

THE LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS IN VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA

Mae Lombos Wlazlinski
State University of West Georgia

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this paper is to present the findings of an investigation into the changes in the patterns of language use and the levels of proficiency in Filipino and English of 50 first-generation Filipino Americans in the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia. It will also describe the conditions that have influenced these changes using a socio-psychological model of bilingual development. Finally, this paper will augment the data base on Filipinos in diaspora: their heterogeneity in terms of migration and settlement pattern, educational background, social and economic standing, attitudes, norms and values, and language(s).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Paulston (1985:7) writes that the "norm for groups in prolonged contact within one nation is for the subordinate group to shift to the language of the dominant group..." Yet predicting the factors that promote language shift is not easy because they normally vary from one case to the next. Besides, the same conditions may produce the opposite linguistic behavior, i.e., language maintenance, in other ethnolinguistic groups.

Change in the linguistic behavior of immigrant populations happens in the course of time. In the case of language shift, the process begins with monolingualism in the immigrant (minority) language, leads to transitional bilingualism in the dominant and the minority languages, progresses to an almost complete loss of the minority language except in "the most private or restricted domains" (Fishman 1966:434), and ends up with language attrition (Lambert and Freed 1982). Eventually, the minority language dies (Dorian 1981, 1982), leaving the institution of the dominant language. However, the process of shift is not necessarily linear and a myriad of factors can arrest or accelerate the rate or evolution of linguistic decline. In the literature, the following determinants have been highlighted: economic factors (Fasold 1984; Fishman 1991), mixed marriages (De Vries 1986; Mougeon and Beniak 1994), educational mobility (Liebertson 1970; Peñalosa 1981), lack of institutional support (Robertson 1981; Veltman 1983), low ethnolinguistic vitality (Fuerverger 1982; Landry and Allard 1994; Saint-Blancat 1985), "relative vitalities of the ingroup and outgroup in an

intergroup situation" (Landry and Allard 1994:186), length of residence in the United States (O'Bryan, et al. 1976; Veltman 1988), political legislation (Mougeon and Beniak 1994), social changes and status of languages under study (Dorian 1981; Gal 1979; Trudgill and Tzavaras 1977), migration, geographical dispersion and absolute number, nationalization, and colonization (Peñalosa 1981; De Vries 1994; Fishman 1991; Schermerhorn 1970; Veltman 1980, 1983). In addition to these are macrosociological causes of shift such as industrialization, urbanization, loss of isolation, and loss of national self-consciousness.

Whereas the factors listed in the preceding paragraph bring into focus the importance of an inquiry into sociostructural variables to account for the variety of language behaviors that members of an ethnolinguistic minority group adopt, the analysis of psychological factors of attitude, language as "core value" to ethnic identity (Smolicz 1981), and perception or attribution and motivation for language use (Cummins et al. 1990; Gardner 1985; Gardner et al. 1987; Lambert 1975; Lambert and Freed 1982) is equally as important and complementary. The last point—motivation for language use—in turn, brings to the fore yet another determinant, the intervening socio-psychological variable of social networks (Barbour and Stevenson 1990; Gal 1979; Gumperz 1977; Milroy 1982; Milroy and Margraine 1980) or individual networks of linguistic contacts (Landry et al. 1991), which acknowledge that individuals have to use their language(s) with significant others. These significant others influence language behavior. In a bilingual context, a close-knit network of friends, family, and colleagues from the same linguistic group acts as a norm enforcement mechanism that sanctions language maintenance; a loose-knit network furthers language shift (Milroy 1980), and a mixed network allows contact simultaneously in two languages (Landry and Allard 1994). The same dimensions of social, socio-psychological, and psychological correlates of language behavior of ethnolinguistic groups in multiethnic societies shaped the study discussed in this paper. The next section gives a general descriptive account of the context of the investigation.

THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH AND THE FILIPINO AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The City of Virginia Beach, Virginia

The present study was conducted in the City of Virginia Beach, one of the seven cities that comprise the Tidewater Area of Virginia. It has a land area of 258.7 square miles and 51 square miles of water; its shore line (ocean and bay beaches) measures 38 linear miles. Virginia Beach is a modern and progressive city. Although not officially designated as a military town, it might as well be; its financial security is anchored on the presence of several military installations. Obviously, the military is a substantial member of the residential family of the city, and the U.S. Navy is the biggest employer in the area, supplying substantive monetary support to the local economy (Kraft and Kraft 1986).

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

In a 1990 Census report detailing the ethnic composition of the total population of Virginia Beach, the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission reported a predominantly White population; i.e., the total population of 393,069 is composed of 80% (316,408) White, 14% (54,671) Black, and 6% (21,990) Other. Obviously, "Other" (to which Filipinos belong) is a relatively small group compared to White and Black. However, the Filipinos in "Other" outnumber all other Asian and Pacific Islander groups: 12,376 Filipinos compared to 1,172 Chinese, 582 Japanese, 566 Asian Indian, 720 Koreans, 686 Vietnamese, 102 Cambodian, 21 Laotian, 96 Thai, 339 other Asians, 365 Pacific Islander, and 3,581 other race. Interestingly, the Filipinos' perception of their absolute number is greater than that in official reports. For instance, in 1990, in the whole Tidewater Area, the Bureau of the Census reported 19,858 Filipinos, yet local Filipinos have been reporting 40,000 since 1985 to the press as archival research shows. In 1985 and 1986 interviews with ethnic leaders, they reported 18,000 Filipinos in Virginia Beach. Since the official Census reports in 1986 do not include breakdown of the "Other" category, it can be speculated that this count of 18,000 Virginia Beach Filipinos is inflated.

The Evolution of an Ethnic Community: From Embarkation to Homeport

A fraternal relationship has existed between the Americans and the Filipinos, especially after WWII when the Americans liberated the Filipinos from the Japanese Imperial Forces. Historical documents on the exodus of Filipinos to the United States show that while Hawaii and California got their fair share of farm hands before WWI and a large number of military dependents and professionals after WWII, Virginia Beach, a relatively new settlement for the Filipinos, is now home to Filipino immigrants and their dependents whose roots in the U.S. germinate from military service.

