Language Patterns and Attitudes of Kinamiging Manobo Speakers

JOHN BRIAN L. ALAMILLO
jbalamillo@gmail.com
http://orcid.org 0000-0002-8800-6655
University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

ISMAEL N. TALILI
http://orcid.org 0000-0002-6994-6991
ismael.talili@must.edu.ph
University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Language diversity reflects a society's richness in culture. Kinamiging Manobo, a language spoken in the southern Philippines, faces a threat of extinction posed by a more dominant language. The study aimed to determine the language patterns and the attitude of the speakers towards their language and the survival probability of the language. The descriptive research involved 40 respondents who resided in Sagay, Camiguin Island – a bilingual community. The study utilized two instruments, namely, sociolinguistic survey questionnaire and matched-guise technique. The sociolinguistic survey questionnaire was adapted from the study of Campos (2014), who investigated the attitudes of Agusan Manobo speakers towards their language. Results show that Kinamiging Manobo is no longer used in most of the respondents' sociolinguistic domains. The findings support the claims that the language is classified as a threatened language. Speakers of Kinamiging Manobo prefer to use Cebuano in all the sociolinguistic domains

(home, friendship, public and religious). However, most speakers have positive attitudes towards their language and are willing to do necessary efforts to preserve it. Kinamiging Manobo is least used in church, and is more often used (but still not the dominant language) at home.

Keywords – Sociolinguistics, Kinamiging Manobo, Philippine languages, language attitudes, language patterns, threatened language, descriptive design, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

In today's globalized age where the world becomes smaller, it is a common observation that languages converge. What is most evident is that languages spoken by minority groups are often taken for granted. As a result, speakers tend to choose those which are much more useful and readily accessible to them.

A country composed of diverse cultures, Philippines has a population of 92.34 million (Philippine Statistics Authority, n.d.) in 2010. These people are scattered throughout the archipelago of 7,107 islands. As a result of geographical separation, distinct languages are formed along with different cultures. To unify these diverse societies, Filipino (based on Tagalog) along with English became the country's official language. Eight major languages are also declared official in regional communication: Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon or Ilonggo, Bicol, Waray, Pampango and Pangasinense (Morrison & Conaway, 2007). Efforts have been made to represent all groups, but are not sufficient.

Other minor languages have become useless and are no longer used in communication because of the dominance and utility of some languages, especially the regional lingua franca. This then results to language extinction or language death. It is reported that out of 187 languages in the country, 183 are living, and four are extinct. Out of these living languages, 175 are indigenous, and eight are non-indigenous. Furthermore, it is reported that 13 of these languages are in trouble, and 11 are dying (Ethnologue: Languages of the World, 2015). If no measures are done to preserve these languages, the number of endangered ones will eventually increase. As a language dies, so dies the culture of its speakers (Sachdev & Hanlon, 2000).

One of the reasons why a language is no longer spoken or preferred by a certain group of people is that it has negative associations like being uneducated

and inferior; or a more prevailing language, which speakers believe as a more superior and can be used with greater advantage is present. As such, the younger generation would choose the one which is more accessible and advantageous (Ihemere, 2006).

The abovementioned factors are the reasons for the examination and exploration of the attitudes of Kinamiging Manobo speakers towards their language (one of the eight threatened languages in the Philippines, spoken in Camiguin Islands). The language is classified as threatened, which means that the language is used for face to face communication within all generations but it is losing its users (Ethnologue, 2015). In addition, the language is not spoken all throughout the island anymore. Speakers are concentrated in the Municipality of Sagay, which has a total population of 531 in 1990 (National Center for Culture and Arts, n.d.).

Attitudes preserve or endanger a language. When a language is preserved or maintained, the identity of its speakers flourish. On the other hand, once a language is endangered, a great probability of losing the identity of a particular group is at stake. Being able to communicate effectively in an individual's first or home language connects a person to his/her ethnic group and helps to shape a person's identity (Dhurrkay). It is then vital that a language of a certain community be preserved to further preserve its identity. Republic Act 7104, Section 4 directs for the creation of the Commission on the Filipino language which aims to undertake, coordinate and promote researches for the development, propagation and preservation of Filipino and other Philippine languages and which shall be directly under the Office of the President (The Lawphil Project, 2015).

