_____

Language Planning and the Programs in Filipino of Higher Education Institutions

Jaine Z. Tarun (PhD)
Isabela State University - Cabagan, Isabela, Philippines
jaine_tarun@yahoo.com

Abstract - *This study was focused on the language planning and the programs in Filipino of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Region 02, Philippines. It aimed to evaluate the extent of contributions in the implementation of national and institutional academic language policies and programs on Filipino in the General Education Curriculum (GEC), Bilingual / Multilingual Education, translation of books and articles, instructional materials development using Filipino and other languages in the region, having published books, scholarly articles and theses in other disciplines and journals written in Filipino and the attitudes of administrators, faculty and students. This evaluative study applied both the quantitative analysis of data using the survey method and qualitative analysis using the multi-method approach or triangulation. A total of 216 respondents from other disciplines, except Filipino, randomly selected among the administrators, faculty and students were utilized. The results confirmed that the minimum required GEC courses in Filipino as stipulated in CHED Memorandum Order No. 59 s. 1996 were implemented in their curricular programs while as a medium of instruction in Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications (HUSOCOM) courses, Filipino was not used. Result substantiated that Filipino aided instruction in classroom discourses both in HUSOCOM and Non – HUSOCOM courses was commonly practiced. Result also vouched the non-existence of institutional policies and programs in Filipino. However, there were no significant differences in the positive attitudes among administrators, faculty and students of Higher Education Institutions.*

Keywords: *Language Policies and Programs, General Education Curriculum, Evaluation, Higher Education Institutions*

INTRODUCTION

The implementation of K to 12 Curriculum brought radical curriculum changes in HEIs. The implications of the Program include the development of a revised general education curriculum hence, CHED Memorandum Order No. 20 s. 2013, otherwise known as the "General Education Curriculum", which was described with greater flexibility by the Commission on Higher Education, was approved for implementation school year 2018 – 2019 to cater the first cohort of K to 12 graduates. The current 9 units of Filipino in CHED Memorandum Order No. 59 s. 1996 (GEC – A) for fields of study under HUSOCOM and 6 units in CHED Memorandum No. 04 s. 1997 (GEC – B) for fields of study under Non – HUSOCOM like in Mathematics and Sciences, were no longer included. Also, in CMO No. 59 s. 1996, it was stipulated that courses under HUSOCOM be taught preferably in Filipino. The replacement of CMO No. 59 s. 1996, the exclusion of Filipino as an academic course in the Revised General Education Curriculum and making Filipino an academic course or a medium of instruction in GE courses a "choice" and no longer a policy are issues of concern today. However, CHED will provide incentives to HEIs that opt to use Filipino in the GE courses or offer several sections of Filipino and other Philippine languages. This raised larger philosophical questions not only of language and its role in higher education but also of the role of education in the development and intellectualization of language specifically Filipino as a national and an official language of the country [1].

Language as described by Tauli [2] is a means of identification, categorization, creative activity, technology, transmitting knowledge across space and time, a social code and a social institution. It is impossible to exaggerate the role of language in a society and culture, and its importance is still increasingly day by day. A developed language is

needed in educating and developing a people; the relationship is reciprocal for the people develop the language which, in turn, is needed to develop themselves [2]. It is clear that the degree of language development required will depend on the choice of language which is particularly evident in the case of an official and national language and it means primarily that these languages should have the structural properties of a standard language to the highest possible extent, both that of flexible stability and that of intellectualization which is a tendency towards increasingly more definite and accurate expression as far as the functions and attitudes were concerned[3].