These local Filipinos were recruited under Article 27 of the 1947 Military Bases Agreement which redefined Philippine enlistment solely to the U.S. Navy and which provided a program that allowed Filipino males to enlist directly from the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. (These U.S. bases in the Philippines, the local Filipinos' portal to the United States, closed down permanently when their leases terminated in December, 1992). According to Longo, "since 1947 to the end of the Naval Station, Subic Bay era (1992), 35,109 Philippine citizens had been recruited, out of which 400 became officers by the mid-1980s. About 400 Filipinos with the highest IQS, highest test scores and the best potential for training are [were] selected annually from among 100,000 applicants" (1990:3). From different previous duty stations, these service members came to Norfolk Naval Station, Virginia, and settled around the naval base in Navy housing. Inevitably, as better highways were built to the suburbs, outmigration resulted, and many Filipinos bought into new housing development projects in the newly chartered city of Virginia Beach. Eventually, moving to Virginia Beach became the trend. From informants' accounts, the Filipinos' expansion into Virginia Beach was significant in their life history in America. Generally, the increase in home ownership among the Filipinos was a positive indication of their rapidly rising socioeconomic status.

Finally, the U.S. Navy played a significant role in the social history of the local Filipino community. It was instrumental in securing their work visas, their immigration and later, their U.S. citizenship. Above all, this common employer was the interagent that brought them together in the city. To date, the Filipinos who were the first to come are now mostly American citizens, and they feel very much settled in Virginia Beach. Since their initial arrival in the 1950s, their roots have deepened and their branches have increasingly grown outward.

The Virginia Beach Filipinos can be loosely categorized into two classifications: the small civilian and the large military-associated group. Looking back at the history of the Filipino settlement in the city shows the military servicemen in the center of the pioneer homesteading activities.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The following basic assumptions guided the study: First, language plays an important role in ethnicity and intergroup relations. It can serve as a symbol of ethnic identity and cultural solidarity. Likewise, it can be used to signal ingroup membership, especially under conditions of ethnic threat (Bourhis and Giles 1977; Taylor, Meynard & Rheault 1977). This suggests that learning a second language and giving up the first, or maintaining it, has strong implications for ethnic identity. In fact, ethnicity, on which language behavior largely rests, is enacted differently by individuals and ethnolinguistic groups depending upon the social milieu; that is, the socio-cultural and politico-economic climate which may promote or preclude language learning. For example, in reaction to outgroup competition or cooperation, ethnolinguistic groups or their members develop varying degrees of ethnic consciousness, ethnic allegiance, and ethnic distinctiveness (Tajfel 1978; Reitz 1980) which are mutable and negotiable depending upon prevailing conditions (Barth 1969).

Second, language behavior is influenced by the relationship between attitudinal and motivational variables (Gardner 1985) and perceptions of ethnolinguistic vitality. As such, predictions concerning second language achievement and use should consider the motivational support from the target language group in addition to the learner's own motivations for learning the language (Genesee, Rogers & Holobow 1983:209). There should be objective and perceived congruence in the minority group's collective goals and the dominant group's goals for them (Schermerhorn 1970).

Third, the individual network of linguistic contacts (INLC) (Landry and Allard 1991) or social networks (Milroy 1980) are indicative of individual variability in language, social identity (Eastman 1984), and ethnic identity (Giles and Johnson 1981). INLC "becomes the major determinant of language competence and also of the individual's cognitive-affective disposition to learn and use the language" (Landry and Allard 1994:187). To summarize, the ethnolinguistic group and individual members' patterns of behavior are outcomes of macrostructural forces and micropsychological processes. However, there are within group variations in the definition (or lack) of ethnic

identity and/or boundaries, in vitality beliefs, in attitudes toward languages, and in adopted linguistic strategies. In other words, depending on existing conditions, members of a group may either act or not act in terms of ethnic group membership.

THEORETICAL ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK THAT INFORMED THIS STUDY

Landry and Allard's macroscopic model of additive and subtractive bilingualism (1991), which links the individual and society as interactive and complementary in processes, provides a coherent and efficient system of organizing and analyzing sociological, socio-psychological, and psychological data to explain the current patterns of language use and levels of proficiency in Filipino and English of the participants.

The macroscopic model of the determinants of additive and subtractive bilingualism has four components: The sociological is comprised of the objective ethnolinguistic vitality factors (OEV), such as demography, status, and institutional supports or the demographic, political, economic, and cultural resources of the group relative to those of the majority group. A language group may have either high or low OEV depending upon its resources or capital relative to that of the outgroup. This is a pivotal component because it influences the frequency and structure of linguistic contacts (INLC) an individual has in the language of his/her community and in different sectors of society such as the media, business, education and government, which, in turn, comprise the second component, the socio-psychological. The socio-psychological includes linguistic contacts, either personal contacts or contacts through the media, school, voluntary associations, etc. This component is important because it provides the opportunities to use the language. Landry and Allard posit that "In a bilingual context, INLC can be divided into three subnetworks: a first language or mother-tongue network (L1), a second-language network (L2), and a mixed network (L1/L2) in which contacts are made more or less simultaneously in two languages" (1994:186). First-language networks of friends, family, and work colleagues promote language shift. The nature and composition of the contacts not only determine the amount of language use but also attitudinal orientation, and this valorization shapes the attitudinal orientation towards groups and languages. In this respect, the quality of the contacts motivates a group to gain communicative competence, which in interaction with the third component, psychological factor, is predictive of language use. This third component includes personality traits, individuals' intellectual and linguistic aptitudes, language attitudes and motivation, and their perception or belief concerning their language and community vitality. In this model, competence and beliefs in one's group vitality are strongly related to language behavior, the fourth component. Language behavior, which feeds back to the INLC, is the actual use of the language within the network. In other words, in this framework, objective ethnolinguistic capital bears upon the structure of the individuals' participation in social relationships, their language use as a result of this participation, their desire to develop communicative as well as cognitive academic competence in the language frequently used (i.e, their language proficiency is related to language use in INLC), their practice of cultural behaviors and traditions, and their valorization of

language(s). All these attributes and behavior patterns reflect the individuals' definition of their social identity as well as their ethnic boundaries. The combination of all these processes predicts the community members' linguistic behavior. All these factors, taken together, account for language maintenance or language shift among immigrant communities.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Is there a longitudinal change in the participants' pattern of language use?
2. Is there a longitudinal change in the participants' level of proficiency in Filipino and English?
3. Do Filipinos have a high objective ethnolinguistic vitality in the community vis-à-vis the majority group? What are their demography, institutional supports, and status in relation to the general Virginia Beach society?
4. Who comprises their individual networks of linguistic contacts? Are their social networks from the same language group?
5. Do the participants give equal value to English and Filipino?
6. Do participants have high or low perceived ethnolinguistic vitality?
7. Is there congruence of collective goals between Filipinos and the majority group in regard to English proficiency; in other words, what kind of social and economic supports/rewards do they receive from the majority group for gaining proficiency in English?
8. What social, socio-psychological, and psychological factors and their interrelationships promoted the present language behavior of the participants? Do educational background, socioeconomic status, and length of residence influence language use and proficiency of participants?

