A Reflection of Linguistic Ideologies, Inequality, and Class: Language Shaming Practices on Facebook

Kyrah Irish M. Porras

Department of English, Ateneo De Manila University, Philippines
Email: kyrah.porras@obf.ateneo.edu

Abstract— This study endeavored to unpack indexical attributes commonly associated to English as well as language ideologies reflected through language shaming practices online. Speakers of non-standard varieties often encounter this linguistic attack, as their ways of using the language that deviates from the norm are seen as indices of laziness, stupidity, and backwardness (Piller, 2017). It is also noteworthy to mention that the trigger of this widespread phenomenon is attributed to the continuing rise of new modes of communication in the digital space. Language shaming is not an unfamiliar phenomenon; this highlights the fact that this phenomenon of discrimination and shaming users of non-standard English does not only transpire in professional and educational domains, but also inhabits and thrives in the digital space (Nguyen, 2019). However, scant attention has been given to language shaming practices emerging in social media. By analyzing the language shaming practices of Filipino Facebook users through their comments in response to non-standard use of English, common indexical values attributed to English were identified. The identified indexicalities are also entwined with the emerging themes of language ideology that Filipinos manifest towards English. The language ideologies identified are as follows: 1.) English as a requisite for upward mobility 2.) English as an instrument of elitism 3.) Standard American English as the ideal model in the domains of education and workplace.

Keywords— Language Ideologies, Language Shaming, Linguistic Insecurity, Philippine English, World Englishes

I. INTRODUCTION

In Europe, where English has become the lingua franca, there seems to be a trend of mockery targeted at individuals who exhibit 'poor' foreign language skills. Even public figures, like politicians, are not spared nor an exemption from receiving this form of censure or disapproval from the public. Exhibit A of this trend is the video of a speech made by the Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi, which became viral. The recorded speech attracted viewers and prompted individuals to comment, mock, and ridicule the prime minister, not because of the content of the delivered speech, but because the speech was apparently delivered in what seems to be like 'bad' or 'rusty' English in the lens of their own citizens. The prime minister was mauled for his heavy accent, frequent stammering, and apparent 'distorted' speech delivered in English. Another public official who was not spared from the same criticism was Germany's previous foreign minister Guido Westerwelle. He was publicly ridiculed for his decision to refuse to answer a question in English. It is also noteworthy to mention that the disapproval and shaming propelled towards these public figures did not come from native English speakers, but from the politicians' fellow citizens (O'Sullivan, 2014).

In Nepal, the populace did not spare another public figure from the same disparagement. The Minister for Health and Population of Nepal, the Honorable Dharma Shila Chapagain, faced the same wave of criticism when her

speech during the UN High-Level Meeting in New York went viral in 2011. The speech was live-streamed on the UN's channel, and from there on, made its way onto several multimedia channels, specifically on YouTube. An excerpt of the minister's speech was re-uploaded on YouTube, where it was titled "Nepali Stupid Speech at UN" (Piller, 2017). Similar to the aforementioned events in Europe, the 4-minute video clip of Chapagain's speech also prompted viewers to make comments. Unfortunately, the commenters overlooked engaging towards the merits and substance of Chapagain's presented arguments in the speech, but were rather fixated on lambasting and finding fault with the form in which her speech was delivered. Chapagain's use of English was negatively evaluated and labeled as 'horrible' English. There were also comments made stating that her English use was shameful and that it is an embarrassment to Nepal, noting how the minister's English is not a representative example of Nepalese English or Nenglish (Karn, 2012). Sharma (2014) reported that most of the harsh remarks were made by the educated group of Nepalis' population based outside Nepal.

In Malaysia, a provocative question was posted in a social media site, specifically on Twitter. The tweet posted intends to look for answers as to why Malays are still incompetent in English. The posted tweet has launched an attack on English teachers, identifying them as the biggest reason why Malays' English competency is declining. However, aside from teacher quality, it was also discussed that there is another external factor why most of the population are still 'incompetent' in English. It was identified that there is this decades-old tradition in Malaysia wherein people who speak falteringly using English receive negative judgments from fluent English speakers. The fluent speakers also label non-standard English use of several Malays as 'broken.' As a result, individuals become hesitant to speak and learn the English language fearing that they will be mocked and ridiculed because they are not perfectly fluent (Kata Malaysia, 2019).