The study identified the attitudes of Kinamiging Manobo speakers and as such, specific measures to preserve the language were formulated which would lead to language revitalization.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study determined the attitudes and language patterns of Kinamiging Manobo speakers. Language attitude, as defined by Ihemere (2006) refers to the feelings people have about their language. It is the speakers' perception whether *Kinamiging Manobo* is important in the different areas of their lives. On the other hand, language pattern refers to the respondents' choice of language in different sociolinguistic domains. As the research locale is basically at least a bilingual community, people tend to use a different language in different places with different interlocutors.

More specifically, the study sought the following: 1) profile of the speakers such as age, sex, occupation, highest educational attainment, time spent in speaking Kinamiging Manobo and perceived fluency; 2) language preferences in different sociolinguistic domains; and 3) attitudes of the respondents towards Kinamiging Manobo.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The paper used a descriptive research design. The study aimed to describe the attitudes of Kinamiging Manobo speakers in a certain period. Furthermore, the data collected in the study reflected the present condition of the language in the locality where the language is spoken.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in the Municipality of Sagay, Camiguin Island. Camiguin Island is a 5th class province with a total population of 93,646 as of 2010 (Philippine Statistics Authority). Located north of Mindanao, this second smallest island province is a popular tourist destination. Four languages are familiar to the people in the island namely: Kinamiging Manobo, Cebuano, Tagalog, and English. Cebuano is used in homes, schools, markets and almost all domains of the locals' lives. Tagalog and English are mostly used with tourists. On the other hand, the native language, Kinamiging Manobo is losing users. Residents from most municipalities no longer use the language, and the speakers are already concentrated the Municipality of Sagay.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were mainly the speakers of Kinamiging Manobo, who lived in Sagay, Camiguin Island –a bilingual community. All the respondents had access to Cebuano, a language used by the majority population.

Instrumentation

The study utilized two instruments: sociolinguistic survey questionnaire and matched-guise technique. The sociolinguistic survey questionnaire was adapted from the study of Campos (2014), who investigated the attitudes of Agusan Manobo speakers towards their language. Survey questionnaire was also used by Ihemere (2006) and Sachdev & Hanlon (2000) in their studies about language attitudes.

As mentioned in Campos' (2014) study, the questionnaire underwent test validity and reliability. As the respondents have slightly different characteristics from that study, some sections were removed and some sections were added. The questionnaire also underwent another round of validity and reliability test after some revisions.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections; each section was soliciting specific information related to the demographic profile, language exposure and language attitudes of the respondents. The following are the sections of the questionnaire: Background Information; Language Use; Language Attitudes: Perceived Importance of Kinamiging Manobo; and Language Attitudes: Agreement Scale.

Matched-guise technique was also utilized. This technique was developed by Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum (1960). This instrument employs recordings of speakers who each read the same passage in two or more guises (language, dialect or accent). The respondents then listened to the recordings and assessed the speakers' personality traits.

Sampling Techniques

The study utilized purposive sampling technique in selecting the respondents. Purposive sampling, also referred to as judgment, selective or subjective sampling is a non-probability sampling method that is characterized by a deliberate effort to gain representative samples by including groups or typical areas in a sample (Key, 2002). The criteria for choosing the respondents were set.

Selection Criteria

The criteria on selecting the respondents were based on Campos' (2014) standards as follows:

1. Respondent was grown and raised in Camiguin Island, and if he/she has lived elsewhere, it is not a significant amount of recent time. This assures that the respondent has a long-term contact with the language, and has been using the language in different sociolinguistic domains.
2. Respondent should have Kinamiging Manobo as his first or second language. This means that the respondent should be from Camiguin Manobo tribe and has access to the language since he/she was a child.
3. Respondent should have at least one Manobo parent from the village.

Data-Gathering Procedure

A letter of permission to conduct the study was sent to the local government units (Municipal Office of Sagay and Offices of the different barangays). After sending the letter, a courtesy call to the key officials (mayor and captains) took place. The purpose of this was to discuss the benefits the study could give to the preservation of language and culture in the research setting. This was also done to assure permission and to set schedules of the surveys and interviews.

After asking for permission, the survey took place. Two enumerators were hired for faster data gathering. These enumerators were informed about the objectives and the content of the questionnaire to extract the needed information from the respondents.

Data gathered during the survey and interview were then tabulated and analyzed statistically. Appropriate statistical tools were used to determine the relationship between variables.

