

Language Use in Distance Education: Basis for Policy Formulation

Lynn M. Besa¹, Richard E. Parcon²

¹*Rizal Technological University, ²Tanong High School*
¹*besalynn@yahoo.com, ²reparcon@rtu.edu.ph*

Abstract

Language use in instruction performs a vital role in facilitating learning. The impact of language policy and practice affirmed that language use in teaching has a significant role in the learners learning outcome. Therefore, the institution needs to have a strong foundation in managing language used to formulate a language policy for the whole institution. Findings on the use of language in university classrooms revealed that the lecturers and the learners are conscious of the language policy. However, the discrepancy in implementing the English Only Policy is observable. The researchers investigated and assessed the language practices during the implementation of remote learning during the Covid-19 pandemic and determined if the face-to-face situation changed the language used during distance learning. Using the mixed-method design, the study sought to determine the language practices in the University before and during distance learning instruction, identify the language practices in the University during distance learning instruction, and find out the ramifications of the language practices in the language acquisition and learning and language use which will eventually lead to the formulation of language policy.

Keywords— communication, distance learning instruction, feelings, policy, practices, ramification, Taglish.

INTRODUCTION

Language use in instruction contributes an essential role in facilitating the learning of content standards. Thus, it is anchored with the given objectives. Several literature reviews and studies show how language policy and language planning affect the institution, learners, and even the country such as those of [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10].

In the Philippine setting, the language provision in [11] instituted a legal foundation for formulating numerous language policies executed in the country. The [12] indicated that in subjects such as Physical Education, social studies or social sciences, Character Education, and Home Economics, the Filipino language should be utilized as medium of instruction. In contrast, the English language shall be used for Science, Mathematics, and Technology subjects. Moreover, [13] ordered that the Filipino language be utilized in all government agencies' official transactions, communication,

and correspondence. Former President Corazon Aquino implemented this executive order, believing that the Filipino people would better understand and appreciate all government programs. [14] mandated the primary education to implement the MTB-MLE or the so-called Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education in which K-3 shall use Mother tongue in the teaching of both Filipino and English as subject areas. [15].

On the other hand, [14] attempted to establish a policy to reinforce the English language, which is essential for economy technology-driven sectors. The [16], recognized under the Higher Education Act of 1994, facilitates language courses in Filipino and English to poster effective communication skills. As such, given the Higher Educational Institutions' discretion, language courses shall be taught in that language. On the other hand, literature subjects shall be conducted in Filipino, English or other

languages with the provision that instructional materials are available and both learners and teachers are capable of using a particular language. While courses in humanities and social sciences could be delivered through Filipino. [17].

With these various legal provisions and issues on language policies, the actual situation in the classroom setting discloses that students and even the teachers used Filipino language or code-switching in some subjects in which English is required as the mode of teaching. The results of the study regarding the use of language in university classrooms revealed that teachers and learners are conscious of the language policy. However, both respondents are still using code-switching, which caused the discrepancy in implementing the English Only Policy [18]. The context of the studies and reviews were documented in actual practices and face-to-face classes. Even, [19], in exploring Filipino teachers' experiences in teaching multi-cultural classes, mentioned that the linguistic environments are complex. Although code-switching claims a prime position, the language of instruction usually varies depending on the subjects. Given the circumstances, the researchers led to investigate and assess the language practices of college students during the implementation of distance learning during the Covid-19 pandemic to determine if the same situation regarding the language used may happen during distance learning. Thus, it sought to answer the questions on what are the language practices in the University before and during the distance learning instruction, what are the ramifications of the language practices of the research participants' reception of the language use, and their perception of English as the sole tool of communication in Technical and English related courses, and, what language policy can be figured out depending on the ramifications of the language practices in the University.

This study aimed to serve as a basis for the administrators and language teachers to formulate a language policy that could be used

in the University other than to help the teaching force improve the students' communication skills. Also, it will serve as an additional source or reference in the growing number of literature reviews regarding language policy and planning.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Method

This study utilized a descriptive method to describe the phenomenon and its characteristics. Specifically, the researchers used the survey method to gather necessary information regarding the language practices of the respondents before and during the distance learning instruction. The researchers facilitated an interview to explore the reasons and factors that affect the language practices of the respondents. Also, they conducted an observation to validate the responses of the respondents in the survey and interview. Thus, they used the triangulation method to strengthen the results of the study.

