

Judging Personality from Language Usage: A Filipino Example¹

By G. RICHARD TUCKER

*Language Study Center
Philippine Normal College*

IN the past decade, a technique has been developed to measure the views that members of one social or language group hold of representatives of some contrasting group. In this technique, groups of judges listen to a series of taped recordings of some standard passage read by different speakers, and then evaluate the personality characteristics of each speaker using only his voice and style of speech as cues.

This procedure, in reality a disguised attitude measuring instrument, appears to measure certain aspects of the stereotyped or biased views that members of one social group hold of representatives of a contrasting group. The technique, moreover, appears to reveal judges' more personal reactions to the contrasting group than does the direct attitude questionnaire.

This procedure has frequently been employed to compare the reactions of groups

of judges who hear the *same* speaker read a passage in contrasting languages (see, for example, Anisfeld & Lambert, 1964; Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, & Fillenbaum, 1960; and Lambert, Frankel, & Tucker, 1966), in contrasting dialects (for example, Lambert, Anisfeld, & Yeni-Kemshian, 1965), or in contrasting accents (Anisfeld, Bogo, & Lambert, 1962). In the use of this procedure, several bilingual or bidialectal speakers record a standard passage first in one language or dialect, and then in their other tongue. Judges evaluate a series of these speakers randomly presented so that Speaker A reading say, French, never immediately precedes nor follows the same Speaker A reading English. The judges are never told that they will listen to a series of bilingual speakers, but rather are led to believe and seem to accept the fact that they will hear a different speaker with every listening.

Often the judges themselves are chosen to represent various language or social groups. For example, in Canada, groups of French-Canadians and English-Canadians were asked to evaluate French-English bilinguals.

¹ A modified version of this report was presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association in Washington, D. C., April, 1968 by G. Richard Tucker and Wallace E. Lambert. This research was financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation to the Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College, Manila.

The evaluation is characteristically done by using semantic differential type bipolar adjective rating scales which are individually selected to be appropriate for each particular experimental situation. The judges are asked to indicate whether they consider each speaker to be Intelligent or Unintelligent, Successful or Unsuccessful, Light or Dark, etc. This technique appears to be reliable in that the same profile of reactions emerge with repeated samplings from a particular social group. The basic research has recently been reviewed by Lambert (1967).

In addition, a variation of this technique has been used to compare the reactions of judges who listen to several groups of speakers, each group being representative of a particular dialect area (Markel, Eisler, & Reese, 1967; and Tucker & Lambert, 1967) or social class (Ellis, 1967; Labov, 1966) read a passage in their "standard" speech styles. In this latter case, it is assumed that by averaging the responses given by a group of judges to several exemplars of a particular speech style, a picture of the judges' general reactions to that class of speakers can be arrived at. And, in fact, various studies have revealed that groups of judges do react differentially to the speech of Negroes as against that of whites, upper class New York whites versus lower class New York whites, etc. The judgments, of course, interact with the judging group.

The present research combines the use of both techniques in a study of the reactions by native Tagalog speaking Filipinos and non-native Tagalog speaking Filipinos to various exemplars of American-English, Filipino-English, Filipino-

Tagalog, and a mixture of Tagalog and English.

Given the ever-present concern over the reputed "Philippine language problem," this research may be particularly appropriate here in the Philippines. The implications of a study such as this become clear when one bears in mind the following facts: officially, English is the medium of instruction from grade 3 on in all Philippine public schools, and from grade 1 on in most private schools; however, English is practically never the language of the home since one—or even more than one—of the many Filipino vernaculars is the family language. Moreover, the Board of National Education is now considering the implementation of a policy which would introduce Filipino (i.e., Tagalog) as the medium of instruction in elementary schools *all over* the Philippines. Ever since the decision was made in 1937 to use Tagalog as the basis of the National Language there has always been some uneasiness over this choice on the part of representatives of the other major language groups such as Cebuano. Then, too, the results of the following investigations, of certain significance for Filipino educators, may also interest scientists who value testing the generality of theories in a wide variety of cultural-linguistic settings. Finally, since they will reflect the relative attitudinal dispositions of Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs toward the language groups used as stimuli, the results may indirectly provide evidence regarding the success which groups of students similar to our judges would have when studying English or Filipino (see Gardner & Lambert, 1959 for a discussion of the importance of attitudinal variables in second language learning).

