2011

The English experience: An examination of Philippine English use among Filipino immigrants in the United States

Nicholas Macias-Williams

THE ENGLISH EXPERIENCE: AN EXAMINATION OF PHILIPPINE ENGLISH USE AMONG FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition:

Applied Linguistics and

Teaching English as a Second Language

---

by

Nicholas Macias-Williams

September 2011

THE ENGLISH EXPERIENCE: AN EXAMINATION OF PHILIPPINE ENGLISH USE AMONG FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Nicholas Macias-Williams

September 2011

Approved by:

[redacted]

Sunny Hyon, Chair, English

6-9-11

Date

[redacted]

Parastou Feiz

[redacted]

Sunny Hyon, Graduate Coordinator

ABSTRACT

The English language is a functional part of many different societies around the world. In these former British and American colonies English has evolved to become a variety unique to the non-native English speaking societies that have re-forged and localized this language. As a result, different world Englishes have emerged as autonomous languages that have been integrated into the cultures of those former British and American colonies. The Philippines is one former colony that has had a longstanding relationship with English. This language is embedded deeply in Filipino culture, but it remains to be discovered if English has provided Filipinos with the benefits of speaking it. This thesis examines the attitudes of a group of adult Filipino immigrants to the U.S. towards the English language vis-à-vis their Filipino languages, and their experiences using English in the Philippines and the U.S. This examination was conducted to begin to understand how a variety of world English, like Philippine English, functions in a native English speaking society, like the U.S. The project begins with a review of literature concerning matters of global language spread, Philippine English, and world English research. It

continues with a methodology section that provides the participants' background information and details their interview process. The interviews focused on their language acquisition experiences and language practice habits. The thesis concludes with a discussion about the findings, which suggest that the participants generally have positive attitudes about the role English plays in their lives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Sunny Hyon and Professor Parastou Feiz for their guidance and help throughout this thesis project. I would also like to thank my family for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

ENGLISH, THE PHILIPPINES, AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP

Introduction

The Philippines is a linguistically diverse country with about 170 different languages all with their own regional dialects that total to over three hundred (Gonzalez, 1998). English, along with Filipino (the Tagalog-based national language), are the co-official languages of the Philippines. For over a century English language use has been practiced and maintained alongside Filipino. More than half of the ninety-two million Filipinos living in the Philippines speak English, or the localized variety of Philippine English (Gonzalez, 1998). The Philippine print media is still dominated by English as well (Dayag, 2004). The Philippine education system still uses English to teach math and science, and students are taught to read and write in English. In some contexts, English use is promoted over Filipino use on both local and national levels. This method of language policy and practice concerns some sociolinguists who argue that non-native English speakers that are required to use English

in public domains will remain subjugated by native English speakers due to their command of the language.

The historical spread of English to various parts of the world has been well documented as "volumes have been written on the role of imperial power, missionary zeal, and concerted efforts at 'civilizing the savages' in the diffusion of the language" (Kachru & Smith, 2009, p. 2). Some researchers have developed theories of linguistic imperialism and language death that have accompanied this history of language spread (Crystal, 1997, Phillipson, 1992). These theories illustrate the power dynamic between the native English speaking population and those who speak it as a second or functional language. At their core is the idea that the English language has a definitive, dominant center where English is the native language (ENL), and that all other non-native English speaking countries that are on the periphery rely on the center to model social and cultural norms (Galtung, 1988). This center functions as the source from which those norms are embedded in the language and distributed to those countries that constitute the periphery, like the Philippines (Phillipson, 1992). The center also serves as

the standard by which non-native speakers of English are measured.

Those who subscribe to linguistic imperialism theory claim that non-native English speakers are restricted to their given space in Galtung's (1988) concentric circles model, but recent research increasingly points to the need for a re-imagining of that model and our ideas of what constitutes a native speaker of English. A Kachruvian model consisting of three concentric circles, rather than just the two found in Galtung's (1988) model, is currently being used to represent a change in the language/power dynamics that some sociolinguists suggest is occurring (Kachru, 1985, cited in Yano, 2001). In this model the inner circle represents English as-a-native language (ENL) speakers; the outer circle represents "functionally native" English as-a-second language (ESL) speakers (Yano, 2001, p. 123); and the expanding circle represents "functionally semi-native" English as-a-foreign language (EFL) speakers (Yano, 2001, p. 123).

ESL speakers may use English in two ways:

1. English may be the language they use in public domains of business or education.

2. Their English language use could extend beyond the public domain into their personal lives and become the language they choose to use to communicate with family and friends.

EFL speakers tend to use English strictly as a lingua franca among people from different speech communities (Yano, 2001).

In contrast to Galtung's (1988) model, the Kachruvian model suggests that functionally native ESL speakers can move from outer core positions into the inner core based on the ways in which they use English (Kachru, 1985, cited in Yano, 2001). Someone who speaks English as a second language uses English not only in public domains, but also in private domains as well. This language serves more than just a functional purpose for them. For example, they may use it to communicate and express their feelings with interlocutors whom they have personal relationships with.

Some sociolinguists reason that the language and power dynamics have shifted because ESL speakers in peripheral countries have firmly established their own varieties of English so that they no longer seek approval from "correct models" of English in Britain and North America (Buttigieg, 1999, Yano, 2001). They are functional

speakers that have re-appropriated English by "re-forging it, localizing it, and making it different" (Saraceni, 2009). That is, they have made "systemic and structural changes" to English, which is the result of a process of "acculturation and nativization" of an outside language (Kachru & Smith, 2009, p. 3,). The new varieties of English that have emerged as a result of nativization are being described as world Englishes. The appropriation of a variety of world Englishes by members of periphery communities suggests that English has been de-imperialized as it has been re-forged (Saraceni, 2009). Of greater significance is the idea that by nativizing English in such a way, members of periphery communities might be creating more opportunities for themselves to achieve social mobility in a Westernized world while also retaining the specific cultural traits that distinguish their community. There is no denying that, to a certain degree, English has become an international language because of its military and economic strength. This began with the expansion of the British Empire and was maintained throughout the Industrial Revolution. By the end of the nineteenth century, the United States economy was "the most productive and fastest growing in the world"

(Crystal, 1997, p. 8). This economic success occurred in part because there were British and U.S. colonies around the world, and where business went the language of business followed.

Despite the longstanding relationship that people from these former colonies have with English, the functions of this language in various contexts are changing for them as they nativize English. The remainder of this chapter reviews previous scholarship on the global spread of English, world Englishes, and the current role of English in the Philippines followed by a presentation of the purpose for this research project.

Literature Review

The Colonizer's Language: English and Linguistic Imperialism

Over the last century, American-English speaking culture has succeeded at dominating the global public sphere almost exclusively. Our business, economic, political, and social trends have penetrated communities in countries around the world. They have also constituted the standard after which to model financial success and economic opportunity. People from other non-English

speaking nations have had to learn English if they desired to participate in the global economy or in global politics. Sociolinguists who subscribe to linguistic imperialism theories see the global spread of English as a move by English speaking nations to create a monolinguistic class where native English speakers enjoy a secured place at the top of a linguistic hierarchy because of their mastery of the English language. This English speaking monolinguistic class is able to attain a higher social status because of the high vitality of English.

A given language is considered to have high vitality if it is widely spoken (Meyerhoff, 2006). Right now there is no language that is more widely used than English. It has been spoken around the world since the inception of the colonial period where it achieved global recognition on the strength of British and U.S. conquests. There have been many different languages that also enjoyed high regional status and/or global recognition, but why did they lose their prestige? How did these languages achieve such recognition in the first place? Did they have immense vocabularies? Were they agents of classical literature and rhetoric? David Crystal (1997) points to the single most

important trait of a global language; "the political power of its people - especially military power" (p. 5)

If you take a look back at the other languages that were globally recognized before English you might notice that Crystal's answer may identify a legitimate trend in linguistic power. Latin, Arabic, Spanish, Portuguese, French, and English spread around the globe on the strength of their nations' military might. As Crystal states, when the people who speak a given language succeed on the international stage, so does their language. Crystal's explanation of how a language achieves international use represents a group of important social and political considerations that affect linguistic vitality, or the strength, of a given language. Those considerations include the demographics of a speech community, that group's social status, and the institutional measures taken to support the speech community's language (Meyerhoff, 2006).

Demographic factors that contribute to the increased vitality of a language center on the premise that when speakers of language A vastly outnumber speakers of other languages the chances of language A enjoying improved vitality are increased. The social status of a language

plays a significant role in determining the longevity of that language's life. The higher the social status of a language inside and outside of that language's speech community the more important the language will appear to be, so there will be a need to know and use it. Higher social status is typically associated with economics. Institutional factors help promote the use of a language by establishing public domains for a language to be used. This includes education and government. The contributions of these three factors can be seen in the present international status of English. The implications for this type of concentrated power have concerned some sociolinguists, who believe that the vitality of English has been a planned operation by the governments of native English speaking nations spanning decades (Phillipson, 1992).

Warnings regarding this ability to control power through language have been issued by sociolinguists like Phillipson (1992) who have focused on the linguistic aspects of Galtung's (1988) imperialism theory. According to Phillipson, "Galtung's theory posits six mutually interlocking types of imperialism: economic, political, military, communicative (meaning communication and

transport), cultural, and social" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 52). Galtung used a model of division that was similar to Kachru's (1986), with concentric circles that separated the dominant countries and placed them at the center, and the subordinated countries along the periphery of that center. For example, it could be said that the U.S. and other native English speaking societies like Great Britain and Australia are at the center of this model, and countries in, say, Southeast Asia make up the periphery. Their relationship is one where the military, economic, and linguistic norms of the U.S. tend to become the norms of periphery nations. According to Phillipson (1992), these norms are most efficiently transmitted through language, and in this case that language is English. Phillipson states that language policies that practice this type of English language maintenance create a linguistic caste system which places the people from periphery countries who speak English at the bottom without any way to get to the top. A higher social standing is given to those people speak English who are from a country where English is the native language (e.g. the United States).