Description of the Respondents

The respondents of the study consisted of 1699 1st to 4th-year college students from different colleges of Rizal Technological University on both campuses. They enrolled in courses requiring English as the medium of communication, such as English language courses, Math, Science, Social Science subjects, Psychology, Engineering courses, and Business courses during the 2020-2021 second semester and school year 2021-2022 first semester. One thousand two hundred eleven participants are female, 408 participants are male, and those belonging to other gender are 18, while 56 prefer not to mention their gender.

In terms of the region of origin, 834 participants are from NCR. Six hundred ninety-seven participants are from Region 4A. Thirty-nine are from Region 3, while 49 are from Regions 5 and 6. Only 15 participants were from Region 8, and only ten were from Region 7.

With the language they use on a typical day, only 419 participants use English less than 25% of the day. Six hundred four participants

use English 25% of the day. Four hundred sixty-seven participants use English 50% within a day. One hundred thirty-eight use English 75% of the day, while only 22 use English the entire day.

Research Instrument

In the conduct of the study, the researchers utilized a survey instrument and an open-ended questionnaire for the interview. The survey instrument consists of questions that describe the language practices of the respondents before and during the distance learning instruction. While the open-ended questionnaire determined the reasons and factors of the respondents as their consideration for their language practices. The survey instrument was a combination of several adapted instruments from [20], [21], [22]

Data Gathering Procedures and Analysis

In consideration of the current situation and to prevent the spread of the Covid-19 virus, the researcher asked the respondents to answer the survey and interview questionnaire through Google forms. Then data gathered from surveys and interviews were tallied, coded, analyzed, and interpreted to achieve the study's goal.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Language practices in university

Language practices include the kind and actual language used in the university and the policies implemented in the courses in which English is generally prescribed to be the medium of communication.

a. before distance learning instruction

Table 1

Languages Used in Communication before the Pandemic

Languages used by the respondents in the following activities before pandemic	Communicating with teachers inside the classroom			Communicating with teachers outside the classroom			Communicating with the classmates inside the classroom			Communicating with the classmates outside the classroom			Communicating with peers inside the University premises			Communicate other people University (canteen, libra	
	N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank	N	%
Filipino	155	9.16	3	639	37.74	2	725	42.82	2	905	53.46	1	678	40.05	2	841	49
English	209	12.34	2	110	6.50	3	62	3.66	3	52	3.07	3	101	5.97	3	65	3
Taglish	1329	78.50	1	944	55.76	1	906	53.51	1	736	43.47	2	914	53.99	1	787	46
Others	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
Total	1683	100		1683	100		1683	100		1683	100		1683	100		1683	100

Table 1 shows that 1329 or 78.50% of the respondents preferred Taglish (Tagalog and English). While 209 or 12.34% of the respondents preferred to use the English language and 155 or 9.16 percent preferred to use the Filipino language when communicating with their teachers in the classroom. Regarding

communicating with teachers outside the classroom, 944 or 55.76% of the respondents preferred to use Taglish (Tagalog and English), while 639 or 37.74% preferred to use the Filipino language, and 110 or 6.50% preferred to use the English Language. When communicating with classmates inside the classroom, 906, or 53.51% of the respondents, used Taglish (Tagalog and English). 725 or 42.82% of the respondents preferred to use the Filipino language, and 62 or 3.66% chose English. In communicating with classmates outside the classroom, 905 or 53.46% of the respondents preferred to use the Filipino language, 736 or 43.37% chose to use Taglish (Tagalog and English), and 52 or 3.07% of the respondents preferred to use the English language. In the fifth column, 914 or 53.99% of the respondents chose to use Taglish (Tagalog and English), 678 or 40.05% preferred to use the Filipino language, and 101 or 5.97% of the respondents preferred to use the English language in communicating with peers inside the university premises. In the last column, 841 or 49.7% of the respondents preferred to use the Filipino language, 787 or 46.5% of the respondents preferred to use Taglish (Tagalog and English), and 65 or 3.8% of the respondents preferred to use English in communicating with other people inside the university premises such as canteen, library, and school grounds). Table 1 shows that before the pandemic occurred, the participants communicated with their teacher and classmates in and outside of the classroom, then communicating with peers and other people inside the University premises using Tagalog and English (Taglish) language.

