BOOK REVIEWS

1. *THE MARIA LOURDES S. BAUTISTA READER, ed. by Elyria S. Bernardino. Manila: De La Salle University, 1997. 220 pp.*

A compilation of eight previously published articles spanning almost two decades (1975-1993), THE MARIA LOURDES S. BAUTISTA READER provides perceptive insights on Filipino-English bilingualism and language contact, as well as useful models for systematic research in sociolinguistics.

The subjects tackled range from (what Bautista cites in her 1993 article as Fasold's) "sociolinguistics of society" to "sociolinguistics of language," being the subareas of the field. In one (sociolinguistics of society), the focus is on society — a speech community's state of bilingualism; its language attitudes, perceptions, maintenance, and shift; and its attempts at language planning, standardization, and educational policy. In the other (sociolinguistics of language), the focus is on language — its actual use as manifested in dialectal variation; in code switching constructions; in coinage and lexical borrowing; in oral interaction; in discourse (e.g., scientific vs literary); and in microlinguistic properties (e.g., polite address, slang, speech acts, etc.).

Although distinguishable as different foci, both language and society inevitably yield information about one another in these studies. Thus, when Bautista defines the parameters for the intellectualization of Filipino (a <u>social</u> initiative in the determination of English-to-Filipino translation and interpretation), she deduces such parameters (like the word-formation, decision-procedure, and discipline-driven approaches of different language intellectualization groups) from these very same groups' translated language data. Conversely, when she analyzes the structure of Tagalog-English code switching; extracts the features of *yaya* English; studies reciprocal borrowing in the case of Filipino and English; or measures the relative amount of classroom interaction — systematic descriptions all of <u>language</u> use — she gathers her data from actual social subgroups (radio program hosts and guests, *yayas* or nursemaids, social scientists including psychologists developing the Filipino vocabulary, and students and teachers in a literature class, respectively).

The vast research she has done in the area of sociolinguistics can be gleaned from the titles of the articles included. These are listed below, arranged non-chronologically, as in the collection itself. (In the READER, the titles of the books and journals in which the articles first appeared, their publication data, and their page

numbers are conveniently provided below the title of each article, all of which have been copied here.)

(1) "A Model of Bilingual Competence Based on an Analysis of Tagalog-English Code Switching"
PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS 8, 1: 51-89. June 1975.

(2) "Scientific and Literary Writing: A Comparison of Two Styles"
VISION 2, 1: 35-46. October 1976.

(3) "*Yaya* English"
PHILIPPINE STUDIES 30: 377-394. Third Quarter 1982.

(4) "Questioning-Responding in Filipino and English: Classroom Interaction in Philippine Literature Classes"
DLSU GRADUATE JOURNAL 12, 1: 1-34. 1987.

(5) "A Survey of Language Use Surveys in the Philippines, 1969-1983"
LANGUAGE PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION: ESSAYS IN HONOR OF BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN ON HIS SIXTY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY, ed. by Andrew Gonzalez, FSC. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, 1984. Pp. 94-105.

(6) "English-Pilipino Contact: A Case Study of Reciprocal Borrowing"
ENGLISH IN CONTACT WITH OTHER LANGUAGES, ed. by Wolfgang Viereck and Wolf-Dietrich Bald. Budapest: Academiai kiado, 1986. Pp. 491-510.

(7) "The Parameters of Intellectualization: Applications to Filipino"
PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS 19, 2: 35-44. December 1988.

(8) "Sociolinguistics in the Philippines"
PHILIPPINE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
(LINGUISTICS). Quezon City: Philippine Social Science
Council, 1993. Pp. 347-356.

Although the editor notes that the articles fall under the sociolinguistic sub-areas of society and of language, no such subcategorization is made in the Table of Contents. Looking at the topics, the reader can but roughly surmise that the first four fall under the sociolinguistics of language; the next three, under that of society; while the last is an encyclopedic article discussing the general area of sociolinguistics. Given that the language-society boundary is rather tenuous, perhaps the editor has chosen, wisely, to leave the distinction to the individual reader. For indeed, where and when does language end and society take over? To say that language can be neatly segregated from the community that speaks it is to postulate that utterances can be studied in isolation. (Even the questionable "idealized speaker" from an equally questionable "homogenous community" in a Chomskyan model is actually one who comes from a real community — that of the researcher who picks up examples here and there from — where else but as the case may be, one's very own non-homogenous community, after all. Thus, even a statement such as "Colorless green ideas sleep furiously" cannot be rendered literally nonsensical without reference to a community who believes that *green* cannot be "colorless" at the same time; or that ideas cannot possibly be green or any color, cannot sleep, and much less sleep furiously. Somehow the speaker has turned into a necessary abstraction for the sake of formal linguistic analysis.) Hence the language-society dyad is really two faces of the same coin. This is just one of the intellectual challenges that the READER throws down at the reader in the manner of, as it were, a gauntlet.