Statistical Treatment

The collected data were managed and analyzed utilizing the descriptive statistical technique. It includes mean, frequency and percentage distribution and standard deviation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There were 40 respondents representing the local communities (barangay) namely: Poblacion, Bonbon, and Mayana. These are the barangays where most bilinguals are concentrated. Respondents' ages were classified into three groups, namely: young (14-29 years old); middle-aged (30-45 years old); and old (46+ years old). The mean age is 42.57 with a standard deviation of 19.12. The youngest respondent was 14, and the oldest was 76 years old. Age is an important variable in studying language as it is used in society because it reflects a speaker's identity changes throughout his/her lifetime (Eckert, 1996). In this study, all ages are represented. For the respondents' sex distribution, male comprises 52.5% while female, 47.5%.

Occupations of the respondents are grouped according to the following: white collar, blue collar, and none. White collar jobs are those that entail mental or clerical work, and it also refers to those employees or professionals whose work is knowledge intensive, non-routine, and unstructured (Business Dictionary, 2016). These jobs include respondents who are government employees, business owners and teachers. They comprise 27.5% of the population.

On the other hand, blue collar jobs are those that require physical labor. This classification includes those respondents who have skilled jobs such as technicians, helpers, farmers, nurses, drivers, and dressmakers. They comprise another 27.5% of the respondents.

The remaining group, which is classified as "none" are the respondents who do not rely on occupation for their living. As described earlier in the table, the majority of the respondents come from Young and Old ages; as such, they are students in senior high school or college and retired employees, respectively. Those Middle-Aged respondents who do not have an occupation (5% of the respondents) are housewives.

Occupation also plays a significant role in a person's language because it determines an individual's choice of words and access to a language. For example, if a person works in a frontline job, he/she should learn vocabulary common to people the company is serving. There are also jobs which do not need the speaker to become articulate in a specific language or languages. After inquiring for the respondents' profile, their education or highest educational attainment was also asked.

A speaker's education is also a factor that affects his or her language patterns. To communicate effectively in school, especially with non-Kinamiging speakers, most of the respondents claimed that they had used other languages such as Cebuano for communication. Some also mentioned that the use of Tagalog and English were very important since their teachers required them to use the said languages inside the classroom. Other respondents also studied tertiary education in cities, as such, their language patterns and preferences could be greatly affected.

Some 47.5% attained basic education, that is, elementary and secondary levels; 15% obtained technical-vocational courses (these are the technicians), and the remaining 37.5 attained the tertiary level.

Time Spent in Speaking Kinamiging Manobo

Some respondents (47.5%) have been speaking it for 7-10 years; 27.5% have been speaking the language for 31-54 years, and 25% have been speaking it for 55-78 years. Time spent in speaking Kinamiging Manobo depends on the respondents' age, location, and other factors. The older the speaker, then the more time he/she is likely to be exposed to a language. Most young speakers have been speaking the language for only 7 - 30 years.

On the other hand, old speakers have been speaking the language for 55 - 78 years. It is interesting to note then that one old respondent spoke Kinamiging

for only 7 - 30 years. It is further noted that there are respondents who belong to the age group "old" but have comparably shorter time speaking the language. As such, other factors also play a significant role to a person's language exposure.

During the interviews, respondents reported that speakers in Poblacion (municipality's downtown and most populous area) are using Cebuano more often. They may have access to Kinamiging, but they prefer to use Cebuano. As a result, the time they use in speaking Kinamiging becomes lesser. In contrast, those who live in rural barangays use Kinamiging in their day-to-day encounters and only use Cebuano when they go downtown. The respondents even asserted that the further one lives from downtown Sagay, the purer his/her Kinamiging is. They also added that those who live in the upper barangays speak better Kinamiging than those in the town center.

Another factor that affects the respondents' time in speaking the language is their length of stay in Sagay. Some of them lived outside the municipality for several months or years to study or to work. As a result, they learn a different language, and to some extent, bring home some vocabulary.

Fluency of Kinamiging Manobo speakers

Since the study emphasizes the speakers' attitude towards their language, fluency and or/proficiency test was not done.

A person's perception of how well he/she speaks in the language could also affect his/her attitude towards it. For example, if a person cannot speak a language well, he/she might think that the language is difficult to learn, or he does not want to speak it because he/she has no interest in it. On the other hand, a speaker who thinks he/she speaks a certain language well may have a positive attitude to a language; that is, he/she likes it or likes to listen to it.

