
Conclusion

This concluding chapter summarizes and evaluates the Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey and then examines the generalizability of the survey's findings to other multilingual settings. The relevance of these findings to the development of sociolinguistic theory is also considered and recommendations are made for future research.

7.1 Summary of the Agutaynen survey

The Agutaynens, a group of eight to ten thousand people, live mostly in northern Palawan province in the Philippines. They identify themselves as Agutaynen, and others identify them as such, largely on the basis of language. Roughly half of the Agutaynen population lives on Agutaya Island and its surrounding island barangays. Large concentrations of Agutaynens also live on the Palawan mainland in the municipalities of Roxas, San Vicente, and Brooke's Point.

Culturally, the Agutaynens are lowland Filipinos, mostly fishermen and farmers, with a growing number of professionals. Many farm at a subsistence level, while others grow rice and/or coconuts on a much larger scale. The Agutaynens' religion is Roman Catholicism, first introduced by the Spaniards in the 1600s.

Agutaynens typically speak four languages to varying degrees of proficiency: their native Agutaynen, Cuyonon, Tagalog, and English. The purpose of this sociolinguistic survey was to determine how Agutaynens use each of these four languages and to what degree of general proficiency they control them.

7.1.1 Methodology

Two primary methods were employed to acquire data for the Agutaynen survey: participant observation and survey interviewing. Six weeks were spent in residence in an Agutaynen household followed by ten-and-a-half months in a separate dwelling in an Agutaynen community. In the first six months primary emphasis was given to learning the Agutaynen language. Even in this early language-learning stage, observations of use and proficiency were recorded in a journal as often and as accurately as possible.

During the second six months over 200 Agutaynens were interviewed, using a questionnaire on attitudes, use, and proficiency (see Appendix 1). Data were analyzed for a sample of 180 respondents, purposively selected on the

basis of sex, age, and location. Half of the respondents were male and half were female. A third of the respondents came from each of three age groups (14-24, 25-45, and 46 and over), and a third came from each of three locations (Roxas, San Vicente, and Agutaya municipalities). Results were analyzed with special reference to the variables of sex, age, location, and level of education.

7.1.2 Findings

The findings of the Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey basically concern language use and proficiency, but only a very incomplete understanding of these phenomena can be reached without reference to language attitudes. It was found that Agutaynens evaluate their own language favorably. A sizeable majority (75%) reported Agutaynen as the language they liked the most. Tagalog was the second most-liked language (21%), with very little mention made of either English or Cuyonon (4% and 3%, respectively). The respondents' preferences for which language their children should learn first displayed a similar ordering, with Tagalog somewhat more popular and Agutaynen somewhat less so (61% Agutaynen, 33% Tagalog, 6% English, 3% Cuyonon). The majority of the sample (80%) felt that Agutaynen would be used for a long time to come.

In spite of their stated personal preferences, however, Agutaynens ranked English, with its international and official status and use in education, as the highest in prestige. They ranked Tagalog second, due to its official status, its use in education, and its increasing popularity in the mass media. Cuyonon, as a regional lingua franca and language of the regional majority, was ranked third in terms of prestige. Agutaynen, as a vernacular of a relatively powerless minority, was ranked lowest. In other words, the Agutaynen language is esteemed as the language for use with the in-group, but is negatively evaluated for use with out-groups. It might be said that Agutaynen is strong in terms of "intimacy" but weak in terms of "power" (cf. Haugen 1972:329).

It was found that Agutaynen, in general, is used solely and exclusively for in-group communication. It is a language of the home. The very few outsiders with whom Agutaynen is used are either "benefactors" (the occasional mayor, doctor, or priest who has learned the language) or *barkada*, members of close Agutaynen social networks formed during childhood.

Agutaynen is used more extensively for all public purposes in Agutaya and San Vicente due to the relative homogeneity of these communities. Only in Agutaya is Agutaynen used publicly in church services, although it is used for other religious purposes in the other communities.

Agutaynen is written in personal letters. There is no other productive source of reading material in the language.

Cuyonon is the language that Agutaynens use for interacting with Cuyonons. Because of demographic and economic factors many Agutaynens

must use Cuyonon regularly. Some of the older generation use it as a language of wider communication, but Tagalog is fast taking over this function, especially among the younger generation. Cuyonon is used most often in the municipality of Roxas, where Cuyonons and Agutaynens live in the closest proximity.

Tagalog (or Filipino) is used by Agutaynens as a national language, a language of education, and a language of intergroup communication with non-Cuyonons. It is occasionally read in magazines and other publications outside of school and is frequently heard on the radio. Its growing use among the younger generation is especially notable. It is used least in the municipality of Agutaya.

English has only limited use for most Agutaynens; it is used mostly by those with advanced education, and then only in educational or other formal contexts. It is used somewhat more frequently in Agutaya than in either of the other two municipalities.

In some situations Agutaynens switch back and forth between languages, often for special effect as in joking. It was beyond the scope of this study, however, to examine code switching.

