A Survey on Language Use, Attitudes, and Identity in Relation to Philippine English among Young Generation Filipinos: An Initial Sample from a Private University

Ariane Macalinga Borlongan
De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines

Abstract

This study looks at the language use, attitudes, and identity in relation to Philippine English among young generation Filipinos through a questionnaire survey of a selected group of students from a Philippine private university. The survey findings would reveal that most domains of use and verbal activities are dominated by English as the language of current usage, and even more domains and activities are dominated by English as the language of preferred usage. It is safe to say that English indeed continues to penetrate the Filipino society, as evidence by the dominance of its use in various domains and activities and even more intimate contexts such as the home, prayers, and expressions of intimate emotionsAnd though the respondents of this survey still prefer Tagalog/Filipino to be the national language of the Philippines, they nonetheless have signified that (Philippine) English could be a symbol of their being a Filipino.

Language Planning and Resulting Sociolinguistic Patterns in the Philippines

Linguistic, economic, cultural, and behavioral patterns have emerged out of the language planning that has been done in the Philippines. Sibayan (2000) plots the resulting patterns in more than four centuries of language planning in the Philippines while Bernabe (1986) discusses more specifically language planning in Philippine education: Of course, parallelism will always be observed as regards language planning in general and language planning in education in

particular as education has always been the primary hand that is used to implement language policies not only in the Philippines but in almost all – if not all – countries. The Spanish Period, which spanned more than three hundred years (1565-1898), used Spanish in the controlling domains of language except in the semi-controlling domain of religion. The Spanish who came to the Philippines – who were primarily priests, if not officials of the colonial government – found that it was easier for priests to learn the local languages of the Philippines rather than teaching the natives Spanish in the evangelization of the country. Spanish then became the source of the Christianization of the local languages and, expectedly, "hispanismos" (Sibayan, 2000, p. 48) eventually emerged out of the priests' learning of the local languages. On the other hand, the controlling domains such as the government and higher education had used Spanish since there was no choice because exported resources in these domains were all in Spanish. This situation created a distinction between the majority who are poor and could only speak the local languages and the very few elites who are able to acquire Spanish through education in universities run by the Spanish or even education in Spain. Obviously, Spanish was the aspired-for language then.

When the Americans arrived in the Philippines in 1898 – after the exit of the Spanish, an altogether different language – and language policy, for that matter – was introduced in the Philippines (Bernabe, 1986; Sibayan, 2000). They established a system for public education of the natives and, through this system, taught the Filipinos

English. While an implementing policy stipulates the use the local languages in primary education, this never took effect and Sibayan assumes that this is due to the unavailability of resources in these languages, and these resources include both teachers and materials. English, on the other hand, "was pursued with vigor and enthusiasm" (Sibayan, 2000, p. 250). Filipino students were required to use English at all times when in school and were punished for not doing so. And not long after, English was used in all the controlling domains (government, education, mass media, commerce, the professions, science and technology, and international relations) that "the hope that the Filipino language will eventually replace English in most, if not all, of these domains is practically impossible" (Sibayan, 2000, p. 250). English eventually became functionally-native (Bautista, 2000; Kachru, 1997) to the Philippines. Gonzalez (2000) believes that the learning of English in the Philippines was perhaps one of the most successful linguistic events in the history of the world, and perhaps only rivaled by the revival of Hebrew. This great success he attributed to the use of the language in the controlling domains, but particularly in education. English then became the language of power and prestige (Sibayan, 2000). However, it should be noted here that a Commonwealth Government espoused by the American colonizers and aptly referred as Transition Government proposed through the 1935 Constitution to develop a common national language based on one of the Philippine languages. The Institute of the National Language was established and the national language based on Tagalog was taught in the senior year of high

school starting June 19, 1940. English then was used less in school with the move to being bilingual in the national language and English. Amidst all these efforts, English remained to be the language of the controlling domains.

The occupation of the Japanese of the Philippines also stopped the progression of the spread of English by propagating the use of the national language (Bernabe, 1986; Sibayan, 2000). However, after the liberation from the short-lived Japanese imperial rule and the independence of the Philippines from external forces, the main language of instruction was shifted back to English again although the teaching of the national language was still continued. During what Sibayan calls as the "Period of Community School" (p. 252), many schools were freed from the rigid supervision of higher authorities and were given liberty to experiment on using the vernacular as the language of instruction. Also, during this period, positions such as supervisors of Filipino were opened and departments for the national language were put up in colleges and universities.

Today, the implementing 1987 Constitution, Article IV, Sections 6-9, has this to say:

> Section 6. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages. Subject to the provisions of law and as the Congress may deem appropriate, the Government shall take steps to

initiate and sustain the use of Filipino as a medium of official communication and as language of instruction in the educational system.