Meanwhile, in the Philippines, while it prides itself as a multilingual and linguistically diverse country, the extent of appreciation and respect given to the richness of our languages still remains unfelt, unheard, and unseen. For some Filipinos, the same occurrences of being ridiculed and mocked for using English are still evident even until this modern day. To quote Martin (2014), "for Filipinos belonging to the Expanding Circle category, using English may become a painful, humiliating experience."

The non-standard use of English of Filipinos has become an obsession for humor, giving birth to the label 'Carabao English,' pertaining to the Filipinos' use of English riddled with grammar mistakes. Indeed, the Filipinos has developed a penchant to subject into a laughing stock any individual who would attempt to speak English but fails to conform to what is 'ideal' or 'standard.'

Take for example, the Filipino professional boxer Manny Pacquiao whose after-fight interviews would often be a subject of comical stints targeting his 'Carabao English.' Even one of the most celebrated authors in the Philippines, the National Artist for Literature F. Sionil Jose could not evade being a target. In one of his editorials published in The Philippine Star, he shared how his English fiction novels were criticized for not being English enough because of the traces of his 'Carabao English' in his works (Jose, 2020). Even in the domain of beauty pageants, the former Bb. Pilipinas World 2008, Janina San Miguel, became a subject of public ridicule because of her 'funny' English during the Q&A portion of the pageant. Another would be Maxine Medina who was crowned Miss Universe Philippines 2016. She received strong criticisms and was bombarded with threads of hate messages all over social media for her 'poor' English skills during a press conference (Custodio, 2017).

And since Philippine English seems to be a spectacle for the Filipinos, it is also often misconstrued as 'deficient' evident in one article published in The Manila Times pointing out how 'Broken English' reflects how Filipino students are greatly deficient in the language. Furthermore, as seen in article title, 'Broken English' seems to be labeled as a 'handicap' for young Filipinos- an upfront conviction that non-standard use of English is seen as an impediment, a disability, and worse, as a defect. Truth be told, using English in this country may warrant an individual to be put into a disadvantage if one deviates away from conformity with the 'ideal' and 'standard', often prized as the only correct and acceptable form (Agtarap, 2021).

Indeed, as English continues its dominance around the globe, it has been a trend that any individual whose English fails to meet social expectations and standards will become a target for mockery and ridicule for his/her 'bad' English. English language users, especially those who do not conform with society's 'ideal' model, find themselves pelted and plagued by this linguistic attack called "language shaming."

Piller (2017) describes this phenomenon of "language shaming" as interactions that disparage, degrade, and demean particular ways of using language, may it be in social media or face-to-face encounters. Speakers of non-standard varieties often encounter this linguistic attack, as their ways of using the language that deviates from the norm are seen as indices of laziness, stupidity, and backwardness (Piller, 2017). For Piller (2017), language

shaming is another form of stigma associated with a group or an individual. Like other forms of stigma, language shaming may have a direct negative impact on the groups and individuals affected as it may result in the disruption of self-esteem, disregard for self-worth, and social alienation. Worst, shaming can become a major deterrent for any group or individual to develop a sense of belonging in their community and impede them from developing connections and relationships with others (Kaufman, 1996).

It is also noteworthy to mention that the trigger of this widespread phenomenon is attributed to the continuing rise of new modes of communication in the digital space. Social media has now become a platform in which language shaming attacks can occur. Certainly, nitpicking other people's grammar mistakes has become an internet pastime (Heisel, 2015). It is in the virtual realm wherein a collective group of users worldwide can utilize a medium where they are free to express their criticisms and publicly disparage others often disguised in the form of comments. To quote Armfield et al. (2016), "by posting declarations of inequity and dominance, the internet has reinvigorated the role of shaming in public environments." More so, social media did not only exacerbate this phenomenon of shaming, it also accelerated the speed of how shaming can occur in the digital space. Any negative remarks to humiliate an entity can easily be posted, shared, and reacted upon with just one click. Users, indeed, can strongly assume that their number of followers hold similar perspectives as them, and will likewise laugh, joke, or ridicule as they would (Armfield et al., 2016). Indeed, social media can be a new source of power in which the creation of ideologies, cultural attitudes, and political views can transpire (Al-Salman, 2017). We are now living in an environment saturated with technology-mediated communication that this digital space is accorded with the power to contour the frameworks of our perspectives and opinions, biases, prejudices, and stereotypes.