In terms of proficiency, the survey indicated that Cuyonon is the best-known second language among Agutaynens at present. Tagalog is a close second. The fact that Tagalog is best known by the more educated younger generation suggests that Tagalog proficiency may surpass Cuyonon proficiency in another generation. Agutaynens are clearly less proficient in English than in Cuyonon or Tagalog.

Sex-related differences in proficiency were minimal, with only English scores being significantly different for men and women ($p < .05$). Greater male proficiency can be accounted for largely by educational background; in the past men received more advanced education than women. It follows, then, that English, a language learned primarily in school, would be better known by men than by women. Moreover, English formerly played a greater role as a medium of instruction than it does today (see chap. 2).

Age-related differences in proficiency revealed opposite patterns for Cuyonon and Tagalog. Cuyonon proficiency increased along with age, while Tagalog proficiency decreased. This pattern is indicative of the different ways in which the two languages are learned. Cuyonon is learned in everyday social interaction with Cuyonons, and since the older generation has had more years of interaction with outsiders, their proficiency is naturally higher. Tagalog, in contrast, is a language learned in the school and in the mass media; and while all living Agutaynens probably have equal access to Tagalog in the mass media, only the younger ones have benefited from the increased use of Tagalog in the school system.

The only significant difference in proficiency related to location concerns the Cuyonon language. Cuyonon proficiency is highest in Roxas, where it is most frequently used.

7.1.3 Proficiency testing

In addition to gathering language data on a specific community, the Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey provided a comparison of two ways of measuring proficiency: one a self-report method, the other a performance-based, direct-interview method. In the 180 survey interviews self-report data were gathered through the use of a series of questions asking whether the respondent could successfully use a given language to accomplish a given task. For example, one question asked if the respondent could, in language X, “understand and respond correctly to questions about where you are from, if you are married, your work, and date and place of birth?” A more advanced question asked, “Can you use as many words in X as in Agutaynen?” (see Appendix 1-A). On the basis of responses to these questions a level of proficiency was assigned for each respondent in each language tested.

In a separate undertaking, the direct-interview method (based on the ILR procedure — see sec. 2.5) was used to rate the Cuyonon proficiency of a group of forty Agutaynens. The same sample of forty respondents was also rated according to the self-report technique. These two techniques gave comparable results (within one level) in 78% of the cases. Thus, although highlighting the imprecisions of any methods for testing proficiency the experiment gave support to the general validity of the self-report technique. It also indicated that, in this situation, women were more likely than men to seriously understate their language proficiency (greater than one level). Perhaps most importantly, the experiment showed that the ILR procedure is adaptable for use on a community-wide basis with a wide range of respondents.

7.2 Evaluation of the Agutaynen survey

The Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey can be evaluated from at least three perspectives. First, was the sample adequate? Second, was the methodology effective? Third, were the goals accomplished? It is also instructive to note what changes could improve this survey if it were to be repeated.

7.2.1 An adequate sample

The sample for the Agutaynen survey was purposively selected (see sec. 4.3) in order to acquire comparable data for three generations of Agutaynens

in three different municipalities. It must be remembered, however, that in the actual population neither the age groups nor the locations contain equivalent numbers of individuals, as in the sample. The 14-24 and 25-45 age groups constitute approximately 20% of the population each, but the 46 and over group accounts for only about 10%. Since it was not feasible to interview younger respondents, the age group of 0-14 years, which accounts for roughly 40% of the population, is not represented. Regarding location, the combined populations of Roxas and San Vicente do not equal the population of Agutaya. It is reasonable to give prominence to the two mainland municipalities, however, not only to reflect an established trend of migration in that direction, but also to investigate differences among Agutaynens who have resettled in different sociolinguistic environments. The most noticeable difference between Roxas and San Vicente is that in Roxas Agutaynens live in much closer contact with Cuyonon neighbors.

While remaining broadly representative of the Agutaynen population, then, the survey sample allows for close analysis of differences in age and location. It also allows for investigation of sex-related differences, since all age groups and location groups are equally divided into males and females. Because the Agutaynen community is not divided into well-defined sectors on the basis of socioeconomic status, this social variable was not emphasized in the sample or in the analysis of the results.

7.2.2 An effective methodology

The two primary methods of investigation employed in the Agutaynen survey functioned in a complementary manner: The method of participant observation contributed to the success of the interview method. The survey interview, administered to over two hundred respondents, helped ensure the representativeness of the data. It also provided many opportunities for observation that would not have otherwise presented themselves in a one-year period.

The appropriateness of survey interviewing in a rural area of a developing country may rightfully be questioned. In the Agutaynen context, however, respondents readily accepted the interview as part of a "school project" and responded with ease for the most part, and even with enthusiasm on some occasions. Agutaynens are familiar with rituals of formal education and are receptive to their language being the object of study.

