

Sociolinguistic Centrifuge: Comparing Language Attitudes from Urban Center to Urban Periphery

Michael Ian Benedict P. Estipona

La Salle Green Hills (High School)

San Juan City, Philippines

E-mail: lastmaximal@gmail.com

Much research on L2 learning and use plays a role in principled and reasoned language planning, and even relevant and pivotal legislation as seen in the tug-of-war between Filipino and English as medium of instruction that has been a national issue for decades. This study builds on the comparatively-emergent language attitudes-based research done in the Philippines, comparing language attitudes of Ateneo de Manila University college undergraduate students with those from Romblon State College. While not necessarily reflective of the attitudes of their larger populations, both respondent sets see both languages as important and useful languages for education, entertainment, and employment; English, while the preferred MOI, does not necessarily carry higher apparent social status. On the whole, integrative and instrumental motivations for using either language still make both of them vital and generally favored options for learners and users close to and far from the urban center.

Key words: language attitudes, urban, language planning

1. Introduction

The current Philippine language situation, characterized by Kaplan and Baldauf (1998) as “linguistically heterogeneous with no absolute majority of speakers of any given indigenous language” (cited in Young, 2002, p. 1) and by Pascasio (2002) as a “multilingual and multicultural environment” (p. 136), has been in various modes and speeds of flux since its earliest days — with whatever local languages encroached upon, at various points and to various degrees, by the languages of whichever conquerors happened to be in power. Language attitudes have been in existence for about as long, especially considering Eastman (1983)’s statement that they come into being when “one social group comes in contact with a second social group possessing a different language [and] each group then develops ideas about the other group’s language vis-à-vis its own” (cited in Ting, 2003, p. 1).

Spanish, for instance, was taught to select sectors of society over the course of three centuries of Spanish occupation. The establishment of a public school system under American rule, characterized by Martin (1999) as “an essential component of military strategy,” (p. 132) then meant that English went on to be taught to everyone who received public education. The Monroe report, Martin continues, led to the inclusion of regional languages as “auxiliary languages to teach character education, good manners and right conduct” (Board of Educational Survey 1925, cited in Martin, 1999, p. 133) but allowed English to remain central to language education and education in general. Taught as a language that would pave the way for unity across the linguistically diverse archipelago and provide the Filipino “access to civilization,” English stayed at the forefront of language teaching until the large-scale American occupation of the era ended.

Filipino, in turn, began as what President Quezon dubbed the “wikang pambansa,” the national language, in 1939. Gonzalez (1998) notes that it then became Pilipino (formerly Tagalog) in 1959 to reflect a “national rather than ethnic” feel (p. 487). Following the 1960s “National Language Wars” between Pilipino and Cebuano supporters, among others, the 1987 Constitution declared the conciliatorily-renamed Filipino the national language, itself a multilingual blend at least in part that “will be enriched with elements (largely vocabulary) from the other Philippine languages and non-local languages used in the Philippines.” This view of it may partly be what leads people, even today, to say Tagalog when referring to Filipino and vice versa.

The Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL International) Web Ethnologue currently posts that the Philippines has 171 living languages and four extinct languages as of 2003 — almost all of which, with the exception of English, Spanish, Hokkien, Mandarin, Chavacano and some others, are of Malayo-Polynesian origin. Filipino and English have official status in this additive bilingual society, with English being the current primary medium of instruction (MOI) as per 2003 Executive Order 210 issued by President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo (shifting from the 1987 policy on bilingual education, which proposed that both Filipino and English be used as media of instruction). This directive has been supported to some extent by subsequent bills and similar proposed legislations — among the most recent of which are House Bills 320, 305 and 406, which seek to set either English, Filipino or a regional language (where appropriate) as the MOI for subjects from preschool to Grade II, and propose to set English as the MOI from Grade III onwards. Proponents of the bills argue that the proposed system is projected

to increase the Philippines’ flagging English proficiency [and, subsequently, competitiveness in the job market] by virtue of increased exposure to and use of the language (Llanto, 2008).

However, several counter-arguments have been voiced by language experts, who cite a number of studies that show that learning takes place faster when conducted in one’s mother tongue and thus with a minimum of language interference. Young (2002) cites evidence from Sibayan (1983) stating that “to provide a relevant early school experience which will build upon pre-school experiences requires the use of the mother tongue” (p. 222). As shown by Dekker in a 2003 paper and supported by members of the FLC Bridging Program, the now-familiar First Language Education project in Lubuagan, Kalinga, stands as proof of this.

1.1 The importance of examining language attitudes

The attitudes and motivation of language learners and users themselves, as language learners and users, are often overlooked but can be of notable influence. This has been seen to a considerable extent in Malaysia, as noted by Ting (2003): “Legislation often precedes change in language-use behaviour and language attitudes, but in the Malaysian state of Sarawak the full implementation of the national language policy had to be put on hold until the people were more receptive towards using Bahasa Malaysia for official purposes of communication” (p. 207).

While certainly not without consideration of the learners’ needs, much, if not all, of the movement behind language use and policy in the Philippines seems to have been motivated by various outside forces, be they political, economic, or otherwise. It may be possible

that changes on this order may have a more meaningful and lasting impact when learners' language attitudes are taken into account.

Motivations for learning these languages, which shape the attitudes, have clear implications for acquisition and learning. Krashen's (1981) theories on the impact of the affective dimension hold that motivation, among other intangibles as self-confidence and anxiety, is a considerable factor in second language acquisition. This is bolstered by informed statements from such other researchers as Castillo (1969, 1972) and Samonte (1981) who argued that "motivation is a necessary factor for successfully acquiring a second language and is related to second language learning achievement as well as to attitude" (cited in Pascasio, 2002, p. 137).

