

LANGUAGE USE AND PREFERENCE OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Conchita M. Temporal, Ph.D.

Associate Professor III, College of Teacher Education
Cagayan State University, Philippines

Abstract:

This study explored the language use and preference of university faculty from both language and non-language areas and third year students from the three academic programs of the university who were selected with the use of stratified random sampling. It made use of a three-part survey questionnaire which has the same form for both faculty and students to elicit responses on language background and language use and preference which were further validated through the conduct of FGDs. After consent was sought from the academic heads, the survey questionnaire was floated to and retrieved from both faculty and students in each academic program. Data were analyzed with the use of percentages, mean and standard deviation. Results show that Ilocano figured prominently as language first learned to speak, used at home, and best understood by students and faculty. Filipino and Ilocano are languages they spoke most fluently, read best, wrote best and thought best. Students generally listen in class lectures, speak most in study group discussions, read most the textbooks, and write most lectures and other notes. If they had a choice, students and teachers prefer the use of English. Students' skillful use of English language is heavily influenced by interlocutors and by will to communicate in the target language. Their optimism and preference for English use in their communication is attributed to power of expression and prestige. It is recommended that teachers strengthen collaboration as their influence impacts students' use of English language.

Key Words: language faculty, language preference, language use, non-language faculty, university students

INTRODUCTION

Language teaching is a complex endeavor that requires a professional approach involving decision-making at various levels. Teachers are not merely agents in the educational hierarchy applying specified methods, but they also have the responsibility of building links between internally imposed curricular objectives and their own course planning, activity design, materials development, and management of learning procedures.

This complexity is now a challenge to government to initiate educational reforms to suit the needs of the educational sector. It should formulate innovations in the form of program that will cater to the needs of both the students and the teachers. Skilled manpower, technological

superiority and a well-motivated workforce are the requisites of a competitive economy. There is an urgent call for critical reforms in the educational system today, one that will make the school fit as training grounds for young citizens who would live in tomorrow's global village.

Responsive to this call is the issuance of the Executive Order No.210 which embodies in its Section 2 that "Institutions of higher education, including state colleges and universities, are hereby encouraged to adopt the use of the English language as the primary medium of instructions in the tertiary level. The Commission on Higher Education shall adopt measures to promote and encourage the use of the English language as the primary medium of instruction in the tertiary or higher education level. These developments have made it imperative for academic institutions to define their language policy and enhance language curriculum.

Surveys have shown that even colleges at present times are no longer fluent in speaking, reading, and writing the English language as shown in the result of the *Test of English for International Communication* (TOEIC, 2002). Linguistic situation in the country today is such that there are less and less opportunities for the students to practice the use of the English language, especially in the macro- skills of speaking. It could be said that if one wishes to master the language, he has to use that language and in the case of second language learning, the language remains to be English. Observations would somehow account for the situation ESL learners are in as they use other languages other than English in actual communication with others. This communication is usually from students to students, students to teachers, and teachers to teachers; hence, spelling out their language preference which is also a crucial factor in language learning. Quality of communication activities engaged in by language users whether they are faculty or students is yet another consideration to factor in. Moreover, numerous books and courses have been prescribed; yet, results revealed that the majority of the students are handicapped in the use of English.

Language experts agree that the use of language by a communicator varies and depends, to a large extent, on a number of factors. Traugott and Pratt (1980) as cited by Azevedo (2009) name these factors like the addressee (whether the party is a peer, a superior, a subordinate, setting (inside the classroom, outside the classroom, in an office, etc.) and degree of formality of the speech situation. Shvidko, et.al. (2015) claim that a variety of sociocultural, linguistic, individual, and psychological factors affect students' language use outside the classroom. They are of the opinion that policies governing language use in and out of the ESL classroom are controversial. While some scholars claim that an English-only policy is necessary to maximize language development, others argue that native language (L1) use is an inevitable part of teaching and learning. In bilingual and multilingual settings, the choice of whether to use the first language or the second language is determined by similar factors. Studies on language use in the Philippines have shown that Filipinos use either the regional language, Filipino, or to a certain degree, English, or a combination of two or even of three languages.

Additionally, Cohen (1998) as cited by Alhaisoni (2012) defined language use as “those processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in action taken to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language, through the storage, retention, recall, and application of information about that language”.