The validity of the survey interview can best be examined according to the type of data being collected. Self-report data on language use has already been found to be useful and reasonably accurate in a number of other studies (e.g., Fishman, Cooper, Ma et al. 1971). The five Philippine community studies reviewed in chapter 2 all contained some sort of check of actual use that

substantiated self-report data in every case but one.¹ Similarly, my extended observation in the Agutaynen community revealed no substantial discrepancies between the languages people used in specific situations and the languages people said they used in those situations.

In contrast to the well-attested validity of self-report data on language **use**, self-report data on language **proficiency** is less well attested. While Fishman and Cooper (1971:141-42) maintain that retrospective self-reports are the best predictors of language proficiency, they point out that other techniques can substantially improve on them. Comparison of the performance-based, direct-interview method in the Brooke's Point experiment with self-report scores showed the latter to be accurate within one level of proficiency 78% of the time. This demonstrated the considerable validity of the self-report ratings obtained in the larger survey.

Since there was only one interviewer for the Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey, no claim can be made that exactly the same results could be obtained by a different researcher. Similar results should be attainable, however, since a standardized instrument was used in each case. The use of only one interviewer was beneficial in that it contributed to consistency among the interviews.

7.2.3 Accomplishment of goals

The primary goals of the Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey were accomplished: There is now empirical evidence for many generalizations concerning how Agutaynens use the languages they speak and the relative proficiency with which they speak them.

One inherent weakness of the Agutaynen survey involves the possible effect of the interviewer's expectations. The expectations of any interviewer, and perhaps more importantly the respondent's perception of those expectations, are liable to influence the respondent's answers (cf. Lynch and Makil 1982:122-23). To minimize this effect as much as possible, questions were asked with a neutral intonation. The only exception to this practice came in a few isolated cases when one of a respondent's first statements was the equivalent of "I can't speak any of language X!" Judging modesty to be overshadowing accuracy, such respondents were actively encouraged to answer the first one or two questions positively. On at least one occasion the respondent continued to answer a few more questions positively, resulting in what was almost certainly a more accurate rating of proficiency.

1 The correlation between self-report data and market transaction counts was especially high. The exception was Mendoza's 1978 study, which uncovered the following discrepancies: "Pilipino was reported number 4 among her Cebuano-Surigao Rs, but actual use showed it to be number 3; English was reported number 3 but in actual use was only number 10!" (Bautista 1984:102).

One definite strength of the Agutaynen survey was that it was conducted in the first language of the respondents. If it had not been conducted in Agutaynen, some of the less confident respondents would have refused to be interviewed. In a discussion of a large-scale sociological survey of the Philippines sponsored by the Peace Corps, Lynch and Makil (1982:120) emphasize language as one of the variables “bound to have far-reaching effects on both rapport and the validity of the gathered data.” In the experience of these survey workers,

it was essential that the interview teams speak the local language fluently. Beyond that, they found that the researcher was more completely accepted if he spoke the language as a mother tongue, and that responses to his questions about ethnolinguistic groups had in that case a validity they would not have otherwise had (ibid).

While it was clear that the present researcher was not an Agutaynen, it was still possible to conduct the survey interview easily and intelligibly in Agutaynen. It was also equally clear that the researcher was neither a Cuyonon nor a Tagalog. An Agutaynen-speaking American could possibly even elicit more natural responses concerning Cuyonons and Tagalogs than could either a Cuyonon or a Tagalog.

In retrospect, there are two improvements the researcher would make to the Agutaynen survey, given the opportunity. The first is a simple change. For the questionnaire items concerning language use with specific officials, such as the mayor or barangay captain, the names of the appropriate individuals for each location would be substituted. (Gal 1979:177 found a similar technique useful in her study of language use in bilingual Austria.) Although this would result in slightly less standardization in the questionnaire, it would ensure that for these particular questions respondents in each location would have the same referent in mind.

The second change is a more important one. If at all possible, the comparison of the two forms of proficiency testing — self-report and direct interview would be conducted before carrying out the larger survey. In this way the questionnaire could be adapted in an attempt to achieve more valid self-report results. The self-report method would still be employed, since it is the most practical one for gathering data on three languages for over two hundred respondents.

7.3 Generalizability

One measure of the importance of a survey is the generalizability of its results. If the results of a survey are not generalizable to other settings, it is instructive to ask why they are not. What are the defining characteristics of a particular situation that make it comparable or incomparable to other situations?

7.3.1 Other Philippine communities

The defining characteristics of the Agutaynen situation are that Agutaynens (1) live in close contact with speakers of a regional lingua franca and to a lesser extent with speakers of Tagalog, (2) are a lowland Filipino minority group, (3) are sometimes negatively evaluated by outsiders, and (4) highly evaluate their own language, nevertheless. In other Philippine communities without these four characteristics it would be unreasonable to expect close parallels in patterns of language use and proficiency, and, in fact, among the diverse language groups of the Philippines there are many which do **not** have them.