Based on the result, the majority of the respondents preferred to use Taglish (Tagalog and English) in some situations before the pandemic. Data revealed that the respondents used Taglish because it is the most convenient language to communicate with their teachers, classmates, and peers, whether inside or outside the classroom or on the university's premises. On the other hand, their utilization of English in communicating is combined with other languages as a form of code-switching. Code-

switching is combining two language varieties within single utterances or conversations.

Table 2

Language policies before the pandemic	Only English policy in technical and English related courses		Use of Filipino language in Technical and English related courses		Use of Taglish (Tagalog and English) in Technical and English related courses		Use of other languages such as regional languages in Technical and English related courses	
	n	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	564	33.31	330	19.49	624	36.86	85	5.0
Sometimes	934	55.17	933	55.11	827	48.85	366	21.1
Seldom	165	9.75	351	20.73	212	12.52	464	27.1
Never	30	1.77	79	4.67	30	1.77	778	45.1
Total	1693	100	1693	100	1693	100	1693	100
Mean	3.20	sometimes	2.89	sometimes	3.21	sometimes	1.86	seldom

Table 2 shows that the participants **sometimes** abide by the *Only English policy in technical and English-related courses*. Respondents **sometimes** Use the *Filipino language in technical and English-related courses*. They also **sometimes** Use *Taglish in technical and English-related courses*. On the other hand, they **seldom** used *other languages, such as regional languages, in technical and English-related courses* before the pandemic.

Based on the result of the study, in terms of language policies before the pandemic, most of the respondents sometimes used English in technical and English related courses, which yield them to utilize Filipino and Taglish (Tagalog and English) during the discussion in their Technical and English associated courses. One factor that can be seen in this result is that the teachers in their courses are using code-switching to deliver their lessons in the class. Second, students may find it difficult to express themselves using English during the discussion freely. Though they always use Filipino and Taglish in their Technical and English language courses, it does not mean that they are not performing well in the class. [23] revealed that the Filipino teachers sometimes code-switched in English language classrooms for pedagogical purposes. On the part of the students, they use Tagalog-English code-switching as support during their participation in the class discussion [24].

b. during distance learning instruction

Table 3

Languages used by the respondents in the following activities during pandemic	Communicating with teachers during class interaction			Communicating with teachers after the class (via online platforms)			Communicating with the classmates during synchronous class (via online platforms)			Communicating with the classmates after synchronous class (via online platforms)			Communicating with peers via online platforms			Communicating with other people in the University (registrar, DSA, etc.) for services		
	N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank	n	%	Rank	n	%	Rank	n	%	Rank	n	%	Rank
Filipino	157	9.27	3	310	18.31	3	540	31.90	2	743	43.89	2	578	34.14	2	741	43.8	2
English	312	18.43	2	314	18.55	2	130	7.68	3	72	4.25	3	201	11.87	3	265	15.7	3
Taglish	1194	70.53	1	1069	63.14	1	1023	60.43	1	878	51.86	1	914	53.99	1	687	40.6	1
Others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1693	98		1693	100		1693	100		1693	100		1693	100		1693	100	

Table 3 shows that 1194 or 70.53% of the respondents preferred Taglish (Tagalog and English). 312 or 18.43% preferred to use English, and 157 or 9.27% preferred to use the Filipino language when communicating with their teachers during class interaction. Regarding communicating with teachers after the class (via online platforms), 1069 or 63.14% of the respondents preferred to use Taglish (Tagalog and English), while 314 or 18.5% preferred to use the Filipino language, 310 or 18.3% preferred to use the English Language. When communicating with classmates during synchronous class (via online platforms), 1023 or 60.4% of the respondents used Taglish (Tagalog and English). 540 or 31.90% of the respondents preferred to use the Filipino language, and 130 or 7.68% chose English. In communicating with classmates after synchronous class (via an online platform), 878 or 51.86% of the respondents preferred to use Taglish (Tagalog-English), 540 or 31.90% preferred to use Filipino, and 72 or 4.2% of the respondents preferred to use the English language. In the fifth column, 914 or 53.99% of the respondents preferred to use Taglish (Tagalog and English), 578 or 34.14% preferred to use the Filipino language, and 201 or 11.87% of the respondents preferred to utilize the English language in interacting with peers via online platforms. In the last column, 741 or 43.8% of the respondents preferred to use the Filipino language, 687 or 40.6% of the respondents preferred to use Taglish (Tagalog and English), and 265 or 15.7% of the respondents preferred to use English in communicating within the University (in the registrar, DSA, and other offices) for services. Table 3 shows that the respondents preferred to communicate with their teacher during class interaction and on online platforms using

Tagalog and English (Taglish) language during the pandemic. While communicating with their classmates during and after synchronous class via online platforms, they also use Taglish. When communicating with peers and other people in the University (e.g., Registrar, DSA, etc.), the majority prefer to use Tagalog and English (Taglish).