Section 7.   For purposes of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, unless otherwise provided by law, English. The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages and shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction therein. Spanish and Arabic shall be promoted on a voluntary and optional basis.

Section 8.   This constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into major regional languages, Arabic, and Spanish.

Section 9.   The Congress shall establish a national language commission composed of representatives of various regions and disciplines which shall undertake the, coordinate, and promote researches for the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages.

And the Bilingual Education Policy of 1987 – originally promulgated in 1974 – in particular aims for an enhanced learning through English and Filipino and the development a bilingual nation competent in the use of both English and Filipino. A clear separation of the use of English and Filipino in schools was made: English is to be used as the

language in teaching English, mathematics, and science while Filipino is for other subjects. The only difference of the 1987 promulgation from that of 1974 is that the latter allows for the use of major vernaculars in Grades I and II.

Current president Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo has once again highlighted the importance of English in the issue of Executive Order 210, an order establishing the policy to strengthen the use of English as the language of instruction as she deemed it necessary "to develop the aptitude, competence and proficiency of our students in the English language to maintain and improve their competitive edge in emerging and fast-growing local and international industries, particularly in the area of Information and Communications Technology".

The Purpose of This Study

This study looks at the language use, attitudes, and identity in relation to Philippine English among young generation Filipinos. A selected group of students from a Philippine private university were used as an initial sample in a questionnaire survey designed to:

(1) identify their selection of languages currently used in various domains and verbal activities;

(2) determine their preferred languages in the same domains and verbal activities; and

(3) ascertain their attitudes towards languages and language(s) of identity with reference to Philippine English.

In doing so, the survey conducted may serve as an initial evaluation and determination of the sociolinguistic patterns resulting in the implementation of the current language policies in the Philippines in general and the current bilingual education policy in particular to a specific sample. However, it should be noted here that this is not in any way similar to the evaluations of the 1974 Bilingual Education Policy compiled by Gonzalez and Sibayan (1993) since most of those evaluations have mainly focused on school achievement and language proficiency vis-à-vis the policy but not on the sociolinguistic patterns emerging from the implementation of the policy. Doing another evaluation in terms of school achievement and language proficiency, perhaps for comparison with those that Gonzalez and Sibayan compiled, is beyond the scope of the present survey.

Surveys on Language Use, Attitudes, and Identity among University Students in Singapore

This study replicates the surveys conducted by Mann and Pirbhai-Illich (2007) and Mann (2007) both sometime between the years 1999 and 2000 in the city-state of Singapore. It appears that their surveys also attempted to determine the patterns emerging from the sociolinguistic engineering the Singapore government has devised and made concrete through the launch and implementation of a policy that positions English as the language of education, thereby having English as the language of instruction at all levels.

The survey of Mann and Pirbhai-Illich (2007) found that English is the primary language of current and preferred usage among young generation Singaporeans in the more formal domains and verbal activities as well as in the community and three intimate contexts. English is also the primary language of communication for the university students involved in the survey. It is only in the market that a language other than English was more preferred over English and that language is Mandarin. Standard English[i] was actually chosen as the city-state's official language and the language that best conveys their identity as Singaporeans, with Singlish as the third choice as language of identity. Parallel to this finding, British English is the preferred variety of English to be taught, acquired, and learned in schools.

Mann's (2007) study consisted of two surveys; the first is actually similar with that of his collaboration with Pirbhai-Illich (2007) – most specially the first part – but he looked more closely at Singlish and Standard English. In his first survey, he has basically identified English also as the primary language in all of the domains and verbal activities supplied in his survey, except in Mandarin. In addition to that, he also found that 95% of the university students sampled in the survey believed that there exists a Singapore variety of English. They appreciated the instrumentality of the local variety which made Mann believe that the sociolinguistic and sociopsychological reality of Singlish is alive and well in their psyche. However, the young generation Singaporeans were divided in as to whether or not the variety should gain more status. His second

survey distinguished language usage and preferences between Singlish and Standard English. And while most of the students did not indicate Singlish as belonging to the languages (and varieties thereof) that they use, they indicated their use of the variety in various domains and verbal activities. Singlish is used primarily in more intimate and relaxed contexts while Standard English is used in the more formal contexts. Obviously, the younger generation Singaporeans are able to distinguish when to use Singlish and/or Standard English and when not to. Half of these students came across English when they were 12 years old and peers were mostly their source of contact with Singlish. Though almost all of them did not feel that Singlish as a source of shame and in fact considered it as a symbol of Singaporean identity, three in every four of them would not like to see Singlish promoted at home because of its possible adverse effects in the acquisition and/or learning of Standard English of children later in school. Three out of five of them believe that it is best to promote Standard English for everyday communication and only two favored Singlish. Seven out of ten students also would not want to see Singlish being promoted in the mass media. However, nine out of ten of them would like to see Singlish promoted in school – or perhaps simply introduced – because the Singapore curriculum gives primacy to Standard English.

