INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE PLANNING AND THE PROGRAMS IN FILIPINO OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Jaine Z. Tarun, Ph. D.

Associate Professor V,
Department of Elementary Education
College of Teacher Education,
Isabela State University, Cabagan, Isabela, Philippines

ABSTRACT

In this paper, the extent of the contributions of state universities and colleges in Region 02, Philippines is aimed at evaluating the implementation of academic policies and programs in Filipino language. Results of the study reveal that all respondent administrators and faculty and almost all of the students confirmed that there is no program in Filipino as an academic discipline among the tertiary institutions. Results of the present study also reveal that Filipino language is not used as a medium of instruction as affirmed by the majority of the respondents. Likewise, as a medium in publications, a greater number of respondents vouch that none of their published books, scholarly articles, theses and journals were written in Filipino which clearly indicates that English language is the medium in all of these programs except in Filipino courses. In terms of having their own language policy and programs in Filipino, result shows that there is none. Quantitative analysis using Z-test, however, shows that there is no significant difference on the attitude of administrators, faculty and students in the implementation of national language policies and programs in Filipino. These findings indicate that institutional language planning of state universities and colleges lack support and advocacy in the intellectualization of Filipino. It is therefore recommended that further evaluation in the implementation of academic language policies and programs in Filipino of state universities and colleges be conducted in other regions of the Philippines.

Keywords: Institutional language planning, implementation, evaluation, medium of instruction, language policy.

INTRODUCTION:

Language planning research has increasingly been studied with'language planning practice' in connection with decision-making on language problems. However, the practitioners, to mention some such as the legislators, policy implementers, government agencies and language academy personnel have not yet turned to utilize the language planning research to any major degree as a guide to their own procedures (Fishman 1974). Since Fishman, one of the first sociologists succeeded in focusing attention on the importance of language planning, the need to concentrate on language planning research perse will be forced to shed light on this undertaking in the future. Certainly, language planning research can only gain by attending more advanced language settings (Fishman - 1973).

Language planning as defined by Haugen (1966, 1969), one of the fathers of language planning, is the normative work of language academies, all forms of what is commonly known as cultivation and all proposals for language reforms or standardization. Thus, he discusses policy formulation, modification, elaboration and implementation which is revised and refined by Neustupny (1970 in Fishman 1974) and adds cultivation. According to Sibayan (1999, this is the intellectualization of language which is included in the study of Banawa (2005). Neustupny views 'cultivation' as being a sequentially later and more advanced stage of language planning. Rubin and Jernudd (1971) refer to 'language planning' as the organizational efforts which are directed to deliberate change. This is all about decision-making on language as supported by Fishman (1971) who describes language planning as the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, usually at the national level. Likewise Ferguson (1968) emphasizes that there are always peculiar characteristics of a language which becomes a standard language, namely: (a) it is accepted by the majority of the population; (b) it is being used by the educated people; (c) it is mutually intelligible; and (d) there is a slight modification to be responsive to all the needs of the society.

In Garvin's analysis (1974), the concept of language planning has two distinct differences: the selection of a particular language as a national language (and official language) and the development of language for literacy and other endeavors for standardization. Gorman (1968) discusses the distinction between language planning and language allocation. He states that the language planning is a decision of authorities to sustain, to widen or limit the boundary of the usage of language in a particular situation. The logic of language planning is based on how language is viewed as a resource of society (Jernudd and Das Gupta 1971).

On the other hand, Cooper (1989) presents three focuses on language planning which are corpus planning, planning on the language status and planning on the language acquisition. The third 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. Process on the acquisition of communicative competence is not entirely completed until an individual knows what language to speak or write, to whom and when to use the language, so it is incomplete until knowing where and when 'academe' is and is not befitting (Fishman 1971).With respect to language policy planning, there are three types of language policy namely: the official language policy, which is the recognition by a government as to which language are to be used and for what purposes; the educational language policy, which concern about what languages will be used as the medium of instruction and as subjects of study at the various levels of public and private education; followed by general language policy, which is the unofficial approval of government regarding language use in business, in mass communications and in contacts with foreigners (Noss, 1967, Karam in Fishman, 1974).