Many of the Philippine minority language groups do live in proximity to a regional lingua franca as the Agutaynens do to Cuyonon. However, among the Agutaynens Cuyonon is giving way to Tagalog. Such a trend makes the Agutaynen situation potentially dissimilar to that of groups in the central Visayas, for instance, where Cebuano, a very strong lingua franca, shows considerable resistance to Tagalog (Otones and Sibayan 1969). Cebuano, a written language with almost as many native speakers as Tagalog, is in a much stronger position than is Cuyonon.

As a lowland Filipino group, the Agutaynens' situation is different from that of either the more animistic or Muslim cultural communities. Agutaynens value formal education and see themselves as part of the larger Filipino nation. Groups who do not value formal education could not be expected to exhibit similarities in their use of and proficiency in English and Tagalog. Groups who do not share in the goal of forwarding a larger Filipino nation might be expected to be less positive toward Tagalog (or Filipino) in particular.

Another Agutaynen distinctive is that of less socioeconomic status and power than their close neighbors of other ethnolinguistic groups. This disparity results in outsiders evaluating Agutaynens negatively. If Agutaynens enjoyed greater social prestige, one would expect to find their neighbors learning to speak the language of the Agutaynens, rather than vice versa. In such a situation, Agutaynen would not be reserved exclusively for in-group communication, as it is.

A striking characteristic of Agutaynens that makes them almost unique in the Philippines is that they maintain a very high view of their language in spite of the negative evaluation it receives from outsiders. It seems that members of many cultural communities are reluctant to tell an outsider what their first language is, even to the point of denying that they speak it (Rufino Bundac, personal communication). This is not the case with most Agutaynens, who readily claim Agutaynen identity and loyalty to their language. If Agutaynens held their language in lower regard, one would expect to find more use of other languages for in-group communication and a less overwhelming percentage of parents using only Agutaynen with their children.

7.3.2 Philippines in general

The generalizability of the Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey's findings is most clearly seen in relation to Tagalog (or Filipino) and English in the Philippines. Sibayan (1975:118) reports that the 1968 data for the Language Policy Survey "appear to support the common impression that Pilipino is becoming a lingua franca, gradually taking the place of English." Later, Sibayan (1985:585) puts it even more strongly: "More and more, the speaking of English will decrease in practically all domains."

Support for this prediction is available from the Agutaynen survey, especially if one considers Agutaya municipality, due to its more remote location, to be representative of an earlier time period. Tagalog was found to be used least in this municipality, English the most. The mainland communities, which would represent a more recent time period, show increased use of Tagalog and decreased use of English.

Sibayan (1985:582) attributes the decrease in the use of English to the fact that it is a "school language" and can be acquired only in school. The Agutaynen data support this position in that the 25-45 age group, the only group that has benefited from advanced education, has the highest English proficiency (see Appendix 5). As the youngest age group proceeds through their college years, their English proficiency as a group is certain to increase. Even so, higher English proficiency for those who acquire an advanced education will not guarantee more frequent use of the language outside the educational setting.

Sibayan implies that one reason the use of Tagalog is increasing is that, unlike English, it is a language that can be learned outside of school. This is certainly the case for Agutaynens, who hear the Tagalog language on the radio and from Tagalogs with whom they come in contact. Nevertheless, the importance of educational policy cannot be overemphasized. It is primarily through the school that young Agutaynens learn to speak Tagalog, as the mass media still have relatively little impact on the language situation in northern Palawan.

7.3.3 Other multilingual settings

A slightly different set of distinguishing characteristics for the Agutaynen situation is offered here, in order to facilitate comparison with other multilingual settings around the world. These characteristics can be summarized in a formula based on Ferguson (1966b). It has been written for the Agutaynen community in the surveyed municipalities of Roxas, San Vicente, and Agutaya:

$$4L = 2L_{maj} (Sioes, Soesw) + 2L_{min} (Vw, Vg)$$

This formula can be read as follows: There are four languages regularly used in the Agutaynen community. Two of them are major languages and two minor. Both major languages are standard (S) languages, one used for international communication and official purposes, as a medium of education, and as a school subject; the other as an official language, a medium of education, a school subject, and for wider (or intergroup) communication. Both minor languages are vernaculars (V), one of which is used for wider communication and the other for in-group communication.

Following Ferguson (1966b), English and Tagalog are classified as major languages on the basis of their official status and use in education. Cuyonon and Agutaynen are classified as minor languages on the basis of number of speakers in the municipalities surveyed.

The one difference between standard languages and vernaculars is standardization, defined by Stewart (1968:534) as “the codification and acceptance, within the community of users, of a formal set of norms defining ‘correct’ usage.” Other concepts used in the formula are sufficiently self-explanatory.