The surveys of Mann and Pirbhai-Illich (2007) and Mann (2007) invite a replication as well as a comparison in the Philippines for several reasons. On the two countries' similarities, they both have English as their functionally-native language. They have also

implemented a bilingual education policy in the 1980s, though the Philippines had an older version of this policy in as early as 1974. Their similarities are also points of their differences: The English localized in the Philippines was transplanted by the Americans while in Singapore by the British. In addition to this, English is slowly moving towards becoming a genetically-native language in Singapore and this is primarily because of the sociolinguistic trends that have just been discussed. The policies under implementation in the two countries are also somewhat different; while the Philippines seems to be more inclined with the propagation (and eventual intellectualization) of Filipino primarily through education, Singapore amalgamates the multicultural identities in the city-state through English. Lastly, the geographic probability of absolute, thorough implementation of the policies in the two countries significantly differs – it is relatively easy to implement policies in a city-state country like Singapore but of course more difficult in an archipelagic country like the Philippines, notwithstanding the fact that human, financial, and material resources are scarce in the Philippines. These reasons, among others, make this study on Filipino students both significant and interesting.

Method

This study surveys language use, attitudes, and identity in relation to Philippine English among selected students of a Philippine private university through a questionnaire that was adapted from the surveys of Mann and Pirbhai-Illich (2007) and Mann (2007) and

responded selected students from a private university in Manila, the Philippines. The respondents and the questionnaire they responded to are discussed below.

The Respondents

The survey questionnaire was responded by 50 students registered and enrolled in a distinguished private university in Manila, the capital of the Philippines. The university is among the top universities of the country and would usually belong to the lists of top universities in Asia (and the Pacific) and the world. This has both positive and negative implications for the representational quality of the respondents of the questionnaire. While the market for such a university would most definitely be more ethnically – and ethnolinguistically – diverse since most high school students from across the country aspire for admission in the university, the high cost of education in the university might have also limited the entry of underrepresented and socio-economically underprivileged ethnic (and ethnolinguistic) groups of the country. Of course, geography also affects the representativeness of the students in the university – and the survey respondents, for that matter – and this is evidenced by the significant number of Tagalog-using students in the sample as well as students who use any of the Chinese languages since the university is in close proximity to communities where most of the Chinese in the Philippines reside. Also, Chinese in the Philippines are usually among the more financially-able in the society and therefore could easily afford their children education from universities of such

kind. Table 1 presents in detail the distribution of ethnic origins of the respondents:

Table 1
Ethnic Origins of the Respondents

Ethnic Origin	f	%
Filipino	30	60
Chinese Filipino	15	30
Chinese	4	8
Taiwanese	1	2

As can be seen in Table 1, a significant percentage of the sample was Chinese Filipino, and there were even pure Chinese in the sample. The Filipino respondents are still more than half of the sample though, and their enthnolinguistic origin is mostly Tagalog, though some are Bicolano, Cebuano, and Ilocano. There is one pure Taiwanese in the sample but she practically lived in Manila all her life.

The respondents were significantly female; almost 75% of all the respondents were female. This is expected since the sample was taken from an arts and humanities college, which is dominated by female. Their age vary from 16 to 19 though almost forty of them are ages 17-18. Needless to say, all the education that these students have gotten were all under the implementing bilingual education policy, which makes them a good sample for an evaluation of the said policy. The sampling technique employed however was convenient sampling and, as made obvious by the description of the respondents, no claims could be made as to the representativeness of the sample –

national representativeness, to be more specific – but they do still make an interesting sample for a sociolinguistic study such as this.

The Questionnaire

A questionnaire survey was deemed enough, and no further participant observation was though to be necessary, as Gonzalez and Bautista (1986), based on their synthesis of several language surveys conducted in the Philippines, concur that Filipinos give accurate reports of their language use when asked through as survey. The questionnaires used in the surveys of Mann and Pirbhai-Illich (2007) and Mann (2007) were adapted in this study, primarily in the section that asked of the respondents' languages used and languages preferred and in the section on language attitudes and identity in relation to Philppine English. In the section that asked of the respondents' languages used and languages preferred, instead of following the original domains of use and verbal activities supplied in the Singapore survey, what was used was the domains and verbal activities explored in previous language surveys in the Philippines as summarized by Gonzalez and Bautista (1986). Of course, the questions in the section that asked of the respondents' language attitudes and identity were rephrased to fit the Philippine context.