METHODOLOGY

Sample Selection and Characteristics

Through four local elementary, middle, and high schools, which were identified by the Central Office of the City of Virginia Beach Public School System as having a large aggregation of Filipino students, volunteer parent participants were sought. A letter explaining the purpose of the study and introducing the researcher was sent to every Filipino home of the four schools whose principals provided supportive leadership. From among 120 parents who responded, 50 first generation native speakers of Tagalog were selected. Non-native speakers of Tagalog were excluded because this researcher, a native speaker of Tagalog, did not speak the other competing Philippine languages represented in Virginia Beach, and therefore, could not have

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

interviewed and assessed their proficiency. All 50 native Tagalogs who agreed to participate were included in the study. The participants were asked to complete a background information questionnaire, and from their responses, the following were culled.

The participants were 42% male and 58% female. Their ages ranged from 32 to 55 years. Their length of residence in the Philippines prior to immigration ranged from 16 to 33 years, and they had lived in the U.S. from 6 to 30 years. Though a few had resided in the U.S. from 6 to 10 years, the majority had from 16 to 20 years. The participants were in varied professions: 34% were either retired or active military service members, 38% professional, 14% skilled and unskilled, and 14% clerical.

The education profile of the participants is as follows: 56% had at least 4 years of college compared to 36% of the Virginia Beach population; 30% had 2 years college; 14% had 6 to 12 years of education compared to 39% of Virginia Beach. This may perhaps explain why only a few had blue collar jobs and why only a few had 30 thousand or less annual income. Specifically, 12% fell within the 30 thousand or less annual income bracket, 44% fell within the 31 to 45 thousand, 40% fell within 46 to 66 thousand, and a small 4% in the 80 to 100 thousand and higher annual income bracket. Considering the relatively low cost of living in Virginia Beach and factoring in military privileges for the majority of the participants, these Filipino Americans lived comfortably on their income. As compared with the general population of Virginia Beach, whose median household income was \$36,271 in 1989 (1990 Census) and that of the Tidewater Area, \$34,505 in 1992, these participants had a higher median income of \$46,000 (1985 figures).

In terms of first language profile, 84% reported Filipino as the language they spoke, understood, read, and wrote first; 6% understood and spoke a combination of English and Filipino first; 22% read and wrote in English first, indicative of the impact of schooling and the English medium of instruction in the Philippines; finally 30% first read and wrote in both Filipino and English, indicating some degree of bilingualism prior to immigration.

Data Collection

To ensure the reliability of data gathered, a triangulation of data collection methods was employed to complement one another as well as serve as checks for one another. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Language use and proficiency data were collected using survey questionnaires, self rating survey questionnaires, interviews, and informal observations. Additional proficiency data were derived from assessment results of naturalistic speech samples of English and Filipino interviews by native speakers of either language. Data on ethnolinguistic vitality, individual networks of linguistic contacts, attitudes and beliefs, and ethnic identity were collected via archival literature, survey questionnaires, open-ended interviews, and informal observations. For greater reliability and validity of data, other measures complemented the triangulation approach, such as taperecording of data for easy reexamination and the independent corroboration of multiple informants.

Instruments and Scales

All the instruments were written in English, and all instructions were given in English. The interview in Filipino was the only exception. Different scales were derived from the questionnaires and were subjected to reliability testing.

1. Past and Present Language Use Questionnaires - Participants' past (prior to immigration) and present language use with Filipino interlocutors (varying in level of intimacy and age; for example, in the domain of home: spouse, children, older and younger relatives, relatives of same age, close friend, acquaintances); 12 speech functions (varying in level of formality: want to convince, ask/give information, ask a favor, give a command; to impress, stress something, to express agreement, social distance, to gossip, discuss educational/technical matters; anger, to casually converse) in four domains (i.e., home, neighborhood, ethnic club, and work) was each rated through a 5-point self report scale with 1 Only Filipino, on one end, 3 Half English and Half Filipino at midpoint, and 5, Only English, on the opposite end. The reliability alpha of past language use scale is .9271. Present use was subdivided into four sets of scales for manageability, e.g., PRHOME (present language use with different interlocutors at home) and was composed of 84 items with a reliability coefficient alpha of .9812.
2. Past and Present Self-Rating Proficiency Scale - Two self rating scales were used to assess the respondent's pre-immigration and current oral language proficiency in English and Filipino. The six performance factors were comprehension (accurate understanding of the language), pronunciation (correct use of stress, intonation, no "Filipino" accent or "non-American" accent), vocabulary (correct choice and use of words and expressions), grammar (correct use of verb tense, pronoun, subject and verb agreement), organization of ideas (complete and well ordered ideas in short and long conversations) and flow of speech or fluency (smooth and easy speech characterized by pauses for effect and not for lack of vocabulary) using a 0 to 5 scale with 0 as not at all and 5 as excellent. Kuder-Richardson and Hoyt coefficients, which use analysis of variance, were employed as measures of reliability. The pre-immigration proficiency scales for English and Filipino yielded reliability alphas of .8869 and .8913 respectively for 49 cases, while the current English and Filipino proficiency scales yielded .8913 and .9305 respectively for 49 cases. These were the four variables of past and present English and Filipino proficiency: PSRPT, PSRPN, PSRET and PSREN.
3. Rater Oral Language Proficiency Assessment Scale - Tape recorded naturalistic speech samples from open-ended English and Filipino interviews of the participants were assessed for proficiency by three native speakers of either language using a six-point Rater Oral Language Proficiency Assessment Scale, a proficiency grid that was developed for this study. The raters, all teachers with graduate degrees, assigned the participants to varying levels of proficiency based on their performance on the six performance areas of oral language proficiency: (a) comprehension, which referred to the ability to understand general language; (b) pronunciation, which

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

included control of segmental and suprasegmental features; (c) vocabulary, which included semantically appropriate word choice and idiomatic expressions; (d) grammar, which included the control of structural features such as morphology and syntax; (e) organization of ideas, which included the ability to support answers with explanations and further elaborations in a logical order; and (f) flow of speech, which included rate and ease of speech or smoothness of expression. The average interrater reliability alpha for all scales is .9545 for 50 cases. Among the variables from this scale were RATERSE for raters' assessment of English proficiency and RATERSF for Filipino proficiency.