Various studies (e.g., Otones & Sibayan, 1969; Feenstra & Castillo, 1970; Gaston, 1978; Bangalan; 1979) have pegged the emergence of what appears to be the Filipino bilingual's "instrumental motivation for learning English and integrative [motivation] for learning Filipino" (cited Pascasio, 2002, p. 136). The increasing speed and inclination towards globalization, one of the prime forces influencing language shifts among other things, may thus be tempered by other concerns to lead to an interesting balance between Filipino, English and other local languages. Fishman (1996) has posited that for many countries, "global arrangements will increasingly make use of English while local life between locals will increasingly be attached to national languages and cultures, each complementing the other by satisfying different needs and granting different satisfactions" (cited in Villacorta, 2000, p. 265). This seems to corroborate the findings of the Filipino bilingual motivation studies above.

Indeed, while globalization and all manifestations of its socioeconomic impact are indeed formidable, it must be acknowledged that what occurs at the learner's core has influence of its own — these attitudes are not hardwired into our being or inherited genetically, but learned and developed — and individuals shape their learning and use, based partly on their attitudes toward what they are learning and using. These may be said to be the trickle-down effects of the larger global movement, but with an impact and influence all their own, one tends to think of oneself less as a cog in a national machine affected by what powers the machine, and more as one's own being with one's own social concerns.

The conscious or unconscious tendency toward acquiring "linguistic capital" — French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's term for the social authority and respect commanded by one's use of language (Bartlett 2003) — or otherwise dealing with those who have it, would seem to logically be of more immediate importance to the average citizen (or, indeed, even to students and teachers themselves) than the language that the business or political sectors want others to use. Thus, learners' language attitudes may serve as significant determiners of whether or not these hypotheses prove true in the long term. The social and linguistic significance of language attitudes is indeed undeniable, and determining their presence and nature in various circles of society is thus equally significant.

1.2 Related literature

Language attitudes have long been an object of various sociolinguistic studies in various bilingual/multilingual locations such as Papua New Guinea (Buschenhofen, 1998), India (Hohenthal, 1998) and Sarawak, Malaysia (Ting, 2003). These

studies generally showed that there were positive attitudes toward English in their respective contexts. Hohenthal acknowledged that English had “acquired new functions, including the self-expressive or emotive function” and Ting noted English’s significant levels of approval toward English as a medium of instruction (and even concern toward maintaining or improving its standard quality).

Ting’s study is particularly notable because it analyzes the connection between language planning — quoting Weinstein’s (1980) definition of it as “a government-authorized, long-term, sustained and conscious effort to alter a language’s function in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems” (cited in Ting, 2003, p. 195) — and language attitudes. Findings regarding the Malaysian government’s language plans to have Bahasa Malaysia take over the role of English showed that these plans did not affect the respondents’ attitudes toward either language, as they still sought to gain proficiency in both languages and had favorable attitudes toward both despite the intended and expected shift in loyalties.

Philippine studies have not been especially lacking in examining language planning and language attitudes, even and especially across shifting national language situations. Gonzalez (1998) and Sibayan (2000) have published articles looking at various “eras” of language planning and resulting sociolinguistic, socioeconomic and other behavior patterns. Language attitudes have also been the subject of much Philippine analysis, as Pascasio summarized in 2002: a study by Otones and Sibayan in the late 60s showed that there was a “preference for English as the language of instruction at all academic levels,” while “activism and national fervor” sparked a desire (evident in the youth, including the young elite, as seen in Castillo

and Chan-Yap 1977) to install Filipino in place of English as the medium of instruction (Pascasio, 2002, p. 137).

In slight contrast to these findings, a study of college students conducted by Borromeo-Santos (1981) connected positive attitudes toward English with integrative motivations toward the same, “conditioned by choice of profession/vocation, age, teacher influence and peer group influence” (Borromeo-Santos, 1981, cited in Vizconde, 2006, p. 12-13). Later studies (e.g., Amano, 2002) covered student, parent and teacher language attitudes toward English and Filipino, which revealed that English is preferred by students and teachers as an MOI (teachers felt that “English is an intellectualized language and a valuable tool to source information technology”) but that parents felt that Filipino provides an avenue for people to “think and express themselves,” as a language through which “they themselves are better understood” (Amano, 2002, cited in Vizconde, 2006, p. 12).

Fuentes and Mojica (1999) attempted to replicate a 1974 Pascasio language attitude study. Their study, which centered on students from the lower middle class and upper class “outside of Metro Manila” established that the respondents’ “attitude toward English [are] more favorable than their attitude toward Filipino,” exhibiting a positive attitude toward both as possible media of instruction and suggesting that Filipino be used in “certain subjects offered at the tertiary level” (p. 54).

The study also supported Pascasio’s earlier statement that English was pursued largely out of instrumental motivation (as well as for “formal situations”) and that Filipino was pursued largely out of integrative motivation (for “informal situations”, “at home and “in the

neighborhood”, to “preserve and enhance his/her cultural and literary heritage”) — the latter influenced by their “spirit of nationalism” and “their awareness to maintain their identity as Filipino.” In general, the study pointed toward a considerably positive outcome of the country’s aim to strengthen the bilingual nature of the Philippines by having its people speak both languages with fluency.

Various studies conducted by Pascasio herself, which are referenced in the same paper, looked at attitudes toward language and identity. Instrumental and sentimental attitudes toward each language supported findings mentioned above, as Filipino was seen to carry the ability to “express the Filipino bilingual’s needs, feelings, sentiments and aspirations” while sentiments toward English indicated that it was seen to give speakers the ability “to impress others, to show status, [and] to impose control/authority” (Pascasio, 2002, p. 141). This indicates that the instrumentally-used English may be more immediately seen as a means toward achieving Bourdieu’s *linguistic capital*. Castillo’s (1999) findings would tend to support this role that English plays, as it is viewed to be a “language of power and upward social and economic mobility deemed to be of economic significance” (cited in Young, 2002, p. 222).