The conceptual framework of Bernabe (1987) consisted of four processes, language formation, programming, implementation and evaluation of education in the Philippines. This shows the need for evaluation as a continuous process. She emphasizes that the sustainable conduct of evaluation is an impetusin establishing excellent means of collecting significant information which will serve as a basis for making changes in policy, planning and implementations. The results of evaluation may serve as basis whether to sustain, amend or revise the plan towards its excellence or to declare the plan to be null or void. The need for evaluation is also emphasized by Fishman (1974). He agrees that language planning requires evaluation and feedback in order to proceed more successfully in the future than it was in the past. He supports the idea that evaluation is strongly avoided or detested of all planning processes, and of language planning as well.

Relative to the amount of time, money and effort devoted to planning, little is devoted to evaluation on feedback for the purposes of more effective planning (Friedman 1967). Fishman (1974) believes that through evaluation, the weaknesses, strengths and even the success and failure of the strategy during the period of implementation would be realized. He recognizes 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 institutional language planning of state universities and colleges fall under the level of micro-planning of language which is consistent as per the recommendations of Neustupny (1974). He suggests 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. These are the Policy Approach and the Cultivation Approach. The first approach is for the treatment of national problems which is macrocospic, while the second approach is microscopic which is used to treat problems on language style, barriers on communicative competence and other related language problems. For this, the need for evaluation to assess the success and failure on the implementation of such strategy on language stresses a strong political will.

As emphasized by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) of the revised model of language planning where evaluation is part of implementation, priority attention must be focused on how to respond the various needs in changing language situations. They discuss evaluation as a continuous process to discover the weaknesses of such strategy to make necessary revisions. According to Rea-Dickins and Germaine (1992 in Lynch, 2003), 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. Hence, this study is undertaken to provide empirical data or information as an input for any change or innovation in terms of language policy formulation, implementation and evaluation through the Commission on Higher Education of the Philippine government.

With these theoretical backgrounds, this paper is aimed to evaluate the institutional language planning and the implementation of academic policies and programs in Filipino of state universities and colleges.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of the contributions of state universities and colleges on the implementation of academic policies and programs in Filipino in terms of the following variables?
   1.1 Academic Discipline
   1.2 Academic Course
   1.3 Medium of Instruction
2. Are there existing institutional and/or regional language policy and programs in Filipino of state universities and colleges?
3. Is there a significant difference on the attitude of administrators, faculty and students in the implementation of academic policies and programs in Filipino of state universities and colleges?

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

The evaluative analysis, using quantitative and qualitative methods is used in this study. In the quantitative analysis of data, survey method was done through the use of questionnaire. Data was analyzed using the frequency distribution, percentage, ranking and Z-test for testing proportion of two samples. A grand total of 260 respondents consisting of 40 administrators, 100 faculty and 120 students from the 3 respondent state universities and 1 state college namely, the Cagayan State University, Isabela State University, Nueva Vizcaya State University and Quirino State College (now a university started Oct. 19, 2012).The qualitative analysis of data was done using the multi-method approach or triangulation. Data was gathered through documentary analysis, actual interviews and actual observation of classes. Individual interviews were conducted with the administrators and faculty while Focus Group Discussion (FGD) for the students. A total of 5 administrators, 10 faculty and 20 students in each institution with a grand total of 160 respondents were interviewed from the 4 respondent institutions in Region 02, Philippines.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

As seen in Table 1, it is regrettable to find out that Filipino language as an academic discipline or degree program is not offered in state universities and colleges as revealed by a "No" response with a grand total of 243 or 93.46% of the administrators, faculty and students. However, as an academic course, the data show as supported by 260 or 100% of the respondents who answered "Yes", agreed that all state universities and colleges implement the minimum requirements for General Education Curriculum in all their degree programs as stipulated in Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 59 s. 1996. Also as an academic course, it is offered as an area of specialization for Bachelor of Secondary Education and Master of Arts in Education programs. These findings were validated through documentary analysis and actual interviews.

Table 1: Distribution of responses on having a program in Filipino as an academic discipline, as an academic course and as a medium of instruction