4. Parent Attitude Questionnaire - This was designed to elicit attitudinal orientations towards ethnicity, group memberships, host group, home and host countries, cultural values, and traditions. From this survey questionnaire, 13 items with a reliability alpha of .5941 for 40 cases were used to comprise the PATTITUD Scale.
5. Parent Language Attitude Survey - This was designed to elicit attitudinal orientations towards the value of English and Filipino, participants' desire to have Filipino taught in schools, and their desire to teach Filipino to their children. Two scales were derived from this survey: (a) EATTRANK Scale, which was composed of six items, with a reliability alpha of .8145 for 49 cases, was used to assess orientations towards English being of value to their children; (b) PATTRANK Scale, which was composed of six items, with a reliability alpha of .8719 for 50 cases, assessed participants' valuation of Filipino to help their children get a job, make friends, make good grades and more.
6. Semi-structured and open-ended interviews - These lasted some one and a half hours depending upon the rapport between the participant and the researcher during the warm-up, and were conducted in the participants' homes. Several important areas were examined: (a) language orientation, (b) intergroup relations, (c) ethnic identity, (d) relationship between language and ethnic identity, (e) ethnolinguistic vitality beliefs, (f) social networks and participation.
7. Objective Ethnolinguistic Vitality - This was assessed through (a) interviews of ethnic community leaders, church leaders, U.S. Navy personnel, school officials; (b) archival research of public and historical documents, municipal agency publications, local newspaper and magazine articles, ethnic clubs' souvenir programs and newsletters, U.S. Navy publications; (c) personal informal observations in the general and ethnic communities of the presence (or lack) of institutional supports for ethnic media, the proliferation of ethnic clubs, and the objectives of these clubs.
8. Observation in the home and in ethnic club meetings - This provided a good overview of language use, particularly the social meaning attached to each language and patterns in the roles assigned to Filipino and English, consistency in the use of a language in recurring situations, occasions where switching was noted, and more.

9. Observation in the general community - This continued for the six-year residence in the research site and provided a wealth of data, generating hypotheses that underwent reformulations and cross validations. A variety of data were gathered on objective and perceived ethnolinguistic vitality, particularly allocation of natural resources, intergroup relations, permeability of social boundaries, intragroup cohesiveness, INLC, language use practices, cognitive-affective disposition towards the language(s), and aptitude-competence in the language(s).

Operational Definitions of Regression Variables

1. LORUS - Length of residence in the U.S. ranged from 6 to 30 years with a mean of 17.60. Participants were assigned to one of the four groups: those who had lived in the U.S. from 6 to 11 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, and 21 to 30 years.
2. EDUC - Participants' educational background was classified under 6 to 8 years of schooling, 9 to 12 years, 2 years college, 4 years college and beyond college. The majority of the participants had education beyond high school (86%).
3. INCOME - Annual family incomes of the participants ranged from \$16,000 to \$100,000 and higher. There were six ranges: \$16,000 - \$20,000; \$26,000 - \$30,000; \$31,000 - \$45,000; \$46,000 - \$55,000; \$56,000 - \$66,000; \$80,000 - \$100,000 plus.
4. PATTITUD - Combined mean of 13 attitude items (with a reliability alpha of .5941 for 40 cases) to determine (a) which language the participants were highly motivated to learn, (b) what kind of perceived ethnolinguistic vitality their responses to ethnic attitude-related questions suggested.
5. INLC - INLC Scale included eight items from the semi-structured interview schedule and had a reliability alpha of .6076 for 50 cases.
6. PRWORK - Mean of present language use of participants with different interlocutors at work for varying speech purposes from 48 items (with reliability coefficient alpha of .9694).
7. RATERSE - Mean of raters' assessed participants' present English proficiency on six performance factors on a 0 to 5-point scale (interrater reliability yielded an alpha of .9602 for 50 cases).
8. RATERSF - Mean of raters' assessed participants' present Filipino proficiency on six performance factors on a 0 to 5-point scale (interrater reliability yielded an alpha of .9545 for 50 cases).

Data Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative techniques were used to complement each other in the analysis of data. While quantitative data provided numerical trends, qualitative and archival research data provided contextual significance. Quantitative analyses included descriptive statistics and T-test of language use and proficiency data, correlation and multiple regression procedures of factor variables that influenced the present language situation. To ensure the validity and reliability of the interpretation of the qualitative data, e.g., interview and the events as the researcher had observed and recorded them, she met with volunteer participants and ethnic leaders who validated the researcher's interpretation of interview and observation data to be reflective of their everyday realities.

Results

For clarity, a question precedes each finding.

1. What is the longitudinal change in language use of the first generation participants?

A comparison of past and present language use means in different domains suggests that over time there has been a decreasing orientation towards Only Filipino which is assigned the value 1. Descriptive statistics in Table 1 show that participants' language use changed from either Only Filipino or Mostly Filipino (assigned the value 2) to Half English/Half Filipino (assigned the value 3) and even approached Mostly English (assigned the value 4) in the work domain.

Table 1. Means of Participants' Past and Present Language Use Per Domain

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum	Valid N
Past Home	1.157	.189	1.00	1.62	50
Present Home	2.798	.720	1.57	5.00	50
Past Neigh	1.087	.186	1.00	1.79	50
Present Neigh	2.845	1.104	1.00	5.00	49
Past Work	1.608	.604	1.00	3.08	35
Present Work	3.749	.795	1.00	5.00	46
Past Club	2.048	.612	1.00	2.92	19
Present Club	3.132	.911	1.00	5.00	40

T-test results in Table 2 show a significant difference between past and present language use. Randomly selected means of the language use measures establish the differential language use at $p < .000$ for a two-tailed test, which means the observed mean difference could not have occurred by chance. In the Table are past and present language use at home with spouse ($p < .000$), language use at home with children ($p < .005$), language use at home with relative of same age ($p < .000$), language use in the neighborhood with strangers ($p < .000$), language use at work with subordinate ($p < .047$), and language use in ethnic club meetings with guests ($p < .000$).