Majority of the respondents (52.5%) believe that they are at the intermediate level. The majority can comprehend and at the same time communicate themselves in Kinamiging fairly well. They are more advanced than the beginner, but they are not expert in the language yet. They say that they often speak it in informal settings.

Another 30% claim that they are well-versed in the language. This means that they can read and write, listen and speak very well in Kinamiging. These people also claim that they have used the language not only in informal settings, in formal settings in some cases as well. These people believe that they have an extensive vocabulary in the language and can translate texts from a different language to Kinamiging well.

However, 17.5% of the respondents believe that they are beginners. They claim that they can understand when someone speaks to them in Kinamiging, but cannot speak it well. These speakers use Cebuano very much often than Kinamiging.

Language Preferences of the Speakers

As mentioned earlier, most of the respondents are at least bilingual. Also, some can speak other languages aside from Cebuano and Kinamiging. The other Philippine languages spoken by the respondents (Ilonggo, Ilocano, and Meranao) were learned through immersion to the different regions in the Philippines such as Bukidnon and Cotabato while English and Tagalog were learned through formal education and television.

Despite the fact that the respondents could speak languages other than Cebuano and Kinamiging Manobo, they report that they seldom use the other languages across all domains because they mentioned that there was only one or two in the family who speak these languages. Therefore, these other languages spoken by the respondents were considered negligible when used as variable in finding correlations.

Social Domains

Social domain denotes a speaker's context of interaction. This term is introduced by Fishman and Agheyisi (1970) and may include the following: family, religion, employment and friendship. Each of these domains requires a specific set of language variety and/or vocabulary because each has distinctive factors: addressee, setting and topic (English Language and Linguistics Online, 2008).

The study includes those domains applicable to its respondents. These domains include the following: home, friendship, social/public and religious domains. These domains were also used by Campos (2014). Each domain has its sub-domain and also includes interlocutors, activities done when interlocutors are in this domain, and its setting.

Table 1. Domains and sub-domains of Kinamiging Manobo usage

Domain	Interlocutors	Activities	Setting
1. Home	parents, grandparents, children, grandchildren, nephews/nieces	family gathering, family leisure time, meals	inside home
2. Friendship	neighbors, Kamigingnon friends, non-Kamigingnon friends	playing, reunions	outside home
3. Social/Public	Kamigingnons, non-Kamigingnons, government officials, teachers, classmates, city people, workmates	village meeting	market, workplace, school or university
4. Religious	priest/pastor, churchmates, Sunday school teacher	fellowship, singing, prayer, announcements, personal prayer, Bible reading	Church

Languages used at home

Home domain includes parents, children, siblings, grandchildren, nephews, and nieces. The following tables specifically describe the languages used by the respondents with specific interlocutors.

When talking to their parents, 77.5% of the respondents answered that they use Cebuano while 60% say that they use Kinamiging Manobo. Cebuano is predominantly spoken when children speak to their parents. The main reason for this is that most young to middle-aged respondents are more accustomed to using Cebuano in day-to-day conversations.

Twenty-one respondents from young and middle-age groups speak Cebuano to their parents while only 13 speak Kinamiging Manobo. On the other hand, ten speakers who belong to the Old age group speak Cebuano and 11 speak Kinamiging Manobo. Data indicates that when speaking to parents, younger respondents tend to speak Cebuano with their parents at home.

Respondents who had children were also asked what language they used when speaking to their children. Majority (92%) speak Cebuano while only 52% parents speak Kinamining Manobo to their children. Some respondents also speak other languages to their parents, which compose 8% of the population.

When talking to siblings, 92.1% affirmed to be using Cebuano while 47.4% speak in Kinamiging Manobo. Those who speak other languages with their parents comprise 2.6% of the population.

Questions related to respondents' language when talking to their spouse was also asked during the survey. A total of 35 married respondents answered the query. Results showed that 88.5% speak Cebuano while 42.3% speak Kinamiging Manobo with their spouses. Another 3.8% speaks another language since the spouse comes from another tribe.

When the respondents conversed with their grandparents, it was noted that 62.9% of the respondents use Kinamiging Manobo while 57.1% use Cebuano. It can be noted that when respondents talked to the eldest members of the family, they used Kinamiging Manobo more often. This is most probably caused by the respondents' ages. Filipino families base hierarchy upon age. Older members of the family are venerated the most; as a result, younger members adapt the language of the older members.

