

Dialect Parception in Pasil, Kalinga (Presentation notes)

Ryn Jean Fe Gonzales (*rynjean_gonzales@sil.org*)

Translators Association of the Philippines

I. INTRODUCTION

Pasil is one of the eight municipalities of Kalinga province in the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR). It used to be part of the Lubuagan Municipality until 1968. Busenitz, Gieser, and Ohlson (1974), identified the areas of Pasil, Lubuagan and Balbalasang (a village in Balbalan Municipality) as the Guinaang-Balbalasang group of languages based on their inherent intelligibility with one other. Thus, it was thought that materials written in the Lubuagan variety of Kalinga could also be used in Pasil. In the Ethnologue, the varieties of Kalinga spoken in Pasil are listed as dialects of Lubuagan (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013).

Pasil has 14 villages divided into 7 subtribes with a total population of around 11,000. The 7 subtribes in the municipality of Pasil are:

- Guinaang, it has 5 component villages
- Magsilay-Balinciagao, with 3 villagess
- Cagaluan
- Dalupa-Ableg, with 2
- Dangtalan
- Balatoc, which was reported to be related to the Balatoc of Abra
- Colayo, whose mother Tribe is the Tulgao of Tinglayan (Pasil Municipality 2010).

Interestingly, each subtribe claims to be speaking differently from one another to some extent.

In 2011, a sociolinguistic survey was conducted in the Pasil area to

1. assess the language vitality,
2. determine the extensibility of Lubuagan materials to Pasil
3. If Lubuagan materials are not acceptable, select a standard variety of Pinasil for possible language development.

Since the survey was focused on language development, we used the Sustainable Use Model or SUM by Simons and Lewis (2010) to assess sustainable level of language vitality and use of Pinasil as our theoretical framework. "This model provides a conceptual framework which can be used in community-based language development to provide strategic direction" (Lewis and Simons 2013).

The EGIDS, which is an expansion of Fishman's GIDS, helps the community evaluate the vitality status of their language while the FAMED conditions can help

the community plan for action when they have already identified at what sustainable level they want their language to be (Lewis and Simons 2013).

The survey was done in six villages of Pasil representing five sub-tribes. We first went to Cagaluan, Dangtalan; Then to two (2) Guinaang villages: Guinaang (UG) and Malucsad (LG) because during our pilot test, some respondents claim that there is variation between the lower and upper Guinaang villages. Then to Magsilay, finally, Ableg. Two sub-tribes, Balatoc and Colayo, were not visited due to peace and order situation at the time of the survey. In addition to the 6 Pasil villages, I also included the Balbalasang village in Balbalan Municipality since it was considered similar with Guinaang in the previous surveys. Data from the Balbalan Kalinga Pilot survey was used

However, in this presentation, I will only discuss the dialect perception study part of the survey and its implications on language development. So in the succeeding slides, I will talk about dialect perception and the dialect mapping tool. Then I will be showing how dialect mapping was done and what it looks like in one of the survey location. Then I will discuss the result of the dialect mapping conducted during the survey. Finally, I will share with you some of our conclusions.

II. Dialect Perception Study

The most common methods of studying linguistic variation are thru intelligibility tests like Recorded Text Test (RTT) and lexicostatistics ("SIL International" 2013). These instruments have been used to measure language variation or dialect variation to determine which varieties can be grouped together for an extensive language development. But there have been numerous incidents when these instruments failed to provide the right information to produce materials that are acceptable to speakers of closely related varieties. Complex sociolinguistic factors such as the speech community's perception of what their language is or is not and their attitude towards the variety used as a written standard often supersedes linguistic similarity. Oftentimes, the variables used by outsiders/ linguists in determining which varieties can share materials are different from what the speakers of the language considers. Thus, a new approach in studying linguistic variation that considers the emic perspective is necessary especially if we are aiming for a sustainable community based language development.