There remains, however, proof that considerable pride remains in being identified with one’s native language (Sibayan & Segovia, 1984), which will hopefully guarantee that ethnic languages — despite their supposedly relatively low cache of linguistic capital — will not be abandoned. Overall, Pascasio’s series of studies seems to collectively reinforce that English and Filipino are “in complementary distribution,” both in spread and in people’s attitudes toward them.

2. The study

The study aims to take a comparative look at the language attitudes (toward Filipino and English) of selected Filipino bilingual students. The specific issues addressed are the following:

1. What are the differences and similarities in the attitudes of Filipino bilingual students from Metro Manila and from other regions toward Filipino and English in general?
2. What are the differences and similarities in their attitudes toward Filipino and English as status markers?
3. What are the differences and similarities in their attitudes toward Filipino and English in the mass media?
4. What are the differences and similarities in their attitudes toward Filipino and English as media of instruction?
5. What are the differences and similarities in their attitudes toward the cultural impact and importance of Filipino and English?
6. What are the significant factors that affect their attitudes toward Filipino and English?

2.1 Scope and limitations

The language attitudes compared in the study were those of male and female college undergraduate students in a relatively urban setting opposite those of college undergraduate students based in a school closer to a relatively provincial setting. Specifically, these were college students from Ateneo de Manila University and students of relatively similar ages and genders from Romblon State College. While the original study plan

contemplated on controlling such variables as respondent age and gender, considerations such as available time, resources and respondents made this unfeasible.

Taking into account findings by Fuentes and Mojica (1999) that socioeconomic class and gender differences tended to cause no significant differences in language attitudes, this study eschews the option of analyzing those as well as course background. Instead, this study was inspired by a suggestion from Fuentes and Mojica to investigate “the attitude of Filipino non-Tagalog speakers” (p. 54), and focuses on finding out whether language attitudes differ substantially with regard to location in relation to the metropolitan/urban center or capital. While cultural backgrounds may be considered a factor influencing whatever differences may be found in language attitudes, the study does not investigate or categorize the respondents’ cultural roots and in fact only ascertains basic demographical information as seen below.

2.2 Methodology

Questionnaire was drawn up to gauge respondents’ language attitudes. The use of this direct method parallels Ting’s (2003), following the same mentalist reasoning (from studies by Agheysi and Fishman and Cooper and Fishman) that “attitude is viewed as a state of readiness, affecting a person’s response” (cited in Ting 2003, p. 199). The final language attitude questionnaire used was designed to have two major parts for recording and tabulation. The first was a demographic information portion that called for respondents to list relevant information about themselves.

- age and gender,
- educational background (elementary and secondary

schools attended and inclusive years),

- target college and course (up to three choices each; all were included in the tabulation),
- target occupation (up to three choices each; all were included in the tabulation), and
- some language information (mother tongue, other languages written/read/spoken, when and how they learned English — no distinction was made between learning and acquisition).

The second was a 36-item language attitude questionnaire using the Likert scale format and incorporating modified questions from Buschenhofen (1998), Hohenthal (1998) and Ting (2003), which were more readily available than the 1974 Pascasio study.

The respondent populations were not selected in any particular manner or according to criteria aside from availability and location (at or closer to the Metro Manila urban center, as represented by the Metro Manila respondents and closer to the periphery as represented by the Romblon respondents). Some 72 or so students in all were given these questionnaires — some 36 from Ateneo de Manila University and 36 from Romblon State College — and 35 questionnaires from each population were tabulated (some had left almost 1/3 of the Likert scale items blank and were thus not recorded). Each sample was composed of males and females with ages ranging from 17-23 collectively, with notable values arranged in the table below.

Table 1. Age and gender groups of Romblon and Manila respondents

Item	RSC	ADMU
Age: Highest	23	21
Age: Lowest	19	17
Age: Average	20	19
Gender: M	6	18
Gender: F	28	17

The items from the Likert scale – half of the questionnaire – were attitude statements that were loosely categorized into groups of similar focus, in order to directly arrange the answers that correlated with the specific research questions:

- general language attitudes (originally 20 items but reduced to 18 for tabulation because two of the items were duplicates from other categories),
- attitudes toward English and Filipino as status markers (5),
- attitudes toward English and Filipino for mass media and entertainment (5),
- attitudes toward English and Filipino as media of instruction (5), and
- attitudes toward cultural impact/importance of English and Filipino (5).

No sophisticated statistical treatment was used beyond tabulating the responses (Strongly Agree was assigned 5 points, Agree 4, Neutral 3, Disagree 2, and Strongly Disagree 1) to check for the totals

and the means per item.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Language background

Respondents from both groups acknowledged that school and home were their source/venue of English learning. Most of the respondents learned the language fairly early, i.e., before the age of 10, with one Romblon respondent being the exception at age 12. Filipino and English were generally the most commonly cited mother tongues, but Romblon respondents mentioned several other languages as their mother tongue (which, like English when listed, were usually in conjunction with Filipino), as listed below. It is notable that Odiongan, which was also listed as a mother tongue by three of the Romblon respondents, was informally described as a declining or dying language by some of the respondents. The language, which is named after the municipality, is otherwise known as Bantoanon or Asi, which may currently be the more consistently used forms of the Odiongan core language.

