandatory General Education Curriculum (GEC) of tertiary courses of study leading to an initial bachelor’s degree are 24 units of language and literature: 9 units of English, 9 units of Filipino and 6 units of English or Filipino. All graduates of tertiary curricula are required to pass examinations in both languages for the practice of their professions.

The language-in-education policy in basic education and tertiary education is presently in effect until it is replaced by another language education policy to be enacted into law by the Congress. The Bilingual Education Policy was adopted and mandated in the language provisions of the 1987 Philippine Constitution.

5. Global Filipino Across Cultures

As citizens of the world, we are Global Filipinos speaking Global Filipino anywhere in the global village. Global Filipino as our national language has crossed beyond the Philippine Sea and the Asia Pacific Ocean – towards the borderless continents: Africa, Asia Pacific, Australia, Europe, North and South America, and the Middle East.

How many Global Filipinos are using our national language as a vehicle of communication beyond the national geographic boundaries? In the United States, there are 314,533 Filipino immigrants from 2001-2008, according to the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO). According to the Philippine Migration and Development Statistical Almanac of the Institute of Migration and Development Issues (IMDI), there are Global Filipinos living in 239 countries in the world. And there are over 10 million overseas Filipinos speaking Global Filipino as their lingua franca.

In the United States of America, they say, there are over 350 Filipino organizations – grouped according to language & culture, profession and religion. They are enjoying “equal rights and opportunities, are being recognized for their valuable contributions in public service, entertainment, sports, culinary arts and other fields.”

Among the most active organizations promoting Global Filipino language & culture is the Advanced Filipino Abroad Program (AFAP), based at the University of Hawaii representing the US Department of Education which serves as the center in the study of Indo-Pacific Languages & Cultures. Other dynamic language organizations are the Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages (COTSEAL) and the Council for Teaching Filipino Language and Culture (CTFLC), based at the San Diego State University in California.
The multimedia of communication and education as important domains of language, play a great role in the unstoppable spread and development of Global Filipino in the borderless world. Perhaps you have been watching on television the regular programs: Citizen Pinoy, Balitang America, Balitang Europa, Balitang España, Balitang Middle East, Balitang Disyerto, and other TV programs using Filipino as a global language of communication for information and entertainment.

6. Global Filipino in Multilingual Education Worldwide

Where in the world Filipino as a Global Language is used, recognized and given importance? In line with the UN’s policy of multilingual Education For All (EFA), promoting solidarity in linguistic and cultural diversity, Global Filipino as a national language and lingua franca of Global Filipinos, is given recognition and support in America. The Filipino language and culture are taught in middle schools, high schools, community colleges, and universities, including University of California and some California State Universities, Cornell University, University of Hawaii, University of Wisconsin and other US institutions of higher education.

In other countries, Filipino, now called Global Filipino is used and taught in elementary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, language institutes and language learning centers. The DepEd has listed more than 22 Filipino schools established in America, China, Norway, United Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Libya, Oman, etc., teaching Filipino language, culture and history. Some higher education institutions also offer courses in Filipino language & culture, like Australia, Canada, China, Japan, England, Norway, New Zealand, Russia, France, Germany, Korea, Malaysia, Indonesia and other Asian countries.

7. Current Issues & Views on Multilingual Education

In our democratic country with freedom of expression, we do not “unfriend” a critic expressing a negative opinion or critical views about issues on language and language-in-education. On the national language issue, the Manila Bulletin (05 March 2009) came out with the editorial cartoon of Juan dela Cruz, saying: “Our national language is a unifying element that connects the different ethnolinguistic groups in the country divided by geographic boundaries” (Manila Bulletin Editorial in the Appendix).

Some non-Tagalog critics consider the Philippine National Language as Tagalog, and they argue that there is no difference between Tagalog, Filipino and Filipino as the national language of the country. If this is so, would Tagalog/Filipino be used only in the Tagalog Region (Region IV), and Tagalog Provinces as Bulacan, Bataan, Nueva Ecija and Zambales belonging to another region (Region III), in the implementation of DepEd Order No. 74 on Multilingual Education Policy? The different names of the national language are just a matter of nomenclatures. A rose is a rose by any other name. Our national language still smells as sweet to the users and speakers of this beautiful language.

