

STUDIES OF PHILIPPINE ENGLISH IN THE PHILIPPINES¹

Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista

De La Salle University-Manila

1. INTRODUCTION

Since studies on Philippine English have accumulated over the years, there is a need to review what has been accomplished and what still needs to be done. The purpose of this paper is to summarize the studies done in key universities in Metro Manila that have spearheaded studies in this field of inquiry – Ateneo de Manila University, De La Salle University, Philippine Normal University, University of the Philippines, and University of Santo Tomas.² This paper, then, is in the tradition of Gonzalez's 1986 review of child language studies in the Philippines, Gonzalez & Bautista's 1986 review of language surveys in the Philippines, and Bautista's 1989 review of code-switching studies in the Philippines. The review will give details of the studies in more-or-less chronological order in an attempt to trace the development of an idea or methodology; however, it should also be pointed out that the continuity or progression of ideas is not always apparent.

Before starting the review, it is necessary to note that two terms have appeared in the literature for the variety of English spoken in the Philippines: *Filipino English* (here abbreviated as FE) and *Philippine English* (abbreviated as PE). In this review I have adopted the term that the authors actually employed in their respective studies. My personal preference, however, is *Philippine English* in order to avoid confusing this variety of English with Filipino (the name of the national language) or with Filipino-English code-mixing.

Three strands – sometimes separate and sometimes interweaving – can be discerned in the studies that have been done on PE. One strand (relatively minor compared to the other two) is concerned with the status of PE as a standard variety of English; a second strand describes the linguistic features of this variety; the third strand evaluates the intelligibility and acceptability of PE. In this introductory section, I will focus on the status of PE and I will consider the 1969 work of Teodoro Llamzon in its entirety because, in its breadth of coverage, it set the parameters for future studies of PE. In the two main sections of the body, I will review the linguistic descriptions of PE and the studies that evaluated its intelligibility and acceptability. In the concluding section, I will summarize the major findings from the studies and suggest areas for future research.

The three strands are interwoven in Llamzon's pioneering monograph *Standard Filipino English* (1969). The importance of this study cannot be overemphasized. First it called attention to the English spoken in the Philippines as a distinct dialect of English and called it "Standard Filipino English" (SFE). After giving evidence that representative speakers of this variety of English could be identified and that their speech was intelligible

BAUTISTA

some of its expressions. Lastly, it conducted experiments on the acceptability of tape-recorded passages that contained the previously identified phonological and grammatical features of SFE.

Looking back on his 1969 work, Llamzon (1973) wrote that to prove the existence of SFE, he had to establish several facts, the most important being: "(a) that there is a community of native speakers of SFE; (b) that the speech community is sizable; and (c) that its speakers can be understood by other speakers" (p. 84). He defined SFE as "the type of English that educated Filipinos speak and which is acceptable in educated Filipino circles" (p. 15). To prove his claim of a sizable community of native speakers of SFE, he cited the results of a survey conducted by the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines that revealed that 51.43% of the families with children in CEAP schools spoke English at home.³ On a theoretical level, he pointed to such public personages as Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos, Foreign Affairs Secretary Carlos Romulo, former Vice-President Emmanuel Pelaez, University president Helena Benitez, and Jesuit provincial Horacio de la Costa as exponents of this variety.

As empirical underpinning for his claims, he conducted an experiment to determine the kinds of speakers who could be considered representative of SFE. He obtained reading, soliloquy, and conversational samples of the speech of a college professor, a college senior, a college sophomore, and a janitor with a sixth-grade education, and then asked 50 subjects (Ss) to rate these speech samples for acceptability in terms of pronunciation and expression. He found the college professor and college senior to be considered "representative speakers" of SFE. He then needed to test the intelligibility of SFE to non-Filipinos. For this experiment he asked native speakers of American English (children and teachers at the school at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines) and Canadian English (students at McGill University in Montreal, Canada) to rate the comprehensibility of the utterances of the four original speakers (college professor, college senior, college sophomore, janitor); he found "high information transfer" or intelligibility between the first three speakers and the non-Filipino Ss.

After Llamzon had boldly stated his position on the standardness of FE, identified its representative speakers, and showed its intelligibility and acceptability, he provided a detailed description of the phonological features of SFE – its vowels, diphthongs, consonants, stress, junctural signs and intonation, and rhythm. However, his description of the grammatical features of SFE was mainly a listing of Filipinisms, "English expressions which are neither American nor British, which are acceptable and used in Filipino educated circles, and are similar to expression patterns in Tagalog" (p. 46), such as "close the light" for "turn off the light" and "my head is painful" for "I have a headache". Armed with these descriptions, he devised four experiments to test the norms of acceptability (which sentences were correct, acceptable, perfect, American or Filipino) of samples of SFE (using sentences with the criterial phonemes and Filipinisms), by comparing Filipino and American speech exemplars and using Filipino and American Ss. In general, he found that PE pronunciations and expressions were generally judged as acceptable, correct, and perfect; however, AE pronunciations and expressions were evaluated as being more acceptable, more correct, and more perfect. In his concluding chapter, he forcefully advocated the teaching of SFE, rather than General American English (GAE), in Philippine schools because SFE was a much more realistic – because attainable – goal for English language teaching in the Philippines.

STUDIES OF PHILIPPINE ENGLISH

The study was immediately recognized as trailblazing but it naturally attracted controversy, especially because of its strong claim that the variety of English spoken in the Philippines had been standardized. Hidalgo (1970:129) questioned the number of native speakers of English in the Philippines and asked rhetorically: "Is there an English variety called Filipino English? Is it not more accurate to call the English which Filipinos speak as English as a second language?" In his extended review, Gonzalez (1972) felt, like Hidalgo, that Llamzon had not provided enough evidence of a sizable community of native speakers of SFE. Moreover, he saw an inconsistency in Llamzon's criterion of "a sizable number of native and near-native speakers" since, Gonzalez claimed, the term "native speaker" refers to acquisition while "near-native" implies attainment of a certain level of mastery and has nothing to do with acquisition. He also pointed to inaccuracies in the description of SFE phonology, inadequacies in the description of SFE grammar, and deficiencies in the design and methodology of the experiments. All in all, however, he acknowledged the great significance of Llamzon's work.

McKaughan revisited the issue of standardness in 1993 and titled his article "Toward a Standard Philippine English" in order to highlight the movement toward a goal, and the fact that the movement had not yet arrived at the goal. He maintained in his paper "that Philippine English has emerged as an autonomous variety of English with its own self-contained system" (p. 52). He emphasized that this was the variety spoken by educated users of the language and that "Philippine English has a world standard for its spelling, its grammar and its lexicon. It has its own distinct accent. The differences in form in Philippine English are not deficiencies but are distinct forms belonging to the Philippine English speech fellowship" (p. 52). With regard to the variety to teach in Philippine schools, his conclusion was straightforward: "My conclusion ... is to teach Standard Philippine English in school, the world standard dialect for spelling, grammar and lexicon with the necessary phonological contrasts. As to accent, any of the varieties, so long as they are from educated Filipino speakers, can model good Philippine English" (p. 52). It seems, then, that in his conclusion, McKaughan had already arrived at a Standard Philippine English.

Several years later, Bautista (2000a) attempted to refute the objections that had been raised against considering PE a standard variety. The first objection was that English was not a native language of the Philippines. To this, she presented the reformulation of "native language" in terms of Kachru's notion of "functional nativeness" (1997) – that is, English has such a wide range in its uses in the Philippines and has penetrated all levels of the society so deeply that it can be considered functionally native to the country. The second objection was that there was no sizable population of native speakers. Against this view, Bautista advanced the new definition of "native speaker" given by Richards and Tay (1981:53): "one who learns English in childhood *and* continues to use it as his dominant language *and* has reached a certain level of fluency in terms of grammatical well-formedness, speech-act rules, functional elaboration, and code diversity". In this new definition, a sizable number of Filipinos would qualify as native speakers of English. The third objection was that there was no SPE pronunciation. Here, she presented Stevens' position (1982) that, although in typical cases accent (pronunciation) and dialect (grammar and vocabulary) are paired and are geographically distributed, the only exception is in the case of the standard variety, where accent and dialect can be disassociated from each other. The conclusion from Stevens, then, was there was no need for a standard pronunciation of PE.

2. STRUCTURE OF PE

2.1. Phonology

A student of Llamzon wrote a thesis that attempted to enrich his phonological description of SFE and apply it in the classroom. The main objective of Martinez (1972, 1975) was to write a speech manual that would hold up SFE rather than GAE as target language. Therefore, guided by the phonological sketch in Llamzon (1969), she prepared a summary of differences between SFE and GAE and designed exercises for teaching SFE. In her manual (1975), she focused on the following differences of SFE from GAE: intonation (of simple statements, requests, questions requiring a “yes or no” answer, sentences composed of two parts, sentences with two primary stressed syllables), pitch (in terms of intonation contours), stress (in SFE not necessarily tied to change in pitch), rhythm (syllable-timed vs. stress-timed), and vowels (in terms of not being followed by glides) and consonants (in terms of aspiration or release of stops, difference in place of articulation of /n/ and /l/, and manner of articulation of /r/).