Another dimension that somehow complicates language use is the attitude of the user towards English and Filipino. The general observation seems to be that English was and still is the language of the workplace. Thompson (2003) opined that English competes with Tagalog and Taglish a mixture of English and Tagalog, for the affections of Filipinos and seconded Sibayan and Segovia (1979) when they reported having observed the use of combination of English and Filipino in informal inter-office memoranda. This reported code-switching variety has evolved into what is now being referred to as Taglish. This is a significant finding, especially since the perceived resistance to Filipino comes from the workplace. The same study noted that the respondents recognized the need for English at the middle and top management levels and for Filipino at the rank-and-file level.

The study conducted by Fabregas involving workers showed that English was still favored by professionals and semi-professionals. As expected, it was the non-professional group that did not use much English, a situation which may be attributed to the nature of their work. Another study by Segovia and Sibayan as cited by Young (2000) that focused on the workplace sought to determine the extent of the relationship between language and job placement or advancement as perceived by Metro Manila residents. The results of their research showed that while the respondents recognized the contribution of Filipino to job placement or advancement, success in the workplace was more closely associated with knowledge of the English language. Based on several studies on the workplace, Gonzalez and Bautista (1996) as cited by Tupas (2004) and as presented in the edited version of Bautista and Bolton (2008) concluded that the perception of the language users indicated that “English stood out as the language to know for mobility to the very top of the job ladder.”

The use of, and preference for, any particular language is attributed to a number of reasons. In the study undertaken by Otones and Sibayan, respondents were asked to choose between English and Filipino and to cite the reasons for their choice Acuña and Miranda (1994) as cited by Young (2011), likewise, compiled possible reasons for advocating either language, based on newspaper articles.

There have also been attempts to compare self-reported language use and actual use (performance) of the two languages. Mendoza studied market transactions and self-reports of actual use. The results of the study showed a discrepancy between what the respondents said they used and what they actually used. Bautista also obtained no correlation between language use and fluency of the respondents. Cruz, on the other hand, interviewed the same set of respondents twice (at an interval of 8-10 weeks) and found that the results of the first interview concurred with those of the second.

Philadelphia annual reports stressed that “language is the heart of curriculum because through language, students learn both knowledge and rules of functioning in the classrooms; language study was to be not a single subject of study, but integrated throughout all subjects”. The language use in the classroom should be carefully considered as Belarmino (2000) found out in her study that in two communicative settings, the language choice and use was dependent on the type of language that would be used in classroom interaction. The language required for the subject would be utilized by the students but with a certain degree of interaction with the native tongue. But for the peer interaction, students conformed to the language spoken by the group.

Additionally, factors like prestige and communicative setting affect language use and choice. These then affect the type of communicative setting where the students were engaged. Responsive to the call of language to be used in instruction is the issuance of the Executive Order No.210 which embodies in its Section 2 that “Institutions of higher education, including state colleges and universities, are hereby encouraged to adopt the use of the English as the primary medium of instructions in the tertiary level.

Various studies have shown that there can be considerable discrepancies of opinion between learners and their teachers or syllabus experts. Qin (2012) supports the idea that a divergence of opinion between these two groups has been noted in relation to what learners need, what they prefer, and the nature of language and language learning (Brindley, 1984). In a published Asian EFL Journal edited by Robertson and Nunn (2007) citing in Barkhuisen’s survey, the teachers were frequently surprised to learn about the thoughts and feelings of their students. In other words, the students’ perceptions did not match those of teachers. The implication of this piece of research is that if teachers are aware of where their learners are coming from, how they approach language learning, what they feel about their language learning experiences, and how they like to learn the language, they will be able to facilitate desired learning outcomes in the classroom. Learners must be encouraged to express their learning preferences, both for themselves and teachers. Doing so would allow learners to consider why they are participating in certain activities, how these activities help them learn English, and what use they can make of them both for academic purposes and outside classrooms.

Likewise, Spratt’s (1999) study showed a considerable lack of correspondence between the learners’ preferences and teachers’ perceptions of them. It was seen that teachers’ perceptions of learners’ preferences corresponded in approximately 50% of cases with learners’ actual preferences. It was also found that there is no obvious pattern to the correspondences or lack of them. This means that it is hard to discern reasons for why they occurred and hard too to predict where they might occur.