Aside from the reflections about language and society that the READER affords, there is the generous sprinkling of methodological procedures and sample data that provides one a

panorama of the nitty-gritty of sociolinguistic research. Beyond becoming a practical companion to the more theoretical READINGS IN PHILIPPINE SOCIOLINGUISTICS (2nd ed. Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, ed., Manila: De La Salle University, 1996), the BAUTISTA READER proves to be THE model for would-be researchers as regards conducting research on language studies (codeswitching, varieties of Philippine English, and classroom oral interaction); surveying surveys; and synthesizing other researches, as well as reporting on all these.

To sample a few passages from Bautista's work, read her rationale for her choice of data on bilingual codeswitching:

> This specific program was chosen because its program host at the time, Gerry Geronimo, code-switched frequently, and his guests noticeably also did the same. It was decided to use a block of ten tapes from the morning broadcasts for the month of September 1973: ten because it seemed reasonable to presume that ten thirty-minute tapes would provide sufficient data for the study; the morning broadcasts because, unlike the evening broadcasts which are picked up by provincial stations, these are beamed specifically at Metropolitan Manila and therefore feature more instances of Tagalog-English code switching; September 1973 because this was the time the original study was planned" (4-5).

Or look at another line taken from her conclusion on the intellectualization of Filipino, particularly through terminological expansion:

> The most important observation concerned the difference between translation (which uses the Filipino language as target) and interpretation (which uses the Filipino language as source) (180).

Lastly, sample this instance of intellectual honesty:

Postscript (August 1990): In the course of advising
Nenita Beluso in the writing of her dissertation in 1987-
1988, I found out that "author talk" was a new category
being placed alongside "teacher talk" and "student talk."
"Author talk" would comprise all instances when the
teacher or the students simply read or quoted [or
dramatized] portions of a text being studied (106-107).
... the new way of counting — this time including a
category for author talk — shows that ... in the old count
[excluding author talk], student talk was as high as 40.5
percent, but in the new count is only 25.4 percent ...
(109-110).

Even the bibliographies (except for "Yaya English," which
has Notes but no Bibliography), especially the last one on
"Sociolinguistics in the Philippines," are as extensive and thorough as
any researcher would wish them to be. Included are the germinal
works of the Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs of Philippine linguistics:
Andrew B. Gonzalez, FSC, Bonifacio P. Sibayan, Ponciano B.P. Pineda,
Teodoro A. Llamzon, Jose Villa Panganiban, Gloria Chan-Yap, Fe T.
Otanes, Emy M. Pascasio, Teresita V. Ramos, and other luminaries,
as well as the distant stars in language studies abroad such as Noam
Chomsky, Harold C. Conklin, Ralph Fasold, Charles O. Frake, Paul L.
Garvin and Madeleine Mathiot, Joseph H. Greenberg, John J. Gumperz,
Dell Hymes, William Labov, and Uriel Weinreich, among others.

While the READER has gathered in one volume Bautista's
research findings that are certainly significant to language planners,
education policymakers, sociolinguists, and other social scientists,
it has also great value in putting together for easy perusal the kind
of studies about language and society that language enthusiasts,
researchers, teachers, and students alike are definitely interested
in. By exemplifying the way to do sociolinguistic research, Bautista,

in this READER, has become the Moses in the journey to the Promised Land that is the fertile ground for studies on language as an index of culture.

But after all is said, done, and shown how, where do descriptive sociolinguistic studies go from here? Given that the language and society relation encompasses the idea that society plans, develops, and standardizes its own language, and that language is used in society for different communicative purposes, either conscious or unconscious, should social scientific studies end here? Or can interdisciplinary efforts be mustered such that as the humanities can be informed by the discipline of the social sciences, so can the social sciences be fine tuned to the critical approach of the humanities? For example, how do various social groups wield bilingual speech as a power tool? Should language planners and educators leave alone the different varieties of Philippine English, or should they incorporate those peculiar features in restructuring the English curricula, both for academic and non-academic purposes? To what extent can marginalized groups participate in standardization? How does lexical borrowing contain and continue colonization through language? What do different discourses and language structures say about social relationships? Why are any findings at all, such?

To answer any of these questions, neither can the humanist nor the social scientist disparage, much less discount, the other's disclosures. The two language lovers need not remain polar parties forever, always in opposition as regards approaches and goals. A complementary venture can be undertaken wherein each one nourishes the other, or else there shall always be a "great divide" — and "never the twain shall meet."

— *Rosalina T. Bumatay-Cruz*

2. *Villamin, Araceli M.; Evelyn L. Salazar; Edilberta C. Bala; and Nilda R. Sunga. INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES IN COMMUNICATION ARTS. Quezon City: Phoenix, 1994. 236 pp. Glossary, pp. 226-230.*

This book is intended for would-be teachers of communication arts especially on the primary and secondary levels, although the strategies (some, admittedly not-so-new) can still be of help to the more experienced ones in reviewing their own approaches, including those used on the tertiary level. (I assume that in college, the communication arts are taught with a view towards developing critical language skills — not just language skills per se — and imaginative as well as action-oriented thinking skills.)