*Experiment I***Method***Subjects*

The subjects (Ss) were 80 female sophomore students at the Philippine Normal College in Manila. Forty girls (average age, 17.8 years) were native speakers of Tagalog, the others (average age, 17.9 years) were not, although they had studied Pilipino as a subject during their 12 years of schooling. The native languages of the non-Tagalogs were Ilokano (22), Pampango (11), Bikol (4), Pangasinan (2), and Cebuano (1). The Ss were randomly selected to match the proportional representation of speakers of these languages among the college student body. All Ss were candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education.

Procedure

Speech samples were collected by recording the speech of four mature female representatives of each of three groups: 1) American-English; 2) Filipino-English; and 3) Filipino-Tagalog. The speakers in group 1 were Peace Corps Volunteers working in Manila. Actually the speakers in groups 2 and 3 were only four bilinguals who read a passage once in English, and again in Tagalog (their first language). All speakers read aloud the same short passage adapted from Thomas (1958). The Tagalog equivalent was prepared via the back-translation method.

Voices were arranged in random order with the restriction that the bilinguals in their various guises be maximally separated. A "practice" voice was included at the beginning of the tape.

The two groups of judges, Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs, were asked to listen to

the voices, and to evaluate each speaker by using 12 eight point bipolar adjective rating scales developed expressly for this study.² In brief, the development of the scales involved collecting adjectival descriptions used by groups of Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs to characterize their friends and successful people. Groups of students were then asked to choose from the large list of adjectives those that they considered to be *most* important for both friendship and success. These two criteria were selected so that a high positive rating by Ss which implied success would not also imply alienation from the peer group. The eight point rather than the seven point scale was used to force judges to choose a favorable or unfavorable position. They are not forced to do this when they can fall back on the neutral mid-point.

Presentation of Voices

The students serving as judges were asked to listen to the stimulus voices and to evaluate each speaker in terms of the 12 bipolar scales listed in Table 1. Separate rating sheets were provided for the evaluation of each speaker, with the order of adjective placement on succeeding sheets being alternated. Standard instructions and examples were given to explain the testing procedure and the use of the rating scales. (See Appendix.)

First, a practice voice was played which the judges rated. Questions were answered before the formal testing session began. Each speaker's taped passage was played twice, separated by a five-second pause. Thirty seconds were allowed between speakers to give the judges time to complete their evaluations. After the

²Two graduate students, Pura Luna and Teresita Mendoza, aided in the collection, tabulation, and treatment of the data.

"practice" voice, all 12 speakers were evaluated by each judge who used each of the 12 scales.

Method of Data Analysis

A number from one to eight was assigned to each rating. The positive end of the scale was arbitrarily given the value eight (e.g., Intelligent), and the negative end the value one (e.g., Unintelligent). The responses by the Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs were tabulated separately. All ratings assigned to the four exemplars of each of the three language groups were combined to provide an overall rating for each group corresponding to every adjective. Analyses of variance, repeated measures design (Winer, 1962), with subsequent Neuman-Keuls comparisons were performed separately on the responses of the Tagalogs and the non-Tagalogs for each adjective scale. The statistical analyses indicate whether the Tagalogs rate differentially the Americans, the Filipino-Tagalogs and the Philippine-English speakers, and likewise the non-Tagalogs.

Results

The results of Experiment I are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 where the ratings by each group of judges for the 12 traits are presented. The statistical analyses reveal that the groups of speakers were rated differentially by both groups of Ss, that is, for each group of judges, language was a significant source of variation. The general pattern of ratings is quite consistent. The Tagalog and the non-Tagalog Ss rated the American speakers most favorably. In fact, the Tagalog Ss gave the Americans ratings significantly more favorable (see Table 1) than those for both the Filipino-English and the Filipino-Tagalog speakers

on 11 of the 12 traits. In addition, they even rated the Filipino-English speakers significantly more favorably than the Filipino-Tagalogs on 4 of the 12 traits; and the differences were in this same direction, although non-significant, for seven of the remaining eight traits. A consistent pattern emerges, therefore, with the American speakers as well as the Filipino-English speakers being rated more favorably than the Filipino-Tagalogs. The dimension Religious . . . Irreligious was the only trait that yielded a non-significant overall *F* value, indicating no perceived significant difference among the speakers on this trait.