Respondents	Academic Discipline				Academic Course				Medium of Instruction			
	YES		NO		YES		NO		YES		NO	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
ADMINISTRATORS												
Cagayan State University	-	-	10	100	10	100	-	-	-	-	10	100
Isabela State University	-	-	10	100	10	100	-	-	-	-	10	100
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	-	-	10	100	10	100	-	-	-	-	10	100
Quirino State College	-	-	10	100	10	100	-	-	1	10.00	9	90.00
Total	**-**	**-**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**1**	**2.50**	**39**	**97.50**
FACULTY												
Cagayan State University	-	-	25	100	25	100	-	-	3	12.00	22	88.00
Isabela State University	-	-	25	100	25	100	-	-	2	8.00	23	92.00
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	-	-	25	100	25	100	-	-	2	8.00	23	92.00
Quirino State College	-	-	25	100	25	100	-	-	4	16.00	21	84.00
Total	**-**	**-**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**11**	**11.00**	**89**	**89.00**
STUDENTS												
Cagayan State University	3	2.5	27	22.5	30	100	-	-	23	76.67	7	23.33
Isabela State University	5	4.17	25	20.83	30	100	-	-	26	86.67	4	13.33
NuevaVizcaya State Univ.	7	5.13	23	23.00	30	100	-	-	22	73.33	8	26.67
Quirino State College	2	1.67	28	23.33	30	100	-	-	25	83.33	5	16.67
Total	**17**	**14.17**	**103**	**85.83**	**120**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**96**	**80.00**	**24**	**20.00**
Grand Total	**17**	**6.54**	**293**	**93.46**	**260**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**116**	**44.61**	**152**	**58.46**

On the issue of Filipino language as a medium of instruction in all courses in Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications or HUSOCOM and in Non-HUSOCOM courses like Mathematics and Science courses, almost all of the administrators and majority of the faculty as substantiated by 39 or 97.5% and 89 or 89%, respectively answered "No" which implies that Filipino language is not used except in Filipino Courses. This is confirmed through actual interviews. On the contrary, greater number of students with a total of 96 or 80% answered "Yes" which means that they use Filipino as a medium of instruction. However, Filipino is not considered as an official medium of instruction as revealed by 152 or 58% of the respondents. To confirm this finding, results of actual observation of classes vouch that English language is the medium of instruction in all Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications (HUSOCOM) and Non-HUSOCOM courses. This embodies that the education of the Filipino people in universities and colleges has been carried out mainly through a foreign language in the twentieth century which is English (Sibayan 1994). Also, it is found out that Filipino language is only used for "aided instruction" in classroom discourses. The results clearly indicate that a lack of support in advocating the national language policies and programs is quite noticeable in state universities and colleges (Rio, 2001).

Language planning should always be a part of government policies (Tauli, 1974).Tertiary institutions are the first and foremost level of education obliged to promote the sustainable intellectualization of the Filipino language. However, educational language policy which concerns Filipino language as the medium of instruction in subjects prescribed by the government is disregarded and a weak political will for implementation is evident in public universities and colleges. This result supports Fishman (1974) that implementation processes anchored in micro-planning have not yet received much attention in macro-language planning.

Table 2: Institutional policies and programs on Filipino language of state universitie and colleges in Region 02, Philippines

Respondents	POLICIES AND PROGRAMS											
	A		B		C		D		E		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
ADMINISTRATORS												
Cagayan State University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isabela State University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nueva Vizcaya State University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Quirino State College	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FACULTY												
Cagayan State University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isabela State University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nueva Vizcaya State University	-	-	-	-	1	4.00	1	4.00	1	4.00	-	-
Quirino State College	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	-	-
STUDENTS												
Cagayan State University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.33	-	-
Isabela State University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.33	-	-
Nueva Vizcaya State University	-	-	-	-	2	6.67	1	3.33	4	13.33	1	
Quirino State College	-	-	-	-	1	3.33	-	-	2	6.67	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	3	2.50	1	0.83	8	6.67	1	0.83
Grand Total	-	-	-	-	4	1.54	4	1.54	9	3.46	1	0.38
Rank	4.5		4.5		2.5		2.5		1		3	

***Note:** F – frequency, % – percentage*

As viewed in Table 2, the *E-Program or Institutional Materials Development using Filipino as the medium* is ranked 1 as substantiated by a grand total of 9 or 3.46 % of respondents. This is followed by the *C-Policy on Bilingual Education* and *D-Program on Translation of Books and Articles to Filipino* as affirmed by both 4 or 1.54% of the respondents which is ranked 2; follows by *F-Others like the celebration of language month* which is ranked 3 as supported by 1 or 0.38% of the respondents. There were none for *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*. These findings are confirmed through the results of actual interviews from the other group of administrators, faculty and students and validated through documentary analysis. Both findings are evident that Filipino language is not recognized in the academe in terms of language policies and programs which is consistent with the findings of Segovia (1988) that very few scholarly materials were written in Filipino language.