Language planning as defined by Haugen [4],[5] is the normative work of language institutions, all forms of what is generally known as cultivation and all proposals for language reforms or standardization. Thus, he discussed policy formulation, modification, elaboration and implementation which is revised and refined by Neustupny [6] and added cultivation. According to Sibayan (1999), this process is considered as the intellectualization of language. Rubin and Jernudd [13] described language planning as the organizational efforts which are directed to deliberate change. This was all about decision-making on language as substantiated by Fishman [9]. He described language planning as the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, usually at the national level. Likewise Ferguson [10] expressed that there are always distinct characteristics of a language which becomes a standard language. First, it is accepted by the majority of the population; second, it is being used by the educated middle class; third, it is mutually intelligible; and lastly, there is a slight modification to be responsive to all the needs of the society. By the term standardization, is meant the creation of uniformity in language for use in schools, administration, law and mass media [1]. In the analysis of Garvin [3], the concept of language planning has two distinct differences: the selection of a particular language as a national and an official language and the development of language for literacy and other undertakings for standardization. The distinction between language planning and language allocation was discussed by Gorman [12]. He stated that language planning is a decision of authorities to sustain, to widen or limit the boundary of the use of language in a circumstantial situation. Jernudd and Das Gupta [13] discussed the logic of language

planning based on how language is viewed as a resource of society. On the other hand, the three focuses on language planning were presented by Cooper [14]: corpus planning, language status planning and language acquisition planning. The last focus aims to increase the population of speakers, to make changes on the negative attitude toward its use and to develop a better speaking and writing ability of those who have weak competence in this level. Similar to the acquisition of communicative competence, this is not complete until one knows what language to speak or write, to whom and when to use the language for appropriacy, so it is not complete until one knows where and when 'academe' is and is not suitable [15].With respect to language policy planning, there are three types of language policy namely: (a) the official language policy, which is the recognition by a government as to which language are to be used and for what purposes; (b) the educational language policy, which is concerned on what languages will be used as the media of instruction and as subjects of study at the various levels of public and private education; and general language policy, which is the unofficial approval of government regarding language use in business, in mass communications and in contacts with foreigners [16,17].

According to Fishman [15], there were two levels of language planning, the macro level and the micro level. The micro-planning level focuses on the specific regions, institutions, schools and others. The scope of language planning of HEIs in Region 02 is categorized under the level of micro-planning of language which is consistent to the recommendations of Neustupny [6]. He suggested two approaches in treating language problems primarily on inadequacy and inconsistency due to the divergent styles of language in a society and to the individuals who use the language themselves. The first was the Policy Approach (macroscopic) which is applied for the treatment of national problems. The second was Cultivation Approach (microcospic) which is used to treat problems on language style, barriers on communicative competence and other related language problems. Jernudd [13] discussed research emphasis on "micro" levels regarding language planning. He opted for going even closer to the source of new knowledge by studying first the effectiveness of educational and planning institutions resulting from institutional activities, attitudes and expectations. Thus, the need for evaluation on the implementation

10

P-ISSN 2350-7756 | E-ISSN 2350-8442 | www.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 4, No. 4, November 2016

of such strategy on language stresses a strong political will.

The conceptual framework of Bernabe [18] consisted of four processes, language formation, programming, implementation and evaluation of education in the Philippines. This showed the significance of undertaking evaluation as a continuous process. She emphasized that the sustainable conduct of evaluation is an impetus to establishing efficient means of collecting significant information. This will serve as basis for making changes in policy, planning and implementations in which results of this study can be of use to both the basic education sectors and the higher education institutions in language planning to efficiently address the needs of K to 12 Program and tertiary education. As stated by Sanyal [19], higher education and basic education are interdependent with each other. Fishman [15] agreed that language planning requires evaluation and feedback in order to proceed more successfully in the future than it has in the past. This partially explains the problems on language and quality in Philippine education today [20]. Kaplan and Baldauf [21] on their revised model of language planning, emphasized that priority attention must be directed on how to respond to the various needs in changing language situations. They discussed evaluation as a continuous process to explore and determine the weaknesses of such strategy to make necessary revisions. There is a period of motivation for evaluation in making a decision if the current program is implemented accordingly and there is also a period that brings innovation or change in the policy or program [22, 23]. Therefore, an evaluation on the implementation of a strategy is essential [24].