Two kinds of important information are not included in the formula. First, the relative number of speakers of each group within the community is not indicated. Although neither standard language accounts for large numbers of speakers in northern Palawan, it is important that native Tagalog speakers far outnumber native English speakers. Similarly, it is also important that among vernacular speakers, Cuyonons far outnumber Agutaynens. Second, mutual attitudes of the majority (Cuyonon) and minority (Agutaynen) are not indicated. Negative attitudes of Cuyonons toward Agutaynens influence Cuyonon behavior toward the Agutaynen language (see sec. 5.1). Likewise, attitudes of Agutaynens toward Cuyonons contribute to their preference of Tagalog over the Cuyonon language.

Given the information provided in the sociolinguistic formula, along with the additional information on numbers of speakers and language attitudes, the specifics of Agutaynen language use and proficiency can be compared with other multilingual situations around the world. It would be especially interesting, given a similar situation, to examine the relationships between the two standard languages, or between the second standard and the first vernacular. What would be the relative strength of each language in terms of frequency used or proficiency attained? Would the second standard language be replacing the other languages?

7.4 Theoretical relevance

The relevance of the Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey to sociolinguistic theory is most obvious in the realm of language use, language proficiency, and diglossia.

7.4.1 Language use

Analyses of language use patterns generally fall into one of two categories, depending on the perspective and interests of the researchers: studies conducted from a **sociological** perspective, emphasizing overall patterns of use based on broad societal concepts (e.g., the domain), and studies conducted from an **interpersonal** perspective, emphasizing factors that influence an individual to choose one language variety over another. Although not every language use study fits definitively into one category or the other, different sociolinguistic concepts are emphasized as a result of these two perspectives.

Whiteley's 1974 study on language use patterns in rural Kenya represents a successful combination of the two perspectives. Whiteley chose four domains as a starting point, and then described language use within those domains.² He concluded that factors influencing language choice varied from domain to domain, from place to place, and even within each place,

depending on a number of factors such as education, age, sex, the linguistic heterogeneity of the participants, and the long-term and short-term objectives of participation, etc. (p. 324).

In the Agutaynen survey, the concept of domain was indispensable for the collection of data. Questions were asked, for example, regarding language used in the market, in the home, at school, at a neighborhood meeting, etc. The psychological validity of these domains was demonstrated by the manner in which respondents readily identified and reported their behavior for each one. The domain analysis was revealing, however, only insofar as it clarified particular factors that influence language use within domains. The survey indicated that the single most important factor within a domain is the ethnicity of the interlocutor: The Agutaynen simply uses the first language of his or her interlocutor.

The importance of the identity of the interlocutor in the Agutaynen community is consistent with the findings of other surveys. In all the studies considered in the present work (e.g., Gal 1979 on Austria), interlocutor was the single most important component of the speech situation. Gonzalez and Bautista (1986), in summarizing the findings of Philippine language surveys with regard to the effects on language use of the four variables of interlocutor, topic, speech function, and place, found that when the interlocutor is easily multilingual, the particular language chosen depends on such factors as role relationships, location, formality, and whether the situation is public or private.

2 The domains Whiteley chose were the homestead, trade, church, work and certain other social occasions involving meetings of friends and others (Whiteley 1974:319-50).

The Agutaynen survey shows that non-Agutaynens are almost never proficient in Agutaynen. Therefore, the characteristic of primary importance in every interaction becomes the ethnicity of the Agutaynen's interlocutor. Agutaynens use the Cuyonon language with Cuyonons, regardless of the interlocutor's proficiency in Tagalog, even with Cuyonons who are of lesser social status than the Agutaynen speaker. (Elderly Agutaynen landholders were observed accommodating to young Cuyonon domestic helpers by using the Cuyonon language with them in both work-related and nonwork-related conversations.)

The factor of the interlocutor's ethnicity is so prominent in the Agutaynen setting as a result of disparity in the social status of the ethnolinguistic groups involved. This observation leads to the formulation of a possible sociolinguistic universal: **In a multilingual setting where language groups are of markedly different social status, the group on "bottom" will accommodate to the group on "top" by using that group's first language in face-to-face interaction, regardless of other components of the social situation such as role relationships, location, formality, etc.**

7.4.2 Language proficiency

The language proficiency findings of the Agutaynen survey are also of theoretical importance to the question of which groups learn the languages of which other groups in multilingual settings. Whiteley (1974:53), in his discussion of the language situation in Kenya, gives certain probable characteristics of a Kenyan who claims quadrilingual competence. The Kenyan quadrilingual, he says, is likely to be a man, at least thirty years old, with five to six years of education, a wage-earner, and with some travel experience outside his home area. In contrast, the Agutaynen survey demonstrates that the Agutaynen quadrilingual need not possess any of these characteristics, although most Agutaynens do have five years or more of education, and this variable is definitely related to English and Tagalog proficiency.

Whiteley also points out that "some groups show a far greater propensity for quadrilingual competence than others." Although he does not discuss these particular groups in detail, he does state that a "high incidence of multilingualism" is more likely in the following situations (Whiteley 1974:35):

- (a) where the community is linguistically heterogeneous;
- (b) where access to education is unlimited and protracted;
- (c) where communications are good and there are incentives to use them;
- (d) where personal mobility is high;

- (e) where strong attempts are made to encourage people to speak a particular language.