It is noteworthy that English is the recognized language in the institutional language planning of the public academe in Region 02, Philippines for the reason that English in any academic situation in universities and colleges is domineering (Magracia, 2005). The non-existence of institutional language policies among state universities and colleges in some regions is also revealed in the study conducted by Navarro (1990). In her study, the development of language policy in Filipino for Pangasinan State University is based on the Filipino language policies of some reputable and prestigious universities in the Philippines like the University of the Philippines (UP), De La Salle University (DLSU), Ateneo De Manila University (ADMU) and Philippine Normal University (PNU) which is the major recommendation.

The distribution of responses of public tertiary institutions in terms of having published books, scholarly articles and theses in other disciplines including journals written in Filipino is shown in Table 3. Results of the study reveal that there is no published books, scholarly articles and theses in other disciplinesand journals written in Filipino both for faculty and students as evidently substantiated by a grand total of both 247 or 95%, 184 or 70.77%, 260 or 100% and 186 or 71.54%, respectively. The affirmation of this finding was noted through documentary analysis.

Table 3 Documents show that there are few textbooks available in Filipino courses and scholarly articles in Filipino only at Nueva Vizcaya State University. In terms of theses, all SUCs offer specialization in Filipino both in Bachelor of Secondary Education and Master of Arts in Education programs which means that thesis writing is a requirement for graduation. As to the students' journal, most of the articles are written in English and very few in Filipino. Results indicate that English is the language used in published books, scholarly articles, theses and journals (Banawa, 2005). On the other hand, findings emphasize 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 matter in English but not in Filipino (Sibayan, 1999).

Table 4 shows the positive attitudes of administrators, faculty and students arranged from the highest number or percentage to the lowest: (1) Both *A* and *D* with a frequency of 222 or 84.62%; (2) *B*-having a frequency of 208 or 80%' (3) *C*-with a frequency of 186 or 71.54%; (4) *E*-supported by a frequency of 85 or 32.69%. Same table also shows the negative attitudes of administrators, faculty and students as substantiated by (1) $A - 43$ or 16.54%, (2) $E - 37$ or 14.23%, (3) $D - 27$ or 10.38% and (4) both *B* and *C* with 0 frequency.

An interesting piece of information brought out by the data on the positive attitudes is that majority of the administrators, faculty and students believe in the capacity of Filipino language in the academe. The data could also be interpreted to mean that the opposition to Filipino language in the academe in the non-Tagalog regions, like the scope of the present study – Region 02, Philippines, is not as strong as some people think (Sibayan, 1999).

As shown in Table 5, the quantitative analysis using Z-test confirms the insignificant difference on the positive attitudes among the administrative, faculty and students on the implementation of policies and programs in Filipino of state universities and colleges in Region 02, Philippines.

Table 5. Z-Value of comparison between the proportion of favorable attitude of respondents on the implementation of national language policies and programs

Variables	Computed Z-Value	Critical Value	Remarks
Administrator vs. Faculty	-1.06	Z > 1.96 and < - 1.96	Accept Ho
Administrator vs. Students	-.04	-do-	Accept Ho
Faculty vs. Students	0.588	-do-	Accept Ho

The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between the favorable attitude of administrators and faculty, between the administrators and the students and between the faculty and the students is accepted. These results affirm the findings of Martinez (2001 in Banawa, 2005) and substantiated the positive attitudes in Filipino of the administrators, faculty and students on the implementation of national policies and programs in Filipino of tertiary institutions in Region 10, Philippines (Banawa, 2005).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following conclusions were drawn based on the findings of the study:

1. State universities and colleges in Region 02, Philippines have no institutional policy and programs in Filipino as the national language and official medium of instruction in education and communication. The present study supported the findings of Banawa (2005) that there is no institutional policy and programs in Filipino in selected universities and colleges in Region 02, Philippines;

2. The official medium of instruction is English in Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications (HUSOCOM) courses and also in published books, scholarly articles, theses and journals in all other fields of study;

3. The most favorable attitude of administrators, faculty and students is both the required number of units in Filipino in the General Education Curriculum is fair and adequate and the proficiency of students both in Filipino and in English with the same grand total of 222 or 84.62%; and

4. That there is no significant difference between the favorable attitude of administrators and faculty, between the administrators and students and between the faculty and students in the implementation of national policies and programs in Filipino.