There are still pockets of resistance to the national language among non-Tagalog critics in the Visayas and Mindanao. Here is the recent issue in the popular press: “But Tagalog is Greek in Visayas and Mindanao” (Philippine Daily Inquirer, 25 August 2009). This strong reaction by a non-Tagalog critic was raised when the “Inquirer Editorial Pushed the use of ‘Filipino’ in our judicial system to promote the ‘national language’ and make
‘court processes more understandable to the people’... the national language is by no means ‘national’; it is only ‘regional’ in usage.” This critic also said: “Tagalog is as Greek as English is to them.” But in his critique, he was all-praise for the use of English, saying: “This country has survived well with English as its principal medium of instruction and communication.” He stated that our country has an edge over other Asian countries because of the use of English in education. A business managing director recently commented in the press: “‘Pinoy’s accent, diction still good’. The Pinoy’s ability to adopt an American, British or Australian accent could make up for his ineptitude in the English language… the Philippines still remains a favorite location of multinational companies to set up a business process outsourcing (BPO), particularly a call center.”

On the use of English and Filipino: Why is the Philippines constantly harvesting gold, silver and bronze medals and other awards of recognition in basic education international competitions in mathematics and science with the use of English as medium of instruction (MOI) in the two subjects? Why are some schools in the non-Tagalog regions get higher score than some schools in the Tagalog region, in subject areas using Filipino as MOI in the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP)?

“In schools that had good administrators and teachers, good programs equipped with good facilities and teaching and learning materials, Filipino children learned well both English and Pilipino/Filipino and the subjects taught in them” (Boldface supplied for emphasis). The BEP should not be blamed for the perceived poor quality of education in the Philippines. This was the convincingly presented report on “Evaluating Bilingual Education in the Philippines” (1974-1985 & 1988, by Gonzalez & Sibayan).

In the MLE Bridging Plans A & B, in teaching Filipino as a language subject, the Mother Tongue (MT) in non-Tagalog areas, is used as medium of instruction (MOI). And another local language (L₃) or a foreign language (L₄) is introduced “during Filipino language subject.” That is, the time allotment for Filipino as a language subject, may be used for a local language (L₃) or a foreign language (L₄).

After the signing of an official memorandum of agreement, the Department of Education has announced the teaching of Spanish/Español and French in Grade 5-6 and High School, beginning June, schoolyear 2010-2011. L₄ as the symbol for foreign languages may represent Arabic used in Madrasah or Madaris Schools, Spanish/Español, French, and other foreign languages which are offered as optional elective subjects in some higher education institutions in the country.

In the implementation of the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP) which started in 1974, in compliance with the language provisions of the Philippine Constitutions, mandating the development, promotion and preservation of the National Language and other Philippine languages and dialects, and the use of English and other world languages in the country, Pilipino/Filipino was given strong support as the Philippine National Language. Its growth, development and rapid spread in the course of time for over 30 years of BEP policy implementation, have been observed and recognized, with the support of the important domains of language, especially the multimedia of communication and education.

Amidst national economic downturn in our supertyphoon-battered nation, with “53% of Filipinos call themselves mahirap (poor), and poverty is the same after 26 years,” according to the SWS September 2009 findings (PDI, 07 November 2009), and “35% now
live below poverty line,” according to experts (PDI, 16 November 2009) – and considering that there are more than 150 languages & dialects as shown in the presented Linguistic Map of the Philippines – can the Philippine educational system successfully implement the DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009: Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education (MT MLE), beginning school year 2010-2011? Is there really an urgent need to change effective immediately the present Bilingual Education Policy (BEP)? Or, just a slight modification of this over 30-year BEP, with the use of the Multilingual Bridging Plan A & B: L₁ Mother Tongue, L₂ Filipino, L₃ English & L₄ foreign languages? How about a Trilingual Education Policy (TEP), from BEP to TEP? That is, the use of the Mother Tongue (MT L₁), Filipino (L₂) and English (L₃), and optional use of foreign languages (L₄) in all levels of the Philippine Education System.