These past several years, there have been development and use of participatory tools in language assessment in the Philippines by SIL and TAP. One of these tools is the Dialect mapping tool. This tool assists speakers of a specific dialect in discussing information they already know about the dialects and levels of comprehension between dialects. The tool also encourages them to think about which varieties of their language could use a single set of written or oral materials. The dialect mapping tool was first used in the Kinamayo Survey in Surigao Del Sur

and Davao Oriental, in the southern Philippines (Hasselbring et al. 2011) and have been used in other parts of Asia, Africa, and other parts of the world.

Dialect Mapping Tool (Hasselbring et al. 2011)

The dialect mapping tool was used in the Pasil survey to facilitate a group discussion with 8-15 people in each survey location (6 in Pasil and 1 in Balbalasang, Balbalan Municipality). The participants in the discussion group were MT speakers and knowledgeable insiders from the different sectors of the community. The facilitation team was composed of one main facilitator, 1 note taker and one multimedia documenter

How is the dialect mapping done? In the next slides, I will be showing illustration of each step of the tool as it was used in Guinaang village.

Steps:

1. STEP 1. Linguistic similarity

The first step of the tool involved asking the group to:

- name the language spoken in the village and the name of the people speaking the language and writing each answer in a separate sheet of paper and laying them down on the floor (which is of course culturally appropriate in Kalinga).
- Then the group was asked to name all the villages where [L1] is spoken. Write each on a separate piece of paper (ask 1 or 2 people from the group to write).
- Asked the group to arrange these papers to show which dialects/municipalities/districts are next to each other (geographical map)
- Asked the group to think about languages that are just a little different from their own language and adding them to the 'map'.
- After eliciting varieties and languages they perceived as similar to theirs...
- The group was asked to group together varieties or languages that they think speak exactly the same way using a loop.

2. STEP 2. Most understood variety

The group was asked to think about which among the varieties/groups do they understand best and mark the group with the number '1' written on piece of cardboard. The group was also asked to mark the varieties they understand 2nd best and 3rd best with numbers 2 and 3 respectively.

3. STEP 3. Level of comprehension

In the third step, the participants to discussed together how much they understand each variety or group. We gave a set of markers which the group used

to mark which they ‘understand completely’, ‘understand most’ of what is said, ‘understand about half’, and ‘understand a little’. We prepared a marker key where they could refer to as they discuss.

4. STEP 4. Language use

Now the 4th step asked the participants to think about what they and the speakers of the different varieties/groups they mentioned speak to each other. The participants marked each variety/group accordingly. We again prepared a marker key. ☺

Markers corresponded to answers such as:

- *“we each speak our own variety”*
- *“we both use ours”*
- *“We both use theirs”*
- *“we each use another variety”.*
- *And sometimes, we added ‘we use ours, they use another variety’*

5. STEP 5. Extensibility of L1

The 5th step is related to extensibility of materials which will be developed in L1, if ever. The group was simply asked, “Some people have said they want to start writing books*/ or making CDs in [L1]. If books were written/ if CDs will be made in [L1], which villages would be able to use those books/CDs?”

The participants were asked to *put a long string around those varieties.*

6. STEP 6. Choice of Written standard

Finally, the group was asked to step back a little and think about which among the varieties they grouped together should be used as the one for writing (or recording) [L1] so that all the others will understand it well? The discussion group were given 3 choices which they marked with A, B and C written on cardboard, A being the top choice.

III. Results

STEP 1. Linguistic similarity

Based on the results of the initial step of the tool, each sub-tribe claims, to some extent, speak differently from one another. Villages within each subtribe actually have a name for the variety they speak and call themselves a specific name based on their location. This is quite common in Austronesian languages like the Philippines. The prefix i- attached to a village, municipality or province name refers to the people of the area and the infix -in- to a place name refers to the language spoken in that place. Thus, the people and different varieties of the language spoken in Pasil have a village specific name and municipal level name. Collectively, the people of Pasil call themselves IPASIL and the language spoken in Pasil as Pinasil.