The result displays that most of the participants preferred Taglish (Tagalog-English) as their medium of communication in various situations during the pandemic. It also revealed that students feel better when they communicate or express their feelings during online classes, especially in times of pandemic. Code-switching does not represent the students' competence, but it shows a particular purpose. By looking at the impact of code-switching, the findings revealed that it resulted in favorable implications for learning the English language. It also helps the students to understand some problematic aspects of the lesson taught in the classroom, which yields them to follow the instructions given. Moreover, code-switching helps learners express themselves freely when it is challenging to utilize the English language in the classroom [25].

Table 4
Language Policies During the Pandemic

Language Policies During the Pandemic	Only English only policy in technical and English related courses		Use of Filipino language in Technical and English related courses		Use of Taglish (Tagalog and English) in Technical and English related courses		Use of other regional languages in Technical and English related courses	
	n	%	N	%	N	%	n	
Always	431	25.46	368	21.74	620	36.62	123	
Sometimes	958	56.59	1026	60.60	892	52.69	449	
Seldom	229	13.53	229	13.53	154	9.10	399	
Never	75	4.43	70	4.13	27	1.59	722	
Total	1693	100	1693	100	1693	100	1693	
Mean	3.03	Sometimes	3.00	Sometimes	3.24	Sometimes	1.98	

Table 4 describes the language policies implemented in Technical and English-related courses during the pandemic. Based on the mean in each category, the respondents **sometimes** used only the *English language during their Technical and English-related courses*. **Sometimes** they use the *Filipino language in Technical and English-related courses*. **Sometimes** they Use *Taglish in technical and English-related courses*. In contrast, they **seldom** Used *other languages*,

such as regional languages, in technical and English-related courses during the pandemic. Table 9 implies that the participants do not always abide by the language policies implemented during distance education.

Table 5
Comparison of Language Use Before and During the Pandemic

Language Use	Before Pandemic	During pandemic
Communicating with teachers inside the classroom	Taglish	Taglish
Communicating with teachers outside the classroom	Taglish	Taglish
Communicating with the classmates inside the classroom	Taglish	Taglish
Communicating with the classmates outside the classroom	Filipino	Taglish
Communicating with peers inside the University premises	Taglish	Taglish
Communicating with other people inside the University premises (canteen, library, grounds)	Filipino	Taglish

Table 5 compares the different language practices of respondents before and during the pandemic. Findings reveal that in most areas, whether in face-to-face or online platforms, they use Taglish (Tagalog and English). It reflects that the respondents are more comfortable using Taglish in whatever circumstances they are in.

Table 6
Comparison of Language Policies Before and During the Pandemic

Language Policies	Before Pandemic		After Pandemic	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
Only English only policy in technical and English related courses	3.20	Sometimes	3.03	Sometimes
Use of Filipino language in Technical and English related courses	2.89	Sometimes	3.00	Sometimes
Use of Taglish (Tagalog and English) in Technical and English related courses	3.21	Sometimes	3.24	Sometimes
Use of other languages such as regional languages in Technical and English related courses	1.86	seldom	1.98	Seldom

As reflected in Table 6, language policies implemented in the classroom before the pandemic show that the respondents **sometimes** used English, Filipino, and Taglish in Technical and English-related courses. In contrast, the respondents seldom used other languages. During the pandemic, the respondents **sometimes** used English, Filipino, and Taglish, while other languages were **seldom** used in Technical and English-related courses. Thus, it revealed that language practice in the classroom might change from time to time depending on the given situation. Moreover, the result also reflects how the respondent shifted from using one language to another language as part of their communication strategy, particularly when they encountered communication problems in or out of the classroom. In the study on Code-

Switching in ELF undergraduate classrooms, code-switching and other languages instead of target language functions to clarify, repeat, recapitulate and socialize [26].