In the DepEd Order No. 74, Filipino as the official national language seems to be “in limbo” searching for a homeland in the linguistic life of our nation – while Global Filipino is gaining prestige, popularity and acceptance beyond the Philippine Archipelago in crossing the borderless world. Global Filipino is not used as a language among the world languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish as official languages in the United Nations – UN General Assembly & UNESCO. But in the sociology of language, Global Filipino is in peaceful coexistence with other global languages, recognized and respected in the community of nations.

8. CONCLUSION: Conference Vision-Mission To Accomplish

“Establishing and Developing Filipino Language Global Programs and Advocacy” are important goals of this 2nd International Conference on Global Filipino – organized by the Council for Teaching Filipino Language and Culture (CTFLC), and jointly sponsored by the Language Acquisition Resource Center (LARC), the SD Research Foundation of San Diego State University, the Shirley M. Hufstedler School of Education, Alliant International University, and the Filipino & Philippine Literature Program of the Department of Indo-Pacific Language University of Hawai’i at Manoa, the host of the 1st International Conference on Filipino as Global Language two years ago.

With the healthy environment in the State of California in general and San Diego in particular, for the rapid growth and development of Filipino as a global language – would a SDSU Global Center for Language Research and Teaching Filipino & Culture – be far behind? The CTFLC, with the strong support of sponsor organizations and institutions in California, has taken the lead with impressive accomplishments and outstanding recognition. This proposed Global Center of the Future could be established with strategic language planning, shared-missions management and influencing skills program – after this 2nd Global Filipino Conference.

With the Spirit from above, and inspired by the launching of the book: MAPPING THE PHILIPPINES: Spanish Period, by our conference Guest of Honor & keynote speaker Hon. Senator Eduardo J. Angara of the Philippine Senate – this paper presenter thought of a Concept Project Proposal: MAPPING GLOBAL FILIPINO worldwide. This will trace the tour of Filipino as a Global Language in the continents of the world. What are the programs, projects and activities using the Filipino language in multilingual education today? Could this be an initial project of the dream SDSU GLOBAL CENTER? This could be done with the ‘can do’ spirit, cooperation and commitment of the Global Filipinos.
The Commission on the Filipino Language (CFL) / Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (KWF), directly under the Office of the President, with its main Office in Malacañang Complex, Manila – can help establish and develop this proposed SDSU Global Center for Language Research and Teaching Filipino & Culture.

The CFL/KWF has established 28 **KWF-Regional Centers for Filipino Language** in Luzon Visayas and Mindanao (KWF Regional Centers / Panrehiyong Sentro sa Wikang Filipino – KWF-PSWF in the Appendix). The KWF has plans to go global in partnership with language & culture centers and institutions abroad – to serve as Global Center For Filipino Language / **Global Sentro sa Wikang Filipino**. The CFL/KWF has a constitutional and Republic Act No. 7104 mandate: Development, Promotion and Preservation of the Philippine National Language: **FILIPINO** nationwide and worldwide.

In the land of Filipinos, we say: **Filipino Ako. Filipino Ka. Filipino Tayo. Itaguyod ang Global Filipino** – with the 2009 **Buwan ng Wika** celebration theme: “**Mula sa Baler Hanggang Buong Pilipinas,**” **Hanggang Buong Mundo Mula sa San Diego!**

This paper ends with the stated vision-mission to accomplish in the right directions with future prospects – to realize the goals of the **International Conference on FILIPINO as a GLOBAL LANGUAGE.**
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Abstract

LANGUAGE & LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION QUESTION: What Is the Answer in the Philippine Setting?

Is there urgency for Congress to enact an enabling law of the 1987 Constitution on language and language-in-education provisions? The politics of language and the language of politics play an important role in making a decision. Can a new legislative act solve a problem like the language-in-education question? Can an enabling law with clear Implementing Rules and Regulation (IRR) give policy direction and definitive terms to the Philippine Education System entrusted to implement the law? In short, is there an urgent need to change the current bilingual education in the Philippines?

This paper explains the pending House and Senate Bills for deliberation and debate in the halls of Congress. The Executive Order No. 210 being questioned awaits the final decision of the Supreme Court on the constitutionality or legality of its provisions on language and language-in-education in the country.