Hence, I will refer to the different varieties of Kalinga spoken in Pasil as Pinasil and the speakers of Pinasil as Ipassil from here on.

Further, Step 1 showed that In all survey locations in Pasil, the different varieties of Pinasil were basically grouped according to their subtribe

Exceptions:

1. Malucsad: separated Lower Guinaang and the upper Guinaang villages
2. Magsilay: grouped Dangtalan with the Ableg-Dalupa subtribe, two adjacent subtribes that are a little separated from Magsilay by the road system. Dangtalan is actually a separate subtribe on its own but it was previously part of the Guinaang subtribe (Pasil Municipality 2003).

The different Banao speaking villages in Balbalan Mun. were also grouped together by Balbalasang and Cagaluan while the rest of the villages in Pasil that referred to Banao only mentioned Banao of Balbalan presumably referring to the three Banao villages. Balbalasang on the other hand, since it is located in another municipality, used the name Guinaang to refer to the variety spoken not only in the Guinaang villages but also in Cagaluan, Magsilay and Dangtalan.

Other varieties mentioned also already referred to a cluster of different varieties like Balbalan and Lubuagan, which encompasses all the varieties spoken in both municipalities or towns. Banao in Balbalan and Banao in Abra (mentioned in three villages probably referring to Bangilo, Daguioman and Malibcong areas) on the other hand, both refer to the subtribe/tribe located in the different villages of Balbalan and Abra province. Lack of familiarity with specific village names could be attributed to the clumping together of the areas where a particular variety is being spoken.

STEP 2. Most understood variety

The second step of the tool asked the participants to identify which of the groupings or individual varieties (if not grouped) they understand best, second best and third best. The participants were given markers (numbers 1-3, 1 being the 'understand best' and 3, the third best) and decided on this by consensus.

Each survey location picked its own variety as the one they understood best and assigned the #1. There was not much difference between the different varieties of Pinasil, except for the 2 varieties perceived as different- Balatok and Colayo, so the varieties they ranked are basically the varieties within Pasil.

STEP 3. Level of comprehension

The third step of the tool probed the participants' comprehension of the different varieties. The participants were asked to categorize or identify which varieties they 'understand completely', 'understand most,' 'understand half,' or 'understand little' using markers.

Based on the results in all 7 villages, Cagaluan and the Dalupa-Ableg varieties got the most number of 'understood completely.' While Guinaang, Malucsad, Dangtalan and Magsilay villages claimed that they understood Ableg and Cagaluan completely as much as they understand their own varieties, the later do not think the same. Ableg and Cagaluan said that they 'understood completely' only their own varieties. Aside from the distance of Cagaluan and Ableg to the these villages (some refer to these villages as interior Pasil barangays), relationship issues including their attitudes toward outsiders, including the Local Govt Unit, could be some factors why they say they don't understand the other varieties as much.

Note that in this activity, Pasil varieties, Finaratok ang Kinolayo/Tinorgaw were not understood as much as the other varieties of Pinasil thus the colors red and yellow.

Balbalasang participants, on the other hand, said they 'understood completely' Banao which is spoken in two other villages of Balbalan, Talalang and Pantikian. In addition, Balbalasang also 'understood completely' the Banao spoken in three areas in Abra (Daguioman, Malibcong and Bangilo).

STEP 4. Language use

The fourth step showed the language used by the community when they speak with speakers of similar varieties they mentioned. As previously reported, when speakers of the different Kalinga varieties speak to each other, each use their own variety with very few exceptions. Participants in the Dialect Mapping sessions from all six villages in Pasil showed a very clear picture of this language use dynamics with one exception. One exception is when speaking with Colayo speakers who live in Pasil Municipality. Respondents from Dangtalan, Guinaang and Magsilay said that speakers of the Colayo variety would sometimes use Colayo mixed with some Ilokano, the LWC in the northern Philippines, when speaking to them or both of them would switch to Ilokano to understand each other. Colayo was mentioned as one of the varieties considered as different from the rest of Pasil during the discussions.