Table 2. T-Test of First Generation Past and Present Language Use

Variable	N	Mean	Difference Mean	Corr	2-tail Prob	T Value	2-Tail Prob
Past Home Spouse		2.5486					
	22		1.2303	0.566	0.006	7.47	0.000
Present		1.3182					
Past Home Children		3.6201					
	7		1.4892	0.196	0.673	4.36	0.005
Present		2.1310					
Past Home Relative Same Age		2.4683					
	42		1.3909	0.101	0.524	8.98	0.000
Present		1.0774					
Past Neigh Stranger		3.2211					
	49		2.1156	-0.129	0.379	10.69	0.000
Present		1.1054					
Past Work Subordinate		4.6500					
	5		2.2667	-0.771	0.127	2.84	0.047
Present		2.3833					
Past Ethnic Club Guest		3.7125					
	18		1.3885	-0.023	0.927	5.21	0.000
Present		2.3241					

Interview data revealed a unanimous conscious decision of the majority of participants not to speak Filipino when they were in the company of the majority group because "Speaking Filipino around Americans is rude". Therefore, they spoke English at work where co-workers were Whites and Blacks, particularly in workplaces where speaking "Only English" was a policy. During social gatherings, such as christenings, birthdays and wedding parties, participants code-mixed freely with close friends and acquaintances. They spoke more Filipino with their spouses and friends but English with their children.

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

Informal observation data validated participants' interview responses. A lot of spontaneous switching from Filipino to English or vice-versa was observed between spouses by the researcher in the participants' homes. However, English was exclusively used in their conversations with their children. Although exclusive use of English was observed being used when ethnic organizations conducted business, language use varied from Filipino to Half English/Half Filipino or more Filipino than English or vice-versa during socials. In the schools of their children during parent-teacher association meetings, these participants switched back and forth between English and Filipino, but the disposition towards using more English was clearly observed.

The above findings indicate that the participants have developed an additive bilingualism in Filipino and English (Gardner 1985).

2. What is the longitudinal change in the levels of proficiency in Filipino and English of the participants?

The current English self rating results show all the means of the six areas of competence as higher than good (3.91) and a little better than very good but not perfect (4.45). Pronunciation has the lowest mean of 3.91 and an SD of .64, and grammar has a mean of 4.40 and an SD of .70. Interview data confirmed this when some participants conceded that they could not eradicate their native accents and were far from mastering the mechanics of grammar despite their long residence in the U.S. In contrast, participants rated their proficiency in Filipino as approaching excellent (4.71).

The raters' assessment of the participants' English speech samples ranged from good (3.36) in the area of pronunciation to very good but not perfect (4.16) in comprehension. Raters' assessment of participants' current Filipino proficiency showed comprehension approaching the excellent level (4.92) and pronunciation, which was rated the lowest, (4.24) was very good but not perfect.

3. Do Filipinos have a high objective ethnolinguistic vitality in the community vis-à-vis the majority group? What are their demography, institutional supports, and status in relation to the general Virginia Beach society?

The strength of an ethnolinguistic group's vitality influences its survival as a distinctive linguistic collective entity in asymmetrical multilingual societies. In contrast, lack of vitality contributes to the loss of the collective distinctiveness of a group and eventually to its linguistic assimilation (Bourhis and Sachdev 1984). Giles et al.'s framework for assessing ethnolinguistic vitality includes three types of socio-cultural factors: demography, status, and institutional support. Demographic variables refer to the community's absolute group numbers, pattern of emigration and immigration, birthrate, their size in relation to the entire city population, their dispersion or concentration in their territorial domicile. Status refers to the ethnic group's consequence: economic affluence, high social standing, political power, and sociohistorical prestige for themselves and their language. Institutional support means representation of the ethnic group in mass media, education, government, business, church, and utilization of the ethnic language in these institutions (Giles et al. 1977).

All the objective ethnolinguistic vitality (OEV) data culled from archival materials and interviews indicated OEV to be disproportionately favoring the mainstream culture and language. Filipinos had an undefined status in mainstream society. In Virginia Beach, Filipinos numbered only 3% compared to the majority group (1990 Census). They did not live in ethnic enclaves as they were dispersed in different residential areas across the city. The Filipino language did not have official recognition. One did not hear it in the media, church, business, school, and government. Also, the ethnic group did not have any political power to shape the political destiny of their new home. To wit, a Filipino has never been elected an official in Virginia Beach or in the other adjoining cities. Political apathy could be indicated by the fact that only 28% voted of the 100 Filipinos surveyed (Bautista et al. 1984). Neither did they have economic clout despite what the results of the survey showed. This was confirmed by ethnic leaders and personal observation: Fifty-six percent of the participants held university degrees and only 14% had less than high school and high school. In terms of occupation, 38% held professional and managerial jobs, 14% clerical, 14% skilled and unskilled, 6% retired U.S. Navy, and 28% are still in active duty in the U.S. Navy. The majority of Filipinos were either in the upper middle class bracket or lower high bracket of the mainstream society. All these indicate that despite their high educational background, middle class status, and respectable occupations, the Filipinos are unquestionably a silent minority group with low objective ethnolinguistic vitality. Lack of representation cuts across all institutions. Church, trade, government, education are exclusively mainstream. Under these conditions, the ethnic group's collective distinctiveness is lost and its linguistic assimilation is inevitable (Bourhis and Sachdev 1984).

4. Who comprises their individual networks of linguistic contacts? Are their social networks from the same language group?

As regards participants' individual networks of linguistic contacts (INLC), they had a mixed network; they did not have strictly all Filipino or all American contacts. Second-language contacts were indicated by the following: Only 20% said they had Filipinos in their neighborhood; 70% went out with American colleagues for leisure; 40% said they were members of formal organizations of the host community; 42% had both Filipino and American co-workers. Specifically, the following conditions which promoted mixed INLC as shown by qualitative data analysis were: (a) residential dispersion and participants' outgroup-dominated linguistic contacts, e.g., work and neighborhoods did not allow for frequent ethnic contacts; (b) in most work environments, English was the implicit or explicit language; (c) the U.S. Navy, which is the employer of the majority of participants had promoted close working relationships between Filipinos and Americans. While participants had second-language contacts, they also reported Filipino networks which provided the opportunity for use of their native language. For instance, they informed the researcher that their close friends were Filipinos; the participants were members of some 42 ethnic organizations, and while they welcomed outgroup friendships, "emotional and spiritual bonding was provided by ingroup relationship". In sum, participants' social boundaries were not demarcated by ethnic lines;

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

they had ample Filipino and English contacts. Consequently, they used and spoke English and Filipino with great facility to serve their best interests.

5. Do the participants give equal value to English and Filipino?

In response to the language attitude question, "What language do you want to have mastery of?", 78% of the participants chose English and 22% both. To the question "Does speaking Filipino around Americans promote discrimination against Filipinos?", 84% said yes. To "Did you have any problems as a result of your accented English when you first got to America?", 72% answered yes. One hundred percent responded yes to "Are you proud that your children speak English like Americans?"