Both Phillipson (1992) and San Juan, Jr. (2005) share perspectives on the implications of such language practices. They claim that linguistic dominance supports the advancement of the dominant group's cultural and social norms, and that to some degree "consciousness and language cannot be divorced from each other" because both are social products that "originate from work, from the labor process whose historical changes determine the function of language as a means of communication and as an integral component of everyday social practice, a signifier of national or ethnic identity" (San Juan, Jr., 2005, p. 2). In other words, the collective identity of a community is expressed through their language/s. When a more linguistically vital language that is not native to a community becomes the dominant language of that community their collective identity may shift away from their native culture towards the culture associated with the more vital language. This is a concern because it poses a threat to the historical and cultural perspectives that were uniquely expressed in the mother tongue of the affected community.

Language Policy and English in the Philippines

The language practices and policies that were implemented and maintained in the Philippines throughout the twentieth century shaped the current linguistic dynamics of this nation. The relationship between Filipinos and the languages they use in the public sphere has been somewhat contentious, but this can be expected in a nation that has an estimated 120 languages. Ten of these languages are considered to be major languages because they have at least one million speakers each (Gonzalez, 1998). These major language are Tagalog, Cebuano Bisayan, Hiligaynon Bisayan, Waray (Eastern Bisayan), Ilokano, Kapampangan, Pangasinense, Bicol, Maranao, and Maguindano. The last two are dialects of the same language, but they are identified as separate languages by their native speakers because of a political rivalry (Gonzalez, 1998). Despite the competition between all of these native languages in the Philippines, English remains at the top of a linguistic hierarchy in large part because its history has created a demand for English language use within this archipelago nation. The global use of English also reinforces the demand to learn the language because it is viewed as a necessary skill needed to succeed in the

world, particularly outside of the Philippines (San Juan, Jr. 2005). Given that historical relationship between English and the Philippines, particularly the first few decades under U.S. colonial rule, research points to the idea that English was implemented in Philippine public domains with the intent to expand the reach of power that the U.S. has across the globe. This appears to be more obvious when its expansion throughout the Philippines is contrast with the former colonial occupiers, Spain, and the lack of official language policy that the Spanish government did not implement during its centuries of colonial rule over the Philippines.

The Spanish occupation of the Philippines began in 1521; the United States gained control of the nation at the turn of the twentieth century. In 1935, after a total of over five hundred years of colonial rule, the U.S. granted the Philippines commonwealth status. However, it was not until after World War II and another brief (and violent) occupation by the Japanese that Filipinos were able to belong to an independent nation. Over the course of its history, the Philippines adopted the customs and languages of its former occupiers. The Malayo-Polynesian languages that dominated the Philippine archipelago for

about five and a half millennia were introduced to Spanish when Ferdinand Magellan arrived (Gonzalez, 1988). The centuries of Spanish dominance meant that the Spanish language would permeate throughout the Philippines and become a part of its native languages.

There is nothing significant about this as far as linguistic imperialism theory is concerned because Philippine government officials were not mandating that Spanish become the language of the public domain. In other words, Spanish language maintenance was not written into official policy, so it did not necessarily advance throughout the Philippines by means of institutional support (Gonzalez, 1988). Spanish was used to conduct government business, but the linguistic demographic breakdown in the Philippines overwhelmingly favored native Philippine language speakers. When the U.S. government came into power in the Philippines at the turn of the twentieth century, it decided to use English as a tool to organize Filipinos under its authority. Some U.S. government officials considered this to be their duty; making the Philippines more like U.S. culture was seen by them as a way to improve the quality of life there.

Establishing spaces for English in the Philippine public domain was carried out with methodical planning by the U.S government. Since its introduction to the nation, English has remained in the Philippine public sphere because of the nation's language policy, which is an important institutional factor in maintaining high vitality for any language. This is in stark contrast to the management of Spanish in the Philippines. As the U.S. gained control of Spanish colonies at the end of the nineteenth century, American economic, political, and cultural norms diffused into the newly acquired colonies in the Caribbean, Guam, and the Philippines. The U.S. government discouraged the use of Filipino dialects in the workplace and established English as the chief medium of instruction (San Juan, Jr., 2005). Outside of Filipino language classes, the practice of using English to teach in the Philippines is one that continues today (Gonzalez, 1988). This type of language planning and management situation that occurred in the Philippines represents a worst-case scenario for some sociolinguists like Phillipson (1992) and San Juan, Jr. (2005) who argue that it is a critical move by a dominant outside government to

establish a linguistic hierarchy that benefits their language at the expense of the minority languages.

Language Competition: Systematic Occurrence or Forced Practice

Phillipson (1992) argued that the spread of English around the world in the twentieth century was desired by Western political and economic elites to "impose their own language on other societies in order to wield their control" over them (Donskoi, 2009, p. 278). He presented studies of multiple post-colonial societies where English acquired a higher status at the expense of those societies' native languages. As was previously mentioned, Phillipson believed that the dominant language of the dominant culture was a means to retain power for that dominant culture, and that a result of the promotion of the dominant language was linguicism, or the death of a language. Some conclusions from Phillipson's argument about macro-level language interaction around the world are:

1. Languages interact in a competitive rather than in a complimentary manner. One language's expansion is another language's decline.
2. It is the political and economic capability of the

societies from which a particular language originates that determines the relative standing of the language vis-à-vis the other languages.

3. Political and economic inequalities reinforce linguistic asymmetries and vice versa" (Donskoi, 2009, p. 279).

Donskoi (2009) is critical of Phillipson's take on how global languages interact with each other as well as of his assessment of global language spread and its effects on non-English speaking societies. He believes that Phillipson is "reluctant to take a neutral positivist attitude and to treat language competition as an objectively given and not constructed phenomenon" (p. 279). Donskoi notes that Phillipson "interprets the effects of language competition - such as language expansion and language hegemony - as an arcane strategy of several dominant societies" (p. 279). There is no denying on Donskoi's part that at some point in history the English language made its way around the world on the strength of British and U.S. military prowess, and that the linguistic vitality of a major language like English will come at the expense of a weaker one. He notes that "languages never compete from scratch: they are hostages

of history, so they have to enjoy or suffer the functional position that has been predetermined by their past" (Donskoi, 2009, p. 286). However, Donskoi makes the distinction that the current practice of using English as a lingua franca is not a result of continued imperialistic maintenance. Rather, it is the result of globalization.

Donskoi (2009) describes imperialism as "any international practice that generates political and economic inequalities" (p. 287) and globalization as "any international practice that generates interconnectedness and interdependence" (p. 287). He argues that the current global state of English offers more in the way of creating global interconnectedness rather than maintaining political and economic inequalities citing the de-colonization of the language as the primary reason why the spread of English is a matter of globalization and not imperialism. Donskoi (2009) offers more criteria which he uses to distinguish between imperialism and globalization. As he illustrates, imperialism is usually associated with:

1. Power politics, or the use of force or threats of force.
2. Zero sum games, where the dominant nation's gain equals loss for the weaker nation/s.

3. The establishment of hierarchical orders between the center and the periphery, which is a dynamic that Galtung (1988), Kachru (1986), and Phillipson (1992) have previously discussed.

Donskoi (2009) states that globalization is usually associated with:

1. No use of power and positionalist designs.
2. Positive sum games, where each party receives equal relative gains.
3. Anarchic and autarkic orders, where there is no "supranational authority that regulates" the interaction between nations, so both nations are sovereign (Donskoi, 2009, p. 288).

Using these measures we are able to construct imperialism and globalization in opposition to each other, which is how the different operating theories regarding the global spread of English have been positioned (Donskoi, 2009). In this globalized society, English is the "lingua franca and a prerequisite for achieving success in almost every domain of social experience" (Donskoi, 2009, p. 80). In terms of language choice for non-native English speaking societies the decision to adopt English can be made strictly for pragmatic purposes;

that is, non-native speakers can learn English and then decide if they want to maintain their use of it to achieve a higher political and/or economic status, which in turn would bring them out of a marginalized position bridging gaps in the division between ENL speakers and ESL speakers (Donskoi, 1999). The nativization of English puts former colonies in a position to participate in global politics and economics and potentially make equal gains in these domains with their ENL counterparts. This reinforces the contemporary belief that the language/power dynamics between native English speaking countries and non-native English speaking countries situated in the Kachruvian circles model that Phillipson (1992) cited have shifted.

The necessity to learn English in order to participate in the global economy gives English its high global vitality. This has created linguistic inequalities in many parts of the world (e.g. the Philippines) where English is promoted on par or above the mother tongues of those regions. Endorsement of the English language by the Philippine government is not a reflection of the sentiment that Filipinos have towards English vis-à-vis the other Philippine languages. Instead, English is a "situational by-product" (Donskoi, 2009, p. 284) of Filipinos' social

lives. What this means is that Filipinos may not necessarily prefer English over their native languages, but they may promote its use more than their native languages because of their country's history with English and its global vitality. There, English appears to serve limited functions in a select number of domains. The languages that are native to the Philippines also have specific domains, so Filipinos are usually maintaining use of at least two or three different languages. Some of those languages, like English and Filipino, simply serve Filipinos in public domains like school or in the workplace, while the other Philippine languages they use might be function in more personal domains, like among family members or other interlocutors.

These current trends in English language policy making, management, and practice in the Philippines are pointing to a perspective that is quite contrary to that of linguistic imperialism theory in terms of the effects of English on non-native English speaking societies. Yes, at one point in time the English language was a tool that the U.S. government used to implement the final phases of colonization there and in other outer-circle countries around the world (Phillipson, 1992), resulting in the

Western domination of economic and political domains around the world. However, as it presently stands English may not pose a huge cultural threat to a non-native speaking society, like the Philippines, that includes English in its daily linguistic practices and its national language policies because this language has been re-appropriated and nativized by the people living there. This transition from English-as-a-colonial language to English-as-a-nativized language appears to be more a consequence of globalization than a product of imperialization because it has provided the peoples of former colonies with a language through which they may be empowered rather than oppressed (Buttigieg, 1999).