The one scholar who has made the most significant contribution to the linguistic description of PE is Andrew Gonzalez, through his own research and through the studies written by students that he directed. Alberca (1978) wrote a dissertation mentored by Gonzalez that described the phonology, syntax, and lexicon of English of the Philippine mass media. The study was reanalyzed and reorganized in Gonzalez & Alberca (1978) and restated as several chapters in Gonzalez (1985). Alberca used data from the mass media on the assumption that, in the standardization process, mass media practitioners were the most likely figures to influence the language behavior of Filipinos. For their analysis of spoken PE, Alberca and Gonzalez used a corpus of seven radio newscasts involving 12 different announcers, five television newscasts involving 10 different announcers, and seven television talk shows involving 33 interlocutors. In their analysis, they counted as distinctive only those features that appeared in the speech of at least three speakers or interlocutors *and* occurred in each of those speakers’ speech at least thrice.

The distinctive features of PE phonology that they identified are the following:

- absence of the vowel reduction rule and a tendency toward spelling pronunciation
- substitution of [a] for [æ], [ɔ] or [o] for [ow], [i] for [iy], [a] for [e], [e] for [ey]
- substitution of voiceless fricatives for voiced fricatives
- absence of aspiration of initial voiceless stops
- substitution of [t] for [θ], [d] for [ð]
- substitution of [p] for [f], [b] for [v]
- simplification of consonant clusters in final position
- shift of the primary stress to a syllable that usually receives only the secondary stress
- different stress patterns in individual words
- a tendency toward syllable-timed rhythm

- rising intonation for statements, clauses, phrases, *wh*- questions
- falling intonation for yes-no questions (Gonzalez 1985:57)

A mentee of Gonzalez, Sta. Ana (1983), studied English in the Philippines across generations by getting one respondent (R) for each decade from 1910 to 1980. The eight Rs consisted of seven teachers of English and one Education student majoring in English, all females and residing in Bulacan, and their year of graduation from high school was the basis for assigning them to a particular decade. They were first interviewed for language background and language use, and then they were requested to read a dialogue of several pages and to give an oral composition consisting of five sentences based on a picture of the inauguration of the first Philippine president. Their oral reading was evaluated for pronunciation of key phonemes (fricatives, affricates, the retroflex consonant, vowels, etc.) and the transcript of their oral composition was rated for certain grammatical features (tense consistency, subject-verb agreement, use of determiners, prepositions, pronouns, etc.). He found that across generations problem sounds were pronounced in the following way: /d/ for /ð/, /s/ for /z/, trilled /r/ for retroflex /r/, /a/ for /æ/, and /o, ɔ/ for /ow/.

Gonzalez (1984) refined the framework of “generations” in Sta. Ana’s pilot study by tying the generations to landmarks in Philippine history and developments in English language teaching in the country. In his formulation, the first period (1901-1920) covered the initial period of colonization and first contacts with English. The second period (1921-1945) was characterized by the Filipinization of the civil service, including classroom education. The third period (1946-1956) was the period of reconstruction after World War II. The fourth period (1957-1968) was marked by the use of TESL principles and the introduction of the use of the vernaculars in Grades 1 and 2 in public schools. The fifth period (1968-1983) embraced the period of student activism and the introduction of the Bilingual Education Policy. Gonzalez chose Ss belonging to these five different “generations” of ELT in the public schools and he elicited oral reading data by giving them an English passage with criterial GAE segmentals and suprasegmentals to read. He thus identified the phonological features of the PE used by the different generations. In general, he found a decided improvement across generations in the attainment of [i], [f], consonant clusters in final position, the mastery of the schwa and the intonation pattern for words in a series and for alternatives. However, he also found that the representatives of the five generations in the study had not really mastered [v], [θ], [ð], [z], [ʒ], retroflex [r], [æ], diphthongized [o], and stress placement on specific words.

Casambre published an article “What is Filipino English?” (1986), which described the phonological, lexico-semantic, and syntactic features of what she called the Philippine Variety of English. Her phonological analysis was based on data obtained from two TV programs and she used the criteria of Gonzalez & Alberca (1978) to identify distinctive phonological features — used three times by a speaker and used by three other speakers. She obtained basically the same list of problem areas in vowels, consonants, stress, and intonation as Gonzalez & Alberca, but she added this observation (p. 35): “[z] → [s] is another stable feature. It has been observed that when the word is spelled with a z the [z] is produced but when spelled with an s the [z] is sounded as [s]. This is a case of spelling pronunciation, corroborated by findings in other studies. Thus *realize* is pronounced with a [z] but *busy* is with an [s].”

There seems to have been a lull in the study of PE phonology until 1997, with Llamzon's publication of "The phonology of Philippine English". In this study he provided a characterization of the basilectal, mesolectal, and acrolectal features of PE phonology and mentioned well-known public figures who could be said to exemplify each level. No data were given as basis for the analysis; it can be surmised that the characterization came from Llamzon's observations and past analyses. For the acrolect, he noted that "the vowel and consonant inventories of PE closely resemble those of the General American English phonemes and are clearly derived from them" (p. 45). He claimed that "the phoneme inventory of the mesolect resembles that of the National Language. Also, there is a tendency for the mesolectal speaker not to reduce unstressed vowels to the schwa" (p. 46). He claimed further that the mesolectal speaker substitutes a rolled or one-tap /r/ for the acrolectal retroflex /r/ and the delivery is sometimes syllable-timed rather than stress-timed. He characterized the basilect as deviating much more than the mesolect from the acrolectal phonemes because the speaker's ethnic tongue forms a substratum; he highlighted the divergences by using a Cebuano speaker and an Ilocano or Pangasinan speaker as examples. He pointed out the reduced vowel inventory and the substitutions of /p/ for /f/, /b/ for /v/, and /s/ for /z/, /ʃ/, and /ʒ/ in the basilect.

2.2. Grammar and Lexicon

These two levels of language will be discussed together because there is a blurring of boundaries between them in the literature on PE. As noted earlier, Llamzon's discussion of grammar in his 1969 monograph was mainly a listing of Filipinisms, unique Philippine English expressions.

Dar (1973), mentored by Llamzon, investigated the nature of Filipinisms and added entries to Llamzon's original list. He used questionnaires and interview guides with English teachers and English classes in tertiary institutions in Baguio, Quezon City, Cebu, Bacolod, Iloilo, Dumaguete, Davao, and Cagayan de Oro to collect such Filipinisms, defined by him as "Filipino English peculiarities in the lexicon, expressions and sentence constructions. These are used, understood and accepted by speakers of Filipino English" (pp. 63-64). He indicated three criteria in the identification of Filipinisms: (1) usage in an English-speaking situation, (2) understandability, and (3) congruity with the English language. Using these criteria, he obtained validation of these Filipinisms from representative speakers of FE (those who spoke English as their first language, or who learned it simultaneously with another first language, or who rated themselves as being more proficient in English than in another language) and also from native speakers of English who were available in the schools he visited.

He identified four categories of Filipinisms:

- (1) Spanish loanwords used along with synonyms in FE, e.g. *barrio*, *bienvenida*, *fiesta*, *merienda*, *ninong*, *querida*, *sala*;
- (2) new terms, e.g. *Amboy* (a clipping of *American boy*), *import* (in basketball), *owner* (Philippine-made jeep for family use), *sugarlandia* (for Negros and Iloilo provinces), *tasty* (for American bread);
- (3) terms with different meanings, e.g. *abortion* (for miscarriage), *chit* (for bill), *conductor* (for one who collects the fare in the bus), *she is under me* (for "she is my student"), *village* (for a high class residential area);

(4) cultural influences, divided into

(a) influence of the native language

- Tagalog word order, e.g. *from where are you?* (“where are you from?”), *this is the book of Tony* (“this is Tony’s book”);
- based on Tagalog expressions, e.g., *eat well* (“enjoy your meal – *kumain ka nang mabuti*”), *way back 1960* (“in 1960 – *noong 1960*”), *I’ll go ahead of you* (“I have to go now – *mauuna na ako sa iyo*”);
- interchanged terms due to Tagalog influence, e.g. *bring/take this book there* (from *dalhin*); *let’s come/go here tomorrow* (from *magpunta*), *do you wani/like more coffee* (from *gusto*);

(b) influence of material culture, e.g. *bibingka*, *Greater Manila Area*, *Mang, provincemate*.

As can be seen, most of the Filipinisms identified by Dar are actually lexical items. However, in the sub-category “influence of the native language”, we can clearly see the crossover to the level of grammar.

Fleshing out the grammar of PE has been a major undertaking of Gonzalez and his students. The dissertation of Alberca (1978), his joint publication with Gonzalez (1978), and Gonzalez’s restatement of their findings (1985) provide the first approximation to a grammar of educated PE.

Alberca’s study of the distinctive features of Philippine English of the mass media used both a spoken and a written corpus, and both corpora yielded data on the grammar of PE. The spoken corpus (as mentioned above) consisted of seven radio newscasts, five TV newscasts, and seven TV talk shows; on the other hand, the written corpus consisted of 14 publications (eight newspapers and six magazines). To be considered distinctive in the written corpus, the grammatical feature that deviated from GAE usage had to be used by at least six different writers.