Since institutional language planning is categorized under the micro-language planning, it was made clear by Fishman (1974) that micro-analysis of language planning has not yet received the attention it deserves, perhaps because implementation and evaluation processes anchored in micro-planning have received less attention in macro-language planning. Thus, similar and/or further studies must be conducted by other researchers in other regions of the Philippines both in public and private tertiary institutions.

REFERENCES:

[1]   Banawa, M. D. (2005). Critical Evaluation on the Implementation of CHED GEC in Filipino of Selected Universities in Region 10. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of the Philippines, Diliman.

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

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

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

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

[6]   Fishman, J. A. (1973). Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. Language in Society 2, no. 1.

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

[8]   Friedman, J. A. (1967). A conceptual model for the analysis of planned behavior. In Fishman 1974. Advances in Language Planning. Mouton: The Hauge.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[16] Magracia, E. B. (2005). Management and Policy in Filipino of Mindanao State University. In Filipino and Language Planning. University of the Philippines - Center of Filipino Language.

[17] Navarro, P. L. (1990). Language Planning and the Programs on the National Language of Pangasinan State University. Unpublished Dissertation. University of the Philippines, Diliman.

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

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

[20] Rea-Dickins P. and K. Germaine. (1992). Evaluation. In Lynch B. K. (2003). Language Assessment and Programmed Evaluation. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

[21] Rio, M.V.C. (2001). Language Planning in Polytechnique University of the Philippines: Towards Active Planning on the Filipino Language. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of the Philippines, Diliman.

[22] Rubin, J. and B. Jernudd (1971). Can Language Be Planned? (Eds.) Honolulu: East-West Center and Univ. Press of Hawaii.

[23] 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.

[24] Sibayan, B. P. (1994). The Role and Status of English vis-à-vis Filipino and other Languages in the Philippines. In English and Language Planning. A Southeast Asian.

[25] Sibayan, B. P. (1999). The Intellectualization of the Filipino Language. Manila: The Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

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

Table 3: Distribution of responses on having published books, scholarly articles, theses and journals written in Filipino

Respondents	Books YES No.	Books YES %	Books NO No.	Books NO %	Scholarly YES No.	Scholarly YES %	Scholarly NO No.	Scholarly NO %	Theses YES No.	Theses YES %	Theses NO No.	Theses NO %	Faculty Journal YES No.	FJ YES %	FJ NO No.	FJ NO %	Student Journal YES No.	SJ YES %	SJ NO No.	SJ NO %
ADMINISTRATORS																				
Cagayan State University	-	-	10	100	0	100	10	100	3	30.00	7	70.00	-	-	10	100	3	30.00	7	70.00
Isabela State University	-	-	10	100	0	100	10	100	4	40.00	6	60.00	-	-	10	100	2	20.00	8	80.00
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	-	-	8	80.00	2	20.00	8	80.00	4	40.00	6	60.00	-	-	10	100	3	30.00	7	70.00
Quirino State College	-	-	10	100	-	-	10	100	3	30.00	7	70.00	-	-	10	100	4	40.00	6	60.00
Total	-	-	38	95.00	2	5.00	38	95.00	14	35.00	26	65.00	-	-	40	100	12	30.00	28	70.00
FACULTY																				
Cagayan State University	-	-	25	100	-	-	25	100	5	20.00	20	80.00	-	-	25	100	5	20.00	20	80.00
Isabela State University	-	-	25	100	-	-	25	100	5	20.00	20	80.00	-	-	25	100	9	36.00	16	64.00
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	-	-	20	80.00	5	20.00	20	80.00	5	20.00	20	80.00	-	-	25	100	7	25.00	18	72.00
Quirino State College	-	-	25	100	0	0.00	25	100	3	12.00	22	88.00	-	-	25	100	4	16.00	21	84.00
Total	-	-	95	95.00	5	5.00	95	95.00	18	18.00	82	82.00	-	-	100	100	25	25.00	75	75.00
STUDENTS																				
Cagayan State University	-	-	30	100	-	-	30	100	6	20.00	24	80.00	-	-	30	100	8	32.00	22	78.00
Isabela State University	-	-	30	100	-	-	30	100	6	20.00	24	80.00	-	-	30	100	10	33.00	20	66.67
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	6	20.00	24	80.00	6	20.00	24	80.00	6	20.00	24	80.00	-	-	30	100	13	43.33	17	56.67
Quirino State College	-	-	30	100	-	-	30	100	6	20.00	24	80.00	-	-	30	100	6	20.00	24	80.00
Total	6	5.00	114	95.00	6	5.00	114	95.00	24	20.00	96	80.00	-	-	120	100	37	30.83	83	69.17
Grand Total	13	5.00	247	95.00	13	5.00	247	95.00	56	21.54	184	70.77	-	-	260	100	74	78.46	186	71.54