De-colonizing a Language: World Englishes

While globalization might provide equal access in some arenas it simultaneously accelerates the divide between rich and poor. Yano (2001) asks a relevant question: "How does this globalization affect our linguistic life?" (p. 120). People in non-native English speaking countries seeking to enter into global economic trade must attend college, or some form of training beyond high school, in order to acquire the skills they need. For non-native English speakers the additional burden of

learning English must be accepted. Beyond simply learning grammar rules and refining pronunciation, non-native English speakers must learn to use English in "ways that are socially and culturally appropriate" (Yano, 2001, p. 120) among speakers of English. Yano (2001) refers to this as "communicative competence" (p. 120). For immigrants living in English-speaking societies like Britain and the U.S., acquiring such competence does not appear to be a problem because it is done so "in the sociocultural framework of these societies" (Yano, 2001, p. 120). Yano (2001) does hypothesize that problems will arise for people who learn English as a second (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL) in places where it is not the native language who then move to an ENL speaking country. For Yano, the problems ESL and EFL speakers will experience in these contexts will still be related to their ability to use English appropriately in social settings for which they could not prepare themselves for while learning English in their homelands. This type of problem might occur for any immigrant group learning English in an ENL speaking nation.

Despite the potential for these initial setbacks, Yano (2001) states that, as a result of the rapid

diffusion of English around the world, the concentric circles model that Kachru (1986) created has evolved. The inner circle once represented exclusive divisions in English language ownership, but some sociolinguists argue that it is now more inclusive as the lines between ENL speaking inner circle and the ESL speaking outer circle have been reconfigured so that perhaps ESL speakers can identify more with the English speaking values of the inner circle (Yano, 2001). Evidence to support their theory of re-thinking English language ownership may lie in the fact that social mobility has been made more possible as accessibility to the English language in non-native English speaking nations has improved (Buttigieg, 1999). English language education has become more efficient and specifically suited to meet the needs of students who seek to use the language in global public domains.

It was the case that the boundaries that delineated each level of English language speaker were impermeable, and that ENL speakers in the inner circle mediated the norms and standards of English language use, which subsequently put them in an advanced position of power (Phillipson, 1992). However, as English spread around the

world and non-native speakers acquired it for pragmatic purposes, its function in their daily lives increased. As this functional use of English increased in societies around the world the language began to undergo "perceptible changes as a result of contact convergence" (Kachru & Smith, 2009, p. 2) with different cultural and linguistic contexts in the different regions that it had settled in. This resulted in English becoming acculturated and nativized by non-native speaking societies. The nativization of English by non-native English speaking societies has been considered a re-appropriation and a re-forging of the language (Buttigieg, 1999). In other words, English is now a tool that they colonized can use towards their empowerment.

As a result, the new varieties of English have been called "world Englishes (WE)" (Saraceni, 2009, p. 177) as it describes the plurality of the language and recognizes that there are now different varieties of the same language all over the world (Saraceni, 2009). Furthermore, "world Englishes have extended the meaning potential of lexical items from referring to concrete objects...to abstract entities" (Kachru & Smith, 2009, p. 4). For non-native English speaking societies like India, Singapore,

and the Philippines the language has literally been re-shaped to help these world English speakers describe their experiences in their own words. Kachru and Smith (2009) note that the re-shaping of English in non-native English speaking societies occurs not only as "lexical innovations" (p.4) and changes in the grammar, but also in sociocultural contexts. Here discourse is organized differently such as in the performance of speech acts. A speech act is "more than enunciating an utterance" (Kachru & Smith, 2009, p. 4); speech acts include apologies, compliments, requests, and even critiques. Kachru & Smith (2009) state that "such acts involve an awareness of sociocultural conventions", and that when a WE speaker uses English in the same manner that they would use their native language in a given social context it is an indication that they have truly re-appropriated English.

World Englishes: Philippine English

Former British and U.S. colonies have taken the language of their colonial masters and claimed ownership over their own distinct varieties of that language. The significance of this phenomenon cannot be underscored. Fanon (1967) once wrote that "to speak a language is to take on a world, a culture" (p. 38), or as Buttigieg

(1999) states, "a language embodies and expresses a culture in the broadest sense of the term; in other words, it is a conception of the world" (p. 47). For a non-native English speaking society like the Philippines, the efforts of Filipinos to gain fluency in the language of their colonial masters (English) "only reinforced the stranglehold of the colonizer (the U.S.)" (Buttigieg, 1999, p. 48). The implications of these efforts by Filipinos are that their own culture and languages are inferior to that of the colonizer. Fanon (1967) considers these attempts at mastery of the colonizer's culture and language to be futile, and a significant contribution to "the death and burial of its (the colonized) local cultural originality" (p. 18).

Fanon's (1967) assessment speaks to Phillipson's (1992) and San Juan, Jr.'s (2005) warnings about the dangers of linguistic imperialism and perpetuating the use of English in non-native English speaking societies. However, what has been illustrated by Buttigieg (1999), Kachru & Smith (2009), Saraceni (2009), and Yano (2001) is that English has evolved from the singular variety of British and North American cultures to having multiple varieties around the world. All of these varieties have

been legitimized by the fact that they have taken on new lexical forms in non-native English speaking societies, and the speakers of these varieties are autonomous in the sense that they are using English in the same domains in which they had previously used their native languages (Kachru & Smith, 2009). These domains have extended beyond the public spaces English used to occupy and into the private lives of WE speakers (Yano, 2001). This has led some sociolinguists to argue that the notion of who a native speaker is should be re-evaluated (Buttigieg, 1999).

Gonzalez (1998) and Hidalgo (1998) noted that in the Philippines the English language has taken on local forms that reflect both the different regional languages there and the different dialects of those languages. In most cases there, English is primarily used in the public domain, but it is not uncommon to find a household - particularly in the urban areas - where English is beginning to be used among family members (Gonzalez, 1998). In Filipino households and between Filipino interlocutors, the preferred language of communication remains the native regional language. However, there is evidence that some Filipino linguistic minorities are

"developing a trend toward identifying with mainstream society (i.e. choosing to speak English or Filipino)" (Hidalgo, p.31). The lingua franca among native Filipinos is contingent on which region they are located in, with their two choices being Cebuano and Filipino. Code switching between English and native Philippine languages is a more frequent occurrence as the division between using these respective languages in specific domains has become less rigid (Gonzalez, 1988; Hidalgo, 1998).

English has been established as a viable alternative language actively pursued by Filipinos seeking higher education and employment overseas (Gonzalez, 1998; Hidalgo, 1998). English will enjoy this high linguistic vitality as long as the English-speaking world remains in a leadership position. The coordinated-bilingual relationship between English and Filipino has raised concerns among sociolinguists who believe that the colonial history of the Philippines still has a negative effect on Filipino culture because English was used as a tool of imperialistic conquest (Phillipson, 1992; San Juan, Jr., 2005). However, sociolinguists who subscribe to world English theory (Buttigieg, 1999; Kachru & Smith, 2009; Yano, 2001) stand in opposition to linguistic

imperialism theory. They suggest that while the history behind the global spread of English is connected to British and U.S. colonial conquests, the current state of English is in flux, claiming that it is a natural competition occurring among English and the new varieties of English that are being spoken around the world by former colonies (Buttigieg, 1999; Donskoi, 2006; Kachru & Smith, 2009; Saraceni, 2009; Yano, 2001).

The addition of Philippine language terms to English is just one of the linguistic traits has enabled this nation to develop a variety of world English that is uniquely Filipino; Philippine English (PE). However, a modifier such as this may perpetuate exclusion rather than the idea of inclusion because it could suggest that Philippine English is different from standard American English (SAE), and perhaps not quite as functional outside of the Philippine's borders. Indeed, Philippine English does have both lexical and linguistic characteristics that distinguish it from SAE. Tayao (2004) pointed to the distinct phonological features of PE at the segmental features level such as "absent categories" of consonants (e.g. labiodental fricatives and interdental fricatives) in some, but not all, regional varieties of PE (p. 78) She

also noted that there exists a "reduction of the consonant system in 'broad' varieties of PE" (p. 78). Tayao also drew attention to features of PE related to syllable structure and its vowel system.

More specific grammar features of PE, and other Asian varieties of English, include this misuse of modals like "would". Bautista (2004) stated that "Colonial varieties tend to reduce grammatical complexity if it is not functionally required" and that "The semantics of 'would' and the other modals is very complex and the complexity may not always be functionally required in a second language" (p. 126). Therefore, there is a tendency by Filipinos, and other Asian English language speakers, to simplify the use of modals like "would" over-looking any interactional or logical meanings of the modal while choosing to defer to "would" anytime they want to sound polite or formal (Bautista, 2004).

Language Policy in the Philippines: Education

PSE plays a major role in the Philippine public domain because the government institutionalized the language with the language policy it created. The official language policy of any nation serves as one of the most significant factors in determining the vitality of a

language, or languages, because language policy creates an institutional space for the chosen language or languages to flourish. In contrast, the language or languages not recognized by a nation's language policy are not allowed the same public place to be maintained through use, and tend to have low vitality (Spolsky, 2004). According to Spolsky (2004) there are three related components that influence the language policy of a given speech community:

1. Language practices
2. Language ideology
3. Language management

Language practices represent the "habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties" (Spolsky, 2004, p. 5) that make up the speech community's linguistic repertoire. The speech community's language ideology is that community's beliefs about a language or languages and language use. The way a speech community modifies or influences the practice of using a language or languages by any means of language intervention or planning represents their language management. Currently, official language planning in the Philippines is not conducted "under one unified agency but is diffused and located in different agencies according to the nature of the task to

be accomplished" (Gonzalez, 1998). There are three institutions that are responsible for creating, implementing, and managing the language policies that in turn affect language choice in the Philippines. Those institutions include the three branches of Philippine government (executive, legislative, and judicial); the Department of Education, Culture, and Sports (DECS) and the Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (Commission on the Filipino Language, or KWF); and the University of the Philippines (Hidalgo, 1998).