The questionnaire was divided into three major sections: (1) Personal information and background, (2) language domain usages, and (3) language preferences and attitudes. The first section of the questionnaire elicited the respondents' sex, age, ethnic origin, and

language contact and repertoire. The second section asked the respondents to identify the languages that they used in a variety of domains and verbal activities. The third section is further subdivided into two subsections. The first subsection is somehow similar to the second section; however, it determined the language preferences in the same domains and verbal activities supplied in the second section. The second subsection is a series of questions relating to their attitudes on language and language(s) of identity in relation to Philippine English.

In answering the questionnaire, the respondents were given the specific instruction to distinguish among English, Tagalog/Filipino, and Taglish whenever necessary.

Results

Reported below are the findings resulting from the questionnaire survey tabulation. A profile of the selection of languages used in various domains and verbal activities vis-à-vis the preferences in the same domains of use and verbal activities will be given. Findings of the survey with regard to attitudes on and identity in relation to (Philippine) English and other languages follows.

In the presentation of figures, percentages are computed against the total number of respondents; therefore, it is always possible to have more than 100% for the total of all the percentages. For example, the total of the percentages of the languages used and languages preferred for each domain of use and verbal activity may be more than 100% since the respondents may have indicated more

than one language in many domains and activities. On the other hand, there are some percentages that would not total to 100% because some respondents did not indicate any option for the item in question.

Language Use (at Present) and Language Preferences

Table 2 presents a summary of the questionnaire findings relating to the languages used at present by the students in various domains and verbal activities as well their language preferences for the same domains and verbal activities. Tagalog here refers to Tagalog and Filipino as responses. Also, since the sociolinguistics of the Chinese languages in the Philippines is beyond the scope of this study, responses that indicated Cantonese, Fookien, and Manadarin were all subsumed under Chinese languages.

Table 2
Languages Used (at Present) and Language Preferences in Various Domains and Verbal Activities of the Respondents

Domain of Use/Verbal Activity	Language(s) Used	f	%	Language(s) Preferred	f	%
Home	Tagalog	32	64	Tagalog	23	46
	Taglish	16	32	English	22	44
	English	14	28	Chinese languages	14	28
	Chinese languages	12	24	Taglish	10	20
	Bicolano	1	2	Bicolano	1	2
	Cebuano	1	2			
	Japanese	1	2			
Intimate/Confidential	Tagalog	24	48	Tagalog	22	44

Table 2. *(Continued)*	Chinese languages	17	34	Chinese languages	15	30
Family Matters	Taglish	16	32	English	12	24
	English	14	28	Taglish	12	24
	Bicolano	1	2	Bicolano	1	2
	Japanese	1	2			
	Tagalog	24	48	Tagalog	26	52
	English	17	34	English	16	32
Contacting Absent Family Members	Chinese languages	11	22	Chinese languages	10	20
	Taglish	10	20	Taglish	7	14
	Bicolano	1	2	Bicolano	1	2
Neighborhood	Tagalog	35	70	Tagalog	34	78
	Taglish	14	28	English	12	24
	English	12	24	Taglish	9	18
	Chinese languages	5	10	Chinese languages	3	6
	Bicolano	1	2	Bicolano	1	2
In the Wider Community	Tagalog	28	56	English	23	46
	English	18	36	Tagalog	22	44
	Taglish	16	32	Taglish	11	22
	Chinese languages	4	8	Chinese languages	3	6
	Bicolano	1	2	Cebuano	1	2
	Cebuano	1	2			
	Japanese	1	2			
With Friends	Taglish	31	62	Taglish	26	52
	Tagalog	21	42	Tagalog	24	48
	English	17	34	English	18	36
	Chinese languages	4	8	Chinese languages	3	6
	Cebuano	2	4			
	Japanese	2	4			
School	Taglish	35	70	English	31	62
	Tagalog	20	40	Taglish	19	38
	English	16	32	Tagalog	14	28
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	3	6

Table 2. *(Continued)*

	Cebuano	1	2			
	Japanese	1	2			
Radio	English	33	66	English	38	76
	Taglish	16	32	Taglish	11	22
	Tagalog	13	26	Tagalog	8	16
	Chinese languages	1	2	Chinese languages	2	4
Television	English	31	62	English	36	72
	Taglish	19	38	Taglish	12	24
	Tagalog	11	22	Tagalog	8	16
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	1	2
Newspaper	English	33	66	English	40	80
	Taglish	14	28	Taglish	10	20
	Tagalog	10	20	Tagalog	8	16
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	2	4
Books	English	47	94	English	49	98
	Taglish	4	8	Chinese languages	3	6
	Chinese	1	2	Taglish	3	6
	Japanese	1	2	Tagalog	2	4
	Tagalog	1	2			
Comics	English	46	92	English	41	82
	Tagalog	4	8	Tagalog	7	14
	Taglish	4	8	Chinese languages	3	6
	Chinsese languages	1	1	Taglish	3	6
				Japanese	1	2
Magazines	English	48	96	English	47	94
	Taglish	3	6	Chinese languages	3	6
	Japanese	1	2	Tagalog	3	6
	Tagalog	1	2	Taglish	2	4
Work	English	24	48	English	29	58
	Taglish	13	26	Taglish	9	18
	Tagalog	12	24	Tagalog	7	14