To quote Martin (2008), "one important reality that many overlook is that students will not learn a language if they fear it." If this type of discrimination will continue to be sustained and propagated, it could lead to irreversible consequences. The worst-case scenario might compel certain minority groups to abandon their language variety, leading to language death and extinction. Indeed, if Filipinos belonging to the minority groups become disempowered and silenced because of their language, they would continue to struggle to embrace their linguistic identities and be forced to abandon them (Canilao, 2020).

Language shaming is not an unfamiliar phenomenon; it transpires in many domains, most especially in workplace and in education. However, scant attention has been given to language shaming practices emerging in social media. More so, only a few investigations have been conducted aimed at exploring how language shaming practices can reflect language ideology and inequalities in society. To quote Tupas and Rubdy (2015), "inequalities that mediate relations between Englishes, English users, and other languages have been overlooked since we have been seduced into celebrating victories over English but forgetting the massive inequities sustained and perpetuated by the unbridled dominance of English today." Thus, it is essential to survey the dominance of ideologies and the effect of inequalities in society in the use of Englishes (Pennycook, 1994).

II.   REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Social Media (Facebook) as a Communicative Space and Online Shaming

According to the report made by Statista (2020), as of July 2020, the Philippines ranks 6th among the top users of Facebook worldwide with around 76 million users. In addition, the current pandemic situation has also impacted the social media dependency of Filipino netizens. Data Reportal reported in 2020 that 64% of the respondents from the country have an increased social media usage compared to the global average of 47%. With this ever-increasing use of social media, it was forecasted by Statista that Facebook users would skyrocket around 88.1 million users by the year 2025. Indeed, with Facebook's accessibility and convenience of use, its massive reach has opened its doors to all users regardless of socioeconomic status. More so, with the current pandemic placing majority of the population in isolation, the need to stay connected and updated continues to escalate, so does the urge to participate more in the activities in the virtual space by sharing personal comments, perspectives, and reactions which can provide a window to users' deeply ingrained ideologies.

With the nature of web platforms being 'multimodal, multi-layered and multi-authored,' it has blurred the boundaries of participation roles and borderline of consumption and production (Androutsopoulos, 2010). This culture has led to arming individuals with the power to 'watch, evaluate, and reprimand other people' for their defiance and non-conformity from social norms (Ingraham & Reeves, 2016). Indeed, this mass digital surveillance prompted the re-emergence of shaming as a punishment tool in modern society (Muir et al., 2021). It is noteworthy to mention that with the support of new technologies, language shaming practices can transpire in the form of online campaigns (Piller, 2017). This highlights the fact that this phenomenon of discrimination and shaming users

of non-standard English does not only prevail in professional and educational domains, but also inhabits and thrives in the digital space (Nguyen, 2019).

With the support of online spaces, it provides a platform where local ideologies of English are created affecting the form of local language practices, which will further shape perceptions about language use (Nguyen, 2019). To quote Al-Salman (2017), "social media can create an alternative source of power which supports the creation of ideologies, cultural attitudes, and political views."

2.2 Language Ideologies

According to Irvine (1989), language ideologies are beliefs and feelings about language. Language ideologies are morally and politically charged representations about language- its nature, structure, and use in society. For Silverstein (1979), language ideology is defined as a system of belief about the structure and use of language which a population of speakers has justified. For a more encompassing view, language ideologies are more than just a belief system as it mediates between language forms and social structures. Language ideologies can be used as "a tool to relate micro-level of language use to macro-level of power and social inequality" (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). To quote Meyerhoff (2006), "the study of language ideologies considers how the beliefs and theories that speakers have about different forms of language help them to rationalize and relate highly complex social systems, such as access to power, and what social processes sustain those beliefs."

This means that language ideologies are not constrained or purely centered around only on the structure and nature of languages. The beliefs and feelings integrated into such structures are of vital importance to institutions that organize and sustain inequalities. It is also noteworthy to mention that in societies, language ideologies are rarely uniform or homogenous. This imbalance and conflict of language ideologies in society may not always be explicitly expressed but are implicitly articulated through behaviors and attitudes since some linguistic features or varieties are favored with greater regard or value than others (Woolard, 2020).

It is also through a community's language ideologies wherein a line between what is legitimate and illegitimate is drawn. Some language varieties will not be solely judged for the merits of its mere linguistic form, the user's social image, identity, and group membership will be critically assessed alongside (Irvine & Gal, 2000), and this is where indexicality relates with language ideology. Language ideology and indexicality link the micro-level of linguistic performance to the macro-level of social context

(Mesthrie et al., 2009). Indeed, language is not just denotational but also indexical of one's social and personal background (Mesthrie et al., 2009).