The ramifications of the language practices to the research participants: Reception of the language use

Table 7
Positive Reception of the Research Participants When English Language is used in the classroom

Receptions of the respondents when English language is used in the classroom	Highly agree		Agree		Moderately agree		Disagree		total	Mean	VI
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
I'm not worried about making mistakes in an English-speaking class	184	10.87	632	37.33	397	23.45	480	28.35	1693	100	2.31
I am calm when my name is called in an English-speaking class	156	9.214	419	24.75	742	43.83	376	22.21	1693	100	2.21
I enjoyed the English-speaking classes I took	285	16.83	688	40.64	654	38.63	66	3.90	1693	100	2.70
I used to be calm during tests in my English-speaking classes	283	16.72	705	41.64	684	35.68	101	5.97	1693	100	2.69
I don't feel anxious about speaking in English speaking with native speakers of that language	117	6.911	353	20.85	782	46.19	441	26.05	1693	100	2.09
I am not embarrassed when the teacher corrects my language mistakes in class	455	25.69	650	37.21	482	28.47	146	8.62	1693	100	2.80
I feel confident when I speak in an English-speaking class	140	8.269	441	26.05	871	51.45	241	14.24	1693	100	2.28
I don't feel any pressure to prepare well in English speaking class	65	3.839	314	18.55	821	48.49	493	29.12	1693	100	1.97
When I go to an English-speaking language class, I feel confident and relaxed	101	5.966	427	25.22	838	49.5	327	19.31	1693	100	2.18
I am calm to face the English language test because I have prepared myself beforehand	210	12.4	619	36.56	741	43.77	123	7.27	1693	100	2.54
I feel comfortable around native speakers of an English language	153	9.037	498	29.42	823	48.61	219	12.94	1693	100	2.35
I don't feel embarrassed when I have to speak English language in class	152	7.797	440	25.99	800	47.25	321	18.96	1693	100	2.23
I may calm if I can't answer the teacher's questions in an English language class	149	8.801	480	28.35	756	44.65	308	18.19	1693	100	2.28
I'm not worried about speaking English languages in front of my friends in language class	213	12.58	548	32.37	692	40.87	240	14.18	1693	100	2.43
I like to ask native speakers questions in English class	169	9.982	470	27.76	815	48.14	239	14.12	1693	100	2.34
	Grand Means									2.36	

Table 7 showcases that the participants' positive reception of the usage of English in the class is moderately agreed with the mean score of 2.36.

Table 8
Negative Reception of the Research Participants When English Language is used in the classroom

Reception of the respondents when English language is used in the classroom	Highly agree		Agree		Moderately agree		Disagree		total	Mean	VI
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
I never feel confident in myself whenever I speak in an English-speaking class	217	12.82	511	30.18	737	43.53	228	13.47	1693	100	2.42
I'm afraid if I don't understand what the teacher is saying in an English-speaking class	238	14.06	483	28.53	621	36.68	351	20.73	1693	100	2.56
I assume that other students have better English-speaking skills than me	666	39.34	624	36.86	359	21.2	44	2.60	1693	100	3.13
I panicked when I had to speak unprepared in an English-speaking class	523	30.89	504	29.77	521	30.77	145	8.56	1693	100	2.83
I don't understand why some people are so concerned about English speaking classes	189	11.4	446	26.34	655	37.51	419	24.75	1693	100	2.24
In English speaking classes, I can become so nervous that I forget things I actually know	472	26.7	586	34.61	519	30.66	156	9.03	1693	100	2.80
I feel embarrassed when I answer a teacher's questions in English speaking class	205	12.11	437	25.81	678	40.05	373	22.03	1693	100	2.28
Even though I had prepared myself for the English-speaking class, I still felt nervous	431	25.46	655	38.69	517	30.54	90	5.32	1693	100	2.84
I often feel like skipping English speaking classes	71	4.194	232	13.7	499	29.47	891	52.63	1693	100	1.69
I am afraid that the lecturer will correct the English language mistakes I make	125	7.383	367	21.68	657	38.81	544	32.13	1693	100	2.04
I feel very nervous when the teacher calls my name in English speaking class	520	30.9	500	29.53	659	38.92	214	12.64	1693	100	2.55
The harder I studied for test preparation, the more confused I became	144	8.506	396	23.39	688	40.64	463	27.47	1693	100	2.13
I always feel that other students speak English languages better than me	531	31.36	575	33.96	499	29.47	88	5.20	1693	100	2.91
I don't feel confident speaking English language in front of other students	279	16.48	487	28.77	700	41.35	227	13.41	1693	100	2.48
I feel more tense and anxious while studying in English speaking class than in other classes	200	11.81	433	25.58	680	40.17	380	22.45	1693	100	2.27
I feel nervous and confused when speaking in English language class	224	13.23	454	26.82	718	42.41	297	17.54	1693	100	2.36
I get anxious when I don't understand every word the teacher says	252	14.88	592	34.97	641	37.86	208	12.29	1693	100	2.52
I was afraid that other students would laugh at me when I spoke in English language	394	23.27	460	27.17	562	33.2	277	16.36	1693	100	2.57
I always feel anxious when facing English language exams	156	9.214	398	23.51	735	43.6	384	22.68	1693	100	2.19
	Grand Means									2.45	