Table 2. *(Continued)*

	Chinese languages	1	2	Chinese languages	3	6
With Co-Workers	Taglish	18	36	English	21	42
	English	16	32	Taglish	16	32
	Tagalog	13	26	Tagalog	12	24
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	3	6
	Cebuano	1	2			
	Japanese	1	2			
With Head	English	24	48	English	36	72
	Tagalog	11	22	Tagalog	5	10
	Tagalog	10	20	Taglish	4	8
	Chinese languages	1	2	Chinese languages	2	4
	Taglish	21	42	Tagalog	26	52
	English	18	36	Taglish	22	44
Shopping	Tagalog	11	22	English	14	28
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	3	6
	Cebuano	1	2			
Marketing Transactions	English	22	44	English	32	64
	Taglish	18	36	Taglish	12	24
	Tagalog	12	24	Tagalog	7	14
	Chinese languages	1	2	Chinese languages	2	4
Praying	English	29	58	English	29	58
	Taglish	17	34	Tagalog	19	38
	Tagalog	14	28	Taglish	12	24
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	2	4
	Japanese	1	2			
Telling Time	English	35	70	English	39	78
	Taglish	17	34	Taglish	9	18
	Tagalog	14	28	Chinese languages	7	14
	Chinese languages	2	4	Tagalog	5	10
	Japanese	1	2	Bicolano	1	2

Table 2. *(Continued)*

	English	32	64	English	29	58
	Taglish	16	32	Tagalog	17	34
Apologizing	Tagalog	14	28	Taglish	13	26
	Cebuano	1	2	Cebuano	1	2
	Chinese languages	1	2	Chinese languages	1	2
	Japanese	1	2			
Arguing	Taglish	25	50	Tagalog	21	42
	Tagalog	21	42	English	19	38
	English	16	32	Taglish	19	38
	Chinese languages	5	10	Chinese languages	2	4
	Bicolano	1	2	Bicolano	1	2
	Cebuano	1	2	Cebuano	1	2
Complimenting	English	27	54	English	25	50
	Taglish	21	42	Tagalog	20	40
	Tagalog	18	36	Taglish	18	36
	Chinese languages	4	8	Chinese languages	3	6
	Cebuano	1	2	Cebuano	1	2
	Bicolano	1	2			
	Japanese	1	2			
Giving Commands	Tagalog	27	54	English	24	48
	Taglish	19	38	Tagalog	23	46
	English	17	34	Taglish	11	22
	Chinese languages	4	8	Chinese languages	2	4
	Bicolano	1	2			
	Cebuano	1	2			
Expressing Fear	English	26	52	Tagalog	25	50
	Tagalog	25	50	English	18	36
	Bicolano	1	2	Taglish	15	30
	Cebuano	1	2	Chinese languages	3	6
	Chinese languages	1	2	Cebuano	1	1
	Japanese	1	2			
	Taglish	1	2			

Table 2. *(Continued)*						
	English	30	60	English	22	44
	Tagalog	24	48	Tagalog	17	34
Expressing Surprise	Taglish	12	24	Taglish	15	30
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	11	22
	Bicolano	1	2			
	Cebuano	1	2			
	Japanese	1	2			
Expressing Anger	Tagalog	27	54	Tagalog	23	46
	English	22	44	Taglish	16	32
	Taglish	14	28	English	14	28
	Chinese languages	6	12	Chinese languages	5	10
	Bicolano	1	2	Cebuano	1	2
	Cebuano	1	2			
	Japanese	1	2			
Expressing Intimacy	English	30	60	English	23	46
	Tagalog	19	38	Tagalog	17	34
	Taglish	16	32	Taglish	15	30
	Chinese languages	4	8	Chinese languages	2	4
	Cebuano	1	2	Cebuano	1	2
	Japanese	1	2	Japanese	1	2
Expressing Nostalgic Moments	Tagalog	26	52	English	18	36
	English	23	46	Taglish	17	34
	Taglish	21	42	Tagalog	16	32
	Chinese languages	2	4	Chinese languages	3	6
	Bicolano	1	2	Cebuano	3	6
	Cebuano	1	2			
Swearing	English	28	56	English	27	54
	Tagalog	23	46	Tagalog	18	36
	Taglish	16	32	Taglish	11	22
	Chinese languages	5	10	Chinese languages	2	4
	Cebuano	1	2	Cebuano	1	2
	Japanese	1	2			
Dreaming	English	25	50	English	24	48