Moreover, the language ideology which accords language varieties to be endowed with greater value can facilitate language practices into symbolic capital that brings social and economic rewards to those who conform with the dominant language (Woolard, 2020). In contrast, any linguistic practices that deviate from the standard norm will have to endure obliteration (Irvine & Gal, 2000). Indeed, all languages are linguistically equal but not necessarily sociolinguistically equal.

If not given enough attention, these assumptions about language can transform as a tool for oppression. As stated by Hudson (1996), "the material uses of language, discourse and ideology, are where social oppression is imposed and reimposed, or resisted and negotiated." Thus, it emphasizes that "prejudice and discrimination are discrimination are not social facts in the sense that they simply exist independently of practice, they are perpetuated in particular acts, and touring on those acts gives us an opportunity how people are actually constrained or not" (Hudson, 1996). Undeniably, language ideologies are not merely passive transmitters as they hold the power to shape both the social and the linguistic structures they represent (Woolard, 2020). It is through the study of language ideologies that we can uncover how social judgments may be interrelated with linguistic judgments.

2.3 Language Policies in the Philippine Context

It was during the American colonial period wherein English was first introduced to the Filipinos through the American public school system. The language was embraced and welcomed by the Filipinos as it was deemed as a "necessary solution to the problem of isolation" experienced during the Spanish colonial period. English was endorsed and advanced as the language that will civilize the Filipino natives (Martin, 2020). Because of the public school system of education, the Filipinos learned the English language through pedagogical strategies such as grammar drills, rote memorization, and reading passages aloud which were employed on American native English speakers. Even as of this modern day, our language beliefs and attitude about English still have remnants of the American colonial education (Martin, 2012)

Now, in this present time, the Philippines has welcomed a new education policy as an attempt to advance the use of mother tongue. In July 2009, to recognize and promote linguistic and cultural diversity in the country, the Department of Education Order No. 74 called for the

institutionalization of the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) framework in the whole stretch of formal education (Department of Education, 2009). In the MTB-MLE policy, the learner's mother tongue and additional language are utilized in the classroom to facilitate learning and instruction. One of the salient features of the policy is for learners to develop a strong foundation in their mother language before transitioning to other languages including English. As a result, the MTB-MLE framework, which aims to uphold multilingual education, received a positive response from its stakeholders.

However, it is a truism that there is a gap between the policy and its implementation. As mentioned earlier, the Philippines has yet to graduate from its colonial past. Currently, even if there is an existing framework to promote the country's languages, Philippine Englishes are still not given an equal treatment, especially in the education and professional domain (Canilao, 2020). The General American English is still regarded as the 'Standard Philippine English,' in the academic field and even in the public lens (Canilao, 2020). Thus, it is evident that there is still an obsession over idealizing a standard variety in the use of English language. This idealization of a standard variety is a manifestation of bias towards other linguistic forms which is sustained by institutional practices (Lippi-Green, 2012). Dominant institutions such as media and school take a crucial part in perpetuating and sustaining the ideology that the only standard variety of English is the "Anglo, upper middle-class, and ethnically middle-American" variety (Lippi-Green, 2012). This causes the conflict faced by language teachers in implementing the MTB-MLE framework in upholding and promoting the country's languages.

In a survey conducted by Canilao (2020), it was revealed that while language teachers acknowledge the value of Philippine Englishes, they are still compelled to foster the 'Standard American English' in their classes and their most preferred target model for English was American English. Although there is an existing framework to uphold other varieties of English, the teachers are still constrained by the prescribed syllabi and constant monitoring by their 'schools' gatekeepers' who prefer students to master the 'Standard American English' as it is endowed with greater value in most domains compared to other local varieties. This situation as described by Bruthiaux (2003) is a 'conflict between linguistic norms and linguistic behavior, with widespread perceptions among users that Anglo-American norms are somehow superior and that their own variants are therefore deficient.' In general, this is one of the major concerns in the field of language teaching in the Philippine society that

such obsession with prescriptivism and standard variety is beginning to be counterproductive with the aim to promote the linguistic diversity in the country.

As much as the Philippines prides itself as a multilingual country, the attempts to promote local varieties of language in country seems to be mere tokenisms of progress. English being the definition of success and requisite for economic mobility has become so entrenched in our society that our education system is still predominantly dominated by English, marking it as the country's 'language of power and prestige' (BusinessMirror, 2019). Such notion is greatly manifested in the country that even Senator Grace Poe deemed it necessary to file a resolution to call for an inquiry regarding the decline of English proficiency among Filipino students (Leonen, 2018). The senator even encouraged the academe to review the current curriculum "to improve teaching and learning of English" and urged the government to "adopt global English standards to improve citizens' communication skills" which is a clear manifestation of the ideology that our local standards seem to be lacking and deficient to thrive in the global stadium.