What are the key issues and primary innovations for change of language-in-education – towards English or First Language/Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education, or Multilingualism in a Multilingual Nation?

What are the rationale and the evaluation results of the bilingual education implementation in the Philippines? What are the issues, dilemmas and problems in the teaching of English, Filipino and the regional languages in today’s Bilingual Education Policy (BEP)?

This paper presents the given answers to the questions. What are the possibilities that could happen if the attempt to change the language and the language-in-education policy is inevitable?

Are we prepared for the coming change – change for the better?

FE ALDAVE YAP, Ph.D.
Director General
Commission on the Filipino Language
Our national language is a unifying element that connects the different ethnolinguistic groups in the country divided by geographic boundaries.
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Roses & Thorns
By ALEJANDRO R. ROCES

Fe Aldave-Yap, outstanding Thomaskan

In the Philippines, the word "Thomaskan" refers to a person affiliated with the University of Santo Tomas (UST), either as a student, faculty member or administrator. The university is the oldest in the country, having been established on April 28, 1611 by the Most Reverend Miguel de Benavidez, O.P., the third Archbishop of Manila. Originally named as the Colegio de Nuestra Señora del Santísimo Rosario, it was later renamed Colegio de Santo Tomas after St. Thomas Aquinas, one of the greatest theologians of the Roman Catholic Church. UST was elevated to university status by Pope Innocent X in 1645 in his brief In Supremiinenti, making it the second royal and pontifical university in the Philippines. It was given the titles "Royal" by Spanish King Charles III on March 7, 1785, "Pontifical" by Pope Leo XIII on September 17, 1902 and the apppellative "The Catholic University of the Philippines" by Pope Pius XII on April 17, 1947.

The university prides itself in the quality of education it offers. Since its inception, UST has produced many outstanding and distinguished alumni, the most notable of whom is Dr. Jose P. Rizal, our country's national hero, who took up medicine there. From within its hallowed halls also came four Philippine Presidents, namely Manuel L. Quezon, Sergio S. Osmeña, Jose P. Laurel and Diosdado P. Macapagal; three Vice-Presidents and six Chief Justices of the Philippine Supreme Court. The fact that it has consistently produced multi-faceted individuals is proof of its time-honored commitment to develop people who will become responsible and outstanding members of society.

To further inspire students to strive for excellence in their chosen fields of endeavor, and to give recognition to those who have made significant achievements and exemplary contributions to society, the conferral of The Outstanding Thomaskan Alumni (TOTAL) Award was commenced in 1993. It has become an annual event that continues to draw inspiration for all the stakeholders of the Thomasian community in the pursuit of greater excellence. The awardees are individuals who exemplify the Thomaskan values of competence and excellence in their respective fields of expertise in pioneering human endeavors, compassion for others, and commitment to their profession.

One of this year’s awardees is my colleague, Dr. Fe Aldave-Yap. Dr. Yap’s field of specialization includes Philippine Linguistics — the science of language, lexicography, and translation. She served as full-time commissioner in the Commission on the Filipino Language and represented the Tagalog region in the Board of Commissioners representing the different ethno linguistic groups in the Philippines. She had served as special consultant in the Chamorro Language Commission and had conducted lecture series on language education and linguistics in the Commission and the University of Guam, USA. She has authored several books and has published articles in the Manila Times, as a columnist.

She taught linguistics in the University of the Philippines, Graduate College of Education and the University of Santo Tomas Graduate School. Besides her many specialization in Philippine Linguistics, she also specializes in general administration and management as a Career Executive Service Officer (CESO), after finishing the Career Executive Service Development Program (CESDP) and the Career Leadership Program in the Development Academy of the Philippines. She had served for five years as the president of the Children’s Literature Association of the Philippines, Inc. (CLAPI), as vice president of the Panitik ng Kababaihan, and as officer of several languages, culture, civic and religious organizations in the country.

Dr. Fe Aldave-Yap has played a major role in the preservation, propagation and amelioration of our National Language. Her work embodies the ideals of what a true Thomaskan is.
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