Table 2. *(Continued)*	Tagalog	25	50	Tagalog	22	44
	Taglish	15	30	Taglish	11	22
	Chinese languages	1	1	Chinese languages	5	10
Counting	English	42	84	English	45	90
	Chinese languages	8	16	Chinese languages	5	10
	Tagalog	8	16	Taglish	3	6
	Taglish	6	12	Tagalog	2	4
	Japanese	1	2			
Giving Interest Rates (if applicable)	English	12	24	English	12	24
	Tagalog	4	8	Chinese languages	3	6
	Taglish	3	6	Tagalog	3	6
	Chinese languages	1	2	Taglish	2	4
Technical Reports	English	40	80	English	44	88
	Taglish	7	14	Taglish	4	8
	Tagalog	3	6	Tagalog	1	2

The general belief is that the home language, Tagalog, and/or the vernacular is used more in less formal contexts while English is used more in formal ones but, as Table 2 has evidenced, English is now gaining ground in more intimate contexts both in current and preferred usage among the respondents. From 21 domains of use and verbal activities where English is currently in use, the language is now more preferred in 26 domains and activities out of the 34 that were supplied in the questionnaire. Therefore, there is a net gain of five domains and activities. Though Tagalog remains the language preferred at home, English follows so closely; in fact, there is only a difference of one respondent between Tagalog and English as regards the preference over the language to be used at home – this is one clear

sign that English is now penetrating more personal, intimate contexts. Expressions of surprise and intimacy and about nostalgic moments are wanted to be in English but are currently in Tagalog. The language preferred in the wider community is also English, moving from Tagalog. The students were not hesitant to admit that Taglish dominates the school – amidst the implementing policies – but they would like to adhere to the policy still and use English. A shift to English is also wanted when communicating with co-workers, when it is also currently done in Taglish.

English remains to be the most common language used and also as the language preferred in the media (radio, television, and newspaper), popular literature (magazines and comics), and books; while praying, in telling time; and when giving interest rates and writing technical reports. The retainment of English is also preferred at work, at work when speaking with one's superior, and during marketing transactions.

Tagalog is the most common language used at present and also the language preferred at home, when talking about confidential family matters and contacting absent family members, and in the neighborhood and the wider community. Taglish is the language currently used and also the preferred language when conversing among peers. There is preference for Tagalog when shopping, though Taglish is currently in use and still follows Tagalog in the same verbal activity.

Language Attitudes and Identity in Relation to Philippine English

While English has dominated almost all of the domains of use and verbal activities where the respondents were asked to identify their languages of current and preferred usage, it is surprising that Tagalog is the language through which the respondents feel most relaxed in communicating. Table 3 presents all the languages the students identified as the language(s) that they feel most relaxed in communicating:

Table 3
Languages the Respondents Feel Most Relaxed in Communicating

Language	*f*	%
Tagalog	27	54
Taglish	22	44
English	18	36
Chinese languages	6	12
Bicolano	1	2
Cebuano	1	2

Taglish follows Tagalog as the language the students feel most relaxed in communicating, but not too closely. More than a third of the respondents identified English as the language they feel most relaxed in communicating while more than ten percent identified either Mandarin, Cantonese, or Fookien. One student said that he is more relaxed in Bicolano and another said in Cebuano.

The survey provides for a basis that these young generation Filipinos now have a belief that there is now a variety of English called *Philippine English*; 80% of the respondents believed so. When

asked to describe what they consider to be Philippine English, here is the summary of their responses:

Table 4
Respondents' Assumptions on What Philippine English Is

Assumption	*f*	*%*
Modifications of Standard English, most especially in terms of grammar	22	44
Taglish	9	18
A variety reflective of the personality typical of a Filipino	6	12
Others	6	12
Unknown or no answer	3	6

Significantly, the students believe that Philippine English is a kind of English that slightly differs from Standard English, most especially in terms of grammar. Some students even cited very specific examples that they believe are peculiar of Philippine English, like the use of the perfective aspect as well as English terms that have undergone some semantic expansion like *traffic* and *xerox*. Almost a fifth of the students considered Philippine English to be simply Taglish. More than a tenth of the respondents believed that Philippine English is the kind of English that very well reflects the typical personality of a Filipino, perhaps in terms of pragmatic and sociolinguistic structuring that follows the non-English local languages of the Philippines. Around ten students have fragmented views about Philippine English and some admitted that they do not even know anything about it.

Though they know that Philippine English has some differences (or deviations) from Standard English, almost 80% of the

students did not find Philippine English as a source of shame for them as a Filipino as almost half of the students who participated in the survey believe that Philippine English reflects their identity as Filipinos. Almost ten students found Philippine English shameful for them though. Note that there were only 47 students who responded to this question.