Table 2. Language backgrounds of Romblon and Manila respondents

Language background	RSC	ADMU
	English, 10 Filipino, 25	English, 7 Filipino, 27
Mother tongue	Odiongan (3) Asi (3) Waray (1) Rinconada (1) Romblonanon (2) Bicolnon (1)	French (1) Kapampangan (1) Bisaya (1) Chinese (1)
Learned English at age	Earliest — 3 Latest — 12	Earliest — 1 Latest — 8
Learned other language/s [not English/mother tongue]?	Nippongo (2; 1 “limited”) Mandarin (1)	Spanish (5) Chinese/Mandarin/Fookien (6) Japanese (1) Portuguese (1) German (1) French (1)

The Manila respondents' fairly consistent mentions of European languages may be due to language electives that are part of the curricula they attended, while the presence of Chinese (as a mother tongue and/or additional language) may have to do with family backgrounds — or, just as likely

if not more, also due to elementary/secondary school curricula (under educational background, more than two respondents listed Xavier School and one listed Lanao Chung Hua School), which may also have provided language subjects for some).

Table 3. Target college contexts of Romblon and Manila respondents

Target colleges	RSC	ADMU
DLSU/CSB	2	13 DLSU, 2 CSB
ADMU/de Naga	3	26 (first choice); Ateneo Law School Rockwell, 1
UST	3	4
PLM	1	--
RSC	30 (first choice)	--
UP/UPLB/Manila/PUP	11	19
Other	Sta. Monica College of Nursing (1) St. Augustine (1)	UA&P (4) UC Berkeley, Stanford (1)

A respondent's language background is a considerably significant factor influencing language attitudes. Pascasio (2002) certainly points to ethnic identity as a factor related to language use (p. 141) and mentions the circular relationship between language use and positive attitude influencing language proficiency (p. 139), which, in turn, positively influences attitudes toward the language. That most speakers consider Filipino and English to be their mother tongues points to a likelihood of a relatively positive view toward either or both, especially in light of modern times' "relaxed relationship among languages in the Philippines" (Villacorta, 2000, p. 263).

3.2 Target contexts (courses)

The "Colleges" part of the demographic portion's Target Contexts segment has been retained in the questionnaire for the current study, considering that this might reflect respondents' ideal college and/or course contexts, especially in light of the possibility of shifting or transferring. As such, the "target contexts" portion of the questionnaire was labeled "future plans/possibilities." In any event, the respondents typically listed either their current school or one they would be willing to shift to under "First Choice." Some listed courses without specific schools. The colleges and courses listed in the tables below, as well as the target work contexts in the next segment, include multiple choices (first, second, third) from each respondent.

Table 4. Target course contexts of Romblon and Manila respondents

Target courses	RSC	ADMU
Business administration/ management	15	15
Accountancy	4	2
Information Technology	1	1
Engineering	1	8
Law	1	4
Mass communication	2	12
Nursing	2	1
Entrepreneurship	--	2
Chemistry	--	1
Fine Arts	--	2
Architecture	--	1
		Management economics (1)
		Management information systems (3)
		European languages (1) Theater (1)
Other		Multimedia arts (1)
		Economics (1)

For this population, business administration/management is the clear leader, with Accountancy being the Romblon respondents' next most popular choice and Mass communication-based courses being the next most popular for the Manila respondents.

The target contexts' frequency of use of English and Filipino (as well as other languages like German or Odiongan), particularly on a day-to-day basis such as is called for by school or work, may have an impact on their language attitudes. It is notable that the Romblon respondents appeared to choose schools that are based closer to (or in) the urban center without necessarily neglecting relatively peripherally-based branches of known institutions (Ateneo de Naga and so on), while almost none of the Manila respondents opted for any locale outside of the greater metropolitan area or abroad.

3.3 Target contexts (work/occupation)

While some left this part blank, most of the Romblon respondents had relatively similar answers. Some 34 respondents indicated interest in managerial positions — some abroad, some at multinational corporations (one specified Unilever) and one at the Department of Science and Technology. Four other respondents signified interest in unspecified government work, while one respondent expressed interest in a post in either the Philippine Air Force or Philippine Navy, and another wanted to become a policeman. Various others indicated interest in occupations such as teaching, secretarial work, banking, accounting, sales and contact center work. Three specified that they would like to become entrepreneurs, while only one mentioned wanting to be a housewife.

Table 5. Target occupation contexts of Romblon and Manila respondents

Target occupations	RSC	ADMU
Managerial	34 (abroad, 1; specified multinational, 2; specified DOST, 1)	3
Government work	“government employee”, 2; Philippine Navy/Air Force, 1; policeman, 1	--
Education	2	2
Secretarial	2	--
Banking	1	1
Accounting	2	--
Sales	2	--
Contact Center work	2	--
Law	--	4
Media	--	3
Film	--	5 (“independent film,” 1)
Arts	--	6 (animation, graphics design, layout, art direction, advertising, painting)
Information Technology		5
Entrepreneurship	3	1
		Unspecified (Ayala Land, Unilever, PLDT), 1
		“Businessman/woman”, 3
		Events management, 1
		Farming, 1
		Politics, 1
Other	Housewife, 1	Biology/Medicine, 1
		Clerical work, 1
		Novelist, 1
		Basketball player, 1
		UN ambassador/translator, 1
		Engineer, 1

The respondents' language backgrounds may influence their choice of target professions (which may, in turn, leads to further reinforcement or change in their language attitudes). The target professions' extent and quality of language use are also clear factors affecting this choice. It is of note that while both sets of respondents cited professions where both languages were used (usually with English as the preferred language) in an interpersonal context, the Manila respondents cited professions that could require more creative, more specialized use of English.

3.4 Language attitudes

General language attitudes

The first set of questions covered general language attitudes toward English and Filipino. These questions incorporated items such as situational preference, emotional reactions toward situations using English and/or Filipino, viewing English and/or Filipino as an advantage in general, and so on.

As indicated in Table 6, both sets of respondents seemed to give similar ratings to the same statements. Both were neutral on using English in most situations, saw both languages as an advantage, and agreed that English was an advantage to the country as a whole. A desire to speak both languages well (and English fluently and accurately) was common to both sets of respondents, as was a belief that Philippines-based foreigners should learn Filipino.