Unfortunately, this traditional concept of success tied to English proficiency leaves some in the periphery, especially those from rural areas. There is a significant mismatch in terms of 'teaching quality, learning outcomes, resources, and facilities' that rural and urban areas receive. In the study of Canilao (2020), students experience a high level of difficulty understanding English because of uneven access to materials and resources. Also, there is a stark difference between students' socio-economic standing. Students from high-income families are well-performing since they receive support and guidance. In contrast, those from financially struggling families are underperforming because they lack access to nourishment and guidance at home. In terms of school resources, leading schools have ideal classrooms for conducive learning, upgraded equipment and facilities, and enough learning materials for students. However, public schools do not share the same quality of resources. Such a trend will lead to a further "English divide," which can intensify the boundary between who has more access to English education and, thus, more social capital (Nguyen et al., 2016).

If such mismatch continues, it compromises the education of those from linguistic minority and further puts them at a disadvantage and may impede their academic performance. For Piller (2016), this is a form of educational injustice in which minority children "have to learn a new language by learning content in that language, and they have to learn new content while learning the language in which the content is delivered."

Indeed, language policies in the Philippines still have a long way to go in incorporating and upholding multilingualism into mainstream education to further cultivate the social and economic fabric of our society. While there are attempts to promote inclusivity and diversity of our languages, our educational policies are still heavily influenced by the language ideology brought about by our reference to General American English as the only ideal model and norm, and any deviation would seem deficient. In this regard, language policies can never be divorced from language practices. Language ideologies are not neutral; they hold power in the formation and enactment of policies (Ricento, 2000). To further emphasize, Ricento (2000) note that language ideologies have far-reaching effects on language policies and practices. It draws the line between what is and is not possible in language planning and policymaking.

III.   METHODOLOGY

The dataset used in this study is derived from corpus of posts, comments, and reactions on a Filipino Facebook meme page. Comments, reactions, and posts were collected in Tagalog, English, and/or a mix of both languages. The Facebook Meme Page selected for the study is named "Pinoy Past Tensed." The page intentionally posts grammatical errors and non-standard use of English in social media posts made by Filipino social media users in attempt to "humorize" it. The entries posted in the page are submitted by the netizens themselves who have encountered the posts in their own accounts. The corpus was extracted from the 5, 140 posts found in the main album of the page. The corpus was filtered and selected based on the number of engagements (shares, comments, and reactions) and the date and month they were posted. Among the 5, 140 photos in the album, the final posts used in this study a were posts made in the first three months of the year 2021. This narrows down the dataset to a total of 35 posts. The social media corpus gathered was analyzed using a qualitative discourse analysis to determine emergent themes in the comments. The corpus was then examined using the lens of Linguistic Ideologies and Indexicality, and Bourdieu's concept of linguistic capital.

IV.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Non-standard use of English as shameful

Because of a specific mistake in using a verb tense on a post of a customer representative of a telecommunications company in the Philippines, netizens stated remarks that this non-standard use of English is "shameful," which is a direct negative judgment on one's language proficiency. Thus, this signals that a non-standard use of English is an index of "shamefulness." This index associated to non-standard use of English is a testament that even there is still a widespread perception that Anglo-American norms are superior, therefore, any deviation would be seen as 'deficient' and shameful (Bruthiaux, 2003).

4.2 English as an index of education and/or intelligence level

Other netizens also question a writer's educational attainment based on one's use of grammar. Although not explicitly stated, comments suggested that it is doubtful that the original status writer is a college graduate based on his use of English. Comments insinuate that if one commits a mistake in grammar, it means that one does not possess fundamental skills in English to be able to enter the workforce, specifically in an industry where a good command of English is a demand. These types of comments are signals that mark English as an indexical value associated with education level. This indexical correlation may be derived from language teaching and learning in the Philippines heavily influenced by our reference to General American English as the ideal model.

4.3 Standard American English as the ideal model

There were some commenters who decided to share corrections with the intention to educate the commenters and sharers of the proper convention when using tenses. However, it was clearly that the corrections made were in adherence to the General American English which is a clear indication that non-conformity is not allowed and implies that one should follow the prescribed rule or norm. This also signals the index that Standard American English is still the ideal language model in the country. This also further emphasizes that there is still an existing 'bias toward an abstract, idealized homogeneous language" (Lippi-Green, 1997).