Non-Tagalog listeners also rated the American-English speakers more favorably than the Filipino-English speakers (see Table 2), significantly so on six traits, with three of the remaining six being in this same direction. Furthermore, they rated the American-English speakers significantly more favorably than the Filipino-Tagalogs on *all* twelve of the traits. In addition, they evaluated the Filipino-English speakers more favorably than the Filipino-Tagalogs on *all* twelve traits. Thus, it is interesting to compare Tables 1 and 2 and to note that judges who were not native speakers of Tagalog proved to be even more adamant in their downgrading of the Filipino-Tagalog brand of speech relative to the other styles than were those whose native language was Tagalog. In fact, the non-Tagalogs rated the Filipino-Tagalog speakers significantly less favorably than did the Tagalog judges on the following traits: Active, Industrious, Intelligent, Possesses self-confidence, Reliable, Religious, and Successful.³

³ The *t* values for the significant comparisons noted are, respectively: 2.0, 3.16, 2.85, 2.36, 3.13, 2.49, and 2.09.

Both groups of judges also indicated, incidentally, that the American-English speakers were employed in better jobs and received more pay than the Filipino-English speakers who, in turn, were seen as better off than their Filipino-Tagalog counterparts.

Experiment II

Method

Subjects

The Ss were 30 female sophomore students at the Philippine Normal College. All were native speakers of Tagalog.

Procedure

The speakers from groups 2 and 3 of Experiment I also recorded the stimulus passage in Tagalog-English (a pidginized mixture, "mix-mix," dominated by Tagalog with English intrusions). This passage was prepared with the assistance of linguists at the Language Study Center and verified as being appropriate. In fact, this rendition of the passage is more natural and represents the speech heard on the streets and in public places more closely than either the pure English or Tagalog versions.

Table I.

MEAN RATINGS OF EACH SPEECH GROUP BY NATIVE TAGALOGS

Rating Scale	American-English	Filipino-English	Filipino-Tagalog	F (2,78)
Active (Passive)	6.39	5.07	5.04	30.92 **
Healthy (Sickly)	6.76	5.57	5.23	40.06 **
Honest (Dishonest)	6.66	6.05	5.74	16.53 **
Industrious (Lazy)	6.30	5.48	5.49	13.10 **
Intelligent (Unintelligent)	6.82	5.63	5.26	42.63 **
Light (Dark)	6.19	5.08	4.26	25.71 **
Patient (Impatient)	6.39	5.80	5.41	16.34 **
Pleasant (Unpleasant)	6.54	5.45	5.16	20.27 **
Possesses Self-Confidence (Lacks Self-Confidence)	6.61	5.51	5.02	34.43 **
Reliable (Unreliable)	6.68	5.74	5.39	23.84 **
Religious (Irreligious)	6.29	6.16	5.96	(1.42)
Successful (Unsuccessful)	6.75	5.46	5.14	50.70 **

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Entries connected by single line differ significantly ($p < .05$) while those connected by double line differ significantly ($p < .01$) using Neuman-Kéuls multiple comparison test.

Table 2
MEAN RATINGS OF EACH SPEECH GROUP BY NON-NATIVE
TAGALOGS

Rating Scale	American- English	Filipino- English	Filipino- Tagalog	F (2,78)
Active (Passive)	5.54	4.91	4.54	15.37**
Healthy (Sickly)	6.02	5.21	4.90	35.03**
Honest (Dishonest)	5.86	5.91	5.34	27.64**
Industrious (Lazy)	5.49	5.38	4.75	8.72**
Intelligent (Unintelligent)	6.36	5.74	4.64	51.49**
Light (Dark)	5.96	5.32	4.42	28.09**
Patient (Impatient)	5.72	6.01	5.01	13.74**
Pleasant (Unpleasant)	5.81	5.62	4.64	25.34**
Possesses Self-Confidence (Lacks Self-Confidence)	6.08	5.62	4.50	35.59**
Reliable (Unreliable)	5.95	5.52	4.62	32.24**
Religious (Irreligious)	5.76	5.79	5.35	6.13**
Successful (Unsuccessful)	5.91	5.59	4.60	31.95**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Entries connected by single line differ significantly ($p < .05$) while those connected by double line differ significantly ($p < .01$) using Neuman-Keuls multiple comparison test.

A second tape was constructed which comprised speakers of groups 2, 3, and 4 arranged in random order with the restriction that bilinguals in their various guises be maximally separated. Again, a "practice" voice was included at the beginning of each tape.

The method of presentation and the manner of rating were the same as those used in Experiment I. Again, separate analyses of variance with subsequent mul-

tiple comparisons were performed on the data.