Shortly after the approval of the 1973 Philippine Constitution, DECS issued guidelines for the national policy on bilingual education in the Philippines (with the exception of the international schools, which operate autonomously). The most important provisions of this order were how it defined bilingualism and how it scheduled its implementation in specific school subjects. These provisions defined bilingualism as the "separate use of Filipino and English as the media of instruction in definite subject areas" (Hidalgo, 1998, p. 25). Theoretically, these two languages were to be used separately for different subjects, but it has been noted that in practice the implementation of this policy has

been carried out with code switching between the two languages during instruction (Gonzalez, 1988; Hidalgo, 1998).

During the initial phases of formal schooling, it is common practice for Filipino teachers to use the local vernaculars as auxiliary languages. However, once this initial phase is completed, typically during the first grade academic year, a shift is made to using Filipino and English as the main languages for instruction. Filipino is used for all subjects except for English language classes, mathematics, and science (Gonzalez, 1988; Hidalgo, 1998). Although there is a written distinction between which languages are to be used to teach specific subjects, in the language policy issued by DECS this policy is not necessarily put into practice by public school teachers. According to data collected from classroom visitations and surveys conducted by Hidalgo (1998), code switching between Filipino and English continues in the upper years of high school and even college, so there appears to be a motivation for some Filipino educators to continue to promote national language alongside English.

The Philippine government has taken steps towards creating an institution that is responsible for at least

maintaining Filipino on a national level; KWF. This institution is primarily responsible for promoting the importance of using Filipino in government correspondence and other types of communication. KWF has also addressed the need to intellectualize Filipino (Hidalgo, 1998). That is, this institution has been focusing on using Filipino not just to teach certain subjects in primary and secondary school, but to also use this language at the higher levels of education such as agriculture, trade and commercial education, vocational and industrial education, and home economics (Hidalgo, 1998). The UP has worked with the KWF to lend additional support in maintaining the practice of intellectualizing Filipino by using it at the university level. Students, their parents, and some faculty have urged for a return to exclusively English language based instruction, with some academic journals lending their support in favor of such a return.

English arrived in the Philippines in imperialistic fashion as it was forced on Filipinos who were simultaneously being required to discontinue use of their native languages in the nation's public domain. Filipinos still recognize the importance of having command of English because they know that it is still an

international language of business and politics. However, since language planning rights have been given to them it seems as if Filipinos are more than willing to make domains available for their own native languages to thrive. Perhaps this move might allow for Filipinos to retain their language and their culture while still being able to adapt and succeed in the English speaking world beyond their nation's borders.

Purpose for this Present Study

The current debate of both English language ownership and the functions of world English varieties in traditionally non-native English speaking societies has led sociolinguists to advocate for more research to be conducted on the globality of English, that is, examining how world English varieties - as decolonized languages - "manifest and impact specific sites" (Buttigieg, 1999, p. 46) around the world. Yano (2001) had expressed reservations regarding the success of world English varieties used in English dominant societies (e.g. Britain and the U.S.), unsure as to whether English learned in a sociocultural setting other than an Anglo-American one would be able to serve the speakers of that variety of

English as well as English learned in an Anglo-American setting.

Although learning a foreign language involves acquiring knowledge of its grammar rules and proper pronunciation, it also requires those learning the language to understand how to use it in culturally and socially appropriate ways (Yano, 2001). Buttigieg (1999) suggested that researchers examine instances in which world Englishes are being used in native English-speaking contexts. Buttigieg's (1999) suggestions center on his idea that acquiring English and "steeping oneself in British and U.S. culture (do not) necessarily go hand in hand" (p. 50). In theory, a speaker of any variety of world English can acquire this language and then take it to an English-speaking society without having to completely concede their culture in the process.

Given these considerations and ideas about the functionality of world Englishes outside of their domains, the present study aims to discover how a variety of world English like PE, serves Filipino immigrants who use it here in the United States. In order to conduct this investigation, a series of one-on-one interviews with Filipino immigrants was conducted.

The main operating research questions for this study and these interviews are as follows:

1. In which contexts did the participants use Philippine English in the Philippines?
2. Now that they are here in the U.S., to what extent and in which contexts has Philippine English functioned for them in a new sociocultural framework?
3. To what extent and in which contexts have they maintained their regional Philippine languages?
4. Has learning English in a non-native English-speaking environment hindered their ability to communicate in the U.S.?

The following chapter describes the method of data collection including how, and the third chapter presents the results of the data, and their implications for the world Englishes conversation.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGICAL BLUEPRINT

Method

The research questions for this project center around the attitudes and perceptions of English-speaking Filipino immigrants living in the U.S. about using a variety of English they learned in the Philippines. As previously mentioned, his study focuses on how this type of world English has functioned for the Filipinos participating in this study in both their personal and professional lives, and how their experiences using English have affected them. Previous research conducted on world Englishes suggests that these varieties of English are moving beyond serving strictly functional uses in public domains into the private domains of world English speakers' personal lives (Yano, 2001, Kachru & Smith, 2009). Studying immigrants' experiences using the variety of world English they learned in their native countries in the U.S. might highlight how the evolution of world Englishes has ultimately caused a shift in language/power dynamics between native English speaking countries and world English speaking countries (Buttigieg, 1999).

The present study aimed to explore these issues through qualitative interview data from the participants. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. The research questions that were mentioned in the previous chapter served as the basis for the interview questions.

Participants

The ten participants for this research project were Filipinos who immigrated to the U.S: four males and six females, all between the ages of twenty-two and thirty-one, and all either working professionals or college/university students. It was important for the participants to all be from the same generation because any patterns, while too small of a data group to be conclusive, might suggest some trends that could potentially be applicable to the larger group of Filipino immigrants in further studies of world Englishes and Filipinos.

Each one of the participants was born in the Philippines, and spent a minimum of eleven years living there before immigrating to the U.S. They had each been living here for at least five years. It was determined that the participants should have at least spent a decade

living in the Philippines learning English in school there and using both their native language/s and English in that sociocultural context. All ten of the interviews, with the exception of one, were informally conducted one-on-one between the researcher and the participant. Danilo and Rachel, who are married to each other, were interviewed together. Their names have been changed to pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.

On the following page is a table presenting each participant's linguistic and demographic data (Table 1).

Table 1. Participant Information

Name, Gender, and Age	Philippine Languages Spoken	Number of Years Lived in Philippines	Number of Years Living in U.S.
Lani, F, 22	Visaya [Regional], Tagalog	11	11
Kayla, F, 25	Visaya [Regional], Tagalog	14	11
Sam, F, 26	Visaya [Regional], Tagalog	14	12
Dennis, M, 24	Cebuano Visaya [Regional], Tagalog	17	7
Danilo, M, 26	Ilongo[Regional], Visaya, Tagalog	21	5
Rachel, F, 29	Cebuano Visaya [Regional], Ilongo, Tagalog	21	8
Jessica, F, 31	Tagalog [Regional]	16	15
Leo, M, 27	Ilongo [Regional], Visaya, Tagalog	21	6
Veruca, F, 27	Cebuano Visaya [Regional], Ilongo, Tagalog	16	11
Edwin, M, 23	Tagalog [Regional], Visaya	18	5

Data Collection and Analysis

The interview questions were designed to reflect the overarching themes of this study's five research questions by initially probing into the participants' linguistic backgrounds in the Philippines, examining how they learned and used English. Interview questions then focused on the participants' attitudes and experiences using English as they transitioned from living in the Philippines to living in the U.S. These experiences represent very critical data for this study as the research questions are primarily concerned with examining the participants' experiences with using the Philippine variety of world English in the U.S. Lastly, the interview questions examined how the participants ultimately feel about the English language and the functions it serves them in the U.S. alongside their native Philippine languages. Specifically, I wanted to explore these three questions:

1. Did English help them achieve a level of professional success that they had expected to attain when they arrived to the U.S.?
2. Did they maintain their native Philippine languages and in which contexts they do so?

3. Do they feel that English has threatened their culture?

The interviews conducted in this research project specifically examine "subject reality" (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 165) as opposed to autobiographical studies of "life reality", which focus on a "thematic analysis to pinpoint repeated events and commonalities in L2 learners' and users' experiences" (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 168), and studies of "text reality", which tend to focus on "how bilinguals construct themselves in their respective languages" (Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 168, 169). Pavlenko (2007) noted that during the late 1960s and early 1970s a "narrative and discursive turn in the humanities and social sciences" (p. 164) opened the door for autobiographic narratives to become "both an object and, in the form of narrative inquiry, a legitimate means of research in history, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and education" (p. 164). Her investigation of autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistic and sociolinguistic research discusses how autobiographic interviews can be analyzed to understand how "people experience second language learning (and use) and make sense of this experience" (p. 164).

Furthermore, Pavelnko's work on autobiographic narratives serves as the academic foundation for this current research project, because it is not only the language learning contexts and practices of Filipinos in the Philippines that are investigated, but also the experiences that Filipinos have had taking a variety of world English out of its native context and using it in the U.S. That is, this current research examines the subject realities of the participants which include:

1. Their thoughts and feelings about their language learning experiences.
2. Their attitudes towards their respective Philippine languages.
3. Their views about the maintenance of their heritage languages and their own ethnic identification (Pavelnko, 2007).

Underlying these questions will be an inquiry into the participants' personal feelings regarding their experiences using English both in the Philippines and in the U.S. Those research questions stem from general sociolinguistic inquires into how we use languages and what we them for. These questions tend to include:

1. Who uses different language varieties and their forms, and with whom do they use them (Meyerhoff, 2006)?
2. Are people aware of their language choices (Meyerhoff, 2006)?
3. Why do some varieties of a language "beat" others in the realm of language choice (Meyerhoff, 2006)?
4. What kind of social information is ascribed to different forms of a language and different language varieties (Meyerhoff, 2006)?
5. How much can people change or control the languages they use (Meyerhoff, 2006)?