Finally, Stapa (2003) concluded that students’ preferences do indeed correlate with those of teachers in many instances. The findings of his study reveal significant results suggesting a need for a closer cooperation between students and teachers as to how learning activities should be arranged and implemented in the classroom.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

In so far as the improvement of language curriculum and policy depend to a great extent on language users' use and preference of the language for communication, this study generally aimed to establish a baseline data by assessing the university faculty members' and students' language use and preference. Specifically, (1) it described the language background of the students and the faculty from both language and non-language areas. (2) It likewise described the communication activities frequently engaged in by the students and faculty. Furthermore, (3) it described the language use and preference in different communication activities in the four macro-skills engaged in by both students and faculty.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study made use of descriptive-survey method in determining the students' and faculty's language use and preference in different communication activities along the four macro-skills and the communication activities they frequently engaged in.

Sampling Procedure and Participants

The population of the study included the students and faculty across all campuses of the University. However, the Slovin's formula was used to determine the number of samples for the study. The sub-samples were proportionately allocated depending on the sub-population sizes.

The student-respondents were selected from the three academic colleges of the Cagayan State University, namely: College of Teacher Education, College of Engineering, and College of Business, Entrepreneurship, and Accountancy. The faculty-respondents, who were likewise randomly selected, came from language and non-language areas. The course common to the third year level in a specific major was determined and from these, sample sections were chosen to answer the proficiency test and the survey. The target population from the faculty, both language and non-language was stratified according to each field of specialization. The samples were then proportionally allocated to each stratum. Furthermore, each stratum was formed by considering the college where the faculty belongs.

There were 292 student-respondents and 87 faculty-respondents (25 language faculty and 62 non-language faculty) that were randomly selected from the colleges of Teacher Education, Engineering, and Business, Entrepreneurship, and Accountancy. The Slovin's sampling formula was used to determine the sample size.

Instruments

The Survey Questionnaire used in the study was adopted from Guzman, Maybelle K. et.al. (1998) in a published book of national researches titled *Living Language: Assessment of Language Proficiency and Needs in the Professions and in the Workplace*. This was spearheaded

by the Education Research Program of the University of the Philippines Diliman and conducted among three big universities and workplace in the country. The survey questionnaire was used to elicit data on variables such as the respondent's personal profile, their language background, and their language use and preference. The study made use of the three parts of an originally five-part Survey Questionnaire written in English. The Survey Questionnaire came in three forms: Student, language faculty and non-language faculty. All forms followed the same format: questions to be answered from tick-off choices, with provisions for responses other than those listed. They also had essentially the same content, with changes or adaptations introduced to suit the context of each respondent.

The Student Survey, in addition to a demographic profile of the student-respondents, had five main parts: the respondent's language background (7 items); and their language use and preference for listening (12 items), speaking (11 items), reading and writing (15 items) and choices for the reasons offered for the choice of language (18 items). There was a separate Survey questionnaire for two groups of faculty members from the different participating colleges with the survey forms essentially the same as the student-respondent forms: language and non-language; the former to include both teachers of English and Filipino and the latter, teachers of major, professional, or technical courses.

The Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were held to gather additional insights on language use and preference from the students as well as to reinforce and validate data obtained in the course of the study. This was done by convening students from the three academic colleges covered in the study, one for each college, to validate their responses in the survey questionnaire. Data were analyzed with the use of percentages, mean and standard deviation.

Data Collection

A formal request for survey and interview for the FGD was secured from the Office of the University President and the university deans and campus deans of the different campuses of the university. Before permission from the respective heads was sought, the researcher made an initial survey on the number of students in the third year level and on the number of faculty from the three academic colleges of select campuses of the University identified as the locale of the study. For this to be facilitated, she referred to the Management Information System, the database office of the University.

Language and non-language faculty and students were asked to tick off their responses on the written survey questionnaire. After tabulating and analyzing the responses, students from the different academic colleges covered in the study were called for focus group discussions, one for each college, to validate their responses in the survey questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The study involved an assessment-type analysis which required substantial use of descriptive statistics. Percentages, mean, and standard deviation were used in answering

objectives related to assessment. Specifically, percentages were used to describe the language background and the language use and preference along four communication skills of the faculty and students. Mean was used to describe the frequently engaged in communication activities as a whole and by specific skill of the faculty and the students. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the proportion per day where communication tasks of the faculty and students are devoted in.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results and discussion that follow present thematic analysis on students' and faculty's language background, communication activities frequently engaged in, and their language use and preference in the listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Language Background of Respondents

Table: 1
Language background of the students and faculty.