Unit 1 is most useful for those who want a theoretical grounding on the various approaches, methods, and techniques in teaching the communication arts. About fifteen pages are devoted to highlighting the goals, characteristics, and sample activities for each strategy, plus sometimes a note identifying the theorist. These strategies are:

(1) grammar translation method
(2) direct method
(3) audio-lingual approach
(4) the silent way
(5) "suggestopedia"
(6) community language learning
(7) total physical response method
(8) communicative approach
(9) language experience approach
(10) basal reader approach
(11) individual reading instruction
(12) management systems approach
(13) programmed instruction
(14) whole language approach

Although the terms approach, method, and technique are distinguished through definition and hierarchical level at the outset, the subsequent listing of the highlights of all fourteen strategies does not show such differing relationships. For example, it is not mentioned which method ("overall plan") is based upon which selected approach ("set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning"). The method or plan emanating from each approach, as well as the approach or assumption(s) behind each method, is not clearly specified; instead, each is treated individually without reference to the other.

The next unit discusses approaches and techniques in teaching the three language skills of listening, speaking, and writing. It includes checklists, lesson plans, sample texts for reading, games, and activity charts. In practice, INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES IN COMMUNICATION ARTS tends towards the reading aspect of communication. This is seen in the proportion devoted to this skill: two units (Unit 3 with 88 pages and Unit 4 with 61 pages) are on reading and on "enhancing literary appreciation" through reading texts aloud, respectively, whereas only one unit (Unit 2 with 50 pages) lumps together listening, speaking, and writing.

Unit 3 is an entire portion on different reading theories, vocabulary building for reading, reading rate comprehension, and technique, among others; Unit 4, the last unit, is devoted still to reading, but this time with focus on oral interpretation rather than comprehension of lines. This portion includes local and foreign selections for choral reading, chanting, rapping, readers theater, and chamber theater.

Unit 3 further includes practical reading techniques such as speedreading, semantic webbing or mapping (organizing and integrating materials through diagrams of categories and relationships), and story grammar (drawing the hierarchy of the elements of a story: setting, theme, plot, and resolution being of a higher level). The unit reports that there is a trend in the use of

the whole language approach and that this approach is a success. The authors recommend that an "effective strategy for teaching bilingual learners like Filipino students" is combining the whole language approach with the basal reader approach (using stories that have some literary value — does this suggest a canon of sorts?).

Unit 4 closes with a sample lesson plan on integrating language and literature through using a literary piece to teach listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Thus, the authors (all teaching at Philipppine Normal University) reveal their pre-theoretical belief in the primacy of literature as a conduit for teaching the communication arts. One wonders what teachers and students in the sciences and other professions have to say about this. In taking a literature-oriented approach, this book continues the debate as to which materials should fit a communication arts course: literary pieces only? or also other forms of discourse, such as medical reports, legal documents, scientific experiments, case studies, popular Philippine songs, etc.?

With half of the book allotted to the reading skill (either silent or oral), Villamin et al. are making a statement about the primacy of the reading component in any communication arts course. After one has appreciated the contents of the book, the question then arises as to whether reading should really be taught independently of writing, or whether writing can instead be made a reflection of the student's reading ability — and conversely — reading be made a handmaid of writing. Moreover, what happens when listening is integrated with reading ("reading" because a student is asked to analyze something), such as when viewing television or film? And what happens when writing is integrated with speaking ("speaking" because one voices one's thoughts spontaneously), such as when writing personal messages via e-mail or on-line chatting?

Lastly, while there are fourteen different approaches and methods to choose from, combine in any number, or use whenever

applicable, can the right approach really be found in this list? Western theorists like Bowen, Goodman, Piaget, Rivers, Rumelhart, and Vygotsky are cited in the book; however, can a Philippine model for teaching speaking, listening, reading, and writing be developed?

Perhaps the answer does not lie in mere adaptation or combination of foreign strategies. For example, can mass-based and folk-oriented strategies be harnessed to teach the different arts and skills involved in communicating — better yet, even before this — in thinking? Are there no listening and reading techniques employed by the respective audiences of (1) TV news, talk shows, drama series, ambush interviews of government officials, church sermons, mothers' naggings, eavesdropped conversations on jeepneys, barangay meetings, negotiation panels (FOR LISTENING); and of (2) comics, tabloids, bilingual novels, labor contracts, income tax returns, hospital and Medicare forms, marriage certificates, land titles (FOR READING)? Are there no speaking and writing techniques when, (1) telling jokes, rumor mongering, toastmastering (FOR SPEAKING); and (2) writing notes on gift cards or scribbling messages to family members (FOR WRITING)?

How can these popular techniques be tapped to develop Filipino-suited strategies in learning how to speak, listen, read, write, and more importantly, think, analyze, and criticize? In fact, are not the communication arts really the art and science of thinking? Was it not an entire nation of Filipinos who dreamt, imagined, and realized a people-powered revolution in the Eighties? I believe the deliberate, time-protracted thinking and faith in one's desires and mental energies that went into that historical creation is the kind of intellectual power that innovative communication arts teachers can begin with.

— *Rosalina T. Bumatay-Cruz*