Even notable differences for this segment of the questionnaire are slight. The

rather subjective item "the English language sounds very nice" was rated higher by the Romblon respondents (most at 48.6% said Strongly Agree) than the Manila respondents (most at 54.3% said Agree). The Romblon respondents were generally divided (most at 34.3% were Neutral) toward the statement "I feel uncomfortable when hearing one Filipino speaking to another in English (standard deviation was among the higher rates at 1.1), although disagreement (45.7% total) remained higher than agreement (20.01% total). The Manila respondents were more clearly in disagreement (40% Disagree) with the item, even compared to a combined 28.5% agreement rating. The overall similarity in perception is clear for most of the items; however, it is also notable that the Romblon respondents' answer concentration was higher in many cases (such as items 3-5, where the majority of the responses were in one of the five columns as opposed to the Manila responses which were more scattered across the five with one slightly higher than the rest).

Both groups were fairly ambivalent toward using English in most situations (although many agreed with a total of 37.1% SA/A for Manila and 28.5% Romblon) or the mother tongue (both nevertheless recorded overall high agreement levels) in most situations. This overall attitude is consistent with their overall high desire for them and other Filipinos to speak both English and Filipino well. It is possible that the specifications "all/most situations" and "whenever possible" may have led most respondents to avoid making a definite answer right away to allow for deviation from the proposed absolute.

Table 6. General language attitudes of Romblon and Manila respondents

Item	Romblon					Manila				
	% S	% A	% N	% D	% S	% S	% A	% N	% D	% S
1. I prefer using English in most situations, whenever possible.	11.4	17.1	68.6	2.86	0	17.1	20	45.7	17.1	0
2. Speaking both Filipino and English is an advantage.	82.9	11.4	0	0	0	82.9	14.3	2.86	0	0
3. English is important to the Philippines as a whole.	34.3	45.7	17.1	0	2.86	37.1	48.6	8.57	2.86	2.86
4. Speaking English is an advantage.	82.9	14.3	2.86	0	0	65.7	28.6	5.71	0	0
5. I would like to speak both English and Filipino well.	74.3	20	5.71	0	0	65.7	28.6	2.86	0	0
6. Filipinos should be able to speak both English and Filipino.	74.3	11.4	11.4	0	2.86	65.7	22.9	8.57	2.86	0
7. I prefer using my mother tongue in all situations, whenever possible.	20	25.7	51.4	2.86	0	34.3	22.9	37.1	5.71	0
8. I think it's important to maintain English to help the Philippines develop.	40	37.1	20	0	2.86	51.4	34.3	8.57	2.86	2.86
9. Foreigners working or living in the Philippines should learn Filipino.	60	20	20	0	0	57.1	37.1	5.71	0	0
10. I like hearing Filipino being spoken by other people.	34.3	34.3	28.6	2.86	0	37.1	37.1	20	5.71	0
11. I feel uncomfortable when hearing one Filipino speaking to another in English.	5.71	14.3	34.3	25.7	20	11.4	17.1	17.1	40	14.3
12. Filipino is less useful to know than English.	2.86	17.1	20	37.1	20	2.86	22.9	25.7	34.3	11.4
13. The English language sounds very nice.	48.6	42.9	8.57	0	0	25.7	54.3	20	0	0
14. I wish that I could speak fluent and accurate English.	71.4	17.1	8.57	0	0	65.7	25.7	5.71	0	2.86
15. I feel uneasy and lack confidence when speaking English.	5.71	14.3	42.9	25.7	11.4	22.9	20	22.9	17.1	14.3
16. Filipino, as a language, is superior to English.	28.6	22.9	42.9	2.86	2.86	22.9	8.57	48.6	11.4	5.71
17. I do not feel awkward when using English.	25.7	22.9	22.9	14.3	11.4	34.3	42.9	11.4	8.57	2.86
18. I would feel embarrassed if I couldn't speak any English.	82.9	11.4	0	0	0	82.9	14.3	2.86	0	0

Language and social status

The second set of questions looked at status height or elevation associated with the use of English and Filipino. While some sets of responses were grouped generally similarly across both populations, the

differences between respondent populations were more pronounced with this group of statements.

The Romblon respondents were mostly Neutral (37.1) toward associating the use of English with a high social status, while the Manila respondents tended to

agree with it more (45.7%). A similar outcome — for a similar question — was evident for a statement that associated English with praise from family, relatives and friends, with Romblon respondents mostly neutral at 42.9% while Manila residents mostly Agreed at 37.1%.

Both groups agreed that English is the mark of an educated person (Romblon respondents 42.9% Agree, Manila respondents 34.3% Agree), and both strongly agreed that English offers advantages in seeking good job opportunities (Romblon respondents 65.7% Strongly Agree, Manila respondents 48.6% Strongly Agree). Notably, however, despite these similarities, the Romblon respondents were in stronger agreement (SA/A totaling 57.1%) than the Manila respondents (SA/A totaling 25.7%, highest average being Neutral 37.1%) that Filipino had a higher status than English in the Philippines.

Positive attitudes toward English and its position as a status indicator were reflected overall, suggesting that the

respondents have grown to see English as a prestigious language with a status that has applications in the real world, whether perceptual (“the mark of an educated person”) or practical (“advantages in seeking good job opportunities”).

However, this is not to say that Filipino is automatically at a serious disadvantage for all respondents: while the majority of Manila respondents were neutral at 37.1% and most others in general disagreement at 37.2% SD/D, the majority of respondents from Romblon saw Filipino as having a higher status than English in the Philippines (57.1% SA/A). Furthermore, the Romblon respondents generally did not strongly associate English with praise and approval from family and friends (most were Neutral at 42.9%) at 28.56% SA/A and 28.61% SD/D, especially compared to the Manila residents who agreed at a combined rate of 48.5% and only disagreed at a combined rate of 20.01% (also lower than the Neutral 28.6%).