The creation of national and regional common languages has become an acute problem all over the world, to mention some are Europe, Africa, America and Asia [2]. In the case of the Philippines as a multilingual country, the educational language policy which concerns the media of instruction and subjects of study at the various levels of tertiary education is in English which continuously dominates however, competence in English is a perennial problem considering the small number of those in the system who reach such an advanced stage in English as a second language [20].Practice and reality do not match because the economic considerations and survival which are the major concerns in social advancements, make language planning for the national language unrealistic[20]. As emphasized by

Tollefson [25], local policies and programs in language education are affected by global processes such as the spread of English and the growth of the integrated capitalist economy. This is one of the critical issues in a wide range of different contexts for educational language policy. With these theoretical premises, evaluation of current national and institutional language policies and programs of HEIs is of high importance. The feedback drawn from this study can be used as bases for the formulation and re-engineering of academic language policies and programs in HEIs.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to evaluate the language planning and the extent of contributions in the implementation of national language policies and programs in Filipino of nine (9) HEIs in Region 02. Specifically, it attempted to: 1) ensure the extent of implementation of CMO No. 59 s. 1997 / GEC - A and CM No. 04 s. 1997 / GEC – B and their institutional language policies and programs on medium of instruction, bilingual and multilingual education, translation of books and articles and instructional materials development in Filipino and in other languages in the region and having published books, scholarly articles and theses in other disciplines and journals written in Filipino; and 2) determine the attitudes of administrators, faculty and students on the implementation of the national and institutional language policies and programs in Filipino in their institution.

METHODS

In this study, evaluative analysis using both the quantitative and qualitative methods was applied to assess critically the extent of implementation of national language policies in HEIs and the extent of their contributions in terms of their institutional language planning and programs in Filipino. In the quantitative analysis of data, survey method was employed through the use of validated questionnaire. Data were analyzed using the frequency distribution, percentage, ranking and Z-test for testing proportion of two samples. The qualitative analysis of data was done using the multi-method approach or triangulation. Data were gathered through documentary analysis, actual interviews and actual observation of classes. Individual interview was employed with the administrators and faculty while

11

P-ISSN 2350-7756 | E-ISSN 2350-8442 | www.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 4, No. 4, November 2016

Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was done for the students. The result of each method served as its confirmation and validation.

Validated instruments such as survey questionnaire, checklist, interview guide and class observation guide were utilized in gathering the data for a period of six (6) months.

An equal allocation using simple random sampling through draw lots was used in getting 4 administrators, 10 faculty and 10 students with a total of 24 respondents in each institution. A grand total of randomly selected 216 respondents consisting of 36 administrators, 90 faculty and 90 students from 4 respondent state universities and 5 private colleges and universities in Region 02. The 24 respondents from each institution were divided into 2 groups, the HUSOCOM group (faculty teaching Languages and Literature were not included) and the Non – HUSOCOM group of Science and Mathematics composed of 2 administrators (dean, department chair or subject coordinator), 5 faculty and 5 students with a total of 12 respondents in each group. The administrators and faculty who were involved in this study have already served their institution in two (2) years or more and the students were already in their third or fourth year in college considering their background and knowledge on language planning and the programs in Filipino of their institution.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 indicates the distribution of responses on the acceptance of 9 units in Filipino as a requirement in the fields of study under HUSOCOM mandated by CMO No. 59 s. 1996 / GEC – A and 6 units in the field of study under Non – HUSOCOM / GEC B like Mathematics and Sciences, mandated by CM No. 04 s. 1997. As shown in Table 1, a total number of 33 (91.67%) administrators, 88 (97.78%) faculty and 79 (87.78%) students with a grand total of 200 (92.59%) vouched that HEIs fully accepted the minimum requirements of 9 units of Filipino in HUSOCOM and 6 units in Non – HUSOCOM. Only16 (7.41%) respondents revealed the non – acceptance of this requirements in their institution.

The confirmation of this finding was done through interviews and documentary analysis. Data gathered from both procedures validated the full implementation of the minimum requirements.