Languages	Students (Percentage)	Language Faculty (Percentage)	Non-Language Faculty (Percentage)
Language first learned to speak			
Ibanag	3.4	16.0	24.2
Tagalog	9.6	4.0	29.0
Kapampangan	1.4	-	1.6
Ilocano	61.3	60.0	37.1
Kalinga	1.0	-	-
Itawes	14.7	12.0	4.8
Isneg	0.7	-	-
Pangasinense	5.1	4.0	-
Others	2.4	4.0	1.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Language most frequently used at home			
Ibanag	3.4	12.0	29.0
Tagalog	10.9	8.0	27.4
Kapampangan	0.3	-	1.60
Ilocano	65.8	60.0	37.1
Kalinga	1.4	-	-
Itawes	15.8	12.0	3.2
Isneg	1.4	-	1.6
Others	1.0	8.0	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Language best understood when listening			
Tagalog	34.3	12.0	38.8
Ilocano	38.7	60.0	32.2
Language spoken fluently			

Tagalog	28.8	12.0	22.6
Ilocano	44.6	52.0	29.0
Language best used in writing			
Tagalog	77.4	16.0	51.7
English	11.3	72.0	29.0
Language best used in reading			
Tagalog	73.6	24.0	40.3
Ilocano	11.3	24.0	16.1
Language used in thinking			
Tagalog	53.5	20.0	41.9
Ilocano	23.3	32	21.0
Others	13.7	44	22.6

The table shows the language background of the students and faculty. Of the 292 students, more than one-half (61.3 percent) stated that the language they first learned to speak was Ilocano, more than one-half (65.8 percent), indicated Ilocano as the language they used at home. The language which most of the students (38.7 percent) said they best understood was Ilocano. The first language of the largest number of language teachers was Ilocano (60.0 percent). Ilocano still figured prominently on the list of the responses to the questions on the language the language teachers used at home and on the language they best understood. It was cited by 60.0 percent as the language they used at home and as the language they best understood. The non-language teachers were also mostly Ilocano speakers (37.1 percent); followed by Tagalog (29.0 percent) and Ibanag (24.2 percent). From there, the responses of the non-language faculty to the other two questions were consistently high for Tagalog and Ibanag.

Most of the students (44. percent) said Ilocano was the language they spoke most fluently followed by Tagalog (28.8). When asked what language they read best, most respondents (73.6 percent) marked Tagalog. Similarly, when asked in which language they wrote best, most respondents (77.4 percent) also cited Tagalog. Ilocano ranked second with respect to reading (11.3 percent) but “Others” which cited English (11.3 percent) ranked second with respect to writing. Conversely, “others” which is English, was a far third for reading and Ilocano for writing. More than fifty percent (53.5 percent) said they thought in Tagalog. Approximately one out of five (23.3 percent) cited Ilocano as the language they thought best. Only a small portion (13.7 percent) cited a language other than those listed, all of whom said it was English.

The trend of figures did not change with respect to the responses to the questions on the language, language teachers best wrote, read, and thought: “Others” and Tagalog. In that order, were the dominant responses. However, in response to the question on what language they spoke fluently, Ilocano was marked by more than one half (52.0 percent) of the total respondents. “Others” came far second with 20.0 percent. However, while “others” and Ilocano received high responses as the languages the non-language teachers spoke, wrote and read best and the language in which they thought, it was Tagalog which topped their list.

Ilocano figured prominently on the list of the responses to the questions on the language the students and the teachers used at home and on the language they best understood. However, when asked what language they best understood, “others” which is English came second for the language faculty. Understanding better the English language could be attributed to the nature of the language teachers’ work and to the fact that they were prepared for and trained on the use of the language.

The prevalence of Ilocano as the language the students and teachers first spoke, used at home, and best understood can all be accounted to the fact that Ilocano is lingua franca in the Region and is one of the major languages in the Philippines. Furthermore, the findings indicate that the first language, in this case, Ilocano, or any other languages of the home, is the same language used by learners in listening and speaking. It also stands to reason that non-language teachers generally are more accustomed to the Filipino language than in the English language.

It could be surmised from the findings that students and teachers generally understand Tagalog and English for these are the same intellectualized languages they encounter in their reading and writing discourses. It could be gleaned then, that Tagalog and English are the languages for reading and writing. This stands to reason since most of the available reading materials are written either in English or in Filipino and that whatever reading materials that were written in the vernaculars (e.g. Bannawag) do not find their way in the library’s rich collection. The culture or context displays its most influence in the speaking discourses of the respondents as Ilocano still remains to be what they fluently speak. It must be noted too as propounded by Stapa (2003) that “culture and practice have been found out to exert a significant influence on the development of life-long learners”.

Communication Activities Frequently Engaged in by the Students and Faculty

Table: 2
Communication activities frequently engaged in by the students and faculty.