Participant from Pasil also reported that they use their own varieties when speaking with the speakers of the different Kalinga varieties in other municipalities north, northwest of Pasil such as Balbalan, Limos and Abra; and with municipalities south-southeast of Pasil such as Lubuagan, Tanudan and Tinglayan although some speakers of Tinglayan would need to use Ilokano to be able to communicate well.

STEP 5. Extensibility of L1

The fifth step relates to extensibility of written materials in L1 to those varieties they perceived as similar. Respondents from all survey locations in Pasil claimed that the whole municipality, even other municipalities like Lubuagan, Tinglayan, Tanudan, Naneng (Tabuk) and

the Banao, Balbalan Proper village and Salegseg villages of Balbalan municipality could use materials developed in their own variety of Pinasil. However, they felt that it would be challenging for Balatoc and especially Colayo to use materials written in any other varieties of Pinasil due to some phonological differences.

STEP 6. Choice of Written standard

As expected, each group picked its own variety as its top choice to be the basis for a written standard in Pasil.

Malucsad turned up picking all 5 Guinaang varieties as its top choice affirming its identification with the Guinaang subtribe.

In some languages one variety will stand out as always being chosen as a second or third choice by groups from each variety. This did not happen among the seven groups in Pasil. Rather three clusters of varieties based on subtribe appeared. These clusters are the Guinaang subtribe, Magsilay-Balinciagao subtribe and finally, the Dalupa-Ableg subtribe varieties.

The varieties spoken by the Magsilay-Balinciagao was the 2nd choice of most villages, three out of the seven locations namely, Guinaang, Malucsad and Cagaluan and was also picked as a 3rd choice by Balbalasang. However, Balbalasang referred to the Magsilay-Balinciagao varieties as Guinaang. The same is true with the other Pinasil varieties which are not actually Guinaang but was referred to as Guinaang by the participants in Balbalasang.

IV. Conclusion

1. The use of written materials produced in the Lubuagan variety of Kalinga could not be extended to Pasil as it was perceived to be different by most.
2. Guinaang variety was the top choice for written standard.
 - five out of six villages, in varying levels, chose the Guinaang variety to be the written standard.
 - Although each variety prefers their own variety on top of the others, they saw Guinaang as the next best variety to be used as a written standard.
 - Considering other factors such as speaker population, Guinaang also has the most number of speakers since it is being spoken in five villages.
3. It is also worth noting that Balbalasang chose Guinaang. This suggests possibility of materials developed in the Guinaang variety to be extendible to Banao speakers in Balbalasang. However, further inquiry into the acceptability of Guinaang materials to other Banao speakers in other areas of Balbalan and Abra province.

REFERENCES

- Busenitz, Robert, Richard Gieser, and Dave Ohlson. 1974. "Kalinga Survey Report". Manila, Philippines.
- Fabiosa, Amario Jr, Sue Hasselbring, Mila Mata, and Rosario Vilorio. 2011. "A Participatory Assessment of Kinamayo: A Language of Eastern Mindanao". 2011-035. SIL Electronic Survey Reports.
<http://www.sil.org/silesr/abstract.asp?ref=2011-035>.
- Lewis, M. Paul, and Gary Simons. 2013. *In Preparation. "Perspectives on Community-Based Language Development"*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig, ed. 2013. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. 17th ed. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.
<http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Pasil Municipality. 2010. "Pasil Comprehensive Land Use Plan (updated)." "SIL International." 2013. *SIL International*. Accessed May 17.
<http://www.sil.org/language-assessment>.
- Simons, Gary, and M. Paul Lewis. 2010. "Sustainable Use Model for Language Development."