Table 7. Language attitudes of Romblon and Manila respondents toward English/Filipino as status markers

Item	Romblon					Manila				
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	S	% A	% N	% D	S	S	% A	% N	% D	S
1. If I use English, I seem to have a high social status.	2.86	31.4	37.1	17.1	11.4	11.4	45.7	25.7	8.57	8.57
2. English is the mark of an educated person.	11.4	42.9	25.7	8.57	8.57	22.9	34.3	28.6	5.71	8.57
3. If I use English, I will be praised and approved of by my family, relatives and friends.	2.86	25.7	42.9	22.9	5.71	11.4	37.1	28.6	14.3	5.71
4. The status of Filipino is higher than that of English in The Philippines.	25.7	31.4	25.7	8.57	0	11.4	14.3	37.1	22.9	14.3
5. English offers advantages in seeking good job opportunities.	65.7	20	8.57	0	2.86	48.6	45.7	2.86	2.86	0

Table 8. Language attitudes of Romblon and Manila respondents toward English/Filipino in mass media/entertainment

Item	Romblon					Manila				
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	S	A	N	D	S	S	A	N	D	S
1. I enjoy seeing movies in English.	42.9	37.1	20	0	0	34.3	57.1	8.57	0	0
2. There should be more locally-produced TV and radio programs available in English.	28.6	48.6	20	0	0	22.9	34.3	34.3	5.71	2.86
3. English should always be used on public signs, notices and ads.	11.4	20	48.6	17.1	2.86	14.3	40	25.7	17.1	2.86
4. To read English magazines is a kind of enjoyment.	37.1	45.7	11.4	2.86	2.86	40	48.6	11.4	0	0
5. Without the knowledge of Filipino, I would miss out on many rewarding and enjoyable parts of culture, such as folk music and indigenous literature.	37.1	37.1	20	0	0	62.9	31.4	2.86	2.86	0

Language and mass media/entertainment

The third set of questions looked at how the respondents viewed the use of English and Filipino in the mass media and entertainment circles. Print media, film and television, music and literature — as well as public notices and advertisements — were all included.

As Table 8 indicates, both populations can be said to enjoy movies in English (Romblon respondents rated higher overall, with 42.9% Strongly Agree and 37.1% Agree to Manila's 34.3% Strongly Agree and 57.1% Agree) and magazines in English (both agreeing — Romblon respondents at 45.7% and Manila respondents at 48.6%). Both populations also generally agreed that Filipino provides rewarding cultural and literary opportunities (Romblon respondents evenly split across SA/A at 37.1% each, and Manila respondents more concentrated in SA with 62.9%). Furthermore, both populations were mostly Neutral with regard to a possible preference for English on public notices and advertisements.

The spread of mass media and their use of English in their content, carriage and coverage may have to do with the overall positive responses toward English in film, television and print. This, however, has not affected the appreciation of Filipino as an entertainment and information or communications medium, likely because Filipino has of late also enjoyed considerable prominence and use as a lingua franca in both real life and media representations.

Language and instruction

The fourth set of questions looked at possible attitudes toward English and/or Filipino as media of instruction. Included in this were statements covering preferences for English or another language as medium of instruction in school, Filipino as medium for social science and mathematics textbooks, and interest in a high standard of English in schools as well as a motivation to study English as a non-required subject.

Overall similarities across both populations continue to be seen, albeit with

Table 9. Language attitudes of Romblon and Manila respondents toward English/Filipino as MOI

Item	Romblon					Manila				
	%				%	%				%
	S	% A	% N	% D	S	S	% A	% N	% D	S
1. I prefer English as the medium of instruction in school.	22.9	40	31.4	5.71	0	31.4	25.7	34.3	8.57	0
2. My social science and mathematics textbooks should be written in, or translated into, Filipino.	5.71	5.71	42.9	28.6	17.1	5.71	25.7	28.6	25.7	14.3
3. English should not be a medium of instruction in the schools in the Philippines.	11.4	17.1	25.7	31.4	14.3	5.71	14.3	28.6	37.1	14.3
4. It is important to keep a high standard of English in schools.	65.7	25.7	8.57	0	0	54.3	37.1	8.57	0	0
5. I would take English even if it were not a required subject at school.	22.9	40	28.6	5.71	2.86	20	45.7	28.6	2.86	2.86

some notable differences. A preference for English as the medium of instruction was clear in both populations' responses (Romblon 40% Agree, Manila 31.4% Strongly Agree), as was a desire for the maintenance of a high standard of English in schools (Romblon 65.7% Strongly Agree, Manila 54.3% Strongly Agree). Both populations were ambivalent about Filipino being used as the medium for social science and mathematics textbooks (Neutral at 42.9% for Romblon and 28.6% for Manila), and both were interested in taking English even if it were not a required subject (Agree at 40% for Romblon and 45.7% Manila). Both were also in disagreement toward not having English as the MOI (Disagree at 31.4% for Romblon and 37.1% for Manila). Both were more clearly in favor of having English as the MOI (62.9% SA/A for Romblon and 57.1% SA/A for Manila, although Manila's highest single percentage was Neutral at 34.3%).

English is clearly seen as a useful and beneficial medium of instruction, although it does not necessarily enjoy this treatment exclusively (there was a high level of neutrality toward it as a preferred medium of

instruction at 31.4% for Romblon and 34.3% for Manila). However, despite a less than absolute preference for it, English is seen as something worth doing and worth doing well, considering the favor ascribed to taking English, even as an optional subject, and to maintaining a high standard of English in schools. English's academic presence and prestige certainly seems assured, at least as far as these respondents are concerned.