Results

The results of Experiment II are summarized in Table 3 where the ratings by the Tagalog judges of the three groups of speakers are presented for each scale. The ratings by these judges were equally interesting and consistent. These Ss rated the Filipino-English speakers significantly more favorably than the Filipino-Tagalog speakers on eight of the 12 traits. They

Table 3

MEAN RATINGS OF EACH SPEECH GROUP BY NATIVE TAGALOGS

Rating Scale	Filipino-English	Filipino-Tagalog	Tagalog-English	F (2,58)
Active	5.21	5.03	4.72	(1.06)
(Passive)				
Healthy	5.46	5.18	4.99	(1.34)
(Sickly)				
Honest	6.01	5.48	4.47	25.83 **
(Dishonest)				
Industrious	5.72	5.04	3.88	17.21 **
(Lazy)				
Intelligent	5.88	5.16	3.47	51.88 **
(Unintelligent)				
Light	5.37	4.44	3.46	19.77 **
(Dark)				
Patient	5.77	5.09	3.85	23.28 **
(Impatient)				
Pleasant	5.67	4.86	3.20	41.10 **
(Unpleasant)				
Possesses Self-Confidence	5.76	5.03	4.20	13.33 **
(Lacks Self-Confidence)				
Reliable	5.69	5.22	3.65	32.78 **
(Unreliable)				
Religious	5.82	5.42	4.57	19.94 **
(Irreligious)				
Successful	5.60	5.05	3.36	40.44 **
(Unsuccessful)				

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Entries connected by single line differ significantly ($p < .05$) while those connected by double line differ significantly ($p < .01$) using Neuman-Keuls multiple comparison test.

also rated the Filipino-English speakers significantly more favorably than the Tagalog-English (mix-mix) speakers on ten of the 12 traits, and the Filipino-Tagalog models more favorably than the Tagalog-English (mix-mix) models on these same ten of 12 traits. The dimensions Healthy and Sickly and Active and Passive did not yield overall significant F values, indicating the differential judgments were not made by the Ss on these two traits. The ratings by these Ss are particularly interesting for they similarly reveal the relatively superior rating of English speak-

ing models over Tagalog speaking models; and also because the judges downgraded so markedly the Tagalog-English style of speech which appears to be the *most* prevalent speech style, at least in the Manila area, in all but very formal situations.

Discussion

These preliminary results should certainly interest Filipino educators and social scientists. Before discussing the perhaps controversial findings, it is important to review the limitations of this study. The ratings, although highly significant

statistically, do nevertheless reflect the views of only one cross-section of judges — female, sophomore students at the Philippine Normal College, a teacher training institution in Manila. These judges, furthermore, rated only female voices, rather than both male and female voices. In addition, they rated only four exemplars of each style, and many other exemplars could have been selected. There were, however, certain important reasons for having imposed these limitations on this study. First, it seemed appropriate to sample the opinions of prospective teachers since these Ss would some day be responsible for shaping the attitudes and opinions of the next generation of Filipino youth. Second, since the judging group was composed entirely of females, it was decided to also limit the stimulus voices to females in order to remove any possibility of significant and uninterpretable male-female interactions in the results. Finally, the speakers actually chosen for each category represented, by external criteria, standard speakers of the group.

The general downgrading of Filipino-Tagalog relative to American-English and to Filipino-English probably represents harsh economic reality. In the Philippines, social mobility now depends upon the acquisition of skill in English. Higher education, better employment opportunities, and travel abroad are easily accessible only to those who possess the necessary skills in English. The Ss, all prospective teachers, were particularly sensitive to these facts of life. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that judges downgraded the Filipino-Tagalog speakers, especially on those rating scales relevant to success and advancement. What is perhaps surprising is that this downgrading also extended to the more personal characteristics. These may exist, then, not

only an acceptance of economic reality but also a type of ethnic inferiority complex reflected by the down grading by the Tagalogs of Filipino-Tagalog on a few traits in Experiment I and on many traits in Experiment II. The downgrading of Tagalog-English (mix-mix) may reflect the inappropriateness of this style of speech in any but the most informal situations.

At this point the results of a separately conducted attitude survey should also be mentioned, for they are relevant. Forty-four female, Tagalog, sophomore students (mean age, 18.2 years) at the Philippine Normal College completed a short questionnaire in which they indicated that a person not skilled in English would be unable to enter such professions as teacher, doctor, secretary, etc., and that a person without this background would be limited to jobs such as janitor, vendor, dressmaker, etc. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of the respondents felt that these restrictions were "just and fair" — perhaps because they themselves had already mastered English. On the other hand, a majority felt that they could more accurately and efficiently communicate their ideas and meanings in Tagalog than in English. But at the same time, they agreed that English has the richer vocabulary, the more intricate grammar, and the more pleasant sound patterns. They rated the English language as being significantly more sophisticated, formal, rigid, and complex than the Tagalog language.