Skills	Students (Mean)	Language Faculty (Mean)	Non-Language Faculty (Mean)
Listening	1.92	2.19	2.95
Speaking	2.45	1.42	1.92
Reading	3.00	2.92	2.28
Writing	2.67	3.46	3.21

Of the four major communication activities, listening was the most frequently engaged in by the students. This was followed by speaking and then by writing. Reading was the communication activity least frequently engaged in. As faculty members, the teachers reported engaging in the four communication activities in different frequencies. However, both groups of teachers ranked speaking as that which they most frequently engaged in.

The students do not actively engage in communication activities as they do more of listening than speaking. This finding implies that students would not effectively use the language necessary of them to be equipped since there were less opportunities given them to speak the language. It could also be explained by the findings of the study that reading is least frequently engaged in, basically because teachers provide readily the information students ought to know by themselves.

Table: 3
Listening activities engaged in by the students and faculty.

Situations	Students (Mean)	Language Faculty (Mean)	Non-Language Faculty (Mean)
1. Class lectures	2.27	5.96	3.62
2. Informal conversations	4.90	6.57	4.75
3. Study-group discussions	4.31	5.26	5.83
4. Consultations/interviews	7.54	4.42	4.90
5. Oral reports/ presentations	4.67	3.50	5.25
6. Recitation/class discussions	4.90	4.32	4.90
7. Informal	6.43	6.79	7.61
8. Audio-visual presentations	7.63	2.79	-

Among the various listening situations, class lectures, with a mean of 2.27, topped the list of listening activities, most frequently engaged in by the students. Interestingly, most language teachers, with a mean of 2.79, said they listened most often to audio-visual presentations. The non-language teachers considered class lectures on top of their list with a mean 3.62, similarly with that of the students.

The findings show that the actual classroom setting employs the use of class lectures. This may not be very motivating for students to learn more the language, because according to Stapa (2003), learning that emphasizes receptive skills only are not appealing to students. They did not like to be sitting passively in classroom, but to be actively engaged in classroom activities.

Table: 4
Speaking activities engaged in by the students and faculty.

Situations	Students (Mean)	Language Faculty (Mean)	Non-Language Faculty (Mean)
1. Informal conversations	3.41	5.13	1.51
2. Study-group discussions	3.21	4.79	4.56
3. Consultations/interviews	5.65	4.21	5.81
4. Informal discussions/brainstorming	4.26	5.17	5.03
5. Class recitations/class discussions	3.39	4.95	4.45
6. Reporting/making oral presentations	4.10	5.00	3.54

Most of the students mentioned that, among the speaking activities listed, they most frequently engaged in study-group discussions. For the language teachers, consultations/interviews appeared to be the primary speaking activity most frequently engaged in while informal conversations for the non-language teachers.

The findings show that there exists collaboration among students with the use of study-group discussions, which may in most cases, use languages other than English. While this may be favoured by some, it may not be the case for still others. Studies show that most groups showed a negative preference for group learning (Reid, 2012), a fact which could be ascribed to the weak facilitation of most teachers.

Table: 5
Reading activities engaged in by the students and faculty.

Activities	Students (Mean)	Language Faculty (Mean)	Non- Language Faculty (Mean)
1. Textbooks	2.99	4.71	1.39
2. Examinations	5.10	5.38	6.68
4. Technical reports	4.56	6.65	6.57
5. Lectures and other notes	8.93	5.48	3.71
8. Technical/professional journals	5.85	7.29	6.47
9. Books for personal/leisure reading	8.70	7.00	7.18
10. Theses, dissertations, and other studies	7.74	7.58	6.38
11. Supplementary readings/ reference materials	7.51	9.23	8.29

The materials most frequently read by most of the students and teachers were textbooks. It stands to reason that students would read more of textbooks as these were the same references to be used by their teachers. It could be surmised from the findings, however, that students read more of materials of technical kind as majority of their subjects have this as a requirement.

The findings of the study show that textbooks are still of the utmost value as the source of information despite the advent of technology where easy information could be readily accessed through medium such as the internet. Both students and teachers reading most frequently the textbooks also imply that the former are most likely guided as to the flow of discussion of their latter's subjects.

Table: 6
Writing activities engaged in by the students and faculty.