For the spoken corpus, Alberca and Gonzalez (Gonzalez 1985:58) found the distinctive features of PE grammar to include non-observance of the concord/governance rules for subject-predicate, main-subordinate clause, pronoun-referent. For the written corpus, much more detail was provided (Gonzalez 1985:103):

- word order features, consisting of the placement of the time adverb before the place adverb, placement of the adverb between verb and object, placement of the adverb between noun and prepositional phrase, placement of the indirect object introduced by *to* between verb and direct object, other unusual adverb placements;
- use of articles, including absence of the definite article, unusual use of the definite article, and absence of the indefinite article;
- noun subcategorization, consisting of the non-pluralization of count nouns, the reclassification of GAE mass nouns as count nouns, mass noun pluralization, pluralization of adjectival nouns in compounds;
- pronoun-antecedent incongruence;
- subject-predicate incongruence;

BAUTISTA

- reclassification of GAE transitive verbs as intransitive verbs;
- tense-aspect usage consisting of unusual use of verb forms and tenses, use of the past perfect tense for the simple past or even present perfect, lack of tense sequence.

In the study (mentioned earlier) done by Sta. Ana (1983) using seven teachers of English and one Education student majoring in English coming from the period of 1910 to 1980, he found that the grammatical features they had not mastered were tense consistency, subject-verb agreement, and correct use of pronouns and prepositions.

Focusing on a different social class and educational background, Bautista (1982, summarized in Bautista 1996) looked at the grammar of the spoken English of *yayas* or caregivers at a day care center in a plush subdivision in Makati. She interviewed 15 *yayas* on their care-giving practices to elicit data for analysis. She found the group to show a broad range of fluency and correctness, reflecting the difference in educational attainment, from less than grade 6 to some college. She characterized the English of this less educated group to be generally idiosyncratic, with no pattern in the way the speakers broke the rules of English grammar (for subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent congruence, verb tenses, adverb use and placement, article use, prepositional usage).

The same idiosyncratic characterization was given to the English of the seven security guards working in a private university in Pampanga described in the project paper written by Sison (1984). In the interviews done with bar girls by some graduate students (Aquino & Cruz 1981, Cotejar 1983, reviewed in Bautista 1996), the same pattern of idiosyncratic grammar was observed, although an additional property seemed to be the influence of the English spoken by the bar girls' customers, such as copula-deletion ("she there sittin' down"), double-negation ("I don't pay no attention"), the expression "you know", and highly idiomatic expressions such as "sick to my stomach", "stuck-up". Yet another subvariety of PE was studied by Perez (1993, summarized in Bautista 1996) – *colegiala* English, the English spoken by convent school girls from an exclusive school in Makati. She found *colegiala* English – generally used in informal situations – to be grammatical but employing a lot of code-switching with Tagalog (insertion of Tagalog enclitics *pa, na, naman, daw*; the construction *make* + Tagalog content word, e.g. "make *kwent*"), some giggling and screaming and contrived expressions such as "baduy", "kadiri", "galing".

Casambre (1986), in the study mentioned earlier, studied the lexico-semantic and syntactic features of what she called the Philippine Variety of English, using print materials, everyday oral conversations, and findings of student research studies as data. She used a frequency of three occurrences in one printed material or occurrence in three printed materials as criterion. Among the lexico-semantic features, she enumerated the following: Verb derivations using N + *ing* (e.g. *balloting, comebacking, tear gassing*), special meanings (*fiscalize, salvage, hostess*), new words (*to meg a film, colorum, tennister*), and loan translations or calquing (*I'll be the one* for "I'll do it", *to ride the bus* for "to take the bus"). Under syntactic features, she listed peculiar word order/phrasal order (e.g. *He was two years in the service*), wrong word use (*deal about* instead of *deal with*), omission (*assure* without an indirect object), unnecessary addition (*at [the] present*), and lack of sustained parallel construction (e.g. *MACE advocates said the coalition will agitate for ... and to promote a nationalist...*).

Arañas (1988) analyzed the lexico-semantic and syntactic features of the English spoken by English and mathematics teachers in four universities in Metro Manila and then gave the samples of spoken English to native and non-native speakers of English for acceptability judgments. Among the lexico-semantic features she noted were calquing and Filipino expressions; also noted was the use of the wrong preposition, especially *in* instead of *at*, *to* instead of *with*, *from* instead of *on*. Mentioned under syntactic features were omission of articles, unusual word order such as misplaced modifiers and placing the interrogative pronoun at the end of the sentence, subject-verb and pronoun-antecedent incongruence, and unnecessary use of the adverbs *already* and *now*. In general, the English spoken by the English and mathematics teachers – although featuring elements which could be considered “nativized” – was found to be comprehensible and acceptable to both native and non-native speakers of English.

Romero (1988, summarized in 1993) and Jambalos (1989) wrote studies that can be considered companion pieces to their mentor’s analysis of the English pronunciation of different generations (Gonzalez 1984). In her dissertation, Romero asked 150 Ss from the five generations (as earlier delineated by Gonzalez) to write compositions in English. All graduates of Metro Manila public elementary and high schools, they were divided into five cohorts of 30 members each, with the oldest being 94 years old and the youngest 18. They each wrote a three-paragraph composition on their perception of themselves, including life in the Philippines before and at present. Romero then asked three raters to rate the compositions in terms of a holistic score for organization and content and she herself rated the mechanics and grammar of the compositions. She found that there were no significant differences between generations in the overall ratings for mechanics (including spelling, capitalization, syllabication), grammar (tenses, agreement, word order, preposition use, determiner use), and rhetorical style (use of topic sentence, paragraph sense, originality of ideas). However, there were significant differences in terms of the subvariables of verbal fluency, use of transition devices, and sentence sense (1993:65-66). The persistent grammar errors across generations occurred in the use of the past tense (wrong usage or wrong form), and, in decreasing frequency, subject-verb agreement, preposition use, word order, and determiner use. With regard to correlations between writing achievement and language teaching methodology, she found some differences in absolute values but nothing statistically significant.

For her study of Filipino competence in English grammar across generations, Jambalos (1989) used the same five-generation framework and asked 30 Ss from each generation to prepare a series of translations of Tagalog sentence captions accompanying drawings. No significant differences were noted in the overall ratings of the first four generations; however, the youngest generation falling under the Bilingual Education Policy showed significantly lower overall scores. She found the following grammatical rules to have been learned by all generations: the non-use of the article *the* for indefinite reference, pronoun-antecedent congruence, use of *is* after the expression “one of the Ns”, and use of *these* before a plural noun. However, the following items were not learned by any of the five generations: non-use of *the* before plural generic nouns, use of *the* before the expression “majority of”, use of the plural form of the noun for the phrase “one of the Ns”, use of the present perfect tense, use of the past perfect tense, contrasting use of the present habitual with the present progressive, tense sequence, use of the correct verb-preposition combination. In correlating language teaching methodology with generation, she observed

that no one method seemed to have been proven effective in teaching English grammar; in the final analysis, method was only part of the equation.

Bautista (2000a, summarized in 2000b) was intrigued by the title of Gonzalez's paper "When does an error become a feature of Philippine English?" (1983) and she tried to provide her own answer to the question.⁴ In the process, she has provided the most systematic analysis of PE grammatical features thus far. Using the print material subcorpus of the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (Bautista, Lising & Dayag 1999), she analyzed 150 texts of 2000 words each and noted the deviations from Standard American English (SAE). In her corpus, she found numerous instances of deviations in subject-verb agreement, articles, prepositions, tenses, mass and count nouns, pronoun-antecedent agreement, word order, and comparative constructions. She showed the sentences with deviations to a native speaker of English (Jeffrey Taschner, at that time, a faculty member of the English Language Education Department of De La Salle University-Manila) to confirm whether these seemed to him to be deviations from SAE. In answer to Gonzalez's question, she adopted D'Souza's recommendation (1998:92) to consider those usages that were widespread, systematic and rule-governed, and used by competent users of the language in formal situations as grammatical features and not errors. (For her purposes, she set a cut-off of a particular deviation occurring in at least 15 texts – one-tenth of her corpus – to be considered widespread.)

Among her conclusions are the following: Deviations in subject-verb agreement involving intervening prepositional phrases, special nouns, *there* sentences/inverted sentences/predicate nominatives, and relative clause antecedents might be counted as grammatical in educated PE because they can be explained as the result of a conflict between, for example, the proximity rule and the non-intervention rule or between notional concord and grammatical concord. For mass and count nouns, the use of *research* and *equipment* as count nouns can be grammatically acceptable because of a blurring in the distinction between mass and count nouns. For prepositions, *result to* and *based from* and the variable use of *at*, *on*, *in* might be acceptable in educated PE because of semantic considerations. And for tenses, the grammaticality of the past form of modals (*could*, *would*, *might*) rather than the present form (*can*, *will*, *may*) might be explained by a desire to be polite or to sound elegant (pp. 78-79).

She also argued that a distinction be made between categorical rules and variable rules (2000a:79-80). For instance, agreement of a straightforward third person subject and singular verb and agreement of pronoun and antecedent is categorical. But in the case of a third person singular noun that is more complexly-structured because it is accompanied by an intervening prepositional phrase containing a plural noun, the use of a plural verb may be allowed – the rule can be variable. Article, preposition, and tense usage can also be open to variability, and this flexibility appears when comparing the usage of the established Englishes (e.g. *different from*, *different than*, *different to*). The variability might be due to the complexity of rules attached to the feature or to the conventions observed in different registers. To her, the categorical-variable rule distinction is important in the attempt to describe the grammatical features of PE.

Turning now to the lexicon of Philippine English, Cruz & Bautista (1993) produced a 63-page collection of PE words beginning with *Abortion* ("miscarriage") and ending with *Zoning* ("a military tactic against insurgents, in which an entire community of civilians is placed under temporary military control"). The booklet was part documentation

and part wry reflection on Philippine culture, as can be seen from their definition of *No* as “yes (non-standard)” and *Yes* as “no (non-standard)”; that is, as several foreigners have observed, a Filipino’s *yes* or *no* is sometimes indeterminate and the actual outcome of *yes* or *no* is dependent on various contingencies.