Table1. Distribution of Responses on the Acceptance of 9 Units in Filipino as a Requirement in HUSOCOM / GEC – A and 6 units in Non – HUSOCOM / GEC B

Respondents	Category Answers					
	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administrators						
Public / SUCs	15	41.67	1	2.78	16	44.44
Private Sectarian	8	22.22	--		8	22.22
Private Non – Sectarian	10	27.78	2	5.56	12	33.33
Total	33	91.67	3	8.33	36	100.00
Faculty						
Public / SUCs	39	43.33	1	1.11	40	44.44
Private Sectarian	20	22.22	--		20	22.22	--
Private Non – Sectarian	29	32.22	1	1.11	30	33.33
Total	88	97.78	2	2.22	90	100.0
Students						
Public / SUCs	33	36.67	7	7.78	40	44.44
Private Sectarian	18	20.00	2	2.22	20	22.22
Private Non – Sectarian	28	31.11	2	2.22	30	33.33
Total	79	87.78	11	12.22	90	100.00
Grand Total	200	92.59	16	7.41	216	100

Table 2 shows courses where Filipino is used as a medium of instruction and ranked from highest frequency / percentage to lowest:1) *A - Philippine History & Government and Rizal's Life and Works*; 2) *B - Sociology and General Psychology*; 3) *C – Economics, Taxation & Land Reform and Current Issues*; 4) *D – Health Education, Population Education & Family Planning and Physical Education*; and 5) *F –Other courses like Computer, Ethics, Religion / Theology, MTB – MLE, etc.* Results of interviews and actual observation of classes substantiated these finding. Although, English is the official medium of instruction in the said courses, "Filipino Aided Instruction "is commonly practiced in classroom discourses. This usually happens when the teacher uses Filipino and allows students to express their ideas in Filipino. It is noteworthy that students hardly speak and express their ideas in English. Teachers vouched that oftentimes bilingual or multilingual instruction is the real language situation inside the classroom due to weak language competence and performance of students in English. These findings were supported by Batang [26] who emphasized that even prospective teachers of English are fairly competent users of English.

Table2.Courses where Filipino Used as a Medium of Instruction

Respondents	Category Answers											
	A		B		C		D		E		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Administrators												
Public / SUCs	7	19.44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Sectarian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Non – Sectarian	2	5.55	1	2.78	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	9	25.00	1	2.78	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Faculty												
Public / SUCs	26	28.89	8	8.89	9	10.00	11	12.22	9	10.00	4	4.44
Private Sectarian	7	7.78	2	2.22	3	3.33	2	2.22	3	3.33	2	2.22
Private Non – Sectarian	14	15.56	8	8.89	3	3.33	1	1.11	2	2.22	2	4.44
Total	47	52.22	18	20.00	15	16.67	14	15.56	14	15.56	10	11.11
Students												
Public / SUCs	40	44.44	13	14.44	17	18.89	24	26.67	10	11.11	4	4.44
Private Sectarian	12	13.33	4	4.44	7	7.78	7	7.78	1	1.11	-	-
Private Non – Sectarian	21	23.33	10	11.11	3	3.33	4	4.44	9	10.00	8	8.89
Total	73	81.11	17	30.00	27	30.00	25	27.78	20	22.22	12	13.33
Grand Total	129	59.72		21.3	42	19.44	39	18.05	34	15.74	22	10.19
Rank	1		2		3		4		5		6	

Table 3.Institutional Policies and Programs in Filipino of HEIs

Respondents	Category of Policies and Programs									
	A		B		C		D		E	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Administrators										
Public / SUCs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Sectarian	-	-	-	-	1	2.78	1	2.78	2	5.55
Private Non – Sectarian	-	-	-	-	1	2.78	-	-	1	2.78
Total	-	-	-	-	2	5.56	1	2.78	3	8.33
Faculty										
Public / SUCs	-	-	-	-	1	1.11	1	1.11	1	1.11
Private Sectarian	-	-	-	-	3	3.33	2	2.22	3	3.33
Private Non – Sectarian	-	-	-	-	5	5.56	1	4.44	5	5.56
Total	-	-	-	-	9	10.00	4	1.11	9	10.00
Students										
Public / SUCs	-	-	-	-	3	3.33	1	2.22	8	8.89
Private Sectarian	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	4.44
Private Non – Sectarian	-	-	-	-	1	1.11	-	3.33	2	2.22
Total	-	-	-	-	4	4.44	3	3.7	14	15.56
Grand Total	-	-	-	-	15	6.94	8		26	12.04
Rank	4.5		4.5		2		3		1	