Situations	Students (Mean)	Language Faculty (Mean)	Non- Language Faculty (Mean)
-------------------	----------------------------	--	---

1. Examinations	4.05	5.83	2.57
2. Personal letters	4.81	4.89	5.87
3. Minutes of meetings	7.09	4.76	7.98
4. Lectures and other notes	3.79	3.36	2.40

Among the writing activities listed, the students most frequently engaged in writing lectures and other notes. Interestingly, with the advent of technology at present, personal letters still came to be at the second rank. Both groups of teachers said they most frequently wrote lectures and other notes.

The findings reaffirm the use of teacher talk in the classroom as students frequently engaged in writing lecture notes by listening to the lectures done by their teachers. This reiterates negative implication on the language learning of students as they were not actively engaged in the learning process.

Language Use and Preference in the Four Macro-Skills

Table: 7
Language Use and Preference when Listening by the Students and Faculty

Items	Students (%)	Language Faculty (%)	Non-language Faculty (%)
Individuals most listened to			
Professors	80.8	12.00	21.3
Fellow Students	17.1	88.00	71.8
Others	2.1	-	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Language used in listening			
Filipino	43.8	36.0	47.5
English	52.4	52.0	47.5
Others	3.8	12.0	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Language preferred in listening			
Filipino	33.6	-	32.7
English	63.7	100.0	63.9
Others	2.7	-	3.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Reasons for the use of the language preferred in listening			
I am a Filipino	10.3	-	18.0
It is more formal	13.0	12.0	1.6
It is less formal	11.3	-	1.6
It is more prestigious	4.8	-	-
It is our own language	5.5	-	6.6
It puts the listener at ease	15.4	-	8.2
It is an international language	3.4	12.0	13.1
It is the language of the masses	4.8	-	1.6
It shows respect for the listener	9.6	4.0	8.2
It is most appropriate for the occasion	1.4	-	1.6
It is the official language of instruction	8.6	40.0	26.2
It has standard practice to use this	2.1	-	1.6
It best expresses the speaker's thoughts and	3.1	8.0	4.9

feelings			
It is the language in which the speaker is most fluent	1.0	-	3.3
There are no equivalent/adequate terms in English or Filipino	2.7	4.0	1.6
It is the language of the professions, government, law, business, and industry	2.4	20.0	1.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

The students cited several reasons for the use of the language by the persons they most frequently listened to. Frequently cited reasons were (a) it is formal; (b) it is an international language; and (c) it best expresses the speaker’s thoughts and feelings. To explain their choice of Filipino, they said it puts the listener at ease; shows respect to the listener; it was less formal; and it was their own language. Both groups of teachers listened more to students than to fellow professors and others combined. As expected, language teachers listened to more English than Filipino spoken by their interlocutors. The non-language faculty listened to both Filipino and English in the same frequency. Both language and non-language teachers would rather their interlocutors used English when speaking to them. Not surprisingly, all of the language teachers preferred English over Filipino while more than half of the non-language teachers would rather listen to English than to Filipino.

The findings provide support to the studies of Belarmino (2000), on language use in the Philippines which showed that Filipinos use either the regional language, Filipino, or to a certain degree, English, or a combination of two or even three languages in their discourses. Seemingly, the attitude of the respondents towards the English language is favourable. It could be gleaned from the table that their language choice and use were dependent on the type of language that would be used in classroom interactions. It further shows that the language for the subject to be utilized by the students is with a certain degree of interaction with the native tongue but for the peer interactions, students conformed to the language spoken by the group.

Table: 8
Language use and preference when speaking by the students and faculty.

Items	Students (%)	Language Faculty (%)	Non-language Faculty (%)
Individuals most spoken to			
Professors	5.1	16.0	14.8
Fellow Students	92.8	80.0	83.6
Others	2.1	4.0	1.6
Language used in speaking			
Filipino	79.8	20.0	24.6
English	9.6	72.0	63.9
Others	10.5	8.0	11.5
Language preferred in speaking			
Filipino	40.1	-	32.8
English	55.8	96.0	65.6
Others	4.1	4.0	1.6
Reasons for the use of the language preferred in speaking			

I am a Filipino	20.5	-	8.2
It is more formal	13.4	8.0	6.6
It is more prestigious	6.2	-	1.6
It is our own language	11.0	-	4.9
It is an international language	9.6	20.0	8.2
It shows respect for the listener	4.5	-	6.6
It is the official language of instruction	3.4	44	19.7
It best expresses the speaker's thoughts and feelings	6.2	4.0	11.5
It is the language of the professions, government, law, business, and industry	4.8	24.0	16.4

Majority of the students said they spoke most often with their fellow students. The language they spoke most frequently was Filipino and a slightly lower percentage said they spoke English least frequently. If they had a choice, majority said they would speak in English. The reasons most often cited for the preference for English were the following: (a) it is more formal; (b) it is an international language; (c) it is more prestigious. The faculty spoke most frequently to students. Language teachers and the non-language teachers spoke mostly in English. Given a choice, they would prefer to speak in English than in Filipino.