Each of these conditions holds true to one extent or another for the Agutaynen community:

- (a) northern Palawan is extremely linguistically heterogeneous;
- (b) access to education is basically unlimited through the secondary level;
- (c) communication between groups is mostly face-to-face, but there are definite economic advantages to encourage such communication;
- (d) personal mobility is not always high, but neither is it officially or institutionally restricted;
- (e) strong attempts are officially made through educational policy to encourage Agutaynens to speak both Tagalog and English.

Given these characteristics, it is hardly surprising that Agutaynens are “quadrilingually competent.”

Bender, Cooper, and Ferguson (1975) found in their language survey of Ethiopia that certain groups in that country were more likely than others to contain large percentages of bilinguals. They report an inverse relationship between the size of a group and incidence of bilingualism (1975:199):

...that is, the higher the proportion claiming a given language as a mother tongue, the smaller the percentage of bilinguals (here defined as people who knew at least two languages) among that mother-tongue group. Conversely, the smaller the mother-tongue group as a proportion of a district, the greater the proportion of bilinguals in that group.

They then highlight the importance of such a finding by comparing it to results of a survey in another setting (*ibid.*):

The same inverse relationship between relative size of a mother-tongue group and the incidence of bilingualism within it was found by Weinreich (1957) in his analysis of the 1951 census of India, and may represent a sociolinguistic universal.

The principle that smaller groups learn the languages of larger groups, but not vice versa, is upheld by the Agutaynen/Cuyonon findings. If the relationship is to be stated as a universal, however, it would seem that reference

must be made to the relative status of each language. The principle as stated by Bender, Cooper, and Ferguson (1975) clearly does not account for situations involving high-status immigrant (or colonizer) languages. In such cases, larger groups learn the language of smaller colonizer groups, rather than vice versa. English, for example, is now widely spoken as a second language in the Philippines, even though the actual number of native English speakers in this country is small. The official status of English and its use in education, quite apart from its importance as an international language, give it greater influence than any of the other eighty-plus vernaculars of the Philippines.

Gonzalez and Bautista (1986:76), in summarizing a number of findings on second-language proficiency in the Philippines, conclude that a confluence of factors affects the Filipino's proficiency in other languages, most importantly: (1) the personal language background of the individual; (2) socioeconomic status; and (3) the use to which a given language must be put. The first factor, subsumed under ethnic identity in this study, is of utmost importance in the Agutaynen setting. According to Gonzalez and Bautista, the second factor influences what languages are learned, but not the level of proficiency. Although socioeconomic status appears to be largely irrelevant to the Agutaynen language situation, the third factor is of some importance. English, for instance, would probably not be spoken at all by the Agutaynen student population were it not for its mandatory use in school.

Another important type of factor to be considered in an analysis of language proficiency is the psychological factor of desire, or will, to learn a second language. In his introduction to Weinreich's *Languages in Contact*, Martinet wrote, "If the will to communicate is wholly or mainly on one side, a bilingual situation will soon develop on that side" (Weinreich 1953:viii). This "will to communicate" has been studied extensively by Lambert, Gardner, and others under the heading of "motivation." Gardner and Lambert (1972) distinguish between two main types of motivation: integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivation involves

a particular orientation on the part of the learner, reflecting a willingness or a desire to be like representative members of the "other" language community, and to become associated, at least vicariously with that other community (ibid.:14).

Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, is "characterized by a desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of a foreign language" (ibid.).

Gardner, Lambert, and other researchers have traditionally stressed the importance of integrative motivation to the successful language learner, based on a number of studies completed in Canada and the U.S. Interestingly, a study conducted in the Philippines changed their perspective on this matter

somewhat. In a project involving 103 high-school seniors in a Manila suburb, researchers found that an instrumental orientation, when encouraged by parental support, can clearly produce successful results (Santos 1969, Gardner and Lambert 1972:120-30). Gardner & Lambert thus concluded that

in settings where there is an urgency about mastering a second language — as there is in the Philippines and in North America for members of linguistic minority groups — the instrumental approach to language study is extremely effective (Gardner and Lambert 1972:141).

Because of negative attitudes between Agutaynens and Cuyonons, Agutaynens probably learn Cuyonon largely for instrumental motives. The considerably more positive Agutaynen attitude toward Tagalog, on the other hand, most likely results in a greater degree of integrative motivation. Tagalog is no doubt learned for instrumental purposes, but since it represents a Philippine national identity, there is integrational motivation as well. English exerts little motivating power of either kind in rural Palawan.

The fact that Cuyonon is no longer as necessary for Agutaynens to learn as it once was accounts for decreasing proficiency in that language. This observation, along with the concept of instrumental versus integrative motivation, allows for the postulation of another possible sociolinguistic universal: **When speakers of two vernacular languages come into contact, one group will learn the language of the other to the extent that it is instrumentally expedient.** In the Agutaynen situation, *instrumentally expedient* means “economically necessary and/or beneficial.” The intensity of this instrumental motivation depends on the individual.