The existence of institutional policies and programs in Filipino among HEIs is shown in Table 3 which were arranged according to rank: 1)*E-Program on Materials Development using Filipino as the medium;* 2)*C-Policy on Bilingual Education* and Multilingual Education;3) *D-Program on Translation of Books and Articles in Filipino; and both 4.5)A – Policy on Filipino as a medium of instruction in HUSOCOM*

courses and B – Policy on Filipino as a medium of instruction in Non- HUSOCOM courses like Mathematics and Sciences;

These findings were confirmed from the results of actual interviews and validated through documentary analysis. Both findings are evident that Filipino is not appreciated in HEIs in terms of language policies and programs. Hence, this data supported the findings of Segovia[27] that very few scholarly materials were written in Filipino and still one of the serious problems assured by CHED (2014).

Table 4 shows data on published books, scholarly articles and theses in other disciplines and journals of faculty and students written in Filipino and in other languages in the region. As gleaned in Table 4, very few respondents affirmed that there are published books, scholarly articles in other disciplines, theses and student journal written in Filipino and in other languages in the region which were ranked from highest to lowest: 1) Theses 2) Student Journal 3) Books 4) Scholarly Articles and 5) Faculty Journal. This finding was vouched through actual interviews and validated through documentary analysis.

Documents show that some of the respondent HEIs offer specialization in Filipino in BSEd and

MAEd programs which means that thesis writing is a requirement for graduation. As to the student journal, very few articles were written in Filipino. Results indicate that English is the language used in published books, scholarly articles, theses and journals in other disciplines. The findings imply that the problem in the use of Filipino language is not only on the technical discipline but in all subjects in the universities except Filipino courses, where there is abundance of written and published materials in English but not in Filipino [26], [24], [27].

Table 5 shows positive attitudes of administrators, faculty and students arranged from highest to lowest: 1)A –The required number of 9 units for HUSOCOM and 6 units for Non-HUSOCOM courses are fair and adequate; 2) D – It is much better if the students are both proficient in Filipino and English: 3) E –Filipino must be the medium of instruction for HUSOCOM and Non-HUSOCOM courses aside from English as the official medium; 4) B – Filipino language must be learned for national understanding and unity; and 5) C – Filipino language can be used in all academic discourses.

Table 4.Published Books, Scholarly Articles, Theses and Journals written in Filipino and in other Languages in the Region

Respondents	Books		Scholarly Articles		Theses		Faculty Journal		Student Journal	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Administrators										
Public / SUCs	2	5.56	2	5.56	8	2.22	-	-	-	-
Private Sectarian	-	-	-	-	3	8.33	-	-	-	-
Private Non – Sectarian	-	5.56	-	-	4	11.11	-	-	-	-
Total	2	11.11	2	5.56	15	41.67	-	-	-	-
Faculty										
Public / SUCs	10	-	8	8.89	8	8.89	-	-	-	-
Private Sectarian	-	11.11	-	-	5	5.56	-	-	-	-
Private Non – Sectarian	-	-	-	-	6	6.67	-	-	-	-
Total	10	11.11	8	8.89	19	21.11	-	-	-	-
Students										
Public / SUCs	10	11.11	6	6.67	12	13.33	-	12	12	13.33
Private Sectarian	-	-	-	-	4	4.44	-	-	-	-
Private Non – Sectarian	-	-	-	-	8	8.89	-	8	8	8.89
Total	10	11.11	6	6.67	24	26.67	-	20	20	22.22
Grand Total	22	10.19	16	7.41	58	26.85	-	40	40	18.52
Rank	3		4		1		5		2	

Table 5.Positive Attitudes of Administrators, Faculty and Students on the Implementation of National language Policies and Programs in Filipino