In connection with the findings, Traugott and Pratt (1980) as cited by Azevedo (2009) concluded that the use of language by a communicator varies and depends, to a large extent on factors like the addressee (whether the party is a peer, a superior, a subordinate, setting (inside the classroom, outside the classroom, in an office, etc.) and degree of formality of the speech situation.

Table: 9
Language use and preference when reading by the students and faculty.

Items	Students (%)	Language Faculty (%)	Non-language Faculty (%)
Writings most frequently read			
Professors	58.5	4.0	14.8
Fellow Students	30.5	84.0	65.6
Others	11.0	12.0	19.7
Language used in reading			
Filipino	21.9	16.0	14.8
English	77.4	80.0	82.0
Others	0.7	4.0	3.3
Language preferred the writers used			
Filipino	25.0	-	19.7
English	73.6	100.0	78.7
Others	1.4	-	1.8
Reasons for the use of the language they prefer to read			
I am a Filipino	9.2	-	8.2
It is more formal	8.2	12.0	4.9
It is more prestigious	16.5	4.0	1.6
It puts the listener at ease	7.2	-	1.6
It is an international language	8.6	20.0	9.8
It is the official language of instruction	5.8	36.0	31.1

It is the language of the professions, government, law, business, and industry	2.1	24.0	19.7
---	-----	------	------

More than one-half of the students said they most frequently read the work of their professors and fellow students. A majority of the respondents disclosed that most of what they read was written in English. Those who preferred English offered the following reasons: (a) it is more prestigious; and (b) it is an international language. The largest number of language teachers and non-language teachers read the written work of their students. Again, the materials frequently read by the language and non-language teachers were written in English. Consistent with the language of materials they usually read, all language teachers marked English as the language they preferred to read but only a clear majority for the non-language teachers.

The results show that while all groups recognized the contribution of Filipino to job placement or advancement, success in the workplace was more closely associated with knowledge of the English language. As pointed out by Tupas (2004) cited in Gonzales and Bautista (1998), English still remains to be the “language to know for mobility to the very top of the ladder”.

Table: 10
Language use and preference when writing by the students and faculty.

Items	Students (%)	Language Faculty (%)	Non-language Faculty (%)
Individuals frequently written to			
Professors	36.3	20.0	16.4
Fellow Students	53.4	64.0	78.7
Others	10.3	16.0	4.9
Language used in writing			
Filipino	28.1	24.0	23.0
English	71.2	72.0	77.0
Others	0.7	4.0	-
Language preferred in writing			
Filipino	29.8	-	16.4
English	69.2	100.0	80.3
Others	1.0	-	3.3
Reasons for the use of the language preferred in writing			
It is more formal	25.0	12.0	6.6
It is less formal	9.2	-	6.6
It is more prestigious	7.9	4.0	-
It is an international language	7.5	24.0	3.3
It shows respect for the listener	4.1	-	1.6
It is the official language of instruction	4.5	28.0	40.9
It best expresses the writer's thoughts and feelings	10.3	12.0	9.8
It is the language of the professions, government, law, business, and industry	3.4	20.0	14.8

Most of the students said they wrote most often to or with their fellow students. A majority of the students cited they most frequently wrote in English. If they had a choice, most of the students said they would choose to write in English for the following reasons: (a) it is more formal; (b) it is more prestigious; (c) it is an international language; (d) it best expresses the writer's thoughts and feelings.

Both groups of teachers wrote most frequently for students. They both wrote most frequently in English. Asked which language they preferred to write in, all language teachers, expectedly, preferred English to Filipino but only a clear majority of the non-language teachers favoured English over Filipino.

It could be surmised from the findings that while most students write in English, they are not given writing activities that call for more formal and standard use of the language as their expected readers are their friends. This finding implies that students' use of English in informal writings such as the ones they forward their friends, do not give learners more directed purposes for doing so, hence, not creating a more conscious atmosphere in their use of the language.

Table: 11
Proportion per day where communication tasks are devoted in.