Table 8 reveals that the participants' negative reception of the usage of English in the class moderately agreed with the mean score of 2.45.

The perception of English as the sole medium of instruction in Technical and English-related courses

Table 9
Perception of English as the Sole Medium of instruction in Technical and English-Related Courses

Do you think English should be the sole medium of communication in technical and English-related courses		
	N	%
Yes	1141	67.40
No	222	13.11
Not sure	314	18.55
Does not care	16	0.95
Total	1693	100

The table shows that in determining the perception of English as the sole medium of teaching in Technical and English-related courses, 1141 or 67.40% of the respondents stated that English should be the only medium of communication. 222 or 13.11% of the respondents indicated that English should not be the single medium of instruction. 314 or 18.55% of the respondents are not sure if English should be the singular medium of delivery, and 16 or 0.95% of the respondents do not care whether English should be or should not be the only medium of teaching in Technical and English related courses. However, when they were asked whether

English should be the only medium of communication in English-related courses, 67.40% responded yes, 18.55% responded not sure, 13.11% responded no, and 0.95% did not care what medium of communication will be used in technical and English-related courses.

In order to propose a language policy, it is necessary that the stakeholders, especially the students, should have been consulted. Thus, the researchers asked for their reasons for the preference for English in the technical and English-related courses. Data show that the research participants **favor the use of English**. The respondents cited that English is comprehensible and is fitting to the courses. It improves communication and builds confidence while preparing them for the workforce. The result of the interview indicated that the majority of the respondents preferred English as the prime medium of communication for the following reasons.

“Yes, because we know that learning English or speaking English help as good in many ways like in understanding textbook, communicating, etc. And also we all know that English is the universal language.”

“Yes, simply because it will help students enhance their ability to speak fluently in English.”

“because English is the international or global language, it is better to improve your skills and be the medium of communication technical and English-related courses.”

“English should be the medium because it has a technical issue that is needed and related to the course.”

“yes, because it is an English subject, we also need to speak in English to communicate with the person we are talking to.”

“Because English is a universal language and it will help anyone have a deeper understanding of each other as the English language serves as a bridge that will connect thoughts and messages despite having different native languages.”

“Because it will encourage us to utilize English speaking skills and be more competitive in a global scale industry.”

“It should be a sole medium of communication in technical and English-related courses because it makes us more proficient in written and oral English.”

“Yes, because it talks about English-related topics, and it will also improve your speaking and fluency in English if we use the English language in a course related to English.”

“Yes, because it is better to understand the certain terms in those courses if we are going to use English. It also helps the students better use the English language and how to apply it in real-life situations.”

“That is the main purpose why you study the course. To be more formed by the foreign language to enhance your skills, knowledge, and experience.”

“Yes, for us to practice and become fluent in English for us to communicate well. And I think that it is the formal language that must be used in technical and English- related courses. So that when we are applying or doing interviews, we can't find it difficult because we are exposed to this language.”

As reflected in these excerpts, the respondents strongly affirm that English is an imperative communication tool in Technical and English-related courses. Despite the results of previous tables in which Taglish is the common language used before and during the pandemic, the respondents are still eager and willing to use the English language as a mode of communication used Technical and English related courses in the university. In connection with the effectiveness of using English as a medium of instruction as an educational strategy for the sustainable progress of EFL learners, students performed better in subject content areas [27]. Thus, based on the study's findings, the utilization of the English language in Technical and English-related courses should be considered a part of the language policy stipulated in the university to address the call for internationalization and globalization. On the other hand, the preference for Taglish

provides the students a sense of comfort and an option when they encounter difficulty in translation.