According to Pavlenko (2007), "the main analytical step in *content* and *thematic analysis* is the coding of narratives according to emerging themes, trends, and patterns, or conceptual categories" (p. 166). The emergent themes, trends, or patterns in this study may potentially revolve around the environments and methods in which participants' language acquisition took place in the Philippines; the contexts in which they used those languages there (i.e. language choice); their experiences using English and native Philippine languages in the U.S.; their feelings about those linguistic experiences; and

their feelings regarding their heritage language maintenance for future generations of Filipinos living in the U.S. The transcripts of each interview were analyzed to identify any emergent themes, trends, or patterns that were present among the participants' responses also relevant to this study's research questions.

CHAPTER THREE

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DATA AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

Data

The purpose of this study was to discover how a variety of world English, like Philippine English PE, is managed by Filipino immigrants when they use it here in the United States. In this chapter, I report on the findings with respect to the research questions:

1. In which contexts did they use English in the Philippines?
2. How does English function for them in a U.S. sociocultural framework?
3. To what extent and in which contexts have their regional Philippine languages been maintained?
4. Did learning English help them achieve the level of professional success that they had expected to attain when they arrived in the U.S.?

The participants' responses have been organized according to the research questions. I begin by presenting data regarding the participants' language use in the public and private domains in the Philippines. Then, I

present data that illustrates how the participants managed their native languages alongside English in the Philippines. From there, I move on to the participants' experiences using English in the United States; and then to the participants' attitudes towards English use, their native language use in the United States, and how their language use might affect their cultural identity. After the data has been presented I discuss the implications this study for further world Englishes research.

Language Use in the Philippines: PE in the Public Domain

The interview data showed a common pattern in how PE was used by the participants in the Philippine public domain. All of them indicated that, aside from hearing English on the television, their first real encounters with PE occurred in school. Their experiences learning English and using it in educational settings occurred right from the start in kindergarten, when most of the participants started using English to describe basic skills like counting and color and shape recognition. This data supports Gonzalez's (1988), Hidalgo's (1988), and San Juan, Jr.'s (2005) work stating that English is the language of the Philippine educational system. This might

seem to be a universal sentiment throughout the Philippines as the schools there teach virtually every subject in English. The exceptions were classes about Filipino history and economics. Math, science, and of course English were taught exclusively in English. According to Lani, a 22 year old who immigrated to the U.S. 11 years ago, schools in the Philippines taught English because "they know that math, science, and English, are tools used for the competitive world" (personal communication, July 9, 2010).

Given the circumstances of today's world and the fact that English dominates the global public sphere, Lani's thoughts on why those subjects were taught in English make a lot of sense. In an academic setting, English is used to teach subjects that Filipino students will most likely have to know in English anyway in order to achieve professional success inside and outside of the Philippines' borders.

The significance of English use in both public and private schools can be measured by my participants' accounts of how this language was used in their classrooms. For the public school students (Dennis, Edwin, Danilo, Kayla, Lani, Rachel, and Sam) the fundamentals of

reading and writing English were taught to them and by nature of learning these aspects of the language they were taught to speak English. However, the focus of their instruction was not on how to become proficient speakers of English as much as it was to have a good knowledge base of how to comprehend what they were reading, and how to compose English language writings. Working on students' pronunciation was a side-note to their classroom read-alouds. Edwin, who is 23 and has been living in the U.S. for 5 years, recalled that in his primary school "there was not a lot of emphasis on speaking English the way Americans do, but my teachers wanted to make sure that we were able to understand each other when we would speak English" (personal communication, June 24, 2010).

For Edwin and the other participants who were products of Philippine public schools, the focus of their English language instruction was limited to learning the structure of the language and deciphering the meaning of English words in context. They were learning English language related topics while also learning math and science skills in English, so there was a push for these students to learn how to use English and learn what exactly they were reading, writing, and speaking in

English. For the two participants who went to private schools in the Philippines, Jessica (31, living in U.S. for 15 years) and Veruca (27, living in U.S. for 16 years), their instruction was centered on learning English for the same purposes as their public school counterparts and also to become proficient at it. Jessica noted that her PE instruction emphasized becoming proficient in formal PE. According to Jessica (personal communication, June 21, 2010) private school instructors wanted their students to be able to converse proficiently and efficiently in English by the time they graduated. She added that "English there was a formal type of English because conversational English did not exist in the school; the emphasis was more on speaking a very proper form of English" (Jessica, personal communication, June 21, 2010).

Honing their PE speaking proficiency was only part of Jessica's and Veruca's educational expectations. They were subjected to classroom and homework activities that required them to use the language in creative and expressive ways. Veruca (personal communication, July 26, 2010) described and assignment in which she had to write a script in second grade. Jessica mentioned that "the

academic papers they wrote in the Philippines were graded for content just like they are here (in the U.S), but there was a greater emphasis on meticulous grammar" (personal communication, June 21, 2010).

Despite the different approaches to PE instruction that private and public schools in the Philippines have, the participants suggested that both types of schools provided enough instruction to make students prepared to use PE in the Philippines. The business world in the Philippines is dominated by English, and it is necessary to be proficient in PE to conduct business. Having a father who owned multiple businesses in the Philippines, Jessica said that business people there "typically know PE because it is expected of them, as business owners, to know and use English" (personal communication, June 21, 2010).

This type of PE use in the Philippine public domain is not exclusive to Jesscia's family. Danilo's (26, living in the U.S. for 5 years) and Leo's (27, living in the U.S. for 6 years) parents were doctors in the Philippines and they frequently used English in the workplace among other doctors and their own patients. Kayla's (25, living in the U.S. for 11 years) mother was a nurse in the Philippines

and also used English from time to time with her co-workers and patients. According to my participants, there is a substantial need for many Filipinos to know PE because the nation's public domain is dominated by the language. The nation's history infused English with the culture and married it to the Philippine public domain (Gonzalez, 1988, San Juan, Jr., 2005). As PE's use was maintained over the years by the global economic and political climate, the notion of divorcing Philippine society from English became more far-fetched. Eventually, English became ubiquitous in the Philippines. Sam (26) stated that "practically everyone speaks English in the Philippines. It is used everywhere; for business and in schools" (personal communication, July 22, 2010).

The other participants confirmed that PE is a lingua franca in the Philippines. Filipinos use it to communicate with non-Filipinos and Filipinos from other linguistic regions. If a common native Philippine language is not known between two Filipino interlocutors, PE is typically used to bridge that communication gap. Leo explained "in the medical field there are Filipinos from different parts of the country who speak different dialects, so English unites us" (personal communication, July 20, 2010). Just

as it is around the world, English is a valuable communicative tool in the Philippines because so many Filipinos can speak it.

The broad demographic appeal of PE has given it a high vitality in the Philippines, which means that at this moment in time it is strong and is not in jeopardy of becoming a dead language there (or anywhere else in the world). A language with high vitality becomes socially important because if someone knows how to speak it they have access to the domains where it is used (Meyerhoff, 2006). As it is around the world, this is also the case in the Philippines.

This use of English can be expected given the global state of English (Crystal 1997), and this use may in turn be responsible for the public perception of English in the Philippines where it is more than just a communicative language; it is also a tool for constructing a social façade or the impression of a higher social status for Filipinos who speaks it. Veruca gave one such example of how PE can be used in the Philippines to create such an impression. "We used English when we had other family come over for dinner. English was used more for showing off to them" (Veruca, personal communication, July 26, 2010). She

added that her other family members weren't privileged, and that English has a status symbol quality in the Philippines (Veruca, personal communication, July 26, 2010).

Other participants, like Jessica and Kayla, echoed similar sentiments about the way that Filipinos in the Philippines perceive PE. Jessica said "speaking English in the Philippines defines the speaker's social status" (personal communication, June 21, 2010). Kayla claimed English has a "higher social standing than Filipino" (personal communication, July 8, 2010), explaining further that if someone speaks English somehow the perception is that they are rich and smart.

Jessica's and Kayla's comments spoke to a trend among the participants' regarding their beliefs about how PE is socially received by Filipinos in the Philippines. According to the participants, there is a direct correlation between PE and the level of education a Filipino has received based on whether or not they speak PE. Sam and Dennis (24) also mentioned that if a Filipino can speak PE then it means that they probably have an education, and it also identifies where (in the Philippines) they came from. Sam said "'common people'

typically will not speak English because they come from rural parts of the Philippines where education is not available to them" (personal communication, July 22, 2010). Dennis added that "a lot of people in the deep province jungle area don't speak English because they didn't go to school, and they don't really need to because they lead simple farm lives" (personal communication, June 23, 2010).

These statements suggest that learning English may be more complicated than just making the decision to learn it or not learn it. The course of their lives might not require them to learn English as extensively as other Filipinos, or they might not have the means to attain an education. These circumstances may reinforce the social significance of knowing how to speak PE because being able to do so allows other Filipinos to know that your family had the ability to send you to school, or that you lived in an area where an education was accessible. This was the case with the participants. Leo (personal communication, July 20, 2010) mentioned that not knowing English in the Philippines could have a negative impact on a Filipino's quality of life if they sought work in a major city like Metro Manila. He believed "it would be very hard to

succeed without English in a major city because the centers of commerce in the Philippines are situated in a major city like Metro Manila, so the odds would be against those Filipinos who did not become proficient in English" (Leo, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

There is a contingent of Filipinos, like the participants of this study, who went to school and learned PE because their families pushed for them to learn it as a means to achieve success in the Philippines. However, as Dennis and Kayla suggested, there is also a belief that PE can help Filipinos achieve success outside of the Philippines as well. According to Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) for a Filipino to be able to communicate with other people outside of the Philippines - whether it is to conduct business or simply live outside of the country - using English means a greater rate of success. He thought that "the Philippine government pushes English in school because it provides us (Filipinos) with greater opportunities to succeed in and out of the Philippines" (Dennis, personal communication, June 23, 2010). Along similar lines Kayla (personal communication, July 8, 2010) added that she came to realize that learning

English would help her get a better job and succeed out of the Philippines.