Respondents	A		B		C		D		E	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Administrators										
Public / SUCs	14	38.89	9	25	6	16.67	14	38.89	-	-
Private Sectarian	6	16.67	5	13.89	2	5.56	3	8.33	-	-
Private Non – Sectarian	10	27.78	7	19.44	3	8.33	8	22.22	-	-
Total	30	83.33	21	58.33	11	30.56	25	69.44	-	-
Faculty										
Public / SUCs	36	40	21	23.33	17	18.89	31	34.44	13	14.44
Private Sectarian	17	18.89	14	15.56	9	10.18	20	8	8.89	-
Private Non – Sectarian	17	18.89	24	26.67	17	18.89	26	22.22	10	11.11
Total	70	77.78	59	65.56	43	47.78	65	72.22	31	34.44
Students										
Public / SUCs	29	32.22	13	14.44	11	12.22	24	26.67	21	23.33
Private Sectarian	16	20	7	7.78	8	8.89	10	11.11	16	20
Private Non – Sectarian	23	25.56	15	16.67	11	12.22	15	16.67	23	25.56
Total	68	75.56	35	38.89	30	33.33	49	54.44	60	66.67
Grand Total	168	77.78	70	32.41	60	27.78	98	45.37	91	42.13
Rank	1		4		5		2		3	

Based on the results of interviews, the minimum requirements of 9 and 6 units GEC – Filipino is enough to address the needs of students in language proficiency. This finding implies that there is a need to sustain the minimum requirements in Filipino language component as an academic course in GEC of HEIs for the vitality of language proficiency among their students.

Table 6.Z – Value of Comparison between the Proportion of Attitudes of Respondents on the Implementation of National Language Policies in Filipino

Variables	Computed Z – Value	Critical Values	Remarks
1.) Public vs. Private Sectarian	1.31	Z > 1.96 and Z < - 1.96	Accept Ho
2.) Public vs. Private Non – Sectarian	0.68	- do -	Accept Ho
3.) Private Sectarian vs. Private Non - Sectarian	0.959	- do -	Accept Ho

Table 6 shows the computed Z – value of the following variables outside the critical region: 1) Public vs. Private Sectarian ($|Zc| = 1.31$ or $< - 1.96$); 2) Public vs. Private Non – Sectarian ($|Zc| = 0.68$ or $< - 1.96$); and 3) Private Sectarian vs. Private Non – Sectarian ($|Zc| = 0.959$ or $< - 1.96$). As shown in Table 6, the computed Z – values of public vs. private sectarian (1.31), public vs. private non – sectarian (0.68) and private sectarian vs. private non – sectarian (0.959) were not inside the critical region (Z > 1.96 and Z < - 1.96). It means that the positive attitudes of administrators, faculty and students on the implementation of national language policies in HEIs has no significant difference. This implies that the difference on the attitudes of administrators, faculty and students from public, private sectarian and private non-sectarian is insignificant.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The implementation of CMO No. 59 s. 1996 and CM No.04 s. 1997 in Filipino language components was highly observed in HEIs in compliance with the policy that the required minimum number of units for GE courses must not be deducted which is strictly monitored in the accreditation of degree programs. As to institutional language policies on Filipino as a medium of instruction, programs on instructional

materials development and publications in Filipino and other languages in the region, there was none. However, the respondent administrators, faculty and students expressed their support with positive attitudes in implementing these policies and programs in their institution. The insignificant difference on their positive attitudes clearly indicates their advocacy in promoting the intellectualization of the national language in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

A need to develop other dynamic process on the evaluation of programs in Filipino of Higher Education Institutions in other regions to contribute a research - based feedback on the formulation / re - engineering of policies and programs in Filipino as a medium of instruction, development of Filipino as a discipline and instructional materials development in Filipino and other languages in the region in support to the implementation of K to 12 Program is recommended. There is also a need for the CHED to formulate a clear and specific guideline, with proper coordination and dissemination, in order to have the same interpretation and proper implementation of national language policies in HEIs in all the regions of the Philippines.