Table 5 now shows the languages that the respondents believe best convey their identity:

Table 5
Languages that the Respondents Believe Best Convey Their Identity

Language	*f*	%
Tagalog/Filipino	31	62
English	19	38
Taglish	8	16
Chinese languages	6	12
Cebuano	1	2

Tagalog was selected by almost 65% of the respondents as the language that best conveys their identity and they believe that this language is a carrier of their cultural heritage as Filipinos. English was also chosen as a language that conveys their identity and almost 40% of the respondents believe so. Taglish was also chosen as a language that conveys the identity of ten of them. Some six individuals who are ethnically Chinese still hold on to Chinese languages as the language that would convey their identity and the same is true for one Cebuano. This seems to be expected as the Chinese and Cebuanos are usually among the most ethnically-loyal in the Philippines when it comes to language. The respondents were

also asked if they consider Philippine English as a symbol of their identity as a Filipino. Except for nine of them, all the students would agree that Philippine English do symbolize their Filipino identity. One student did not give any response. Most of the respondents feel that the variety distinguishes them from other speakers of English; thus, the variety makes them "unique" in speaking English. They also reasoned out that, since most of the Filipinos use Philippine English, it is then without doubt truly Filipino.

The favorability and unfavorability of the promotion of Philippine English and Taglish in various domains were also asked of the respondents. Around 60-70% of the respondents signified their being in favor of the promotion of Philippine English at home, in school, in everyday communication, and in the mass media. They were also in favor of promoting Taglish at home and in everyday communication but were hesitant with the promotion of Taglish in school and the mass media. Table 6 displays in detail the figures on the promotional favorability of Philippine English and Taglish:

Table 6
Respondents' Views on the Promotion of Philippine English and Taglish in Various Domains of Use

Domain of Use	Philippine English				Taglish			
	In Favor		Not in Favor		In Favor		Not in Favor	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Home	31	62	18	36	23	56	26	42
School	31	62	19	38	14	28	36	72
Everyday Communication	31	62	17	34	28	56	21	42
Mass Media	33	66	17	34	11	22	38	76

Discussion

What can be gleaned of these trends that are being revealed by the questionnaire survey conducted? On current and preferred language usage, English appears to dominate numerous domains of use and verbal activities (supplied in the questionnaire). It is also interesting to note that English is now penetrating more intimate contexts, the home in particular. Though most of the respondents identified Tagalog as the language that they are more relaxed in communicating with, there seems to be expressed willingness to own the language, so to speak, because, among the reasons supplied as regards this interest in the preferential use of English at least at home is to be able to "practice and master" the language not only by the respondents themselves but also by their family members who are with them at home. But they also reasoned out that English is among the more easily comprehensible languages to them and this finding seems to be consistent with Taglish (22 or 44%) and English (18 or 36%) not being too far away from Tagalog (27 or 54%) in terms of being the language the respondents are most relaxed in communicating with.

It is interesting to note that this want to move to English (and Tagalog) as the language(s) of home is even expressed by the Chinese Filipino respondents. Though there are still sentiments that the Chinese languages would express their distinct Chinese identity. Though six respondents believed that Chinese (are among the languages that) best convey(s) their identity, this is not significant knowing that there are 19 Chinese Filipino and Chinese students in

the sample. This trend may imply that Chinese Filipinos in the Philippines are little by little acceding to a Filipino identity in terms of language (if English is to be considered Filipino too, as was also found out by this survey).

There is still stigma as regards code-switching between English and Tagalog, as seen by the preference for this language sub-variety and also the willingness to uphold formality in several domains like school and work where the current usage is Taglish (Taglish is currently used when communicating with co-workers but English with superiors).

However, most students who participated in the survey still believed that Tagalog/Filipino is still the language that best conveys their identity as a Filipino and it is still the language that they believe should be the national language of the country. Philippine English is seen as symbolizing the Filipino identity too, though. The respondents believed that the localized variety distinguishes them as Filipinos even when they use English when communicating and they never found it shameful to be using the said variety. Perhaps, this positive view towards English is reflective of their appropriate definitions of the variety: Philippine English is not seen as deficient or erroneous English but simply an English variety that is distinctly Filipino and structurally different, in particular in terms of phonology, lexicon and semantics, grammar, and pragmatics. They even agreed to the variety's promotion at home, in school, in everyday communication and in the mass media.

Comparing now this survey's findings with that of Mann and Pirbhai-Illich (2007) and Mann (2007): It appears that, while the Singapore surveys found the almost complete domination of English in all the domains of use and verbal activities surveyed (and thereby proving that English is indeed becoming the first language among many of the Singaporeans and that Singaporeans are becoming monolingual in English), the findings of this survey would tell that both Tagalog/Filipino and English is retained and that Filipinos are still at least bilingual in Tagalog/Filipino and English. And as Mann and Pirbhai-Illich and Mann have considered Singapore's unification-through-English sociolinguistic engineering a success, it seems that the current bilingual education policy of the Philippines is also success in producing bilinguals who are able to successfully carry out their daily communicative acts in the society and express most of their life experiences in English, if the findings of this survey are to be used as yardstick for evaluating the said policy. Though English is just functionally-native to the country, there is an expressed identity affiliation with the language among these students.