Language Use in the Philippines: PE and Other Languages in the Private Domain

The participants pointed out the functional uses of PE in the Philippine public domain (education, business, as a lingua franca, and mark of social status), and emphasized the significance of knowing and using PE in the Philippines. Some of them detailed experiences of PE use which suggest this language extends beyond the public domain into that of the private domain, such as family conversations.

The group was split nearly in half between those participants who used PE in some way to communicate at home with their families and those that did not use English at all. It was surprising to discover that many of the participants did not use PE at all with their families despite using the language everyday at school and even with some of their friends. Among this group, Kayla, Lani, and Veruca admitted that their families would use PE only to show off their speaking ability or the new words they learned to other visiting family members. Although Dennis and Sam said that they did not use PE at all with their

families back in the Philippines, they admitted that there would be a couple of rare occasions in which they would speak in PE. According to Sam "an exception would be made if I needed a glass or if I was talking to my siblings, but that more or less was the extent of English language use in my house" (personal communication, July 22, 2010). Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) expressed that he did not use English in conversation, but that he and his brothers would repeat what they saw on TV and re-enact it in English.

The most common role that PE played in some of the participants' homes where it was used was as part of a code-switching tandem with the participants' native Philippine language. Edwin, Danilo, Leo, and Rachel (29, has lived in the U.S. for 8 years) said that they regularly used PE with Filipino, Ilongo, and Visaya respectively in conversations with their families. Danilo and Leo, the sons of doctors, grew up in homes where PE was spoken more than their regional language. Danilo admitted that "This had a positive impact on my English proficiency. I can speak better English than my native dialect" (personal communication, July 6, 2010), adding that he only knows the "'shallow' words in my dialect"

(personal communication, July 6, 2010). Danilo stated that in most conversations he would usually use English vocabulary instead of the vocabulary of his dialect (personal communication, July 6, 2010).

Leo (personal communication, July 20, 2010) said that his grandparents would explain things to him in PE, and that they taught him how to count in English before he learned how to do that in Ilongo (his native Philippine language).

Rachel (personal communication, July 6, 2010) noted that her parents would mix PE and Visaya (her family's native Philippine language) frequently when talking to her and her sisters. "My parents would use English occasionally, but I knew we were in serious trouble when my dad was angry and he would use English to express his anger" (Rachel, personal communication, July 6, 2010).

Edwin and Jessica said that they would often speak Taglish, a mix of Tagalog (aka Filipino) and English, when they were growing up in Metro Manila. Edwin spoke Taglish at home with his family and with his friends. "English use for me was a competition with my siblings and my friends to see who could throw in the newest American slang words with Tagalog" (Edwin, personal communication, June 24,

2010). Jessica (personal communication, June 21, 2010) explained that she did not speak Taglish at home with her parents, but when she would hang out with her friends they would often use Taglish.

For the participants who used PE in their personal lives it was a language that continued to be a used more as a method to gain social recognition among their peers and their other family members than it was a method to communicate. Despite the positive attention PE brought the participants when they spoke it, PE was not the language they used for more meaningful communication with their friends and families. That role was still reserved for their native Philippine languages.

According to the participants, more often than not they would defer to their regional native languages (RNL) when communicating with their families. Over half of them (60%) primarily spoke their RNL while the others occasionally mixed in some words and phrases in PE. Kayla, Lani (Visaya speakers), Dennis, Rachel, Sam, and Veruca (Cebuano Visaya speakers) all spoke either Visaya or Cebuano Visaya almost exclusively with their families. The Cebuano Visaya linguistic region of the Philippines has been known to exhibit strong regional pride. It gave the

most opposition against making Filipino the national language when the Philippine Constitution was going through the last of its multiple revisions during the late 1980s (Gonzalez, 1988). However, Dennis, Rachel, Sam, and Veruca said that this was not a factor in their families' decision to speak Cebuano Visaya at home. Instead, they said that their regional native language maintenance was attributed to the fact that they had plenty of opportunities to speak PE in the Philippine public domain, but Cebuano Visaya may not enjoy that same attention. According to Veruca "it was important to my family that we speak our dialect at home and around our neighborhood There were more opportunities to speak English at school and later on in life" (personal communication, July 26, 2010). Sam also mentioned that she "rarely spoke English at home because I always spoke English at school, so the only chance I had to speak Cebuano was with each other, at home, or with my neighbors in Buhol" (personal communication, July 22, 2010). Rachel (personal communication, July 6, 2010) confirmed that there were many chances to speak PE in the Philippines, but she was the only participant who expressed a kind of relief about being able to speak her regional native language at home.

"In the Philippines I would usually speak English all of the time, and the only time I felt like I didn't have to speak English was when I was with my family" (Rachel, personal communication, July 6, 2010). Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) had a similar explanation for speaking Cebuano Visaya at home, but he added that a part of him factored in his feelings towards his parents as a reason why he spoke to them in their regional native language. "My parents spoke English at work and I spoke it at school, so if I spoke it to them at home I would feel like I was disrespecting them" (Dennis, personal communication, June 23, 2010).

Lani and Kayla both stated that their parents never held discussions with them regarding which language to speak at home. For these two participants, speaking Visaya took less effort, and it was the most contextually appropriate language to use. Lani (personal communication, July 9, 2010) specified that in the Philippines she would have to create a context where she could speak PE because she would only speak it in the classroom. It was easier for her to speak Visaya in the Philippines. Much like Lani, Kayla (personal communication, July 8, 2010) mostly spoke Visaya at home because it was her parents' primary

language. This meant that she was exposed to it early on and regularly.

For the participants whose families did use PE, it was infused with their own regional native language (code-switching). Leo, a native speaker of Ilongo, succinctly summed up the other participants' (Danilo, Edwin, Jessica, and Leo) in-home linguistic practices. Leo (personal communication, July 20, 2010) admitted that he spoke English at home, but Ilongo was the primary language used there.

In terms of day-to-day communication, where the speaker expresses their thoughts and emotions through language with one or more interlocutors, RNL dominated in frequency of use. As previously mentioned in the participants' responses, PE thrived in the Philippine public sphere, but it did not enjoy the same vitality in their homes. However, all of the participants' linguistic relationship with PE would change after they moved to the U.S.

English Language Use in the United States: Initial Experiences

The participants had mentioned that both their instructors and parents emphasized learning PE because it

would eventually help them achieve professional success inside and outside of Philippine society. This perception was supported by the participants' statements regarding the dominant role PE has in the Philippine public domain. All of the participants moved to the U.S. by their early 20s, so they did not have the opportunity to see if knowing PE helped them become successful in the Philippines. Instead, they brought their English language speaking abilities to the U.S.

There was some variation among the obstacles that each participant initially faced based on how old the participants were when they arrived in the U.S. For example, Sam, Kayla, and Lani were the only participants that attended high school in the U.S. for all four years. Sam and Kayla arrived from the Philippines when they were 14 and were immediately introduced to American high school culture. Sam (personal communication, July 22, 2010) described the challenges of her first year in high school as 'Hell'. "The language barrier had a significant impact on my assimilation into American culture; it didn't make that process any easier" (Sam, personal communication, July 22, 2010). She added that aside from her PE sounding more formal, it was her strong PE accent that immediately

distinguished her from the native English speakers she went to school with.

"It became my focal point to reduce my accent and begin to use more American sounding pronunciation so that I could fit in" (Sam, personal communication, July 22, 2010).

Kayla (personal communication, July 8, 2010) described a similar situation where she did not have a lot of friends because she did not speak English very well. "The most frustrating aspect of my English speaking ability was that I could not speak like my American peers" (Kayla, personal communication, July 8, 2010).

Observing how her American peers spoke English was part of Sam's strategy, but she also spoke more English at home to help refine her fluency. "The longer I stayed in the U.S. the more frequently I spoke English with my parents" (Sam, personal communication, July 22, 2010). Kayla (personal communication, July 8, 2010) also said that she began to speak more English, but not with her parents. "I would speak English with my older sister. I practiced with her because I figured that she could help me sound more American better than our parents could

because she was more involved with contemporary American culture" (Kayla, personal communication, July 8, 2010).

Lani's early experiences using English in the U.S. were similar to Kayla's and Sam's because she also had to deal with teenage-aged peers who were very critical of how different from the norm she was. "The way I dressed compounded with the way I spoke English made me stand out apart from the rest of the middle school students" (Lani, personal communication, July 9, 2010). However, she emphasized that it was her accent, not her vocabulary that distinguished her from other Americans. She did not speak much English at home with her family, but she was able to get tutored in pronunciation by some of her teachers after school. Eventually, Lani was able to pronounce English words more like her American peers, which went a long way in helping her assimilate to the culture (personal communication, July 9, 2010).

After her first year of living in the U.S., Lani returned back to the Philippines for a vacation. She noticed that there was a big difference in the way she sounded when she spoke English and the ways that her friends in the Philippines sounded. Lani (personal communication, July 9, 2010) said that she felt like when

she went there she was the person that was more in tune with how to truly speak English. "When I came to the U.S., I felt like my English was not good enough, which is why I decided that I needed to make the gap smaller, so I could be looked at equally as a student" (Lani, personal communication, July 9, 2010). Lani also admitted that when she was learning PE in the Philippines she did not think that she would have to use it in the U.S., so she was not preparing herself to learn English to use functionally throughout her day (personal communication, July 9, 2010). She described having to code-switch to fill in gaps where she lacked the PE fluency.

On the other hand, Sam was able to prepare for a life of speaking English in the U.S. because she knew that she was moving here. However, she could not replicate the same social contexts that she would encounter in the U.S. "I thought my English speaking ability was good enough to get me by when I moved to the U.S. only to discover that was not the case when I spoke English with Americans" (Sam, personal communication, July 22, 2010).