4.4 Language inferiority complex

There were also which are indications of language inferiority complex or linguistic insecurity. One commenter expressed that he/she is experiencing overcorrection in terms of spelling and grammar whenever he/she would use English to express his/her sentiments in social media. These signals of hypercorrection, unease, and uncertainty are signs of linguistic insecurity. More so, linguistic insecurity emanates from the speakers' perspective that their language is deficient, inferior, and inappropriate (Canilao, 2020).

4.5 Disassociation between English proficiency and superiority

Another indexical link emerged from the corpus were comments which surprisingly intend to disassociate English proficiency and superiority. As a response to demeaning comments towards non-standard use of English, one commenter stated his sentiments over disappointment regarding the traits of Filipinos wherein individuals would rather choose to humiliate a person for his/her grammatical errors, instead of educating him/her. The commenter explicitly disassociated English proficiency with superiority by stating that having a good command in English does not equate with the measure of one's intelligence.

Lastly, to answer the question of how these language shaming practices uncover class inequality, it is shown that the condescending corrections and disparaging remarks made towards those who used non-standard American English were expressed by those who obviously have greater access to education and other linguistic resources. While those who were subjected to ridicule and shaming seems to be from the struggling population. This only translates that these language shaming practices also help unveil class inequality. Those who were regularly shamed were from the struggling population, individuals who do not have the capital to access the privileged language. While those who conformed with the dominant variety were rewarded, affirmed, and endowed with a sense of superiority.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study endeavored to unpack indexical attributes commonly associated to English as well as language ideologies reflected through language shaming practices online. Moreover, the language ideologies emergent serve as an overarching context in which we can determine social inequalities. By analyzing the language shaming practices of Filipino Facebook users through their comments in response to non-standard use of English, common indexical values attributed to English were identified: 1.) Non-standard use of English as shameful 2.) English as an index of education and/or intelligence level 3.) Standard American English as the ideal model 4.) Non-standard use of English as a marker of linguistic insecurity 5.) Disassociation between English proficiency and superiority. These indexicalities are also entwined with the emerging themes of language ideology that Filipinos manifest towards English. The language ideologies identified are as follows: 1.) English as a requisite for upward mobility 2.) English as an instrument of elitism 3.) Standard American English as the ideal model in the domains of education and workplace.

While the present study is only a peek- a glance towards a fuller and more comprehensive understanding of language shaming and how it is interwoven with language ideologies and social inequalities. Although this is just a glimpse, the study was still able to uncover insights over the emergence of language shaming practices which thrives in this digital era. This study resonates well with the argument that the privilege status of English in our country, particularly the GAE variety, is derived from social and attitudinal factors. The issue is that even when our local models of English are linguistically identifiable and functionally valuable, they are still not necessarily attitudinally acceptable. This is a testament that, indeed, we have yet to graduate from our colonial past- from the century-old subordination instilled to us and is continually sustained by the unbridled demand for English as a means for social and economic mobility. If we continue to disregard and not recognize the possible irreversible effects of linguistic shaming, then the cycle of linguistic-socioeconomic hierarchies and inequalities will just continue to be further perpetuated and sustained in the society. Language shaming is not just merely a short-lived phenomenon; it is interwoven in our identity and culture as ideology is rooted in affect. We have to understand that linguistic shaming practices is pivotal to the emergence of social alienation and inferiority- it can disrupt a speaker's self-esteem. It is high time that we dismantle the system of practices that help sustain dominant hierarchies, those which continue to encourage hostility towards our local varieties. We should focus on establishing a system which perceives the structure and elements of our local varieties as positive influence and not as interference.

Thus, change must begin within educational institutions which should be the frontrunners of advocating linguistic diversity. Pedagogical strategies should be contextualized and should not always zero in on obsession over prescriptivism- allow local varieties to thrive in their own accord. Teachers must expose themselves more to the World Englishes paradigm, so they can also begin to acknowledge that they should start embracing the use of Philippine English. Second, language policies and curriculum should be revisited so as to make proper adjustments and modifications to allow flexibility on the part of the teachers - advance and highlight policies which reinforce, promote, and empower local varieties of English both in theory and in practice. Third, this also calls for the government and LGUs to provide better assistance to schools which are struggling in terms of resources and materials. Lastly, this calls for an attitudinal change among Filipinos- to start involving speakers of local varieties of English, acknowledge its legitimacy, and understand that

they are functionally valuable. More so, with the advent of digital technology, this study intends to educate social media users to practice digital citizenship- to encourage them to make more educated and compassionate choices online, especially in terms of how they interact and communicate. This study can educate social media users that their ability to speak hurtful and demeaning words behind the cloak of their devices can have far-reaching effects which may be irreversible.