As shown, most respondents from the older generations (middle-aged and old) use Kinamiging when speaking to their grandparents. On the other hand, younger generations speak Cebuano with their grandparents. This shows that the elder generations speak Kinamiging Manobo more often. Furthermore, this also testifies that the introduction of Cebuano language happened just recently to the area.

The intergenerational language pattern clearly describes the gradual shift of languages choice of the speakers in the locality from Kinamiging Manobo. When asked for the reasons of their choice, respondents declared that Cebuano is more useful than Kinamiging Manobo. Younger respondents also mentioned that Kinamiging Manobo is difficult to learn.

When asked about the common language used with their grandchildren and/or nephews, 78.4% of the respondents said that they use Cebuano while 40.5% use Kinamiging Manobo. The remaining 10.8% speak other Philippine languages with their grandchildren and/or nephews.

Languages used with friends

This domain includes the respondents' neighbors, Camiguingnon and non-Camiguingnon friends as interlocutors. Communication process happens outside home and activities vary according to the respondents' interests. Some 67.5% of the respondents speak Cebuano while 62.5% speak Kinamiging Manobo with their Camiguingnon friends. Majority (92.5%) use Cebuano. A notable 20% speak Kinamiging Manobo with their non-Camiguingnon friends; respondents say the reason for this is that they teach the language to their friends.

Languages used in social/public situations

The public or social domain includes places such as market, workplace or school. Interlocutors could include government officials and employees, teachers, classmates, salespersons, and workmates.

Respondents were asked what languages they use in the market with Camiguingnon and non-Camiguingnon traders. Some 75% of the respondents use both Kinamiging and Cebuano with fellow Camiguingnons. On the other hand, 92.5% speak Cebuano while only 20% speak Kinamiging Manobo with non-Camiguingnons. The remaining 5% speak other languages.

Aside from business settings, respondents were also asked about their language patterns during endeavors done in government offices and with officials. The setting includes communication with municipal and village offices, talking to government employees and village meetings.

Cebuano is the most common language used in government settings. It is used by 90% of the respondents when communicating with government officials and employees and also being spoken by 86.8% of the respondents during village meetings. Respondents described that during meetings, Kinamiging Manobo is only used in greetings during the first part of every meeting and announcements during the last part.

Another public setting where the respondents often communicate is the school. Despite the fact that only 10% are students, 87.5% of the respondents had secondary education and 100% went to school.

Cebuano is predominantly used in school with different interlocutors. Even with Camiguingnon classmates, the majority of the respondents (72.5%) still use Cebuano. Respondents said that for them to cater to communicative needs of Cebuano speakers, they compromise using Cebuano. Other languages spoken in school include English and Tagalog. Respondents explained that during their time, they are sanctioned every time they do not speak either English or Tagalog.

Languages used in church

Since the municipality is predominantly Roman Catholic, most of the respondents say that the language used in church depends on the priest that presides the mass. Data show that Cebuano is still used in almost all church activities.

Cebuano language dominates in all church activities. Respondents further mentioned that other languages include English and Tagalog when the priest or pastor gives the message. They also explained that Kinamiging Manobo is more often used in greetings and sometimes when the priest inserts stories where the use of language is more appropriate.

As shown, Cebuano language is the most prevalent language being used in all sociolinguistic domains. It is most dominant in church, which is being used by 97% of the respondents. On the other hand, it has the smallest percentage in the home domain but still has the higher percentage than Kinamiging Manobo.

Kinamiging Manobo, on the other hand, although the less preferred language, is more often used in with friends, which is used by 30.2% of the respondents. It is least used in religious activities, only used by 2.4% of the respondents.

Attitudes of the Speakers towards Kinamiging Manobo

According to Eagly and Chaiken (2005), attitudes are psychological tendency expressed through evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor. Furthermore, they believe that attitudes do not exist until someone distinguishes an object as a discriminable entity or curious awareness. As such, attitudes can be identified by using several approaches (stimuli) to arouse the appropriate subsequent response (attitude) of an individual (Melander & Dalarna, 2003).

In response, the study used several techniques to solicit the respondents' attitudes. Several questions were asked pertaining to Kinamiging Manobo's importance in daily activities. Statements about the language's importance and likeability were also asked where respondents could agree or disagree.

Respondents' attitude towards Kinamiging Manobo is divided into two: the way they see the usefulness of their language in specific situations, and their tendency to like the language.