A detailed treatment of PE lexicon is provided by Bautista (1997), who had access to Macquarie Dictionary’s Asian English corpus. She enumerated the processes by which a lexicon develops and exemplified them in PE:

- normal expansion processes such as extension or adaptation of meaning, e.g. *pampers*, *pentel pen*, *brown-out*, *topnotcher*, *salvage*; shift in part of speech, e.g. *conscienticize*, *fiscalize*;
- preservation of items infrequent in other varieties, e.g. *solon*, *viand*;
- coinage, by analogical construction, e.g. *awardee*, *honoree*, *mentee*, *rallyist*, *bedspacer*; by clipping, e.g. *ballpen*, *aircon*, *supermart*; by abbreviation, *CR*, *DH*, *DI*; by total innovation, e.g. *Imeldific*, *eat-and-run*, *presidentiable*; by compounding, e.g. *bar girl*, *bedsheet*, *face towel*, *green joke*, *landgrabbing*, *phone pal*, *bakya crowd*, *colegiala English*, *sari-sari store*, *turo-turo restaurant*;
- borrowing, of terms for local flora and fauna, e.g. *abaca*, *calamansi*, *tamaraw*, *tilapia*; for food, e.g. *bagoong*, *lechon*, *pancit*; for national identity/culture, e.g. *bahala na*, *pakikisama*, *balagtasan*, *harana*, *tinikling*; for politics, e.g. *barangay*, *masa*, *provinciano/a*; for life, e.g. *barkada*, *balikbayan*, *bienvenida*, *querida*, *yaya*, *Ate*, *Ninong*.

Bautista concluded by discussing the implications of the productive processes of lexicon build-up with regard to speakers of different varieties of English. She suggested that coinages and borrowings – because they call attention to themselves as “new” or “different” words – may not cause as much inter-variety misunderstanding and miscommunication as the use of ordinary words that are used differently in different varieties of English (p. 69). Perhaps the best way to exemplify the potential for misunderstanding is to cite PE *salvage* (with the exact opposite meanings between PE “to summarily execute” and GAE “to save”) and *motel* (with its connotation of illicit sex in PE).

2.3. Discourse

Gonzalez (1985) contains two studies of the styles of written PE – the first one based on Gonzalez & Alberca (1978) and the other on Gonzalez (1982). In the first study, Gonzalez & Alberca typologized newspaper and magazine writing into formal and informal – news stories, informative feature articles, news columns, and editorial page columns were studied for the formal style, and entertainment columns, personality columns, and amusing feature articles for the informal style. In his conclusion, Gonzalez (1985:119) claimed that in written PE, the differences in style of the various types of articles are minimal – found in the relatively minor features of more frequent use of loanwords, nicknames, contractions, and the use of the suspensive three periods (e.g. “and this is what I get in return...”) in informal writing. He observed that even society and entertainment

BAUTISTA

columns were “still written in the relatively formal style reminiscent of classroom themes”, except in the case of a few stylistically versatile journalists.

In the second study (based on Gonzalez 1982), he analyzed a bigger sample of newspapers and magazines and he again looked at editorials, columns, and features. In this instance, he identified three distinct styles in the English of Philippine mass media: the formal style, the informal style, and the familiar style. He found the most salient feature distinguishing formal style from informal style to be lexical choice, such as the use of *super* (for *very good*), *bottom* (for the rear part of the human anatomy), *a lot* (for *much/many*). The most obvious differences in syntax were the use of ellipsis (or sentences with deleted parts) and the high frequency of short and simple sentences in the informal style; the formal style utilized long complex sentences showing processes of relativization, complementation, and nominalization. The third style he identified was the familiar style where there was a clear attempt at bridging the gap between writer and reader, and here the feature that stood out was code-switching, the easy and natural alternation between English and Pilipino passages. But what also emerged from his analysis was that the switching was typically between a familiar style of Pilipino and a relatively formal style of English. His contention was that Filipinos typically have mastery of only the formal style (“classroom English”) because the classroom is the context in which they have studied and learned English. For the language of familiarity, Filipinos use the vernacular, which is the language of the home and the community. When Filipinos try to be casual and familiar in writing, the easiest and most natural way to do it, it seems, would be to code-switch and to bring in the familiar style of the vernacular.⁵

Another study at the discourse level is Sanchez’s 1993 dissertation on lect-shifting in spoken FE discourse among highly proficient speakers of English. She obtained speech samples from 10 academics and 10 prominent persons (including media practitioners) and studied the amount and nature of lect-shifting between the communicative (more informal) and rhetorical (more formal) styles. Both groups shifted freely between the rhetorical and the communicative style. Lect-shifting occurred in greetings and other initiation acts of conversation, in gambits and back channels, in illustrations, in humor and jesting. Speakers used both lects depending on their momentary inclination and speech function; they shifted lects depending on interlocutors, topics, and role relationships. She concluded that highly proficient speakers of FE command the full range of both the communicative and rhetorical styles.

3. INTELLIGIBILITY AND ACCEPTABILITY OF PE

3.1. Phonology

Prior to Llamzon’s 1969 monograph (but not mentioned in it perhaps because Llamzon was out of the country when it was done), an important study was undertaken by Philippine Normal College graduate students under the mentorship of UCLA’s Tommy Anderson, then a visiting professor at PNC. The study deserves extensive discussion here because of its practical objective, well thought-out methodology, significant hypotheses, and extensive regional coverage. Aquino, Duque, Pimentel & Rojas (1966, adapted by the Language Study Center 1972) set as the problem for their thesis the determination of the most intelligible variety of English pronunciation for use in the Philippines. They tested the following hypotheses: (1) whether contact with a native speaker of American English improves pronunciation, (2) whether college students do better than high school students in

pronunciation, (3) whether regional language background is a factor affecting pronunciation, (4) whether Filipinos understand Filipino pronunciation of English, and (5) whether Filipinos understand their fellow Filipinos using English better than they can understand Americans, and whether Americans understand their fellow Americans better than they can understand Filipinos speaking English. The study presented three varieties of English pronunciation for the purpose of determining the best variety to adopt in teaching English pronunciation in Philippine schools: American English, Filipino English that maintains phonemic distinctions, and Filipino English that suppresses or obscures phonemic distinctions (1972:40).

The sound contrasts that the study focused on consisted of: /ɪ/ - /iy/, /ɔ/ - /ow/, /a/ - /æ/, /ow/ - /uw/, /ɪ/ - /ɛ/, /ts/ - /ch/, /p/ - /f/, /s/ - /sh/, /k/ - /g/, /p/ - /b/, /t/ - /d/. The test consisted of 25 items divided into five equal groups, and each group of five items contained one vowel contrast and five consonant contrasts. The test had two parts: One part consisted of three readings recorded in advance, performed by a representative speaker of AE, a representative speaker of FE with full phonemic contrasts, and another representative speaker of FE without certain phonemic contrasts based on the pattern of Cebuano. The second part of the test consisted of the Ss themselves reading to each other a pattern of selection from the same test items.

Ninety-six students (half of whom had studied at least a year under a native speaker of AE and half of whom had not; half of whom were in third year college and half in third year high school) each from the Ilocano, Tagalog, Bicol, Waray, Cebuano, and Hiligaynon regions, for a total of 576 Filipino students, participated in the study. In addition, a "contact group" of 48 American students of the American School in Manila (half in the equivalent of third year high school and half in the equivalent of second year college) and a "non-contact group" of 24 American students of UCLA (all in the equivalent of third year college) participated in the study, totaling 72 American students.

The answer to the major question of the study was: Regardless of contact status, educational level, and language background, AE was the most intelligible of the three varieties, followed closely by the FE that maintained the phonemic contrasts; on the other hand, the FE that suppressed certain phonemic contrasts trailed behind badly. One conclusion of the study – important for teachers of English – is that a sound is intelligible (1) when phonetically it is within the acceptable phonetic limits of one member of the contrast, and (2) when contrastively it has sharp distinctive features (1972:148).

Regarding the finding for Hypothesis 1, contact with native speakers of English appeared to have led to a marked improvement in pronunciation; however, whether this was because of direct influence of the native speaker teacher or whether this was a product of attendant sociological advantages was not clear. As for Hypothesis 2, the results suggested that going to college made only a little difference in the improvement of English pronunciation. In connection with Hypothesis 3, the study showed that there were no clear regionally defined varieties of English in the Philippines (1972:152): "A regionalized pronunciation of English is limited to very few distinctions of sounds that are neither extensive in use nor significant in a linguistic sense. The results of the study indicated no basis for believing that with English continuing to be used in our country there will emerge a Cebuano, Tagalog, or Ilocano English." A surprising result was obtained with regard to Hypothesis 4: The Filipino Ss interpreted or understood spoken English less capably than they could produce or speak the language; this seemed to indicate that Filipino students had

difficulty distinguishing minimal contrasts. Another surprising finding appeared for Hypothesis 5: The American group understood the Filipino speakers better than the Filipino group did, and the explanation of the authors was "it would seem that Americans watch for phonological, or sound, cues more than Filipinos do when they listen to someone speak" (1972:136). In the last chapter of the book, the authors derived very clear guidelines for the teaching of pronunciation from the study's findings.