While the use of English language has been insofar beneficial in our serving as a bridge to engage globally, it might be potentially used as a tool for oppression and elitism. Thus, it is vital that from the result of this study we gain a better perspective that the English language can be promoted in a way which does not compromise our local varieties and the same time realize that language is a tool for social equality and not for social or cultural separation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

[1] Agtarap, E. (2021, February 17). Broken English a handicap for young Filipinos. The Manila Times. https://www.manilatimes.net/2021/02/18/campus-press/broken-english-a-handicap-for-young-filipinos/842249/

[2] Al-Salman, S. M. (2017). Has the Power of Language been Compromised by the Influence of Social Media? Studies in English Language Teaching, 5(2), 172–185. https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v5n2p172

[3] Androutsopoulos, J. (2010). Localizing the Global on the Participatory Web. The Handbook of Language and Globalization, 201–231. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444324068.ch9

[4] Armfield, S. W. J., Armfield, D. M., & Franklin, L. O. (2016). The shaming: Creating a curriculum that promotes socially responsible online engagement [E-book]. In In Social Justice Instruction: Empowerment on the Chalkboard (Softcover reprint of the original 1st ed. 2016 ed., pp. 271–280). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12349-3_24

[5] Bartlett, L. (2007). Literacy, speech and shame: the cultural politics of literacy and language in Brazil. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20(5), 547–563. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390701207426Blommaert, J. (2005). Discourse: A Critical Introduction (Key Topics in Sociolinguistics) (Illustrated ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[6] Blommaert, J. (2010). The Sociolinguistics of Globalization (Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact) (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[7] Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste (Routledge Classics) (1st ed.). Routledge.

[8] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.

[9] Bourdieu, P. (1990). The Logic of Practice (1st ed.). Stanford University Press.

[10] Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and Symbolic Power. Harvard University Press.

[11] Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: issues in modeling English worldwide. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13(2), 159–178. https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00042

[12] BusinessMirror. (2019, September 9). Why we should stop bashing English speakers in PHL. https://businessmirror.com.ph/2019/09/09/why-we-should-stop-bashing-english-speakers-in-phl/

[13] Canilao, M. L. E. N. (2020). Foregrounding Philippine Englishes in fostering linguistic equality. Asian Englishes, 22(2), 195–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1715575

[14] Custodio, I. A. (2017, June 6). When speaking in English. . ..INQUIRER.Net. https://opinion.inquirer.net/104563/when-speaking-in-english

[15] Department of Education. (2009, July 14). July 14, 2009 DO 74, s. 2009 – Institutionalizing Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MLE) | Department of Education. Https://Www.Deped.Gov.Ph/2009/07/14/Do-74-s-2009-Institutionalizing-Mother-Tongue-Based-Multilingual-Education-Mle/. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2009/07/14/do-74-s-2009-institutionalizing-mother-tongue-based-multilingual-education-mle/

[16] Heisel, A. (2015, April 20). Stop shaming people for online grammar errors. Op-Eds – Gulf News. https://gulfnews.com/opinion/op-eds/stop-shaming-people-for-online-grammar-errors-1.1495684

[17] Hudson, R. A. (1996). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge University Press.

[18] Ingraham, C., & Reeves, J. (2016). New media, new panics. Critical Studies in Media Communication, 33(5), 455–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1227863

[19] Irvine, J. T. (1989). when talk isn't cheap: language and political economy. American Ethnologist, 16(2), 248–267. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1989.16.2.02a00040

[20] Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities (P. V. Kroskrity ed., pp. 35–84). School for Advanced Research Press. https://web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/IrvineGal2000.pdf

[21] Jose, S. F. (2020, February 2). My Carabao English. Philstar.Com. https://www.philstar.com/opinion/2020/02/03/1989884/my-carabao-english

[22] Karn, S. K. (2012). On Nepalese English Discourse Granting Citizenship to English in Nepal via Corpus Building. Journal of NELTA, 16(1–2), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v16i1-2.6127

[23] Kata Malaysia. (2019, May 27). "It's all the teacher fault!" https://katamalaysia.my/culture/its-all-the-teacher-fault/

[24] Kaufman, G. (1996). The Psychology of Shame: Theory and Treatment of Shame-Based Syndromes (2nd ed.). Springer Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.27-0587

[25] Leonen, J. N. (2018, February 16). Inquiry into decline of English skill of PH students sought. Inquirer.Net. https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/969318/inquiry-into-decline-of-english-skill-of-ph-students-sought

[26] Lippi-Green, R. (1997). English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States (1st ed.). Routledge.