Language and culture

The fifth and last set of questions covered impressions of English and Filipino as elements of culture. Statements in this set covered personal identification with either Anglo-American or Filipino cultures, values and languages, allowing the respondent to base his or her response on a personal definition of what these values and ideas were. As Table 10 suggests, there were clear parallels in response ratings from both populations; both strongly agreed that Filipino as a language is closely tied to culture, heritage and identity, and strongly disagreed that using English means that one is not

nationalistic. The last item is of interest to a reader aware of nationalism's impact on language planning: it has been a factor in various shifts in national language policy, being part of the reasons why the Pilipino/Cebuano/other language conflicts of the 1960s were shelved in the name of unity and being one of the influential forces resulting in the Bilingual Education Policy of 1974. Nationalism itself has long been used in arguments in favor of minimizing or eliminating the focus on English or trying to downplay English's prestige and influence in favor of the national language. It is thus

culture (leaning toward disagreement at 45.7% Neutral vs. 42.9% SD/D) and with modern, western values, as well as toward English being a significant part of Philippine history and identity. This may have to do with their comparative personal distance from the language as compared to the Manila respondents. The Manila respondents, on the other hand, were more forthrightly opinionated: they were in disagreement with self-identification with British/Anglo-American culture (31.4% Disagree, 20% Strongly Disagree) but in agreement with self-identification with modern, western values

Table 10. Language attitudes of Romblon and Manila respondents toward English/Filipino in culture

Item	Romblon				Manila					
	% S	% A	% N	% D	% S	% S	% A	% N	% D	
1. The Filipino language is such a big part of our culture, heritage and identity.	77.1	20	0	0	0	62.9	28.6	5.71	2.86	0
2. If I use English, it means that I am not nationalistic.	2.86	8.57	11.4	31.4	45.7	2.86	5.71	5.71	37.1	48.6
3. I identify myself with the British and Anglo- American culture.	5.71	5.71	45.7	28.6	14.3	11.4	11.4	25.7	31.4	20
4. I identify myself with modern, western values, and thus I also find the knowledge of English important.	11.4	25.7	45.7	14.3	2.86	17.1	42.9	20	17.1	2.86
5. English makes up a significant part of our Philippine history and identity.	20	28.6	48.6	0	2.86	25.7	34.3	28.6	5.71	5.71

notable here that the use of English is not seen by either population to mean a lack of nationalism.

(42.9% Agree) and English being significant in Philippine history and identity (34.3% Agree).

There were also slight but noticeable divergences. Romblon respondents were consistently neutral toward identifying themselves with the British/Anglo-American

4. Conclusion and implications

The ratings from both sets of responses were generally similar. Both populations — one closer to the country's first and main urban center (mostly oriented toward using Filipino and English, with some use of foreign languages), and one closer to a provincial base (who generally used more Filipino and other local languages) — had positive attitudes toward English in general, as a language that was important to individual and national development. English was seen as a language that represented an educated nature and advantages in seeking job opportunities, but was not necessarily superior to Filipino or a threat to nationalism. Filipino was also seen positively by both populations, as a language integral to culture and literature and a language that Filipinos and foreigners alike should speak. Both populations were ambivalent toward absolutely choosing one language or the other for use.

The generalization is that the respondents from both urban and less urban locales do indeed exhibit mostly similar language attitudes toward English and Filipino. As with Fuentes and Mojica's (1999) study, the overall results pointed toward positive movement of the country's bilingual tendency, with language users having positive attitudes toward their mother tongues and the second language as well as strong desires to use both with adequate fluency. Various factors may be cited for this healthy collective attitude: the maintenance of Filipino as a lingua franca, an informed and practically moderated sentiment of nationalism, and consistent with Fuentes and Mojica's (1999) findings which themselves continue a trend from Feenstra and Castillo's 1970 study, a clear understanding of English's instrumental potential and role as well as those of Filipino.

What implications does this continued

strong bilingual tendency have for language planning? In the words of Gonzalez (1996), "Life precedes law, prescription or policy. In fact, language policy must be based on life" (p. 215). It remains true that there is a need to support both English and Filipino, and that neither language is going away any time soon. English is set to stay; as Wardhaugh has suggested, "it is unlikely that external languages which open up access to the world outside will disappear" (cited in Ting, 2003). Fishman (1996) adds that "global arrangements will increasingly make use of English while local life between locals will increasingly be attached to national languages and cultures" (cited in Villacorta, 2000, p. 265). Hence, continued institutional support for and promotion of both in various circles can only be a good thing. This will require, in no uncertain terms, "an improvement of the entire educational system" (Villacorta, 2000, p. 264).

There is considerable headway to be made for both languages. The results suggest that learners would be open to measures that try to improve and maintain the quality of English use, and to its continued extensive use in mass media. Gonzalez (1996) also has much to say about what has yet to be done for Filipino: "The Filipino language is still in the process of standardization (not a major difficulty at present for its uses in the classroom) but also in the process of modernization...and the process of intellectualization (begun in the domain of Literature but still relatively developing in the domain of Science and Technology)" (p. 213).

As to language planning covering MOI, bilingual and first-language approaches such as the Lubuagan project (Dumatog & Dekker, 2003) seem to be heading in the right direction with its initial focus and later movement toward using both languages. Indeed, macro-level policies such as the bills in Congress currently under consideration

would do well to avoid outright favoring one of the two languages, and instead focus on the promotion, development and use of both — streamlining the subject matter and content into proportionate amounts for the students' developmental pace and following a language path similar to the Lubuagan project's.