Moreover, 98% of the participants answered "yes" to the question "Do you want your child to speak English fluently?". In contrast was the 62% who responded "yes" to "Do you encourage your child to speak Filipino?".

Participants were asked to rank from "most important" to "not important" the reasons why they would like their children to learn English. The results show that 98% of participants ranked "to get a job" and "to get good grades" as "most important"; 90% thought learning English "to understand the American way of life and culture" and "to make friends with Americans" was "more important". Similarly, participants were asked to rank from most important to not important the reasons why they would like their children to learn Filipino. The results are as follows: 82% ranked Filipino as "most important" to understand the Filipino culture and way of life; 38% ranked as "more important" to talk to Filipinos, to think and act like them. In contrast, 72% ranked Filipino as "less important" to get a job, 82% "not important" to get good grades; 44% "not important" to discuss varied topics; and 30% ranked Filipino as "not important" to think/ behave like an American.

As the results indicate, learning English has a greater utilitarian appeal than learning Filipino.

6. Do participants have high or low perceived ethnolinguistic vitality?

The participants are secure in their position in society and have some degree of ethnolinguistic vitality. As a matter of fact, despite their inconsequential size of 3% in relation to the general population, participants have an inflated notion of their size as a community. Further, they believe that they can do anything to improve their station in life. This stems from their acknowledgment of their poor beginnings prior to immigration; they are proud of what they have accomplished socially and economically in their host country. Besides, a source of great pride for these participants is the academic recognition their children get from the general Virginia Beach society. Local mass media publish their accomplishments.

Interestingly, participants stress that they see themselves as better than their American counterparts in terms of moral values, money management, and work ethics. They work hard, save money, and accumulate rental properties. Although the participants concede that they are no match to the Americans in proficiency in English, they do not, by any means, regard themselves as inferior to Americans. As a matter of fact, interview data show 50% feel comfortable with Americans and "can hold their own".

Finally, perceived ethnolinguistic vitality was further explored by examining the nature and dimension of participants' cultural identity, specifically pride in their culture and history. Also addressed was their belief in the maintenance of the ethnic language as an integral component of ethnic identity. Interview data indicate that 84% took pride in being Filipino; 66% said yes to the importance of knowing Philippine history; 52% said yes to the importance of speaking Filipino and teaching it to their children; 78% said they were not embarrassed to speak Filipino in public places. However, only 26% of the participants said yes to the question "Is it necessary to speak Filipino to be a Filipino?". In terms of ethnic identity, 56% of the participants regarded themselves primarily as Filipinos, 38% Fil-Americans, and 6% Americans. The responses suggest that a strong ethnic identity and ethnic pride do not include transfer of the ethnic language to the next generation and speaking Filipino as a requirement to being a Filipino. Evidently, participants do not make an issue of the lack of institutional support for the ethnic language.

7. Is there congruence of collective goals between Filipinos and the majority group as regards English proficiency; in other words, what kind of social and economic supports/rewards do they receive from the majority group for gaining proficiency in English?

Having good credit ratings, these participants can secure loans from banks, purchase cars, etc. without difficulty. However, data from interviews with ethnic leaders and from participants reveal that Filipinos do not get preferential treatment in terms of educational assistance for their children. Their children, although members of a minority group, do not get educational assistance to go to college.

Four interview questions assessed participants' perception of permeability and group accommodation. To the question, "Do you feel Filipinos are discriminated against in Virginia Beach?", 58% said no, 20% yes, and 22% somewhat. To the next question, "Are there Filipinos in the upper bracket of Virginia Beach society?", 2% said no, 84% yes, and 14% not sure. To "Is it advantageous for Filipinos to unite and maintain close ties with each other for political and economic reasons?", 54% said no, 40% yes, and 6% somewhat. Finally, to "Should Filipinos unite for social and cultural reasons?", 14 said no, 84% yes, and 2% somewhat. The high rate of participant agreement to cultural and social unity as versus political and economic reasons indicates the disinterest of these Filipinos in being considered militant.

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

Intergroup relations were further assessed by the question about the degree of socio-economic opportunity open to Filipinos in mainstream society. Participants, as well as ethnic leaders, took pride in the economic status the Filipinos had attained in the larger community. Relative to the issue of racial discrimination, Filipinos in Virginia Beach had varied reactions; however, there were no bitter recriminations between the Filipinos and the Americans. Discrimination was acknowledged by some, but the incidence was so infrequent and not vicious enough to have merited any public outcry. Filipinos felt secure that the law was on their side when they perceived a discriminatory act which maliciously and blatantly violated their rights as American citizens. Notwithstanding the unpleasant experiences, participants, in general, believed that the mainstream community had been responsive to their needs. In a city where there was no ethnic institutional support, this was paradoxical. They expressed contentment in being able to live and work "undisturbed" by their American neighbors. Consequently, they had not felt threatened, much less dispossessed, by the mainstream community. In spite of, or perhaps because of, the differences between perception and reality, peaceful intergroup co-existence prevailed. Naturally, in this kind of environment, the desire to blend in was popular. Participants recognized the value of becoming a member of the Virginia Beach society whose boundaries were permeable and whose rungs were not impossible to climb. To many participants who experienced language related discrimination, mastery of English was the key to equal opportunity in this country. In other words, they acknowledged the expediency of English and acculturation which precluded the transfer of Filipino to the next generation.

8. What social, socio-psychological, and psychological factors and their interrelationships promoted the present language behavior of the participants? Do educational background prior to immigration, socioeconomic status, and length of residence influence language use and proficiency of participants?

Interrelationships among language use, proficiency, and their determinants were analyzed using correlation and regression analyses. Correlation results show the relationship among the variables while regression analysis results show predictors of the dependent variables. In the analyses, the dependent variables were participants' present level of rater-assessed English proficiency (RATERSE), present language use in the work domain (PRWORK), and present level of rater-assessed Filipino proficiency (RATERSF). The means of language use in all of the four domains investigated—work, home, neighborhood, and ethnic club—correlated at $p < 0.000$; hence, the selection of PRWORK was arbitrary. Independent variables included in the analysis were length of residence in the U.S. (LORUS), educational background (EDUC), income (INCOME), attitudes and motivation (PATTITUD = a high score equals a strong Filipino affiliation), social networks (INLC = a high score equals Filipino dominated social networks), and present language use (PRWORK = a high score equals exclusive use of English). The last three variables are composite scores from several variables that comprise various scales: INLC scale derived from Parent Interview Schedule, PATTITUD scale from Parent Attitude Survey Questionnaire, and PRWORK scale from the Language Use Survey Questionnaire.