7.4.3 Diglossia

A fundamental concept underlying much of the Agutaynen survey is **diglossia** — the functional differentiation of language varieties (Fishman 1970:74). Ferguson (1959) coined the term *diglossia*; however, his original use of the term was considerably more restricted in meaning than it is today. Ferguson’s *diglossia* refers to one particular kind of situation “where two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play” (1959:325). On the basis of nine criteria, the most important being function, one variety is classified as High (H), while the other is classified as Low (L). Ferguson specifies that the degree of linguistic relatedness between the two varieties be, in Fasold’s terms, somewhere “between clearly separate languages and mere style shifting” (Fasold 1984:50). Ferguson gives four examples of speech communities exhibiting diglossia: Arabic, Modern Greek, Swiss German, and Haitian Creole.

Fishman (1970:74) broadened Ferguson's definition of diglossia to include "functionally differentiated language varieties of whatever kind." He also allowed for the presence of several different codes and clarified the distinction between diglossia, a matter of societal differentiation, and bilingualism, a matter of individual proficiency.

Fasold (1984) refined Fishman's use of *diglossia* based on degree of linguistic relatedness. Under the rubric of "broad diglossia" Fasold distinguishes between superposed bilingualism, classic diglossia, and style shifting, by which he means the differentiated use of separate language, divergent dialects, and stylistic differences, respectively (ibid.:53-54). He also recognizes more complex situations where more than two language varieties are involved. These situations can be seen as examples of "standard with dialects diglossia," "double-overlapping diglossia," "double-nested diglossia," and "linear polyglossia" (ibid.: 43-50). Fasold, who is reluctant to give up the term *diglossia*, states that "we can keep the term if we understand the prefix to refer loosely to the two ends of the formality-intimacy continuum of language use, rather than to two linguistic varieties" (ibid.:53).

Platt (1977) holds a different perspective. He maintains that there are many speech communities where the concepts of diglossia and bilingualism are inappropriate. Using three examples from Singapore and Malaysia, he argues that for these speech communities it is more appropriate to speak of "polyglossia" and "multilingualism." A two-way division into H and L forms of language, or even one H and several Ls, is not adequate (Platt 1977:362). Languages instead need to be ranked on a scale divided into H, M (Medium), and L, with the possibility for several languages of each type. Platt also postulates a fourth position on the scale, that of Dummy H (DH). The DH category is used for

speech varieties of which some of the members have a certain knowledge, and which are given prestige ratings by the speakers and are even recognized by government authorities, media, or prestige groups within the speech community, but which are not in fact utilized extensively in any domain (ibid.:373-74).

Two main criteria are considered in order to rank languages on the H-M-L scale: the domains in which a language is used, and the attitudes of its speakers toward it. Platt (1977:368) employs Fishman's definition of domains as

situations in which individuals interact in appropriate role relationships with each other, in appropriate locales for these role relationships and discuss topics appropriate to their role relationships.

He points out, however, that "sub-domains" are also relevant in many cases. For instance, within one family there may be several different intra- and

intergenerational norms for language use. With regard to language attitudes, presumably the attitudes of the entire speech community are to be considered for each language, not just the attitudes of mother-tongue speakers only. An individual's language choice for a particular situation, Platt (1977:377) says, is

determined by the speaker's own verbal repertoire, his interlocutor's verbal repertoire and to what extent the speaker is prepared to accommodate to his interlocutor.

Platt's conception of polyglossia with multilingualism is indeed applicable to the Agutaynen situation, for a simple distinction between H and L forms is clearly inadequate. The four relevant languages can be classified in at least two different ways, as illustrated in table 7.1. English can be either one of two H forms, or a DH. It is a possible DH in light of survey results showing very low overall proficiency, and very little use outside the classroom. Tagalog is an H form. Cuyonon can be either an M or one of two Ls, depending on the importance one assigns to it as a regional lingua franca and as the language of a larger ethnic group. It is different from Tagalog in that it is not learned in school or used in official contexts. It is different from Agutaynen in that it is not learned or used in the home. Agutaynen is clearly an L form.

| | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| H1 | English | DH |
| H2 | Tagalog | H |
| L1 | Cuyonon | M |
| L2 | Agutaynen | L |

Table 7.1. Two ways of characterizing polyglossia in the Agutaynen community

This simple characterization of polyglossia in the Agutaynen community is quite revealing. From it, many of the functions of each language are immediately obvious. Several patterns of proficiency can likewise be deduced. The second style of notation, using Platt's DH and H categories, is the preferable one, since it maximally distinguishes each language.

7.5 Recommendations for future research

The Agutaynen survey findings suggest that further sociolinguistic research would be beneficial in several areas. A great deal could be gained, first of all, by analyzing the same data in different ways and from different perspectives. Perhaps more importantly, insights could be obtained by comparing multilingualism in the Agutaynen setting with multilingualism in similar rural settings in other parts of the world. In addition to these more theoretical investigations, at least one practical

aspect of the present study deserves replication — the attempt to calibrate self-report and performance-based proficiency tests.