Language policy which can be figured out from the ramifications of the language practices in the University

Language policy is generally a by-product of thorough language planning. Among the many definitions, [28] stated that a language policy aimed to realize the planned language change in the societies, groups, or systems. In formulating language policy, fact-finding is a critical stage in planning. [29] added that the background of the language environment must be considered in the process. Background information which includes the language spoken, its social and sociolinguistic status, the existence and kind of written forms, and the elaborateness of vocabulary, must be assessed. Therefore, before implementing a language policy, a particular institution, especially an academic institution, should consider the linguistic context of the speech community [18].

It could be gleaned that according to the language profile of the participants, which is bilingual (Filipino and English), it is commonsensical that they use Filipino in regular daily communication. Comparatively, in the academic setting, whether inside or outside the classroom, Taglish is the language used. However, it is also noticeable that when the research participants were asked about the language to be used in technical and English-related courses, they responded that English should be utilized. Therefore, it could be concluded that the research participants prefer English to be the medium of communication in the technical and English-related courses because of the benefits they could acquire from it.

The research participants recognize the value and role of English in the academic setting and their professional careers. English plays a potential part in the formulation of language policy in the Institution. However, before the Institution implements EOP, it needs

to initiate several language programs that could enhance the communicative competence and communicative performance of the speech community to achieve its goal of implementing language policy. Furthermore, since translanguaging, which includes CS, is being taken positively, the University may assess the role of the first language in the acquisition and use of the second language. Hence, language transference should be considered to avoid language stress among the language users and eventually fully implement the EOP in technical and English-related courses.

Conclusion

The study unveils that the respondents, whose ages range from 17-to 41 years old, are dominantly originating in NCR. In contrast, the others come from Regions 3, 4A, and 5.6.7, whose language spoken varies from English, Filipino, Taglish, regional dialects, and foreign languages. It could also be noticed that the research participants use Filipino on a typical day.

Findings reveal that majority of the participants used Taglish in their communication before and during the pandemic. In terms of the language policies, the respondents sometimes comply with the English-only policy in technical and English-related courses. Sometimes, they use Filipino and Taglish in technical and English-related courses. On the other hand, they seldom use other languages such as regional languages in said courses.

When the research participants were asked about the ramifications of the language practices, they moderately agreed on the use of English. In contrast, they highly agree that English should be used in different everyday activities. In connection, when they were asked about their perception of the sole usage of English in technical and English-related courses, more than half of them said yes.

Lastly, as part of the language plan of the University, the use of the English language as the only medium of communication in Technical and English-related courses should be implemented to address the needs of internationalization and globalization of the

Higher Educational Institutions in the Philippines. However, before fully implementing the policy, the University should first prepare the speech community through various language initiatives to achieve its goal fully.

REFERENCES

1. Trudell, B. (2016). The Impact of Language Policy and Practice on Children's Learning: Evidence from Eastern and Southern Africa. *The Impact of Language Policy and Practice on Children's Learning: Evidence from Eastern and Southern Africa*. <https://www.unicef.org/esa/sites/unicef.org/esa/file>
2. Goundar, P. R. (2017). The Characteristics of Language Policy and Planning Research: An Overview. *Interdisciplinary Perspective*. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.68152
3. Danladi, S. S. (2013). Language Policy: Nigeria and the Role of English Language in the 21st Century. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(17). <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/328023643.pdf>
4. Demeterio, F. P. A., & Liwanag, L. A. L. (2014). The Language Policies and Practices of the Philippines and Thailand: Insights and Lessons for Language Planning. *Silliman Journal*, 55(2), 19-59.
5. Dumanig, F. P., David, M. K., & Symaco, L. P. (2012). Competing Roles of The National Language and English in Malaysia and the Philippines: Planning, Policy, and Use. *Journal of International and Comparative Education (JICE)*, 104-115. <http://mjs.um.edu.my/index.php/JICE/article/view/2550/766>
6. Cots, J. M., Llorca, E., & Garrett, P. (2014). Language Policies and Practices in the Internationalization of Higher Education on the European Margins: An Introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(4), 311-317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.874430>
7. Mthombeni, Z. M., & Ogunnubi, O. (2021). A Socio-Constructivist Analysis of the Bilingual Language Policy in South African Higher Education: Perspectives from the University of Kwazulu-Natal. *Cogent Education*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1954465>
8. Kuteeva, M., & Airey, J. (2014). Disciplinary Differences in the Use of English in Higher Education: Reflections on Recent Language Policy Developments. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 533-549. DOI 10.1007/s10734-013-9660-6
9. Kagwesage, A. M. (2013). Coping with English as Language of Instruction in Higher Education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 2(2), 1-12. *International Journal of Higher Education*
10. Hamid, M. O., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2016).). Globalization, English Language Policy, and Teacher Agency: Focus on Asia.). *Globalization, English Language Policy, and Teacher Agency: Focus on Asia*, 15(1), 26-43. <http://openjournals.library.usyd.edu.au/index.php/IEJ/index>
11. Article XIV Sec 6 & 7 of the 1987 Constitution. (1987). *EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, ARTS, CULTURE AND SPORTS*. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/the-1987-constitution-of-the-republic-of-the-philippines/the-1987-constitution-of-the-republic-of-the-philippines-article-xiv/>.
12. DO Order No. 25, Series of 1974 .Implementing Guidelines for the Policy on Bilingual Education.
13. EO 335 Series of 1988. Enjoining All Departments/ Bureaus/ Offices/ Agencies/ Instrumentalities of the Government to Take Such Steps as are Necessary for the Purpose of Using Filipino Language in Official Transactions, Communications and Correspondence.