REFERENCES:

[1]   Statement of the Commission on Higher Education on Filipino and the Revised General Education Curriculum (CMO No. 20 series of 2013). Nov. 27 2014. Statement: CHED On Filipino and Revised General Education Curriculum. http://www.gov.ph/2014/11/27/statement-ched-on-filipino-revised-general-education-curriculum/

[2]   Tauli, V. (1974). The Theory of Language Planning In Fishman (Ed.).Advances in Language Planning. Mouton: The Hauge.

[3]   Garvin, P. L. (1974). The Standard Language Problem Concepts and Methods. In Hyves, Bell (Ed).Languagein Culture and Society.

[4]   Haugen, E. I. (1966). Language Conflict and Language Planning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[5]   Haugen, E. I. (1969). Language Planning, Theory and Practice.In A. Graur (Eds.).Reprinted in the Ecology of Language.

[6]   Neustupny, J. V. (1970). Basic Types of Treatments of Language Problems. In Fishman (1974). Advances in Language Planning. Mouton: The Hauge.

[7]   Neustupny, J. V. (1970). Basic Types of Treatments of Language Problems. In Fishman (1974).

[8]   Rubin J. and B.H. Jernudd. (1971). Can Language Be Planned? Honolulu: The Universit6y Press of Hawaii.

[9]   Fishman, J. A. (1971). Language Structure and Language Use. California: Stanford University Press.

[10]   Ferguson, C. A. (1968). Language Development. In Fishman, Ferguson, Das Gupta (Eds.). (1968). Language Problems in Developing Nations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

[11]   Alisjahbana, T. S. (1974). Language Policy, Language Engineering and Literacy in Indonesia and Malaysia. In Fishman (1974).Advances in Language Planning. Mouton: The Hauge.

[12]   Gorman, T. P. (1968). Bilingualism in the Educational System of Kenya.Comparative Education. (June) 4:3.

[13]   Jernudd, B. H. and J. Das Gupta. (1971). Towards a Theory of Language Planning. In Can Language Be Planned? Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press.

[14]   Cooper, R. L. (1989). Language Planning and Social Change. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[15]   Fishman, J. A. (1974). Advances in Language Planning. Mouton: The Hauge.

[16]   Noss, R.   (1967).Language Policy and Higher Education. Higher Education and Development in Southeast Asia (Paris UNESCO). Vol. 3, Part 2.

[17]   Karam, F. X. (1974). Toward a Definition of Language Planning.In Fishman (1974).Advances in Language Planning. Mouton: The Hauge.

[18]   Bernabe, E. J.F. (1987). Language Policy Formulation, Programming, Implementation and Evaluation in Philippine Education (1565-1974). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

[19]   Sanyal B. C. (2005). The Rokle of Higher Education in obtaining EFA goals with particular focus on developing countries Paper is prepared for the UNESCO Forum on HIGHER Education, Research &Knowledge. June 28, 2005.

[20]   Gonzales, A.B. (2016). Language planning in multilingual countries. http://wenku.baidu.com/view/9e5b4bf14693daef5ef73df6.html.

[21]   Kaplan, R. B. and R. B. Baldauf. (1997). Language Planning from Practice to Theory. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

[22]   Rea-Dickins P. and K. Germaine. (1992). Evaluation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[23]   Lynch, B. K. (2003). Language Assessment and Programmed Evaluation. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

[24]   McGrath, I. (2002). Materials Evaluation and Design for Language Teaching. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

[25] Tollefson, J. W. (ed.) (2002). Language Policies in Education. New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

[26] Batang, B. L. (2014). Communicative Competence and Language Learning Styles of Prospective Teachers of English. Researchers World Journal of Arts, Science and Commerce. Vol- V, Issue – 4.

[27] Segovia, L.Z. (1986). The Implementation of Bilingual Policy on the Tertiary Level. In Evaluating Bilingual Education in the Philippines (1974-1975). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

COPYRIGHTS

17

P-ISSN 2350-7756 | E-ISSN 2350-8442 | www.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 4, No. 4, November 2016