The limitation of the Aquino et al. study, thorough as it was in design, was its narrow focus – it considered the question of intelligibility only in terms of 11 vowel and consonant contrasts in minimal word sets. Llamzon's experiments in his 1969 monograph, described in Section 1, though not as tightly designed as Aquino et al.'s, considered intelligibility and acceptability from a broader perspective, in terms of the phonological features and Filipinisms he had described in an earlier part of the publication.

An indirect way of tapping attitudes toward language is through the matched-guise technique developed by Lambert and his associates in Canada. In such studies, Ss listen to voices which they believe belong to different persons when in reality each individual is speaking in different language guises; thus, instead of judging the personality of the speaker, Ss are actually judging the language that the person is using. In the first such study conducted in the Philippines, Tucker (1968) asked four Americans to read a passage in English and four Filipinos to read the passage in English and also to read the passage in its Tagalog translation. The 80 Ss studying at Philippine Normal College in Manila (40 Tagalogs and 40 non-Tagalogs) were under the impression they were listening to 12 different speakers. They rated each speaker on several semantic differential scales such as intelligent – not intelligent, active – passive, self-confident – not self-confident. Tucker found that the Ss rated the American group reading English most favorably, the Filipino group reading English next favorably, and the Filipino group reading Tagalog least favorably; the differences were statistically significant. Furthermore, the non-Tagalog group rated the Filipino group reading Tagalog significantly more unfavorably than their Tagalog counterparts. In relation to PE, then, this study showed the highly positive ratings of AE compared to PE.

Luzares & Bautista's 1971 replication of the Tucker study added another group to the original three groups – an American group reading the Tagalog translation. They wanted to test whether Americans, as a group, would be rated favorably, regardless of the language they used (Tagalog, in addition to English) and their proficiency in the language (they would certainly have less proficiency in Tagalog compared to English). The researchers also wanted to find out how the ratings for the Tagalog spoken by the Filipinos would compare with the ratings for the Tagalog spoken by the Americans. They also wanted to see if the downgrading of the Tagalog exemplars by the non-Tagalog Ss would still manifest itself. The results showed that the 15 Tagalog Ss and the 15 non-Tagalog Ss studying in a private university in Manila did not differ significantly in the ratings they gave the voice exemplars. With regard to the ratings of the voices themselves, the findings were significant: Americans reading English received higher ratings than the Filipinos reading English and Tagalog (the scores of these two groups clustered together), who in turn received generally higher ratings than the Americans reading Tagalog. Luzares & Bautista concluded that English and Tagalog, when spoken by Filipinos, had attained practically the same prestige; that is, Tagalog had improved its acceptability status since 1968. However, English was still regarded as the language for better education and better

jobs. In terms of the acceptability of PE, then, this study indicated that AE was still more prestigious than PE.

Fallorina wrote a project paper (1985) comparing reactions to what he called non-accented English and accented English, using the same materials as Tucker and Luzares & Bautista. By accented English, he meant the kind of English that showed the interference of the first language in the pronunciation of *p/f* and *b/v* and in a sing-song intonation. He obtained voice exemplars for the English passage from six English teachers – three from private schools in Metro Manila and three from private schools in Pampanga (strictly speaking, then, not a matched-guise study). He compared the evaluations on semantic differential scales of 60 high school students, half coming from an exclusive private school (and assumed to be high-income) and half from a public school (and assumed to be low-income). He found no significant differences in the overall ratings of the students belonging to different income families, although the low-income Ss generally gave higher ratings than the high-income Ss did. However, non-accented English was rated significantly higher than accented English, although accented English was still rated fairly high.

Aglaua & Aliponga (1999) replicated Luzares & Bautista in 1998, the year of the Philippine Centennial, in Metro Manila. Using exactly the same methodology as the earlier study, they looked at the same independent variables: two types of language background of the Ss (Tagalog or non-Tagalog) and four voice groups (Americans reading English, Americans reading Tagalog, Filipinos reading English, Filipinos reading Tagalog). They found, like Luzares & Bautista and unlike Tucker, that there were no significant differences in the ratings given by the Tagalogs and the non-Tagalogs. However, unlike the Tucker and Luzares & Bautista studies, the ratings given for the four voice groups no longer showed significant statistical differences – they were all rated favorably. Aglaua & Aliponga also did the same study in Cebu, a place that has shown some resistance to the national language based on Tagalog. Their Cebuano college student sample showed the same results – a generally favorable attitude toward English and Tagalog spoken by the American and Filipino groups. Therefore, in terms of the national language Filipino, the Aglaua & Aliponga study showed the acceptability of Filipino in the year of the Centennial. In terms of PE, the study yielded the new finding that PE had achieved the acceptability level of AE, at least for a limited sample.

In her master's thesis, Lagazon (1975) sought to determine the effects of regional "accent" on children's perception of segmental phonemes. Her hypothesis was that there would be better listening perception from a listener-speaker dyad with the same language background than from a listener-speaker dyad with different language backgrounds. She prepared a sound discrimination test using the problem sounds of Tagalog, Cebuano, and Pangasinan speakers in English. The test was tape-recorded by an American, a Tagalog, a Cebuano, and a Pangasinan, and a similar test in Filipino was taped by the same speakers except for the American. Thirty-two Grade Four pupils each from public schools in Bulacan, Cebu, and Pangasinan participated in the study. The results confirmed her hypothesis: There was better listening perception when the speaker and the Ss had a similar language background. In the Pilipino test, the Ss showed a tendency to rate the speakers with the same language background as theirs as the one who spoke the clearest. However, in the English test, the Tagalog and Pangasinan Ss both rated the Pangasinan speaker as the one who spoke the clearest – the American speaker was not found to be highly intelligible, perhaps understandably, for these were children who had not received

BAUTISTA

much, if any, exposure to native speakers of AE. In this latter finding, believers in the new Englishes can find support regarding the viability of these varieties.

For his dissertation, Buzar (1978) wanted to identify the factors that helped or hindered international students in their ability to comprehend the oral communication of Filipino speakers of English. By a process of careful elimination with the help of "judges", he chose one "good" Filipino speaker of English and one "poor" Filipino speaker of English. These two speakers then taped a 12-minute lecture on lightning and the two tapes were played back to two groups consisting of 40 international students each. (The international students – graduate and undergraduate students at the University of the Philippines – came from 17 nationalities.) He did several statistical tests on his data and these showed that the two groups of Ss were similar in English language proficiency, self-concept of English language proficiency, language background, and listening habits, but differed in their listening comprehension and Cloze test scores. He found that the Ss who listened to the good speaker obtained higher listening comprehension test scores than the Ss who listened to the poor speaker. Furthermore, his results showed that English language proficiency favorably affected the listening comprehension of Ss who listened to the good speaker but not of the Ss who listened to the poor speaker. He thus concluded that the key variable to comprehension, all things being equal, is the speaker. Furthermore, his findings suggested that foreign students in general need to have both proficiency in English and exposure to, and familiarity with, Filipino speakers of English for better listening comprehension.

Like Aquino et al. and Lagazon earlier, Sarile (1986) was interested in attitudes toward, and comprehensibility of, regional phonological varieties, in her case, Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilocano, and Ilonggo. She tape-recorded two speakers of each phonological variety, one speaker identified as "urban" (that is, residing in Metro Manila) and the other as "non-urban" (that is, still residing in the region), for a total of eight speakers, reading a 12-minute academic essay on the nature of Political Science. She presented the tape to 80 Filipino graduate students of the UP College of Education and 34 American graduate students of UP Clark, divided into blocks of 10 Filipino and four American Ss listening to one speaker. She made the Ss respond to a background information sheet, an attitudinal questionnaire consisting of nine semantic differential scales for the speaker, an acceptability questionnaire on the speaker's spoken English, a Cloze test on a passage from the lecture, and a 20-item comprehension test. In general, the American Ss gave higher ratings to the four varieties than the Filipino Ss – all ratings were in the "moderately favorable" range. An ANOVA test revealed statistically significant differences in the attitudinal ratings given by the American and Filipino Ss to the Ilocano-English variety; no other significant differences were obtained. In the acceptability ratings, the American Ss again gave higher ratings to the four varieties than the Filipino Ss – all ratings were "moderately acceptable" or "acceptable". Once again, the ANOVA showed significant differences in the ratings given by American and Filipino Ss only in the case of Ilocano-English. As expected, a high correlation was found between the attitudinal ratings and the acceptability ratings of the Ss. Sarile also obtained a correlation between the Cloze and the comprehension test results. However, no correlation could be established between the Cloze, comprehension, attitudinal, and acceptability ratings.

3.2 Grammar and Lexicon

The intelligibility and acceptability of Filipinisms – departures from the expected AE expressions and idioms – have been the object of investigation in several theses and dissertations. In this area, Rosario Maminta has been most influential as a mentor and reader.