- <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1988/08/25/executive-order-no-335-s-1988>
14. EO 210 Series of 2003. Establishing the Policy to Strengthen the Use of English Language as a Medium of Instruction in the Educational System. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2003/05/17/executive-order-no-210-s-2003/>.
 15. Dawe, C. J. (2014). Language Governmentality in Philippine Education Policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 29(1), 61-77. <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol29/iss1/4>
 16. CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 59, s. 1996. New General Education Curriculum. <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.-59-Series-of-1996-New-General-Education-Curriculum-GEC.pdf>
 17. Espiritu, C. (n.d.). *Language Policies in the Philippines*. National Commission for Culture and the Arts. <https://ncca.gov.ph/about-ncca-3/subcommissions/subcommission-on-cultural-disseminationscd/language-and-translation/language-policies-in-the-philippines/>
 18. Besa, L. M. (2014). Language Use in the University: A Clash of Policies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134, 92-100. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.226
 19. Soffronow, M. (2015). Multilingual Classrooms: A study of Four Filipino Teachers Experiences. *Dissertation*. Jonkoping University. doi:<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:823241/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
 20. Lorimer, R. (n.d.) Student Questionnaire on Language Background. <https://dept.writing.wisc.edu/wac/student-questionnaire-on-language-background/>
 21. Mangila, B B. (2018). Pedagogic Code-Switching: A Case Study of the Language Practices of Filipino Teachers in English Language Classrooms. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal (ELTEJ)*, 1(3): 115-133. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1288199.pdf>
 22. Lampiran. (2018). The Questionnaire to Survey Validity and Reliability Questionnaire of Students' Motivation. Retrieved from <http://repository.uki.ac.id/961/8/Lampiran.pdf>
 23. Yaikhong, K., & Usaha, S. (2012). A Measure of EFL Public Speaking Class Anxiety: Scale Development and Preliminary Validation and Reliability. *English Language Teaching*, 5(12), 23-25.
 24. Liwanag, M H and Labor, J. (2016). Mother or Adapted Tongue: The Discursive and Pragmatic Effects of Code-Switching in Content-Based Learning. *International Journal of Education and Research*. 4(11):31-46. <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2016/November-2016/04.pdf>
 25. Memory, N D., Nkengbeza, D., and Liswaniso, C M. (2018). The Effects of Code Switching on English Language Teaching and Learning at Two Schools in Sibbinda Circuit. *International Journal of English Language Teaching. Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK*. 6(5): 56-68. <https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Effects-of-Code-Switching-On-English-Language-Teaching-and-Learning-at-Two-Schools-in-Sibbinda-Circuit.pdf>
 26. Adriosh, M., & Razi, Ö. (2019). Teacher's Code Switching in EFL Undergraduate Classrooms in Libya: Functions and Perceptions. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019846214>
 27. Peng, J.-E., & Xie, X. (Serina). (2021). English-Medium Instruction as a Pedagogical Strategy for the Sustainable Development of EFL Learners in the Chinese Context: A Meta-Analysis of Its Effectiveness. *Sustainability*, 13(10), 5637. doi:10.3390/su13105637

28. Kaplan, R., & Baldauf Jr., R. (1997). *Language Planning: From Theory to Practice*. UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
29. Appel, R. & Mysken, P. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.