In the first part, respondents were asked the importance of Kinamiging Manobo in its four different functions: 1) facilitating in-group relationship; 2) facilitating out-group relationship; 3) economic use; and 4) literacy and use of technology (Campos, 2014). They were asked to rate the following activities as:

very important, important, neutral, unimportant, and very unimportant. Table 22 further details the abovementioned functions.

The second part consists statements on the likeability of Kinamiging Manobo. Respondents were again asked to rate their agreement on the following scale: strongly agree, agree, no comment, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Facilitating in-group relationship includes the respondents' perception of how important a language is in building friendship, being accepted in the community, talking to friends and the people within the community and going to church.

Results showed that most of the respondents (32.5%) believe that Kinamiging Manobo is not so important in making friends. This "neutral" response is translated into the local language *sakto lang*, which means not really important, but not unimportant as well. On the other hand, the majority (45%) of them believe that Kinamiging Manobo is important to be accepted in the community. Another 40%-45% of the respondents believe that Kinamiging Manobo is also important in talking to friends in school and the people in the barangay. There is one activity that the speakers find Kinamiging Manobo as unimportant. Most of the respondents (42.5%) believe that Kinamiging Manobo is unimportant in church-related activities.

Results in the respondents' attitude in church-related activities corroborate with the use of their language. Cebuano language is used in almost all of church-related activities. As a result, the respondents found the use of Kinamiging Manobo unimportant in this specific activity.

Out-group relationships include activities whereby the respondents communicate with people whom they do not identify themselves with. This happens when the respondents are talking to their teachers and the people outside their local communities. This also includes the transaction with government employees and officials.

Majority of the respondents (65%) believed that Kinamiging Manobo is important to neutral in communicating with the people outside their barangays. Respondents explained that the language is important when they talk to those people coming from far-flung areas where people only understand Kinamiging Manobo. On the other hand, the respondents also explained that it could be not so important because people from other local communities, especially those near the town center can speak Cebuano.

Most of the respondents (30%) also believed that Kinamiging Manobo is not so important when talking to their teachers. They say that they seldom use

Kinamiging Manobo in school. Instead, they use Cebuano because they say that some teachers do not understand Kinamiging Manobo. They further explained that aside from Cebuano, they use Filipino and English with their teachers because they are required to do so in schools. Some respondents even said that when they speak Kinamiging Manobo or Cebuano with their teachers, they receive sanctions.

When negotiating with government officials, 37.5% of the respondents believe that Kinamiging Manobo is not important in communicating with government employees or officials. They said that talking to employees or officials in Cebuano is enough because both parties can understand the language well. However, 25.0% of the respondents believe that it is also important to use kinamiging Manobo with government officials because it helps them build rapport and close deals easily.

Economic activities include earning money, looking for a job, going to market and shopping. These activities involve the respondents' financial aspects. Most of the responses consider Kinamiging Manobo as unimportant in economic activities. The percentage of Kinamigng Manobo viewed as unimportant is highly evident in activities such as looking for a job and shopping having response rates of 60% and 70%, respectively. The respondents explained that when they look for a job, especially when undergoing interviews, English, Filipino and Cebuano languages are more useful. They further explained that most of the employers are from outside provinces and do not speak Kinamiging Manobo. On the other hand, when they go to malls for shopping, the respondents explained that salesladies do not understand Kinamiging Manobo. As such, they tend to use the most common languages for commerce (Cebuano, Filipino or English).

The last linguistic function where the respondents' attitudes were determined was the importance of Kinamiging Manobo in Literacy and Use of Technology. Activities include reading, writing, listening to radio and making phone calls.

Most of the respondents view Kinaminging Manobo as unimportant. They say that they seldom read and write in Kinamiging Manobo. They further explained that there are no circulating materials written in Kinamiging Manobo; thus, they did not find the language necessary in these activities.

Moreover, the respondents said that programs in radio stations aired all throughout Camiguin Island are all in Cebuano or Filipino. Only greetings are in Kinamiging Manobo; so the respondents believe that the language is not important when listening to radio. Most of the respondents also explained that

the use of Kinamiging Manobo in making phone calls depends on the person the person they are talking to. They said that they only use Kinamiging Manobo to someone who knows the language.