The tradition of looking at unidiomatic expressions or deviations from AE formulaic expressions appears to have started with Ponio (1974), Maminta's mentee at the University of Santo Tomas. She prepared a questionnaire consisting of 40 passages with Filipinisms obtained from local newspapers and asked the respondents to read them at normal reading speed and to indicate whether each of the passages could be accepted in any situation, or only in certain situations, or rejected in any situation. She also asked the Rs to underline the words that were considered awkward or un-English in the passage. The 50 Rs consisted of 10 Americans (native speakers of English) and 40 Filipinos (10 supervisors and head teachers of English, 10 English instructors, 10 non-English instructors, and a mixed group of 10 professionals – lawyers, doctors, engineers). She obtained the following results: (1) The educated AE speakers rejected most of the terms and expressions in the passages and accepted only a few as acceptable AE usage; (2) The educated Filipino speakers of English hardly recognized the existence of Filipinisms in the items; (3) Among the Filipino speakers of English, the instructors of English were the most sensitive to Filipinisms and the non-instructors of English the least sensitive; (4) The Filipinisms were due to the following causes: a) literal translation from Pilipino, b) misuse of idioms, c) wrong choice of lexical item, d) wordiness, and e) incorrect preposition.

The following item from the questionnaire exemplifies the methodology and also indicates the differences in the judgments of the American and Filipino Rs:

- (a) XXXXXXXX who needs another surgery because of a damaged esophagus said that his wife is the one supporting the family and they are quite hard up. – The American Rs completely rejected this because of the use of “surgery” (instead of “operation”) and because of the colloquial “hard up”, while a majority of the Filipino Rs rated this as restricted.

Although Ponio's study addressed a relevant issue and used a fresh methodology, the example above shows that the questionnaire consisted of rather special expressions and did not consider Filipinisms of wide currency. The study of Tan (1982), done under the supervision of Maminta, attempted to correct that shortcoming. Tan focused on formulaic expressions and deviations from them, as can be seen in this item from her questionnaire:

1. *At home: Wanting to listen to the radio*

After a hard day's work in the office, Mr. Santos takes time to relax with his children in the living room. “Please _____ the radio. I want to listen to good music,” he asks his son.

She gave the 50-item questionnaire to 106 graduate students at the University of the Philippines and obtained common deviant forms from their responses. She found the deviant forms to consist of the following types: substitutions/paraphrases, partially acquired expressions, translations, and ambiguous expressions. She then constructed another questionnaire consisting of items with the deviant constructions (e.g. in 1 above, *open the*

BAUTISTA

radio) and asked her Rs to rate them for comprehensibility and acceptability using five-point scales.

Her judges consisted of 10 supervisors and heads of English, 10 heads and teachers of non-English courses, 10 other professionals (lawyers, doctors, engineers, businessmen, a newspaper columnist, an economist), 10 Southeast Asian nationals (Thais, Malaysians, Singaporeans, Indonesians), and 10 native speakers of AE. She obtained significant differences in the comprehensibility and acceptability ratings of the five groups of judges. On both comprehensibility and acceptability, the other professionals, the teachers and heads of non-English courses, and the Southeast Asian nationals gave the highest ratings to the deviant utterances. The native AE speakers and the supervisors and teachers of English gave the deviants low ratings, with the English supervisors and teachers giving lower ratings than the Americans. On the whole, however, many of the deviants attained respectable ratings. The statistical analysis revealed that comprehensibility and acceptability were significantly and positively correlated. Levels of acceptability were affected by degrees of comprehensibility; thus, an acceptable deviant had to be comprehensible, but not all comprehensible deviants were acceptable.

In his dissertation, Park (1983) explored the deviance in formulaic expressions of other Asian national groups (students at the University of the Philippines) using Tan's questionnaire of 50 fill-in-the-blank conventionalized expressions and idioms. He found the Thai group to have produced the greatest number of variant forms, followed by the Chinese, the Japanese and Korean, and the Indonesian groups; however, the ANOVA showed no significant difference in frequency among the five groups. He analyzed the deviant forms in terms of speech communication strategies: simplification-reduction, substitution-paraphrase, and translation-literal expression. When he asked five Filipino and five American judges to rate the deviant expressions on a five-point intelligibility scale and a five-point acceptability scale, he obtained "Quite intelligible" and "Slightly acceptable" ratings for the deviant forms. He found a positive correlation between the two, with intelligibility being rated slightly higher than acceptability. There were no significant differences in the intelligibility and acceptability ratings of the two groups of judges, though the American judges gave slightly higher ratings than the Filipino judges.

Mildred Gonzales (1990), again mentored by Maminta, expanded Tan's study by looking at deviant formulaic expressions as an expression of social and psychological distance of Filipino immigrants in the US. She adapted Tan's original questionnaire (using only 30 out of the original 50 items) and gave it to 64 Filipino bilingual immigrants to elicit their forms for these formulaic expressions. She obtained statistically significant differences in frequencies of occurrence of FE forms produced by Filipino graduate students in Tan's study and Filipino bilingual immigrants in the US, with more AE formulaic expressions produced by the latter group. She found that Filipino bilingual immigrants who persisted in the use of FE expressions differed from Filipino bilingual immigrants who acquired the AE norms in terms of social and personality characteristics. In addition, she tested 60 formulaic expression deviations (the most frequently-occurring deviants for each of the 30 items in the questionnaire) for comprehensibility and acceptability with 20 judges consisting of five American and five Filipino professionals in the US and five American and five Filipino professionals in the Philippines. In general, there were no statistical differences among the four groups in their comprehensibility and acceptability ratings; all the formulaic expression deviants were found "quite comprehensible" and "quite acceptable", though the acceptability ratings were generally lower than the

comprehensibility ratings. Another finding was that the ratings given by the Filipino judges were lower than those given by the American judges, with the American judges in the US appearing to be the most tolerant.

4. LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING FORWARD

The review of the studies on PE done in the five universities has yielded a rich harvest from the point of view of method and substance. The review has uncovered an interesting array of methods used in the studies. It can be noted that in the description of the phonological, grammatical, lexical, and discourse features of PE, researchers generally analyzed a well-specified corpus and used criteria for identifying a feature so that what was identified was truly dialectal in nature rather than idiolectal. Several studies were empirical, utilizing rather sophisticated methods of inquiry. The matched-guise studies using semantic differential scales assessed attitudes toward AE, PE, and Filipino indirectly. The method employed in the formulaic expression studies was ingenious and utilized multiple stages: first, eliciting deviations from the formulaic expressions and, second, measuring the intelligibility and acceptability of the deviants. Another good point was the use, on the one hand, of native speaker (American) informants, or, on the other hand, of English-as-a-Foreign-Language (e.g. Thai, Korean, Indonesian) informants in assessing the grammaticality of certain constructions and the acceptability of formulaic expression deviants. The informants or subjects also came from different regional language backgrounds (Filipino ethnic groups) and therefore some insights were obtained on commonalities and differences in their reception and production of PE and in their intelligibility assessments. Also innovative was the concept of “generations” linked to the history of English language teaching in the Philippines; commendable was the conscious effort to locate respondents to represent each generation. In this review, then, the chronological presentation of the studies helped underscore the fact that the researchers and their mentors made a conscious effort to replicate previous studies to build on the insights and challenges of the past while trying to innovate in the use of research methods.

In terms of substance, looking now at the three strands, for the first strand, the status of PE, the studies show that educated PE is the basis of Standard Philippine English, and the only question seems to be whether PE is already standardized or is some way from being standardized. A consensus must first be obtained on how “Standard” will be defined.

Regarding the second strand, the linguistic description of PE, the studies have presented an outline of the distinctive features of PE phonology, grammar, and lexicon across generations and across different language teaching methods. These features are what Gonzalez (1985) calls the “perduring” features of PE – they appear and reappear in different corpora of PE and may be permanent fixtures of the variety.

In pronunciation, these include difficulty with /f/, /v/, /z/ in certain contexts, /θ/, /ð/, /š, ž, č, ʃ/æ/, /ə/. In grammar, these include lack of agreement of subject and verb (especially when there is an intervening prepositional phrase), difficulty with prepositions, difficulty with articles (especially regarding when to use the definite, indefinite, and zero article), difficulty with mass and count nouns, and difficulty with verb tenses (especially the past tense, present perfect tense, and past perfect tense). In lexicon, these include lack of mastery of the use of idioms and formulaic expressions (Filipinisms can be viewed negatively in this light, but can also be viewed positively in certain contexts as innovations),

BAUTISTA

and the tendency to use calques or loan translations; on the other hand, borrowing and coinage appear to be legitimate means of expressing Filipino cultural realities in PE.

The description given above is basically for educated PE. The studies have also looked at regional pronunciations of educated PE (e.g. Ilocano, Cebuano, Tagalog, etc.) and the finding is that, in general, the features of the different regional accents are not extensively or significantly different in a linguistic sense. A handful of studies have also attempted to characterize the English spoken by a lower socio-economic class with less education. The finding in this regard is that the English of *yayas* or caregivers, security guards, and bar girls is idiosyncratic in its application of grammar rules.

With regard to the third strand, the intelligibility and acceptability of PE, the different studies have shown that Filipinisms and different types of deviations from SAE expressions are generally understandable to foreigners and locals alike and also quite acceptable to them. But, in some cases, even if the expressions are intelligible, they may not be completely acceptable – acceptability norms are higher than intelligibility norms. Another finding, especially from the earlier studies, is that higher acceptability is still accorded to AE compared to PE, i.e. AE is “more perfect” than PE. Interesting is the finding that foreigners (usually Americans in the studies under review) are generally more tolerant of Filipinisms than Filipinos; this is probably to be expected because native speakers allow more latitude for deviations among non-native speakers of the language. Another interesting finding from the studies is that among Filipinos, the least tolerant of deviations are teachers of English and this, again, is to be expected because Filipino teachers of English see themselves as keepers of the flame of high standards of English. Because of the excellent and painstaking work already done, intelligibility and acceptability studies of Filipinisms may have reached the point of diminishing returns.