[27] Lippi-Green, R. (2012). English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States (2nd ed.). Routledge.

[28] Martin, I. P. (2008). Fearing English in the Philippines. Asian Englishes, 11(2), 76–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2008.10801237

[29] Martin, I. P. (2012). Diffusion and directions: English language policy in the Philippines. English in South East Asia: Features, Policy, and Language in Use, 189–205. https://www.academia.edu/1505205/Diffusion_and_directions_English_language_policy_in_the_Philippines_2012_

[30] Martin, I. P. (2014). Philippine English revisited. World Englishes, 33(1), 50–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12054

[31] Martin, I. P. (2020). Philippine English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), The Handbook of Asian Englishes (pp. 479–500). Wiley Blackwell.

[32] Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., & Leap, W. L. (2009). Introducing Sociolinguistics: 2nd Edition (2nd ed.). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[33] Meyerhoff, M. (2006). Introducing Sociolinguistics (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429507922

[34] Muir, S. R., Roberts, L. D., & Sheridan, L. P. (2021). The portrayal of online shaming in contemporary online news media: A media framing analysis. Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 3, 100051. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100051

[35] Nguyen, H. D. (2019). Language shaming practices on Youtube : ideologies of English in Vietnam (Master's Thesis). University of Jyväskylä. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/64883

[36] Nguyen, L. C., Hamid, M. O., & Renshaw, P. (2016). English in the primary classroom in Vietnam: students' lived experiences and their social and policy implications. Current Issues in Language Planning, 17(2), 191–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1089629

[37] O'Sullivan, F. (2014, July 24). Why Are Europeans "Bad English Shaming" Their Politicians? Bloomberg CityLab. https://www.bloomberg.com/tosv2.html?vid=&uuid=c5780000-a598-11eb-a7d4-5905e7d066e6&url=L25ld3MvYXJ0aWNsZXMvMjAxNC0wNy0yNC93aHktYXJlLWV1cm9wZWFucy1iYWQtZW5nbGlzaC1zaGFtaW5nLXRoZWlyLXBvbGl0aWNpYW5z

[38] Pennycook, A. (1994). The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language. Routledge.

[39] Piller, I. (2016). Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics (1st ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199937240.001.0001

[40] Piller, I. (2017a, September 28). Explorations in language shaming. Language on the Move. https://www.languageonthemove.com/explorations-in-language-shaming/

[41] Piller, I. (2017b, October 16). Anatomy of language shaming. Language on the Move. https://www.languageonthemove.com/anatomy-of-language-shaming/

[42] Ricento, T. (2000). Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[43] Setati, M. (1998). Code-switching in a senior primary class of second language learners. For the Learning of Mathematics, 18(2), 114–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/30034945

[44] Setati, M. (2005). Teaching mathematics in a primary multilingual classroom. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 36(5), 447–466. https://doi.org/10.2307/30034945

[45] Sharma, B. K. (2014). On high horses: Transnational Nepalis and language ideologies on YouTube. Discourse, Context & Media, 4–5, 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2014.04.001

[46] Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels (In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.) ed., pp. 193–147). Chicago Linguistic Society.

[47] Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. Language & Communication, 23(3–4), 193–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0271-5309(03)00013-2

[48] Speciale, T. (2020). A Cycle of Shame: How Shaming Perpetuates Language Inequalities in Dakar, Senegal. The Dynamics of Language and Inequality in Education, 61–70. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788926959-006

[49] Statista. (2020, July 19). Number of Facebook users Philippines 2017–2025. https://www.statista.com/statistics/490455/number-of-philippines-facebook-users/

[50] Tupas, R., & Rubdy, R. (2015). Introduction: From World Englishes to Unequal Englishes. Unequal Englishes, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137461223_1

[51] Woolard, K. A. (2020). Language Ideology. The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0217

[52] Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language Ideology. Annual Review of Anthropology, 23(1), 55–82. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2156006