As discussed above, there were four identified functions where the respondents could use Kinamiging Manobo. Each function is composed of activities done by the respondents on a daily basis. Results showed that most of the respondents perceive the use of Kinamiging Manobo as unimportant in three out of four functions. These are: facilitating out-group relationship, literacy and use of technology, and economic activity. This perception is much evident in the use of the language in economic activities, where almost majority (57.5%) of the respondents believe that the use of Kinamiging Manobo as unimportant. Respondents pointed out that the use of Kinamiging Manobo in the mentioned activities is not evident. For these areas, Cebuano is predominantly used.

For facilitating in-group relationships, most of the respondents (45%) perceive the use of Kinamiging Manobo as neutral. This means that their language, the respondents believe is not so important in dealing with friends and other group of people they identify with. This is because, in a community of bilinguals, speakers can actually switch languages depending on situation and interlocutors.

Agreement Scale

Another method used to identify the respondents' attitudes was through an agreement scale. Respondents were asked questions about the likeability of Kinamiging Manobo, and they responded whether they strongly agree, agree, no comment, disagree or strongly disagree with the positive statements asked to them. Most of the respondents answered "Agree" to all the statements asked to them. The following are the statements that received the most number of "Agree" responses:

(a) I like hearing Kinamiging Manobo;
(b) I like speaking Kinamiging Manobo; and
(c) We need to keep speaking Kinamiging Manobo from one generation to next.

These statements were agreed by the majority (62.5%) of the respondents. As noticed, the statements are about how Kinamiging Manobo is perceived through senses. Majority of the respondents like to speak and listen to Kinamiging Manobo, but this is not reflected in their preferences in different sociolinguistic domains. Respondents reported that Kinamiging Manobo is unimportant in

almost all of their daily activities. Respondents may not use their language but they like speaking and listening to it. This implies that even if speakers are proud of their language and consider it their identity, it can still be useless if not found relevant in daily activities.

On the other hand, statements that gathered the most responses for "Disagree" among all statements are listed below. These statements, though highlighted in the discussion do not receive the highest response for the specific item.

(a) Kinamiging Manobo is important in the modern world.
(b) Kinamiging Manobo is easy to learn.

The statements were rated "disagree" by 22.5% of the respondents.

As observed, the statements solicited the modernity and the learnability of Kinamiging Manobo. Respondents reported that the language is not important in the modern world and not easy to learn as well.

These responses corroborated with the respondents' responses about the perceived importance of Kinamiging Manobo in literacy, technology and economic activities. Data showed that respondents' perception of Kinamiging Manobo in earning money, getting a job, reading and writing, listening to radio and making phone calls is "unimportant."

Matched Guise Result

Besides interview, matched guise is another method used to determine the attitude of the respondents. They were asked to listen to audio recordings in Cebuano and Kinamiging and then describe the speaker through the attributes mentioned to them.

One female speaker was asked to read a passage in Kinamiging Manobo and Cebuano. Another recording of the same passage (in Kinamiging and Cebuano as well) was read by a male speaker to serve as a filler so the respondents would not identify that there was only one person speaking in two languages.

Positive responses show that eight out of 13 qualities have more responses when the person speaks Kinamiging Manobo. These are the following traits: honest, friendly, beautiful, respectful, generous, confident, intelligent and trustworthy. When the person speaks Cebuano, majority of the respondents rated her positively in the following attributes: educated, modern, ambitious, industrious and confident. To find out if there is a significant difference between the responses, Mann-Whitney U test was used. Test showed that among all the attributes, only honesty had a significant difference. It revealed the p-value of 0.015, which is less than 0.05.

For honesty, 90% of the respondents say that the speaker appears to be honest when speaking Kinamiging Manobo, while only 65.0% of the respondents rated her positively when she spoke Cebuano. The significant difference between the two languages means that respondents believe that being honest is more associated to those who speak Kinamiging Manobo than those who speak Cebuano.

Honesty, especially in relation to people belonging to a different ethnolinguistic group is a concern in the area. During an observation, it was noted in a store that a Kamigin woman said to a Cebuano saleslady:

> *"Ayaw baya ko ilara day ha, kasabot baya ko mag Binisaya."*
> Don't fool me, I can understand Bisaya (Cebuano).