From these participants' accounts their accents did not hinder communication, nor did the formal structure of PE. What their accents did do was make them sound

different, and at that point in their lives they did not want to be different from their American peers because it separated them from the group. They were in an unfamiliar environment, and like many American teens they just wanted to fit in with the crowd. Despite the social hurdles their accents created for them, these participants were still able to convey information with other interlocutors in English.

The other participants – Danilo, Dennis, Edwin, Jessica, Leo, Rachel, and Veruca did not have to deal with the social pressure of fitting in with the American teenage crowd. They came to the U.S. as college students looking forward to beginning careers as teachers and nurses. However, the irony is that while they may have escaped scathing remarks from heartless teens, they still had to endure ridicule from family members and Filipino friends that had been living in the U.S. for a longer period of time. Jessica (personal communication, June 21, 2010) expressed that being ridiculed by her mother and her older sister, who had been living in the U.S. for 6 years before she moved here, was the prime motivation for her to reduce her accent. "My mom and older sister would say things to me like 'You sound like a FOB (fresh off the

boat).' This motivated me to work hard on reducing my accent" (Jessica, personal communication, June 21, 2010).

Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) also acknowledged that he sounded funny to Americans and Filipinos who had been living in the U.S. for a while. According to him "when I first moved here I got made fun of a lot by my Filipino friends because of my accent" (Dennis, personal communication, June 23, 2010). Ironically, when Dennis felt like he got better at speaking American English he would make fun of other Filipinos who still had a strong accent (personal communication, June 23, 2010).

According to Jessica, Dennis, Edwin, and Veruca, from their experiences in the U.S. Filipino community, sounding like a Filipino immigrant who had just arrived to the U.S. - a FOB - is not desirable. As Edwin (personal communication, June 24, 2010) stated, this sentiment may be rooted in the social capital that English carries with it in both American Filipino and native Philippine communities. "English in the Philippines is highly regarded, but you do not have to be perfect at it" (Edwin, personal communication, June 24, 2010). Edwin added that here in the U.S. it is not good enough for Filipinos to

come here and just know how to speak English. "You have to really sound like you know it too" (Edwin, personal communication, June 24, 2010). He went on to say that this belief seems to be something that is more popular with the younger generation (i.e. approximately the demographic I chose to represent Filipino immigrants) that is arriving here in the U.S. today.

Danilo (personal communication, July 6, 2010) noted that this accent issue is not something that only occurs in the U.S. He said that similar incidents of pronunciation mockery would also happen in the Philippines. "If I spoke in front of a Filipino group I would have to have his grammar correct because if I mispronounced something the audience would be brutal and make fun of me" (Danilo, personal communication, July 6, 2010). This was also true if his teachers made a mistake with their accent because the students would also laugh at them (Danilo, personal communication July 6, 2010).

By their own admission, sounding more like an American was the only aspect of learning PE that their education in the Philippines did not prepare them for. Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) explained that his teachers always made sure that they knew how to

properly speak and write English, but they never worked with students to sound like an American because it is not a big issue in the Philippines - to sound more American. However, in the U.S. Dennis felt like he had to sound like an American just to get by.

PE might be ideal for the English language contexts in the Philippines, but it seems as though it did not meet all of the participants' needs here in the U.S. PE served the participants as a good English language foundation onto which they could add different types of English for different contexts (i.e. colloquial English or SAE). There was just no way for the participants to prepare themselves for the different social situations they would encounter in the U.S. They also had no idea that their accents would have a negative connotation attached to them here.

English Language Use in the United States: Current Experiences

At the time of their interviews, the participants were using English in their professional lives. Most of them had graduated from colleges here in the U.S. and were employed (only Dennis has yet to finish his nursing program). Jessica is an elementary school teacher; Veruca works for Human Resources for a health care provider; and

the other participants are all nurses (Rachel and Leo are RNs). They all improved their American English well enough to attain the jobs they sought after in the U.S., competing for the same positions with other native and non-native speakers of English.

The participants unanimously agreed that even though they had to work on their accents for a little while after they arrived in the U.S., learning PE at an early age and practicing it throughout their education in the Philippines gave them an advantage over other immigrant groups who did not have the same opportunity in their homeland. This background prepared them for the type of professional lifestyles they now lead, and it is not surprising that the participants use English well in the American public domain (which more or less demands that a person speaks English). Leo (personal communication, July 20, 2010) admitted that just knowing English before he came to the U.S. - even if it was too formal and it did not sound American - helped him a lot because he started college here right away and he could use the English he knew quite well in that environment.

Veruca (personal communication, July 26, 2010) also expressed that learning English was preparation for her to

move here. "If someone can come to the U.S. already speaking English then they definitely have an advantage over someone who moves here and has to take the time to learn English here" (Veruca, personal communication, July 26, 2010).

For the participants, knowing English had advantages beyond succeeding in college and gaining employment. Jessica (personal communication, June 21, 2010) added that knowing English literally helped her become an American. When she took her test for citizenship and they found out she spoke English she was in and out in less than three minutes. Rachel (personal communication, July 6, 2010) added that knowing English helped her become a nurse because she had to know it to pass her boards.

The participants' use of English in the public domain here mirrored the same type of English language use that they would have encountered in the Philippines. Rachel and Leo explained how they use English here in the U.S., and how its function here is not unlike its function in the Philippines. Rachel (personal communication, July 6, 2010) stated that most of her patients are Americans, so it is important for her to use conversational English with them just as she would have to in the Philippines. She did

admit that the English here is different, and that over in the Philippines she would have been able to speak Visaya or Tagalog to her patients in conjunction with English (Rachel, personal communication, July 6, 2010).

Leo (personal communication, July 20, 2010) stated that he would definitely have to know English as a nurse in the Philippines. The demand to speak English in the medical field is the same in the Philippines as it is here in the United States. He did make the distinction that in the U.S. nurses are discouraged from speaking anything other than English while they are working, but in the Philippines it was common to code-switch between English and Filipino (Leo, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

Participants who are still students, like Danilo and Dennis, mentioned that the English they used in high school and college courses in the Philippines is the same type of English that they use in their college classes here. Danilo (personal communication, July 6, 2010) confirmed that it is the same type of English. Other than occasionally having a professor in the Philippines explain things in Tagalog to students, they pretty much used the same type of academic English there as he does here. Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) added that

he is actually more comfortable speaking English in his classes than he was speaking English with me during his interview. He claimed that this was because the English he used at school was familiar to him. He had been speaking it almost his entire life. When he has to speak with an American he still has to think roughly 5 or 6 sentences ahead of what he wants to say (Danilo, personal communication, June 23, 2010).

Participants' current English use in the U.S. public domain is not drastically different than how they used PE in the Philippines. However, the interview data revealed a very different trend in the participants' English use in the U.S. private domain. For them, here English use had a more significant role. Rachel (personal communication, July 6, 2010) explained that she has twin sisters that are 13 and were born here in the U.S., and when they were kids before they started school they used to speak Visaya. When her sisters started school they lost their ability to speak Visaya. She concurred that this happened because everyone at school was speaking English. At home her family also reinforced speaking English. Although she would speak Visaya with her parents sometimes they all

started using English more around their house (Rachel, personal communication, July 6, 2010).

Danilo experienced a similar situation after he and his family moved to the United States. "We went from not really speaking English at home in the Philippines to speaking English all the time" (Danilo, personal communication, July 6, 2010). His parents wanted to practice their English with their children, which had a big impact on how much English Danilo spoke at home (Danilo, personal communication, July 6, 2010).

This private domain, much like the one in the Philippines, encompasses how the participants use a language, or languages, in their personal lives at home and with their friends. With the exception of Dennis, who still defers to Cebuano Visaya use at home, every other participant uses English at home now. Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) explained that his parents both speak English at work here in the U.S., but he still speaks their native language with them at home because he views it as a sign of respect. Dennis added that he also speaks mostly Cebuano Visaya with his brother too.

None of the participants use English exclusively at home, but it certainly has a presence there for most of

them. Code-switching is still the preferred method of communication among many of the participants both with their immediate family and with their friends. They all stated that they would determine when they would code-switch by assessing who the other interlocutors in their conversation were, and whether or not these other interlocutors also spoke a Philippine language. Danilo (personal communication, July 6, 2010) explained that a lot of times when he is with Filipino friends and they all speak the same dialect it is easier to throw in words in English when they are speaking Ilongo or Visaya. "Most of the time it is easier to speak my dialect because I do not have to think as much" (personal communication, July 6, 2010), but even in these situations he still frequently uses English words or phrases.

Some of the participants specified that that the amount of code-switching they did during a conversation would be adjusted according to the age of their interlocutor. Danilo (personal communication, July 6, 2010) admitted that if he is talking to one of his grandparents he would not use as much English mixed with his Ilongo as he would with either of his parents, siblings, and especially his friends. He did this out of

respect for his grandparents because they do not speak English as well as he does. Veruca (personal communication, July 26, 2010) also talked about using English with certain interlocutors based on their age. A lot of her Filipino friends who were born here do not speak as much Visaya as she does, so she does not speak it with them. She will use it more with her parents and their friends, but they still speak English too.

English does not exclusively rule the participants' private domains, but it clearly plays a larger role here than it did in the Philippines. The shift in the demands of the linguistic context, from Filipino languages, to English seems to be the reason why the participants use more English at home. Despite this shift, it was interesting to discover that the participants still rely on their native languages to bridge gaps in communication.

Perceptions of English Vis-à-Vis Philippine Languages

Despite the negative experiences some of my participants had using English when they first arrived in the U.S., their overall perceptions of English are positive. There was not a single participant that said they had regretted learning English. However, there were a

couple that mentioned that their experiences with their grandparents and Filipinos from that generation informed them that there still existed some Filipinos that did not hold English with the same reverence that most of the younger generation does. Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) explained that he thinks his grandparents urged him to continue maintaining his native language because it was a way for him to stay intimately connected with his Filipino culture. "If I speak my native language then I will be able to talk to other Filipinos who do not speak English very well and perhaps see the world as they see it" (Dennis, personal communication, June 23, 2010).