Going back to the present research, an equally important finding concerns the rather ruthless downgrading of Filipino-Tagalog speakers by non-Tagalogs. In addition to indicating a practical orientation regarding the "value" of English and Tagalog, the ratings may also indicate a

partial rejection of Tagalog as a unifying force. This downgrading suggests that, perhaps, some linguistic ill-will does exist. The next stage in this research which is currently being undertaken involves sampling respondents from more diverse backgrounds using additional languages as stimuli.

This results also suggest that language planners may be well-instructed to carefully assess the attitudes of people in various regions of the country before they decide on any major change in language policy. I fully realize that these results are only tentative; but I think that they will be well-received if they serve the useful function of asking planners whether they have really assessed the language situation fully.

REFERENCES

- Anisfeld, M., Bogo, N., and Lambert, W. E. Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1962, 65, 223-231.
- Anisfeld, Elizabeth, and Lambert, W. E. Evaluational Reactions of Bilingual and Monolingual Children to Spoken Languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, 69, 89-97.
- Ellis, D. S. Speech and Social Status in America. *Social Forces*, 1967, 45, 431-437.
- Gardner, R. C., and Lambert, W. E. Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 1959, 13, 266-272.
- Labov, W. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.
- Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., and Fillenbaum, S. Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1960, 60, 44-51.
- Lambert, W. E., Anisfeld, M., and Yenikomshian, Grace. Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arab Adolescents to Dialect and Language Variations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1965, 2, 84-90.
- Lambert, W. E., Frankel, Hannah, and Tucker, G. R. Judging Personality Through Speech: a French-Canadian example. *The Journal of Communication*, 1966, XVI, 305-321.
- Lambert, W. E. A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. In J. Macnamara (Ed.) Problems of Bilingualism. Special Issue, *Journal of Social Issues*, 1967, XXIII, 91-109.
- Markel, N. N., Eisler, R. M., and Reese, H. W. Judging Personality from Dialect. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1967, 6, 33-35.
- Thomas, C. K. *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English* (2nd ed.). New York: Ronald, 1958.
- Tucker, G. R., and Lambert, W. E. White and Negro Listeners' Reactions to Various American-English Dialects. Paper presented at meetings of Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, 1967.
- Winer, B. J. *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

APPENDIX

Standard Instructions Given to the Judges

We are conducting research to determine how people react to the voices of others. You do this every day -- for instance, when you hear an unfamiliar voice on the telephone, you try to imagine what type of person is speaking.

Now, I would like to have you listen to a series of tape recorded voices and evaluate, or make certain judgments about each voice that you hear. As you listen to the first speaker, I want you to evaluate this speaker on each of the dimen-

sions or traits that are listed on your questionnaire. You will notice a series of 12 adjective scales on your questionnaire. Each line contains an adjective followed by 8 spaces and then another adjective [find the proper place on the questionnaire]. Your job is to evaluate the speaker whose voice you hear on each of these dimensions by placing one mark (X) somewhere along the line which represents each of the dimensions. You may *not* mark more than one blank on any particular line, and you *must* mark one on every line. [Standard instructions, found in any introductory Psychology text, were also given concerning rating with a Semantic Differential scale. Instructions were repeated, questions were answered.]

Each speaker will repeat his message twice. You may begin evaluating a voice at any time that you wish following the beginning of the message. You will have ample time between speakers to complete your ratings.

When you finish rating one speaker on the adjective scales, then indicate on the space provided the average salary that you think this person earns. Also indicate the probable occupational level of the speaker. When you finish these ratings, turn to the next page of your questionnaire and wait until you hear the announcement for the next speaker. You will now have a chance to listen to and evaluate a "practice" voice. Are there any questions? . . . [sample voice] . . . Are there any questions?

	Light	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Dark
	Dishonest	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Honest
	Reliable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unreliable
Possesses self-confidence		_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Lacks self-confidence
	Passive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Active
	Religious	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Irreligious
	Pleasant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unpleasant
	Successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unsuccessful
	Healthy	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Sickly
	Patient	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Impatient
	Lazy	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Industrious
	Intelligent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unintelligent

Salary: _____ ₱ per month

Occupation: _____ Farmer; _____ Laborer; _____ Office Employee; _____ Office Executive; _____ Professional