Table 4: Attitude of administrators, faculty and students on the implementation of National language Policies and Programs

	POSITIVE ATTITUDE										NEGATIVE ATTITUDE									
	A F	A %	B F	B %	C F	C %	D F	D %	E F	E %	A F	A %	B F	B %	C F	C %	D F	D %	E F	E %
ADMINISTRATORS																				
Cagayan State University	9	90.00	5	50.00	4	40.00	9	90.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	-	-	-	-	2	20.00	3	30.00
Isabela State University	6	60.00	4	40.00	4	40.00	3	30.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	-	-	-	-	2	20.00	4	40.00
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	8	80.00	7	70.00	7	70.00	8	80.00	2	20.00	1	10.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10.00
Quirino State College	8	80.00	5	50.00	4	40.00	7	70.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	-	-	-	-	1	10.00	1	10.00
Total	*31*	*77.50*	*21*	*52.50*	*20*	*50.00*	*27*	*67.50*	*5*	*12.50*	*6*	*15.00*	*-*	*-*	*-*	*-*	*5*	*12.50*	*9*	*22.50*
FACULTY																				
Cagayan State University	23	92.00	21	84.00	17	68.00	23	92.00	5	20.00	3	12.00	-	-	-	-	5	20.00	5	20.00
Isabela State University	21	84.00	14	56.00	10	40.00	21	84.00	3	12.00	2	8.00	-	-	-	-	7	28.00	7	28.00
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	25	100	24	96.00	17	68.00	23	92.00	5	20.00	1	4.00	-	-	-	-	4	16.00	3	12.00
Quirino State College	24	96.00	20	80.00	15	60.00	24	96.00	2	8.00	1	4.00	-	-	-	-	2	8.00	3	12.00
Total	*93*	*93.00*	*79*	*79.00*	*59*	*59.00*	*91*	*91.00*	*15*	*15.00*	*7*	*7.00*	*-*	*-*	*-*	*-*	*18*	*18.00*	*18*	*18.00*
STUDENTS																				
Cagayan State University	23	76.67	29	96.67	27	9.00	26	86.67	16	53.33	10	33.33	-	-	-	-	2	6.67	5	16.67
Isabela State University	25	83.33	27	90.00	25	83.33	25	83.33	14	46.67	8	26.67	-	-	-	-	1	3.33	3	10.00
Nueva Vizcaya State Univ.	27	90.00	27	90.00	28	93.33	28	93.33	18	60.00	5	16.67	-	-	-	-	0	0.00	1	3.33
Quirino State College	23	76.67	25	83.33	27	90.00	23	76.67	17	56.67	7	23.33	-	-	-	-	1	3.33	1	3.33
Total	*98*	*81.67*	*108*	*90.00*	*107*	*89.17*	*102*	*85.00*	*65*	*54.17*	*30*	*25.00*	*-*	*-*	*-*	*-*	*4*	*13.33*	*10*	*8.33*
Grand Total	222	84.62	208	80.00	186	71.54	222	84.62	85	32.69	43	16.54	-	-	-	-	27	10.38	37	14.23
Rank	1.5		2		3		1.5		4		1		4.5		4.5		3		2	

Note: F – frequency, % - percentage

POSITIVE ATTITUDE:

A – The required number of 9 units for Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications (HUSOCOM) courses and 6 units for Non-HUSOCOM are fair and adequate.

B – Filipino language must be learned for national understanding and unity.
C – Filipino language can be used in all academic discourse.
D – It is much better if the students are both proficient in Filipino and English.
E – Filipino must be the medium of instruction for HUSOCOM as well as the Non-HUSOCOM courses aside from English as the official medium.

NEGATIVE ATTITUDE:

A – The required number of 9 units for Humanities, Social Sciences and Communications courses and 6 units for Non-HUSOCOM are too much.
B – Filipino language is not an access for national understanding and unity.
C – Filipino language is not adequate in all teaching-learning conditions.
D – It is much better if the students are proficient in English.
E – It's English and not Filipino, must be the medium of instruction for both HUSOCOM and Non-HUSOCOM courses.