Another contribution of the studies reviewed here is the concern with the antecedents of the differences in the learning, mastery, intelligibility, or acceptability of PE. In the generation studies and in the “most intelligible variety of English pronunciation” study, an attempt was made to tease out the factors that contribute to success in mastering a language, whether at the level of phonology, grammar, or composition. Is the factor that of being taught by an American teacher or is it the language method used or is it a “speak English campaign”, and so on? What emerged is that such factors are important but that there are a lot of moderating and intervening variables between the independent and the dependent variables and it is not easy to identify specific causes and effects.

Yet another important contribution is the focus on what the findings (whether on the status, linguistic structure, or intelligibility and acceptability of PE) imply for language teaching. Although the authors were researchers when they were doing their studies, they were basically language teachers at heart and thus the question always was: What do these findings mean for language teaching? It can be said that the studies on PE generally tend toward the view that language teaching in the Philippines should begin to be endonormative, that is, aim at the standard of English spoken by educated Filipino speakers of English. Since the studies have begun to show the difference between errors and features (deviant usages that are widespread, rule-governed and systematic, and used by educated users of the language in formal contexts), there is no reason to say that educated PE is “wrong” English and therefore it should not be taught in our schools.

Where do we go from here? Regarding the first strand, the status of PE, determining whether a sizable community of native speakers of PE exists should be on the research agenda. Demographic studies need to be done. How many Filipino children in urban centers acquire English simultaneously with the vernacular? How many entering kindergartners can claim that their first language is English? To what extent has the spread of cable TV (Cartoon Network, Kermit Channel, Nickelodeon, Discovery Channel) in urban centers contributed to the learning of English at an early age? Likewise, statistics on number of English-medium newspapers vs. Filipino-medium publications and their respective circulation, English broadcasts and Filipino broadcasts and their respective audiences should be obtained to determine the depth and breadth of penetration of the English language. The issue of standardness should also be viewed beyond the parameters of native speaker and native language and should be appraised within a language planning framework. To what extent is PE being codified via grammars and dictionaries? Has its literary canon been established? What other issues are encompassed by “standardness” and should be addressed before we speak of a Standard Philippine English?

As far as the second strand is concerned, the linguistic description of PE, a strong beginning has been achieved. The next stage should involve undertaking very focused studies of specific grammar features. An example would be tense and aspect usage in PE – how does it differ from SAE? To what extent does the substrate of the first language and culture influence tense and aspect in PE? Svalberg’s analysis of tense and aspect in Bruneian English (1998) provides a model for this kind of study. He gave a grammaticality judgment test that focused on tense and aspect to undergraduate students with different levels of language proficiency of the Universiti Brunei Darussalam. He found certain usages to be common among all Ss, regardless of proficiency, and he then studied public texts to see if those usages were also common there. He observed – in both sets of data – that *would* was chosen in non-past, non-conditional contexts to lessen the assertiveness of personal opinions, intentions, offers, invitations, and pronouncements about future events. He concluded that such a use of *would*, though considered non-standard in Standard British English, fulfills an expressive need of Bruneians and would become part of a stable nativized Bruneian English variety.

Still in the area of linguistic description, studies need to be done of PE grammatical features in specific registers. The placement of adverbs of time and place, for example, is different in the newspaper register. The use of the determiners *a*, *an*, *the*, *Ø* in natural science journals appears to be different from their use in other publications. A subsequent analysis should look at the use of these features in these registers in PE compared with the use in SAE. In short, generalizations of greater delicacy should be made about the features of PE grammar. For such studies, a large corpus of PE texts should be developed, to go beyond the 800,000 word corpus compiled by Bautista, Lising & Dayag (1999).

The use of corpora opens up more possible studies. Schneider (2000) has shown how corpus linguistics allows for the formulation and testing of hypotheses. In his paper, he showed how analysis of the use of the subjunctive vs. *should* using corpora from different national varieties of English led to the following tentative hypothesis: Colonial varieties tend to reduce grammatical complexity if it is not functionally required, i.e. meaningful (p. 130). The build-up of a corpus of PE and corpus linguistic studies should therefore be a research priority.

BAUTISTA

More discourse studies of PE should be undertaken to confirm or disprove Gonzalez's contention that there is an underdifferentiation of styles in PE discourse and that in fact PE discourse is generally monostylistic, using a "classroom English style" (1985). Employing a contrastive rhetoric framework, future studies should compare texts written in PE and AE and the other new varieties of English, such as Singaporean English and Indian English. For example, how are editorials, letters to the editor, op-ed columns, sports commentaries, obituaries written in the English that is being nativized in different English-using communities?

Going now to the third strand, the intelligibility and acceptability studies of PE, the groundwork has already been done on formulaic expressions and Filipinisms. One study can profitably look at all the expressions compiled in the UP studies to see which of the deviants from formulaic expressions have perdured and, in a sense, are already institutionalized.

Perhaps of greater interest will be macrostudies on the acceptability of PE as a whole, as a variety to be counterposed against AE. The papers of Baumgardner (1995) and Crismore, Ngeow & Soo (1996) in the journal *World Englishes* are instructive. Baumgardner addressed the issue of the acceptability of Pakistani English – one questionnaire dealt with the issue of the norm for Pakistani English (i.e. What variety of English do you speak? What variety of English do you think Pakistanis should learn?) and the other questionnaires asked about the acceptability of various Pakistani English lexical items (e.g. *gunman* for bank guard) and grammatical constructions (e.g. local preposition use as in *to fill up a form*, verb complementation as in *He avoided to enter the building*). He found that in general the Rs still held on to the ideal of British English. However, from the fact that Pakistani English constructions in lexicon and syntax were becoming more acceptable, Baumgardner was led to the conclusion that a Pakistani English norm was beginning to emerge.

Crismore et al. used a 24-item Likert Scale questionnaire to tap the attitudes of university lecturers and students toward Malaysian English; the questionnaire included item statements such as "If we want to be understood internationally, we must use British/American/Australian English", "Foreigners do not understand us if we talk to them in Malaysian English". After doing frequency counts and cross-tabulations, they came to the conclusion that although the Rs acknowledged the usefulness of Malaysian English, they nonetheless rejected it as the norm for their society because Malaysian English was perceived to be "wrong" and non-standard.

One macrostudy on attitudes toward PE based on Baumgardner and Crismore et al. is currently underway.⁶ In addition to direct attitude studies using the survey method, follow-up studies pursuing leads provided by previous studies should be done. One study can be a replication of Lagazon's and Sarile's studies on the intelligibility and acceptability of PE spoken by different regional groups. Lagazon (1975) used elementary school children who therefore were relatively unsophisticated and unprejudiced while Sarile (1987) did not really look at cross-evaluations by listeners of one regional group listening to speakers of their own group and of other groups. Such studies would yield rich insights into the psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics of speech perception. The study would provide an answer to the intriguing question of whether Ilocanos, for example, would perceive Ilocano speakers – rather than Tagalog speakers or Hiligaynon speakers or Cebuano speakers – as speaking the best variety of PE. Still on the matter of using previous studies to take off

from, the study of Aquino et al. (1966, adapted in 1972) yielded two tantalizing conclusions: one, the Filipino Ss were better at producing certain sounds than they were in hearing them and, two, the American Ss could understand Filipinos producing those sounds better than the Filipino Ss could. Certainly, those were unexpected findings – as the investigators themselves pointed out – and the matter needs to be investigated further.

It is clear that in the Philippines, Philippine English is a fertile field of study.

ENDNOTES

¹I would like to thank the Research Faculty Program of De La Salle University-Manila for making this study possible.

²Although this paper has tried to be exhaustive as far as those institutions are concerned, it is possible that some studies have been inadvertently left out. I apologize for the unintended omission.

³The geographical distribution was given as follows: Luzon – 54.53%, Visayas – 46.03%, and Mindanao – 33.53%. There seems to be a computational error here – the mean of the figures for Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao is 44.69%, not 51.43%. The error may be in computation or it may be that a figure is missing, for example, a separate figure for Manila. Another problem with this citation is that the CEAP study was not listed in the References of the monograph.

⁴Gonzalez's own answer in the 1983 paper was the guidelines of "historical precedents" and "communicative efficiency". But these guidelines were not specific enough to be applicable and he suggested another answer in a later publication: "When do these errors cease to be errors and become part of the standard? If enough educated elite in the society 'commit' these errors, then these errors in effect have been accepted by the society as the standard" (1985:199). This recommendation was subsequently elaborated on by Bautista (2000a).

⁵The best sketch of the distinctive features of PE phonology, grammar, lexicon, and discourse is Gonzalez's entry on PE in the *Oxford Companion to the English Language*, ed. by Tom McArthur (1992).

⁶I am doing the macrostudy based on preliminary work done by my graduate students in four universities in Luzon: Juliet Cura in Cagayan State University, Rhodora Suarez and Yuko Oshitani in Cavite State University, Jocelyn Garcia and Yon Jung Kang in Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila, and Jenifer Loy Lising and Charito Aglaia in De La Salle University-Manila.