Conclusion

The survey findings would reveal that most domains of use and verbal activities supplied in the questionnaire are dominated by English as the language of current usage, and even more domains and activities are dominated by English as the language of preferred usage. It is safe to say that English indeed continues to penetrate the Filipino society, as evidenced by the dominance of its use in various

domains and activities and even more intimate contexts such as the home, prayers, and expressions of intimate emotions. This only proves that English remains to be a functionally-native language to the Philippines. And though the respondents of this survey still prefer Tagalog/Filipino to be the national language of the Philippines, they nonetheless have signified that (Philippine) English could be a symbol of their being a Filipino.

While it is difficult to draw conclusions based on the survey conducted among a relatively small sample of 50, it may be possible to make some future predictions based on its findings: English will stay in the Philippines, at least in some of the next few generations. These young generation Filipinos still continue to see the utility of the language not only in socio-economic terms but also familial, personal, identificational, and cultural terms.

Implications and Recommendations

While the survey yielded interesting findings, it could still be improved methodologically to be more insightful. Of course, in terms of sample size, the survey is definitely small. Perhaps a larger sample, at least comparable to the Singapore surveys (Mann and Pirbhai-Illich, 2007; Mann, 2007), should at least be tried to be attained, in one way or another. It might be very difficult to collect a sample that is representative of the Filipino population due to the vast land area of the country as well as its geographic contours.

The findings of the survey must also be referred back to the respondents, perhaps through focus group discussions, to be able to verify the reasoning behind what they have as responses.

And while this survey was able to flesh out the emerging patterns of use among selected students from a university in Manila, the Philippines (and that this emerging patterns are indicators of sociolinguistic success of the bilingual education policy), it is still important to still look at the effects of such a policy on the school achievement and language proficiency of Filipino students, as exemplified by the evaluations compiled by Gonzalez and Sibayan (1993).

As regards language planning and policy-making in the country, the "success" that seem to be demonstrated by the findings of this survey should be still be strengthened. Information should be widely disseminated as regards the sociolinguistics of languages in the Philippines, their contact, and the emerging patterns of use (and most especially bilingualism and multilingualism). It is important that this success be supported and maintained by the educational system, which definitely has a hand in language planning. Of course, such systems should be designed and structured very well to be able to reflect the sociolinguistic reality of the country.

References

Bautista, M. L. S. (2000). *Defining Standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features*. Manila, the Philippines: De La Salle University Press, Inc.

Bernabe, E. J. F. (1987). *Language policy formulation, programming, implementation, and evaluation in Philippine evaluation.* Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Gonzalez, A., & Bautista, M. L. S. (1986). *Language surveys in the Philippines (1966-1984).* Manila, the Philippines: De La Salle University Press.

Gonzalez, A., & Sibayan, B. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Evaluating bilingual education in the Philippines (1974-1985).* Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). English as an Asian language. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context –* Proceedings of the conference held in Manila on August 2-3, 1996) (pp. 1-23). North Ryde, Australia: The Macquarie Library Pty Ltd.

Mann, C. C. (2007). *Language use, attitudes and identity, in relation to 'Singlish' and Standard English: A survey of young generation Singaporeans.* Paper presented at the Meeting of the Minds: The 1st National Graduate Conference on English and Applied Linguistics, May 4, 2007, Manila, the Philippines.

Mann, C. C., & Pirbhai-Illich, F. (2007). Language use, attitudes and identity: A survey of tertiary level students in Singapore. In C. C. Mann (Ed.), *Current research on English and applied linguistics: A De La Salle University special issue* (pp. 191-214). Manila, the Philippines: De La Salle University-Manila, Department of English and Applied Linguistics.

Sibayan, B. P. (2000). Resulting patterns of sociolinguistic, socioeconomic, and cultural practice and behavior after more than four hundred years of language policy and practice in the Philippines. In M. L. S. Bautista, T. A. Llamzon, & B. P. Sibayan (Eds.), *Parangal cang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his sixtieth birthday* (pp. 247-261). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

About the Author

Ariane Macalinga Borlongan is a doctoral candidate at the Department of English and Applied Linguistics of De La Salle University, Manila, the Philippines. His interests are on Philippine English and world Englishes, English grammar, sociolinguistics, educational leadership and management, and language teaching and learning.

Acknowledgements

Notes

[i]In this paper, "Standard English", for lack of an alternative term, loosely refers to the exonormative standard English of the nativized Englishes mentioned in the paper. Of course, these nativized Englishes may have also reached a point of stabilization and standardization.