This sentiment is not just expressed by older Filipinos living in the U.S., like Dennis' grandparents. According to some of the participants' responses, Filipinos living in the Philippines also disapprove of excessive English use in contexts where the native regional language is preferred (i.e. among immediate family). Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) said that if he went back to the Philippines did not speak Filipino he would experience a lot of resentment from Filipinos because they would feel like he was too good to speak his native language. Veruca (personal communication,

July 26, 2010) also mentioned that even though speaking English in the Philippines can mean a lot to people, when she would return to her old neighborhood she would not use it too much because Filipinos there would think negatively about her.

These sentiments from Filipinos living in the Philippines towards Filipinos returning to the Philippines to visit do not detract from the overall presence of PE in the Philippines. It is ubiquitous there and all of the participants agreed that they could not imagine their life without English. Jessica (personal communication, June 21, 2010) commented that it provided her with a lot of options, and this was the general consensus among the participants. Sam had a similar opinion when I asked her if she thought PE had taken anything away from Filipino culture. She said that she thinks it is beneficial because it made her dimensions so much wider; she could relate to both Americans and Filipinos (Sam, personal communication, July 22, 2010).

The participants stated that they significantly benefitted from learning PE at an early age because they had enough knowledge of how to read, write, and speak the language to survive by the time they arrived in the U.S.

What they did not expect was the response to their accents when they spoke English here. That was not something that they could prepare for, but it was not a significant enough obstacle to prevent any of the participants from succeeding this far by all definitions of success.

English Use in the United States and Filipino Identity

Admittedly, most of the participants did not spend much time thinking about how English and American culture could impact Philippine culture and its languages. Danilo (personal communication, July 6, 2010) discussed what he described as the "colonial mentality" and further commented on his feelings about English. He defined colonial mentality as the belief that everything from the U.S. is better, and he speculated that perhaps this mentality has contributed to the high social standing that English has in the Philippines. He added that he could see the reasoning that sometimes it (PE) kind of degrades the Philippine culture, but he believes English helped Filipinos in the long run because if he spoke English well during an interview with an employer then he would have a big advantage (Danilo, personal communication, July 6, 2010).

Rachel and the other participants agreed with Danilo's assessment, and they also expressed a genuine desire to continue the linguistic maintenance of their native languages. Rachel (personal communication, July 6, 2010) testified that she appreciates Filipino culture more now that she is living in the United States. "When I was in high school I did not see the value in maintaining her Filipino language, but now I recognizes that it is a part of my heritage" (Rachel, personal communication, July 6, 2010). She added that she considers herself American because she is an American citizen, but she recognizes that she still has to appreciate where she has come from to know who she is (Rachel, personal communication, July 6, 2010).

At the time of her interview, Rachel was expecting her first child. She said that she and the baby's father both felt that it was important to teach their child Visaya, their native language. Jessica already has a son, and she has been teaching him Tagalog even though she does not speak it much anymore because she wants him to be able to connect with other Filipinos and experience a different level of the culture. This trend was expressed through the data; each participant said that they plan on teaching

their children their native language because it brought them closer to Filipino culture and made them multi-dimensional. Veruca (personal communication, July 26, 2010) stated that when she has children she will teach them Visaya because she will want them to be able to communicate with their family back in the Philippines.

Dennis (personal communication, June 23, 2010) also discussed his plans for maintaining Cebuano Visaya in conjunction with English so that his children have a broader cultural experience available. He believes that knowing more than one language makes him multi-dimensional because he can relate to different people on different levels. Dennis' comments captured the participants' general consensus. They all believed that PE added advantages to their lives that they would not have been able to have if they did not know PSE. They were able to transfer their knowledge of that language when they arrived in the U.S. and adapt to using SAE and functioning in American society relatively quickly (within or around a year). As important as English is in their lives, the participants also acknowledged that they still valued their native languages because it enabled them to stay connected to their Filipino heritage.

Implications

In this study, I set out to investigate the English language experiences of a small group of Filipino immigrants. I was particularly curious to discover if the functional role English played in the participants' lives had changed when they moved to the U.S., and how this affected them. The data revealed consistent trends among the participants' responses indicating that the nature of their native and English language use had changed, and that this change affected their perceptions of their native languages. Although they are only from a small group sample, the trends in the data do have some positive implications for world Englishes and the global spread of English.

Global English: Linguicism

Given the circumstances of recent history, English has a central role in Philippine politics and education (Gonzalez, 1988; Phillipson, 1992; San Juan, Jr., 2005). Linguistic imperialism may have established English as a powerful language in the Philippines, but the participants' responses might suggest that even a century after English was introduced there the native languages continue to thrive. In the Philippines, all of the

participants spoke their native languages at home, with their friends, and with other family members. These languages were maintained by the participants during their lives outside of the classroom, in meaningful communicative situations with people who were close to them. At the very least, this finding could suggest that even though English is a language with a prominent reputation in the Philippines, there might still be a natural deference, or perhaps a desire, by more Filipinos to continue maintaining their native languages in their personal lives. What this could mean in terms of linguistic imperialism and the linguicism often associated with it (Phillipson, 1992) is that perhaps there are less globally vital languages that can survive the global spread and institutionalization of English. A large component to this would be that national language policies afford native languages official recognition and provide non-native English speakers with the opportunities to speak their native languages. Philippine national language policy does this, and it seems to have had a positive effect on native language practices there.

Of course, due to the limited scope of this study there could be a much larger population of Filipinos that

speak English all of the time than there are those who speak their native languages. It should also be noted that the participants mentioned that English did cause a social divide in the Philippines, where people who spoke English had better opportunities to advance their careers. Some participants even stated that the "common", or rural, people usually did not speak English because they did not receive the same education. This type of social division along language lines is what has concerned some sociolinguists about the nature of globalized English. However, it cannot be confirmed by this study whether there is a legitimate social division based on language practices throughout the Philippines, nor can it determine whether such a social divide is involuntary or not.

Global English: A Positive Outcome

For world Englishes research, this study offers an example of how a variety of world English, like Philippine English, has functioned for a small group of Filipinos who have immigrated to an "inner circle" English speaking country. This discussion about the participants' acquisition and use of English may provide valuable insight as to the success of world English varieties in native English speaking social contexts, a first of its

kind. PE stands as its own type of English localized by Filipinos in the Philippines, and it is used in a variety of ways from bridging communication gaps between Filipino interlocutors to being used as the medium of instruction in Philippine classrooms. Its true success as a variety of world English may be measured by my participants' experiences. The sample group was too small to be more than the impetus for further research on the subject, but their testimonies that knowing PE did indeed help them here in the U.S. does lend credibility to previous world Englishes studies that claim world Englishes has equalized language/power dynamics between native and non-native English speakers (Donskoi, 2009; Kachru & Smith, 2009; Saraceni, 2009).

However as Yano (2001) hypothesized, learning English in the Philippines did not completely prepare the participants for English language use in a native English speaking society. The most pressing dilemma that the participants faced centered on their Filipino accents when they spoke English. This was the most noticeable characteristic about their English, and it motivated them to try to sound more American. Previous world Englishes research (Donskoi, 2009; Kachru & Smith, 2009; Yano, 2001)

suggested that these new varieties of world English being spoken were no longer measured against native English for correctness. This may very well be true, but it may also only be true in non-native English speaking societies. This would be a great sign for those non-native English speaking societies that use their own varieties of world English, like the Philippines, because it would suggest that they have created a form of English unique to their society. Outside of the Philippines, though, PE may be measured against native English, like SAE, because it is in a different social context. This might make PE speakers, like my participants, feel insecure about their English, but it is not permanently debilitating.

Conclusion

The participants' desire to continue to maintain their native languages with their families in the U.S. is a positive sign for the vitality of their Philippine languages. They may not be international languages of business or politics, but their cultural value is recognized and reinforced by the participants. The global spread of English was an inevitable consequence of British and American colonization, but there is evidence in this

thesis that suggests that language and cultural death are not also inevitable consequences of globalized English. The participants' positive attitudes towards English suggest that maybe a balance between languages can occur, and that both languages can co-exist as representations of who the participants are in different social contexts.

REFERENCES

Bautista, L. (2004). The verb in Philippine English: A preliminary analysis of modal would. *World Englishes, 23,* 113-128.

Buttigieg, J. (1999). Teaching English and developing a critical knowledge of the global. *Boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture, 26,* 45-57.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dayag, D. (2004). The English-language media in the Philippines. *World Englishes, 23,* 33-45.

Donskoi, V. (2006). Systemic theory of language competition. *Journal of Language and Politics, 5,* 277-298.

Galtung, J. (1988). *Methodology and Development.* Essays in methodology, volume 3. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.

Gonzalez, A. (1998). The language planning situation in the Philippines. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 19,* 487-525.

Hidalgo, C. A. (1998). Language choice in a multilingual society: the case of the Philippines. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 132,* 23-33.

Kachru, B.B. (1986. *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kachru, Y. & Smith L. (2009). The Karmic cycle of world Englishes: some futuristic constructs. *World Englishes, 28*, 1-14.

McKaughan, H. (1993). Toward a standard Philippine English.*Philippine Journal of Linguistics. 24*, 41-55.

Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1997). *Linguistic imperialism* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saraceni, M. (2009). Relocating English: towards a new paradigm for English in the world. *Language and International Communication, 9*, 175-186.

Tayao, L. (2004). The evolving study of Philippine English phonology. *World Englishes, 23,* 77-90.

San Juan, Jr., E. (2005). Inventing vernacular speech-acts: Articulating Filipino self-determination in the United States. *Socialism and Democracy, 19*, 136-154.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yano, Y. (2001). World Englishes in 200 and beyond. *World*

Englishes, 20, 119-131.