To operationalize Landry and Allard's macroscopic model of additive and subtractive bilingualism and to determine the theorized links among the sociological, socio-psychological, psychological, language behavior, predictor variables, such as INLC, PATTITUD, PRWORK, which were representative of socio-psychological, psychological and language behavior, were subjected to regression analyses. However, these data were used to qualify and clarify the quantitative results.

For the purpose of regression, INLC represented socio-psychological factors and PATTITUD represented psychological factors. PRWORK represented the fourth factor, language behavior. In the analyses, variables PRWORK, RATERSE, and RATERSEF were used as independent variables as well as dependent variables of one another since language use and language proficiency were hypothesized to affect each other. SPSSX multiple regression procedure, Enter model, was used to determine the predictors of present English proficiency (RATERSE). Variables that are less manipulable, such as length of residence, education, and income, were entered first in order to estimate how much variance could be accounted for uniquely by each variable before the manipulable variables of INLC, PATTITUD, and PRWORK were entered into the equation. This analysis is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Regression of Participants' Present English Proficiency (RATERSE) on Six Predictor Variables (N=45)

Variables	Multiple R	Rsquare	Rsq Change	Simple R	Beta	Sig T
LORUS	.53	.28	.28	.41	.32	.03
EDUC	.54	.29	.01	.14	.28	.04
INCOME	.61	.37	.08	.49	.42	.00
INLC	.61	.37	.00	.09	.10	.41
PATTITUD	.72	.52	.15	-.34	-.49	.00
PRWORK	.74	.54	.02	.28	-.18	.21

The effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable is shown by the following increments: LORUS accounted for 28% of the variance, EDUC accounted for an additional 1% while INCOME added 8% to the accounted variance of 37%. There was no increment in the explainable variance when social network, INLC, was entered. Attitude and motivation, PATTITUD, and present language use, PRWORK, brought the total explained variance to 54%.

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

To determine the predictors of the participants' present language use, PRWORK, seven independent variables (shown in Table 4) were used as regressor variables. It can be seen in the Table that the correlations between length of residence and income and present language use are significant at $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.01$ respectively. Correlation between participants' present language use and education was positive and significant at $p < 0.05$, while correlation between language use and current English proficiency was significant at $p < 0.10$. Positive correlations between the variables indicate the relationships between them.

The following Table shows all regressor variables except Filipino proficiency as predictors of current language use. Length of residence accounted for 23% of the variance in language use. Education accounted for the incremental variance of 9%, while income explained 2% of the variance. INLC, attitudes, and motivation, and present English proficiency accounted for an increment in explained variance of 4%, 3%, and 2% respectively, bringing the total explained variance to 43%.

Table 4. Regression of Participants' Present Language Use (PRWORK) on Seven Independent Variables (N = 5)

Variables	Multiple R	Rsquare	Rsq Change	Simple R	Beta	Sig T
LORUS	.48	.23	.23	.48	.43	.00
EDUC	.57	.32	.09	.29	.41	.00
INCOME	.58	.34	.02	.41	.27	.11
INLC	.62	.38	.04	-.14	-.13	.35
PATTITUD	.64	.41	.03	-.14	-.28	.09
RATERSE	.66	.43	.02	.28	.22	.22
RATERSF	.66	.43	.00	.06	-.05	.68

Results of regression analysis in Table 5 show that regressor variables of length of residence, education, and income did not account for any explainable variance in Filipino proficiency. Meanwhile, INLC accounted for 3%, while PRWORK brought the total explained variance to 4%. No incremental variance could be attributed to attitudes and motivation. Notably, there was no linear relationship with any of the independent variables and the dependent variable Filipino proficiency (RATERSF). All these may be due to the low variability in some variables, lack of variability in Filipino proficiency data (50 cases, mean of 4.5 and SD of .3593), and the relatively small sample size.

Table 5. Regression of Participants' Filipino Proficiency (RATERSF) on Six Predictor Variables (N = 45)

Variables	Multiple R	Rsquare	Rsq Change	Simple R	Beta	Sig T
LORUS	.03	.00	.00	-.08	.03	.88
EDUC	.06	.00	.00	-.01	.06	.74
INCOME	.07	.00	.00	-.02	.06	.77
INLC	.17	.03	.03	.13	.15	.38
PATTITUD	.17	.03	.00	.02	-.04	.82
PRWORK	.19	.04	.01	-.06	-.10	.63

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

By all indications, sociological, socio-psychological, and psychological factors have contributed to the evolution of the participants' additive bilingualism. The participants have low objective ethnolinguistic vitality relative to that of the mainstream society, but their perceived ethnolinguistic vitality is high, buoyed by ethnic pride, a sense of belonging, and acceptance in relation to the host group because of membership in the U.S. Navy, economic independence and incorporation, high academic achievement of their children, and the lack of blatant discrimination in the general society. These conditions promote positive attitudes towards the host group and their language, English. At the same time, these conditions allow endless opportunities for English use and competence. Meanwhile, although occasions for Filipino use may be limited, participants are not fully curtailed in their use of it. Consequently, continued use prevents loss of skills.

In terms of psychological factors, absence of perceived group boundaries and intergroup conflict make assimilation to the host group convenient (Giles and Johnson 1981). Filipinos have not really experienced flagrant discriminatory practices, and they tend "not to rock the boat" or do anything to change the status quo. For instance, the U.S. Navy, the main employer of the majority of the participants, in spite of the unequal status-power relationship, gave participants and their families a cocoon. Positive attitude and good feelings for the Navy influenced their outlook towards the host community and America in general. Another aspect of this relationship is the perception among the participants that the host group has the same collective goals for them, which are (cultural) assimilation and (political and economic) incorporation (Schermerhorn 1970). Also important to consider is Giles and Byrne's (1981) notions of multiple membership and individual mobility, which cause a person to converge towards the ethnic outgroup and attenuate the ingroup's speech markers. Giles' (1977) accommodation theory may also explain the participants' decision to enhance their social identity by ridding themselves of ethnic accents to encourage further interaction and decrease perceived discrepancies between speakers. In sum, the congruous attitude towards the host group has served as a trajectory for further use of English and improvement of English skills. To these Filipinos, therefore, improved English skills serve as a catalyst for better communication with supervisors, higher visibility for more accurate assessment of performance, and eventually social and economic reward. Meanwhile, they maintain a high level of Filipino for its emotional and sentimental appeal (Wlazlinski 1995).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to colleague and mentor, Jim Cummins, of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada, for his comments on content and to my dear friend, Judy Mercier, of Old Dominion University, Virginia, for her editorial suggestions.