The sociolinguistic data presented in this survey report could be analyzed further from a number of different perspectives. For example, the major finding that Agutaynens almost always speak the language of the outsider when addressing an outsider is an extreme example of linguistic convergence. As such, further analysis in the tradition of Giles (1977 and elsewhere) is in order, emphasizing accommodation, ethnicity, and intergroup relations.

Furthermore, findings concerning the different roles of English versus Tagalog, and Tagalog versus Cuyonon, could be reanalyzed as likely examples of language shift. Tagalog, in particular, presents an example of language spread. Agutaynen, on the other hand, is a good example of language maintenance. Further interpretive and quantitative analysis on each of these three phenomena would clarify the picture of language use and proficiency presented here.

The available data on the three municipalities investigated provide opportunity for additional analysis of the impact of certain other variables on patterns of use and proficiency. The linguistic makeup of each municipality, along with information on patterns of interaction among the municipalities, would be of interest here, and while detailed analysis of social networks is not explicitly provided in this study, a certain amount can be inferred. The Ministry of Local Government's report on rural roads development, along with publications of the National Census and Statistics Office, would also be helpful.

The Agutaynen survey data provide a basis for comparison of the language situation of this one community with those of other rural multilingual communities in different parts of the world. Of particular interest would be a comparative analysis of what types of languages fill what types of functions, in the spirit of Fasold's (1985:71-82) "new beginning" for qualitative description. It would also be important to compare the social relationships between language groups in the same way that Agutaynen/Cuyonon relationships are described in the present work. Perhaps this line of research would result in a greater understanding of a crucial variable referred to indirectly at various times in the Agutaynen study — that of ethnolinguistic vitality.

The part of the Agutaynen study that most urgently needs replication is that involving language proficiency testing. The Brooke's Point experiment demonstrated that oral proficiency interviews such as the ILR procedure (see sec. 2.5) are practical on a community-wide basis when only one language is being tested. Self-report methods must be relied upon, however, for larger populations or for rating proficiency in more than one second language. A combination of the two methods might prove effective in some multilingual settings. For example, the interviewer(s) could actually test proficiency for one language, and then ask for self-report data on other languages spoken. Once performance data are available for language X, questions can be asked

comparing the respondents' relative proficiency in languages Y and Z: "Do you speak Y as well as X?" "Do you speak Y better than X?"

The particular self-report technique employed in the Agutaynen survey — that of asking respondents about their ability to perform specific tasks in a given language — is a promising one that deserves further field testing. This method avoids asking respondents to directly rank their own proficiency according to categories that may or may not be clear to them. At the same time, it provides a standard way to rate proficiency, making comparison possible with other surveys at different times or in different locations.

7.6 Concluding remarks

The Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey provided both quantitative and qualitative data on language use and proficiency in a rural multilingual setting in Southeast Asia. The findings have been presented here for further analysis and for comparison with other multilingual settings.

The survey found that Agutaynens typically speak four languages at varying degrees of proficiency: (1) an international language of official status and educational importance, but little real relevance to life outside the classroom; (2) an official Philippine language used relatively extensively both in and out of the classroom; (3) a vernacular of a neighboring language group, traditionally used as a regional *lingua franca* due to the numeric, socioeconomic, and political dominance of that group; and (4) a vernacular of the home, associated exclusively with in-group use.

The main deciding factor as to which language an Agutaynen uses at a given time is the ethnic identity of the interlocutor. (Ethnic groups in the Philippines are divided according to mother tongues and are ranked in northern Palawan by intergroup convention on a scale of status or prestige.) Since Agutaynens as a social group enjoy less status or prestige than the groups with whom they have contact, they learn to use the languages of the other groups. Members of other groups, in contrast, do not as a rule learn the Agutaynen language.

Patterns of language use and degrees of proficiency vary most among Agutaynens according to age group, although there is also considerable variation according to location. Variation in English use and proficiency appears to be most closely related to medium of education. Cuyonon is best known and most frequently used by the older generation, suggesting a decline in its importance in northern Palawan. Tagalog is best known and most frequently used by the younger generation, reflecting that language's increasing attraction and utility in the Philippines. The rise of Tagalog in northern Palawan can be attributed largely to its use in education and to its increasing usefulness. The Agutaynen language is a strong mark of "Agutaynen-ness" for an ethnically strong group of people.

The Agutaynen sociolinguistic survey represents an attempt to better understand the roles of different languages in the lives of Agutaynen people. Apart from providing cultural and historical data on this particular ethnolinguistic group, the survey's most important contribution is in its adaptation of an existing tool for measuring second-language proficiency. It is hoped that this effort to understand the Agutaynen language situation will contribute toward the development of theory and practice in the field of sociolinguistics.