It was evident in the place that the natives who live in remote areas are often fooled by those who live downtown. As such, Cebuano speakers are then noted to lie more often than Kinamiging Manobo speakers. This event then supports the fact that a language helps build solidarity among its speakers. When a person identifies himself or herself with another person through language, it helps them build trust with one another.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes and supports the claim of other researches that Kinamiging Manobo is a threatened language, and necessary measures must be done to preserve it. It is interesting to note that although the speakers believe their language is unimportant in their daily activities, they have high regard of its preservation.

The presence of Cebuano language has made it more convenient for the speakers to express themselves in some sociolinguistic domains. Also, it has helped the respondents communicate with other people outside their community. Speakers perceive it helped them in their social and economic aspects. However, the presence of Cebuano language threatens the existence Kinamiging Manobo.

Language patterns and attitudes reveal the survival probability of a language. As to Kinamiging Manobo, speakers' language patterns tell the status of the language, that is, it is a threatened one. This is further supported by the speakers' view on their language, which they believe it is unimportant in almost all the

aspects of their lives. Speakers of Kinamiging Manobo prefer to use Cebuano in all the sociolinguistic domains (home, friendship, public and religious). Kinamiging Manobo is least used in church, and is more often used (but still not the dominant language) at home.

LITERATURE CITED

Agheyisi, R., & Fishman, J. (1970). Language Attitude Studies: A Brief Survey of Methodological Approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics, 12*(5), 137-157. Retrieved on August 18, 2016 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30029244

Campos, R. P. (2014). *Language Attitudes Among Agusan Manobo Speakers in the Philippines.* Chang Mai: Payap University, Chiang Mai, Thailand. Retrieved on August 29, 2016 from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.695.2094&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Dhurrkay, Y. (n.d.). *Our land our languages.* Language Learning in Indigenous Communities. Galiwin'ku, North East Arnhem Land. Retrieved on August 29, 2016 from file:///C:/Users/Executive%20Editor/Downloads/http---www.aphref.aph.gov.au-house-committee--atsia-languages2-report-pamphlet.pdf

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (2005). Attitude research in the 21st century: The current state of knowledge. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. Retrived on August 29, 2016 from http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2005-04648-018

Eckert, P. (1996). Age as a Sociolinguistic Variable. In F. Coulmas (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.DOI: 10.1111/b.9780631211938.1998.00011.x

English Language and Linguistics Online. (2008). Retrieved on August 18, 2016 from Sociolinguistics: The Domain: http://www.ello.uos.de/field.php/Sociolinguistics/Domain

Ethnologue: Languages of the World. (2015, October 28). Retrieved on August 18, 2016 from Ethnologue - Philippines: http://www.ethnologue.com/country/PH/status.

Ihemere, K. U. (2006). An Integrated Approach to the Study of Language Attitudes and Change in Nigeria: The Case of the Ikwerre of Port Harcourt City.

In O. F. Arasanyin, & M. A. Pemberton (Ed.), Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics (pp. 194-207). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Retrieved on August 18, 2016 from http://www.lingref.com/cpp/acal/36/paper1424.pdf

Key, J. P. (2002). Research Design in Occupational Education. Oklahoma State UniversityRetrieved on May 14, 2016 fromhttp://www.okstate.edu/ag/aged-cm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/index.htm.

Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., &Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60(1), 44.http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0044430

Melander, L., & Dalarna, H. (2003). Language Attitudes: Evolutional Reactions to Spoken Language.Retrieved on August 18, 2016 from http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:518098/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Morrison, T., & Conaway, W. A. (2007). Kiss, Bow or Shake Hands: Asia. Avon, MA: Adams Media. Retrieved on August 18, 2016 from https://www.amazon.com/Kiss-Bow-Shake-Hands-Bestselling/dp/1593373686

National Center for Culture and Arts. (n.d.). Retrieved on August 18, 2016 from Kinamiguin Tribe: http://ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/culture-profile/kamiguin/

Philippine Statistics Authority. (n.d.). Retrieved on November 17, 2015 from https://psa.gov.ph/

Sachdev, I., & Hanlon, D. (2000). Language Attitudes, Perceptions and Identity: Some Haida and Cree Data. London Journal of Canadian Studies, 69-87. Retrieved on November 17, 2015from http://www.canadian-studies.net/lccs/LJCS/Vol_16/Sachdev+Hanlon.pdf

The Lawphil Project. (2015, November 23). Retrieved from http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1991/ra_7104_1991.html

White collar. (2016). In Business Dictionary.WebFinance Inc. Retrieved from http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/white-collar.htm