Gonzalez's 1998 paper on the state of Philippine language planning seems to continue to ring true ten years on, especially the suggestion "to make the students functionally literate in Filipino first, then slowly leading them to carry on higher order cognitive activities in Filipino while, at the same time, training them in oral skills in English and eventually reading skills for higher cognitive order activity in English" (p. 521). Micro- level policies and programs, as seen in the schools themselves, would ideally avoid the traditional, penalizing and sometimes traumatizing institutional English campaigns in favor of providing reading material and writing activities that help establish the language in the students' comfort zone and helping them see what they can be capable of with its use. Overall, Kirkpatrick's (2007) observations of language planning implications — as drafted by the 2003 HK Curriculum Development Council — seem to provide good general objectives here as well: to give second-language learners "opportunities for extending their knowledge and experience of the cultures of other people as well as opportunities for personal and intellectual development," and "to enable every learner to prepare for the changing socio-economic demands resulting from advances in information technology" (p. 388).

This will hopefully help stem a possible tide of what Sibayan (2000) calls "semilinguals" who use languages for various purposes but have limited command of the languages themselves and content written in the languages. Indeed, Gonzalez's (1996) point is reflected in the ideal step taken

today that "there must be some transitional arrangement using a language [students] do know before a new medium of instruction (a second or a third language) can be used. Otherwise, one will have a bi-channel mode of instruction which results in wastage and ineffectiveness" (p. 216).

However, as he also cautions, "in the Philippines, there is unfortunately a tendency to make fine plans and projects for implementation, perhaps a subconscious belief that once proper plans are formulated, implementation eventually follows. The reality is different" (Gonzalez, 1996). While we may continue to establish close similarities between language attitudes of urban and less-urban respondents and find empirical grounds to take action that we may then spend much time designing to perfection, the implementation and follow-up still remains a constantly underestimated part of the work that we must focus on seeing through.

Finally, as for future research, while the direct approach of using the Likert-scale questionnaire format has yielded interesting results on its own, future studies would do well to, where circumstances permit, add and incorporate more varied subjective-response collection formats such as a commitment scale, motivational-intensity scale, and semantic differential. Care will have to be taken, however, to ensure that the format keeps from overwhelming and/or otherwise intimidating the respondents. On the other hand, if a Likert-type scale format continues to be used, it may be instructive to remove the "Neutral"/"Undecided" option so as to avoid "safe" answers from respondents.

A more extensive study would do well to incorporate more of the languages of the region said to be farther from the urban center, instead of merely stipulating Filipino as the English counterpart for both situations — although questions would have to be carefully constructed for the sake of

analysis, and closer screening of respondents will be necessary due to the need for specific L1's spoken. Future studies can also try and track language attitudes through time instead of just across the urban spectrum — from respondents as they move from secondary school age to college and possibly on to work, to try and gauge how

much their individual language backgrounds and contexts ultimately affect their concepts of language. Expansions of the scope and limitations set by and/or upon this study can also be looked into, as well as the control of other variables (gender, age, migratory pattern), in addition to the urban/provincial location.

References

- Bartlett, L. (2003). Social studies of literacy and comparative education: Intersections. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5, 62-76.
- Bautista, M. L. S., Llamzon, T., & Sibayan, B. (2000). *Parangal nang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his 60th birthday*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Dayag, D. T., & Quakenbush, J. S. (2005). Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond: A Festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- De Beaugrande, R. (1999). Theory versus practice in language planning and in the discourse of language planning. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 107-121.
- Dumatog, R. and Dekker, D. (2003). First language education in Lubuagan, Northern Philippines. Retrieved October 16, 2008 from <http://www.sil.org/asia/ldc/parallel_papers/dumatog_and_dekker.pdf>
- Ethnologue report for Philippines. (n.d.). Retrieved Oct. 16, 2008.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). Setting attainable and appropriate English language targets in multilingual settings: A case for Hong Kong. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 376-391.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. (English Language Teaching series). London: Prentice-Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Llanto, J. (2008, June 9). Legislators push English as medium of instruction. *Newsbreak*. Retrieved from <http://newsbreak.com.ph/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=4898&Itemid=88889066>.
- Mann, C. C. (2000). Language attitudes, instrumentality and identity: Survey findings from urban Southern Nigeria. In M. L. S. Bautista, T. Llamzon and B. P. Sibayan (Eds.), *Parangal nang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his 60th birthday* (pp. 288-299). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Medium of instruction: English, Filipino or both? (2008, June 11). *RP Congress House of Representatives Committee News*. Retrieved October 16, 2008 from <http://www.congress.gov.ph/committees/comnews/commnews_det.php?newsid=947>.
- Pascasio, E. (2002). The Filipino bilingual from a sociolinguistic perspective. A paper presented at the International Conference on Applied Linguistics and Language Education: Theory and Practice, Manila, December 9-11, 2002.
- Republic of the Philippines. (1987). *Constitution of the Philippines*.
- Rubrico, J. The metamorphosis of Filipino as national language. *Languagelinks.org*. Retrieved October 17 2008 from <http://www.languagelinks.org/onlinepapers/fil_met.html>.
- 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. Llamzon and B.P. Sibayan (Eds.), *Parangal nang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his 60th birthday* (pp. 247-261). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Ting, S-H. (2003). Impact of language planning on language attitudes: A case study in Sarawak. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 24(3), 195-210.
- Villacorta, W. V. (2000). Filipino language and nationalism in the 21st century. In M. L. S. Bautista, T. Llamzon and B. P. Sibayan (Eds.), *Parangal nang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his 60th birthday* (pp. 262-266). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Vizconde, C. (2006). Attitudes of student teachers towards the use of English as language of instruction for science and mathematics in the Philippines. *The Linguistics Journal*, 1(3), 7-33.
- Young, C. (2002). First language first: Literacy education for the future in a multilingual Philippine society. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(4), 221-232.