REFERENCES

- AGLAUA, CHARITO M. & JONATHAN A. ALIPONGA. 1999. Judging personality from language usage: 1998 sample. In *The Filipino bilingual: A multidisciplinary perspective*, ed. by Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista & Grace O. Tan, 36-43. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- ALBERCA, WILFREDO L. 1978. The distinctive features of Philippine English in the mass media. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Santo Tomas, Manila.
- AQUINO, FE O. & ESTRELLA CRUZ. 1981. An exploratory study of the phonology and syntax of the English spoken by bar girls in Olongapo. Term paper for the course "Introduction to Language Study", De La Salle University-Manila. (Manuscript.)
- AQUINO, MILAGROS R., LUZMINDA A. DUQUE, SALAVERGA B. PIMENTEL & JOSE T. ROJAS. 1966. A study to determine the most intelligible variety of English pronunciation for use in the Philippines, 2 volumes. Master's thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila. (Adapted by the Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College. 1972. The most intelligible variety of English pronunciation for use in the Philippines. Quezon City: Alemar-Phoenix Publishing House, Inc.)

BAUTISTA

- ARAÑAS, PATRIA GARCIA-. 1988. A characterization of the English spoken by English and Mathematics teachers on the tertiary level of education in selected universities in Metro Manila. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- BAUMGARDNER, ROBERT J. 1995. Pakistani English: Acceptability and the norm. *World Englishes* 14(2).261-271.
- BAUTISTA, MA. LOURDES S. 1982. *Yaya* English. *Philippine Studies* 30.377-394.
- _____. 1989. Code-switching studies in the Philippines. *In International Journal of the Sociology of Language special issue on Sociolinguistic Studies in the Philippines* (88), ed. by Bonifacio P. Sibayan and Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, 19-32.
- _____. 1996. Notes on three sub-varieties of Philippine English. *In Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics*, ed. by Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, 93-101. Manila: De La Salle University.
- _____. 1997. The lexicon of Philippine English. *In English is an Asian language: The Philippine context*, ed. by Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, 49-72. Australia: The Macquarie Library Pty. Ltd.
- _____. 2000a. Defining Standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- _____. 2000b. The grammatical features of educated Philippine English. *In Parangal kang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his sixtieth birthday*, ed. by Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, Teodoro A. Llamzon & Bonifacio P. Sibayan, 146-158. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- _____, Jenifer Loy Lising & Danilo T. Dayag. 1999. Philippine English data for the International Corpus of English project. University Research Coordination Office, De La Salle University-Manila.
- BUZAR, JAIME M. 1978. Correlates of international students' listening comprehension of Filipino speakers of English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman.
- CASAMBRE, NELIA. 1986. What is Filipino English? *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching* 14(1-4).34-49.
- COTEJAR, RODELIA C. 1983. An analysis of the English spoken by hospitality girls. Term paper for the course "Introduction to Language Study", De La Salle University-Manila. (Manuscript.)
- CRISMORE, AVON, KAREN YEOK-HWA NGEOW & KENG-SOON SOO. 1996. Attitudes toward English in Malaysia. *World Englishes* 15(3).319-335.
- CRUZ, ISAGANI R. & MA. LOURDES S. BAUTISTA (comps.). 1995. A dictionary of Philippine English. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- CURA, JULIET O. 2000. Educators' attitudes towards Philippine English: Cagayan State University sample. Term paper for the course "World Englishes", De La Salle University-Manila. (Manuscript.)
- DAR, RODRIGO A. 1973. A study on the nature of Filipinisms. Unpublished master's thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City.

- D'SOUZA, JEAN. 1998. Review of Arjuna Parakrama's De-hegemonizing language standards: Learning from (post) colonial Englishes about "English". *Asian Englishes* 1(2).86-94.
- FALLORINA, ELVIRO R. 1985. Judging personality from language usage: Accented vs. non-accented Filipino English. One of three project papers submitted for an M.A. in Education, major in Language and Literature, De La Salle University-Manila.
- GARCIA, JOCELYN & YON JUNG KANG. 2000. Philippine English attitude survey: Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila sample. Term paper for the course "World Englishes", De La Salle University-Manila. (Manuscript.)
- GONZALES, MILDRED JARETA-. 1990. A comparative study of formulaic expressions in the interlanguage (Filipino-English) of Filipino bilinguals in Philippine and American settings: The influence of social and psychological distance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- GONZALEZ, ANDREW, FSC. 1972. Book review: Standard Filipino English, by Teodoro A. Llamzon, S.J. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching* 7(1-2).93-108.
- _____. 1982. English in the Philippine mass media. *In* *New Englishes*, ed. by John B. Pride, 211-226. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- _____. 1983. When does an error become a feature of Philippine English? *In* *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia*, ed. by Richard B. Noss, 150-172. (RELCA Anthology Series #11.) Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- _____. 1984. Philippine English across generations: The sound system. *DLSU Dialogue* 20(1).1-26.
- _____. 1985. *Studies on Philippine English*. Occasional Papers No. 39. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- _____. 1986. Child language studies in the Philippines. *In* *Language acquisition and multilingualism: Festschrift for Els Oksaar on her 60th birthday*, ed. by Brigitte Narr and Hartwig Wittje, 129-150. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- _____. 1992. Philippine English. *In* *Oxford companion to the English language*, ed. by Tom McArthur, 765-767. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ & Wilfredo L. Alberca. 1978. *Philippine English of the mass media*, preliminary edition. Manila: De La Salle University Research Council.
- _____ & Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista. 1986. *Language surveys in the Philippines (1966-1984)*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- HIDALGO, CESAR A. 1970. Review of Teodoro A. Llamzon's Standard Filipino English. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 1(1).129-132.
- IAMBALOS, THELMA V. 1989. Grammatical competence of Filipinos in English across generations. Unpublished master's thesis, De La Salle University-Manila.
- KACHRU, BRAJ. 1997. World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17:66-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BAUTISTA

- LAGAZON, TERESITA O. 1975. A study to determine the extent of the effects of regional "accent" on the listening perception of children. Unpublished master's thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila.
- LISING, JENIFER LOY V. & CHARITO M. AGLAUA. 2000. Attitudes of DLSU-Manila teachers toward Philippine English. Term paper for the course "World Englishes", De La Salle University-Manila. (Manuscript.)
- LLAMZON, TEODORO A. 1969. Standard Filipino English. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- _____. 1973. Reply to Gonzalez's review of SFE. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching* 7(3-4).80-90.
- _____. 1997. The phonology of Philippine English. *In English is an Asian language: The Philippine context*, ed. by Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, 41-48. The Macquarie Library Pty. Ltd.
- LUZARES, CASILDA E. & MA. LOURDES S. BAUTISTA. 1972. Judging personality from language usage: 1971 sample. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3(1).59-65. (Reprinted in *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics*, 2nd ed., edited by Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, 169-177. 1996. Manila: De La Salle University Press.)
- MARTINEZ, NORMA D. 1972. An integrative approach to teaching and learning Standard Filipino English pronunciation. Unpublished master's thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City.
- _____. 1975. Standard Filipino English pronunciation. Manila: National Book Store, Inc.
- McKAUGHAN, HOWARD. 1993. Toward a standard Philippine English. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 24(2).41-55.
- PARK, WON. 1983. Linguistic variety of English expressions produced by Asian adult bilinguals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- PEREZ, IMELDA Q. 1993. A description of the English spoken by students of Assumption College, San Lorenzo Village, Makati. Unpublished master's thesis, De La Salle University-Manila.
- PONIO, NORDIAN EUSOOF. 1974. Determining the sensitivity of educated Filipino and American English speakers to Filipinisms found in leading newspapers. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Santo Tomas, Manila.
- RICHARDS, JACK C. AND MARY W.J. TAY. 1981. Norm and variability in language use and language learning. *In English for cross-cultural communication*, ed. by Larry E. Smith, 40-56. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- ROMERO, MA. CORONA S. 1988. Filipino writing competence in English across generations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, De La Salle University-Manila.
- _____. 1993. Filipino writing competence in English across generations: A research report. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 24(2).57-71.

STUDIES OF PHILIPPINE ENGLISH

- SANCHEZ, MILDRED ELUMBA-. 1993. Lect-shifting in spoken Filipino English discourse among highly proficient speakers of English: An analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- SARILE, ANGELA P. 1987. Determining the comprehensibility and acceptability of phonological varieties of Filipino English as used in academic lectures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- SCHNEIDER, EDGAR W. 2000. Corpus linguistics in the Asian context: Exemplary analyses of the Kolhapur corpus of Indian English. *In Parangal nang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his sixtieth birthday*, ed. by Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, Teodoro A. Llamzon & Bonifacio P. Sibayan, 115-137. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- SISON, PURITA D. 1984. An initial study of the English spoken by security guards. One of three project papers submitted for an M.A. in Education, major in Language and Literature, De La Salle University-Manila.
- STA. ANA, ALAN. 1983. English in the Philippines across generations: A pilot study. Unpublished master's thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City.
- STREVENS, PETER D. 1982. What is standard English? Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- SUAREZ, RHODORA P. & YUKO OSHITANI. 2000. A comparative study of the attitudes and perceptions of the Sciences and Humanities instructors of Cavite State University towards Philippine English. Term paper for the course "World Englishes", De La Salle University-Manila. (Manuscript.)
- SVALBERG, AGNETA M.-L. 1998. Nativization in Brunei English: Deviation vs. standard. *World Englishes* 17(3).325-344.
- TAN, PERLA MIRASOL-. 1982. Comprehensibility and acceptability of deviant forms of formulaic expressions in English of Filipino graduate students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- TUCKER, G. RICHARD. 1968. Judging personality from language usage: A Filipino example. *Philippine Sociological Review* 16(1-2).30-39.