Language	Students		Language Faculty		Non-language Faculty	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
English	39.34	19.91	67.60	18.37	58.78	18.46
Filipino	34.80	17.36	15.83	7.94	26.72	16.02
Taglish	29.51	17.92	16.88	12.53	19.82	15.78

The table presents the languages and the time the students and teachers use the languages in their daily communication. While English was still favoured by the teachers, it stands to reason that the non-language group did not use much English, a situation which may be attributed to the nature of their subjects. The finding further indicates that students are not motivated enough to express themselves in the English language as what is required of them to develop because teachers themselves do not model the use of the English language in their discourses. This claim was further supported by their responses in the focus group discussions conducted with them. If learners would be demotivated, they would not consequently take language learning for granted, thus, sacrificing the development of their English proficiency.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study generally aimed to assess the university faculty and students' language use and preference. Specifically, it described the language background of the students and the faculty, the communication activities frequently engaged in by them and their language use and preference in

different communication activities in the four macro-skills. The language use and preference for English and the amount of time devoted for its use in the different communication skills as shown in this study can address the problems on lack of language policy for the University and the meeting of minds of both faculty and students as regards the effective use of English in communication and in instruction. This debunks the notion that native language is preferred over the English language in most situations. Also, having knowledge that English is the preferred language of both students and Filipino can help improve the language curriculum by enhancing students' exposure and engagement in the language and with the faculty exemplifying the effective use of the English language as well. Hence, the baseline data yielded along language use and preference could serve as basis for crafting language policy that would optimize the development of the students' and faculty's English language proficiency.

It is recommended that teachers need to strengthen their collaboration with one another as their influence as models to their students impacts students' use of the English language. It is also encouraged that the university creates more welcoming attitude of making English as the lingua franca in the university. Language across Curriculum should likewise be enhanced especially if the end in view is to make students English proficient and more authentic and real-time world situations need to be provided for students to practice the use of the English language as well. Lastly, a follow-up study is suggested to be conducted to include the English proficiency of students as perceived and actually performed by them and ascertain whether there is a relationship that exists between the two.

Although this study produced significant data on students' and faculty's language use and preference, there are also limitations to this study. One limitation is the locale of the study which is only for few academic programs. Another limitation is on the design which only made use of descriptive survey. While FGD was conducted to validate responses, this was only true to students and not with teachers. Moreover, the documentation for the actual use of the language through observation and immersion were not considered in the study which may have been additional authentic sources of data.

REFERENCES

- Alhaisoni, E. (2012). *Language Learning Strategy Use of Saudi EFL Students in an Intensive English Learning Context*. Asian Social Science. Vol. 8, No. 13.
doi:10.5539/ass.v8n13p115.
- Azevedo, M. (2009). *Literary Linguistics in the Context of a Literature Department*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Belarmino, P. (2000). *Sanghaya: Philippine Arts and Culture Yearbook*. National Commission for Culture and the Arts.

- Bautista, M. & Bolton, K. (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Hongkong University Press.
<https://www.scribd.com/document/369610668/Philippine-English-Linguistic-and-Literary-Perspectives-pdf>
- Nical, I. (2000). *Language usage and language attitudes among education consumers: the experience of Filipinos in Australia and in three linguistic communities in the Philippines*. Published Dissertation. University of Adelaide.
- Qin, X. (2012). *A comparative study of activity preferences of learners and teachers in college english teaching and its implications for curriculum design*. International Journal of English Linguistics; Vol. 2, No. 6; 2012. doi:10.5539/ijel.v2n6p40.
- Reid, J. (2012). *The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students*. TESOL Quarterly. Volume 21 Issue 1.
- Shvidko, et.al. (2015). *Factors affecting language use outside the ESL classroom: Student perspectives*. System Volume 51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.03.006>
- Stapa, S. (2003). *ESP Students' Learning Preferences: Are the Teachers Aware?*. University of Malaysia Language Learning.
- Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC). (2002). *Teachers' Guide to TOEIC*. Oxford University Press.
- The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly March 2007 Volume 9, Issue 1. Asian EFL Journal Press.
https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/March_2007_EBook.pdf
- Thompson, R. (2003). *Filipino English and Taglish: Language switching from multiple perspectives*. John Benjamins Publish Co. Amsterdam/Phildelphia.
- Tupas, T. (2004). *The Politics of Philippine English: Neocolonialism, Global Politics, and the Problem of Postcolonialism*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. USA. World Englishes Vol. 23 No.1
- Young, C. (2011). *Enablers and constraints of an effective and sustainable mother tongue based multilingual education policy in the Philippines*.
https://www.sil.org/system/files/reapdata/16/46/70/.../YoungC_PhD_Thesis.pdf