REFERENCES

- BARBOUR, S. and P. STEVENSON. 1990. *Variation in German. A Critical Approach to German Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BARTH, F. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston, Massachusetts: Little Brown and Co.
- BAUTISTA, A., K. BAUZON, and M. HILL. 1984. *Changing Political Values among Filipino Americans: A Descriptive Summary*. Unpublished manuscript, Norfolk State University, Norfolk, Virginia.
- BOURHIS, R.Y. and I. SACHDEV. 1984. *Vitality perceptions and language attitudes: Some Canadian data*. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 3, 97-126.

- _____ and H. GILES. 1977. The language of intergroup distinctiveness. In *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* ed. by Howard Giles, pp. 119-34. London: Academic Press.
- CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY. 1987. *The World Factbook*, pp. 197-8. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs.
- CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA. 1988. *Roads to the Future*, 1.1. Virginia Beach, Virginia: Author.
- CUMMINS, J., B. HARLEY, M. SWAIN and P. ALLEN (eds.). 1990. *The Development of Second Language Proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DE VRIES, J. 1986. *Towards a Sociology of Languages in Canada*. Quebec: International Center for Research in Bilingualism.
- _____. 1994. Canada's official language communities: An overview of the current demolingistic situation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 105/106, 37-68.
- DORIAN, N. 1981. *Language Death. The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- _____. 1982. Language loss and maintenance in language contact situations. In *The Loss of Language Skills* ed. by R. Lambert and B. Freed, p. 44-59. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- DREXLER, J. (Gen. Ed.) 1991. The Facts on File *Encyclopedia of the 20th Century*, p. 721-22. New York, N.Y: Facts on File, Inc.
- FASOLD, R. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- FISHMAN, J. and J. HOFMAN. 1966. Mother tongue and nativity in the American population. In *Language Loyalty in the United States* ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, pp. 34-50. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- FEURVERGER, G. 1982. An Exploratory Study of the Ethnolinguistic Vitality of Italo-Canadian Students in Toronto. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Toronto, Canada.
- GAL, S. 1979. *Language Shift: The Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- GARDNER, R.C. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

- _____, R.C., R.N. LALONDE, MOORCROFT, and F.T. EVERS. 1987. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 6.1.29-47.
- GENESE, F., P. ROGERS, N. HOLOBOW. 1983. The social psychology of second language learning: another point of view. *Language Learning* 33.2, 209-223.
- GILES, H. 1977. *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- _____, R.Y. BOURHIS and D.M. TAYLOR. 1977. Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic Group Relations. In *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* ed. by H. Giles, pp. 307-48. New York: Academic Press.
- _____ and P. JOHNSON. 1981. The role of language in ethnic group relations. In *Intergroup Behaviour* ed. by J.C. Turner and H. Giles, 199-243. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- GUMPERZ, J. 1977. The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code-Switching. *RELC Journal*, 8.2.1-34.
- KRAFT, C. and N. KRAFT. 1986. The military is big business for the community. Supplement to *Virginia Pilot*, p. M3.
- LAMBERT, W.E. 1975. Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In *Education of Immigrant Students* ed. by A. Wolfgang, pp. 55-83. Toronto: Ontario for Studies in Education.
- _____ and B. FREED (eds.) 1982. *The Loss of Language Skills*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- _____ and R. ALLARD. 1991. Can schools promote additive bilingualism in minority group children? In *Language, Culture and Cognition* ed. by L. Malave and G. Duquette, pp. 198-231. London: Multilingual Matters.
- _____ and R. THEBERGE. 1991. School and family French ambiance and the bilingual development of Francophone Western Canadians. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 45.5, 878-915.
- _____. 1994. The Arcadians of New Brunswick: Demolinguistic realities and the vitality of the French language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 105/106, 181-215.
- LIEBERSON, S. 1970. *Language and Ethnic Relations*. New York: John Wiley.
- LONGO, J. 1990. Citizenship door may open for U.S. Navy Filipino sailors. *Navy Times*, 39.13. Springfield, V.A.: The Army Times Publishing Co.
- MILROY, L. 1980. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- _____. 1982. Language and group identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3.3, 207-216.

- _____ and S. MARGRAINE. 1980. Vernacular language loyalty and social network. *Language in Society* 3, 43-70.
- MOUGEON, R. and E. BENIAK. 1994. Bilingualism, language shift and institutional support for French: The case of the Franco-Ontarians. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 105-106, 99-126.
- O'BRYAN, K., J. REITZ and O. KUPLOWSKA. 1976. *The Non-Official Language Study*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- OTANES, F. 1977. Language use and translation preference. In *The Filipino Bilingual: Studies on Philippine Bilingualism and Bilingual Education* ed. by E.M. Pascasio, 51-59. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press.
- PAULSTON, C.B. 1985. Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism: Linguistic Consequence of Ethnicity and Nationalism in Multilingual Settings (Tech Rep). Paris: Centre for Educational Research in Innovation.
- PENALOSA, F. 1981. *Introduction to Sociology of Language*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- REITZ, J. 1980. *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.
- ROBERTSON, B. 1981. The Role of Institutions in Language Retention: Niagara Falls, Ontario. Unpublished manuscript. State University of New York at Buffalo.
- SAINT-BLANCAT, C. 1985. The effect of minority group vitality. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6.1.31-45.
- SCHERMERHON, R.A. 1970. *Comparative Ethnic Relations*. New York: Random House.
- SMOLICZ, J.J. 1981. Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4.75-90.
- TAJFEL, H. ed. 1978. *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- TAYLOR, D.M., R. MEYNARD and E. RHEAULT. 1977. Threat to ethnic identity and second language learning. In *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* ed. by H. Giles, pp. 99-117. London: Academic Press.
- TRUDGILL, P. and G.A. TZAVARAS. 1977. Why Albanian-Greeks are not Albanians: Language Shift in Attica and Biotia. In *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* ed. by H. Giles, pp. 171-184. New York: Academic Press.
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE. The Census Bureau 1990. 1990 CPH 5-1.

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED FILIPINO AMERICANS

VIETNAM, C. 1980. The Retention of Minority languages in the United States (Tech Rep). National Center for Education Statistics.

_____. 1983. *Language Shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton.

_____. 1988. Modeling in language shift process of Hispanic immigrants. *International Migration Review* 22.4, 545-562.

WLAZLINSKI, M.L. 1995. *Social and Psychological Determinants of Language Shift: The Case of the Filipino Community in the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia, U.S.A.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto dissertation.