

TESOL IN THE PHILIPPINES, 1948-1958

Alfredo T. Morales

De La Salle University

1. INTRODUCTION

Opening their files generously for materials to use in this paper, Laura S. Oloroso, retired supervisor of English in the Division of Manila, and Aurora L. Samonte, retired Professor and Assistant Director of the Institute of Language Teaching, University of the Philippines, and former Chief Supervisor in the English Section, Instruction Division, Bureau of Public Schools, showed rare copies of the *Manila Secondary Teachers' English Quarterly (MSTEQ)* and the *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching (PJLT)*. Oloroso and Samonte founded, respectively, these two pioneer publications in the history of TESOL in the Philippines, the former beginning as early as 1950, and the latter in 1960. For a brief recollection of the beginning and the efforts devoted by many people to the project of the second-language teaching approach to English in our schools after the end of the last war, one might start with a paper in the issue of July 1955 of the *MSTEQ*. Starting with this recollection, I hope to flesh out this postwar early stage of the second-language teaching movement to satisfy the desire expressed by Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, for some historical background of the movement.

2. THE FIRST PERIOD: SOME LANDMARK DATES

That paper entitled *Language Arts for Development and Responsibility in a Free Society* written by the Executive Secretary of the Fulbright Foundation was characterized by Oloroso in her editorial as the most challenging of the papers presented at the UP College of Education workshop on Improving the Secondary School Curriculum that early summer of 1955. In part, it said the following:

'Mrs. Margaret H. Williams, the Chief Cultural Affairs Officer of the American Embassy, has assured me that she is glad to have the public know that she and her office are in sympathy with such a change as many of us Filipinos hope to help bring about, teaching English as a second language side by side with the vernaculars in the elementary grades, instead of continuing with English as the language of instruction in those grades. In fact, one of the two projects to which the Fulbright Program in the Philippines is now devoted is the teaching of English as a second language, the other project being Asian Studies.

The concentration of half the Fulbright Program on second language teaching of English is the final development of the program's interest in this subject as early as 1948, the first year of the US Educational Foundation in the Philippines. We tried then to secure the appointment of Dr. Charles C. Fries himself, who was and has been in demand in many other countries, especially in Germany and Puerto Rico. In passing, I am sorry to say that for language teachers this Workshop has been held too soon, I am afraid. It should have been held next June, for it gives me special pleasure to tell you that the US Educational Foundation will have Dr. Fries here in the Philippines for consultation that month.

Most of you know Dr. Prator, whom the Foundation brought over in 1950, and who was followed by groups of Fulbright English lecturers every year afterwards. Their coming was the product of the planning by Filipinos and Americans together on the bi-national Board Directors of the US Educational Foundation in the Philippines, with the closest cooperation possible from officials of the Department of Education, the University of the Philippines, the Philippine Normal College, and the public normal schools in the provinces. The American Embassy's cultural officers

have been generous in their support and have fully agreed with the aims of the project. Besides these officers, every great American linguistic scientist and every authority in second-language teaching in the world, whom I consulted as a Guggenheim Fellow recently, agree with the program of teaching English as a second language instead as the language of instruction.

It is ironical in our record of independence after colonialism that possessing the power to make a change, we have not yet changed a policy which the Americans started fifty-five years ago, but which they themselves would correct today if they still could. I urge this Workshop to reflect and defy this new twist of fate, labor to liberate the mind and personality of the Filipino child, and ultimately of the Filipino nation' (Morales 1955:6-30).

(A policy change came about soon, when on the basis of the Iloilo experiment, the Department of Education, in 1957, ordered a reform in elementary education. This order made the eight major vernaculars the medium of instruction in Grades I and II, with English and Filipino as separate subjects. However, there was no reliable follow-up on the implementation of this policy, and it was overturned in 1974 by a new Department Order on the Bilingual Education Policy.)

Some landmark dates in the growth of the movement for English as a second language are cited in the foregoing passage. They are the years 1948, 1950, and 1955. Fortuitously, or by some inscrutable design, a cluster of significant far-reaching events was taking place during the first half of the fifties, which may be called the first period, when the foundation for the TESOL educational innovation was laid. The following encomium comes from Gonzalez, who calls TESOL 'one of the few truly successfully implemented innovation in the history of Philippine education'. In addition to the three landmark years already mentioned, there were 1951, 1953, and 1956. When the Philippine Center for Language Studies was established in Manila in 1958—a reality brought about by the Rockefeller Foundation—and was operated under an agreement between the Philippine Department of Education and the University of California at Los Angeles, the second major period of TESOL began. It had thus 'arrived' in the Philippines after and because of the pioneering first major period of the early fifties. How intimately bound these two periods are, what influence the national historical features of this period in the country exercised, and how the convictions and decision of Filipino educators and Rockefeller friends, like the late Charles Fahs, emerged in harmony out of early divergence, is the saga of this successful educational innovation in its early stages.

3. DR. CLIFFORD PRATOR, FULBRIGHT TEACHER AND RESEARCHER

The Fulbright Program started in the Philippines in 1948, one of the first, and now the oldest, of such postwar program worldwide—including England, France, Germany, Italy, Greece, and other European countries, and Thailand, India, China, Japan, and Korea in Asia. Clifford Prator, a product of Michigan, and possessing extensive experience in second-language teaching worked in a number of countries around the world, came from his base at UCLA as the first Fulbright Professor in linguistics and TESOL in 1949-50. While contracted as a teaching professor—a separate category from that of research scholar—Prator displayed such vision, dedication, and industry that having been persuaded and given support by the Foundation's executive secretary to take on another responsibility, that of undertaking a major research investigation of the problem of language teaching, he engaged in this project in addition to teaching at the Philippine Normal School and in the Bureau of Public School's in-service programs. As a result, he produced the classic and most influential report, *Language Teaching in the Philippines, 1950*. A book, *Manual of American English Pronunciation for Adult Foreign Students*, partly growing out of his Philippine experience, was also written by Prator and published by the UCLA Press in 1951.

Such was the monumental influence of his research study, and the widespread indebtedness of Filipino English teachers and scholars to it, that the other equally great contribution made by

Prator has become somewhat obscured. It is nevertheless of parallel worth and even greater impact. The first seeds of applied linguistics in language teaching and of the TESOL movement were planted in the minds and hearts of an unforgettable band of educational pioneers and disciples, and in their own future disciples, whose names are synonymous with the introduction of second-language teaching of English in the Philippines. These first and second generation disciples and Michigan and UCLA graduates, include, with varying degrees of contribution to the movement, the names of Laura Oloroso, Aurora Samonte, Bonifacio Sibayan, Adelaida Paterno, Felicidad Nisperos, Purification Reyes, Jose Feliciano, Fe Manza, Fe Dacanay, Fe Otones, Rosalina Morales, Nelly Ilagan, Nelly Guanco, Comemoracion Concepcion, Concepcion Licsi, Anaclea Encarnacion, Teresita Ramos, Emma Bernabe, Beatrice Low, Florentino Ano, Gloria Ariola, Esperanza Fuentes, Galo Manalo, and many others (see issues of the Manila Secondary Teachers' Quarterly for contributors' names and the 1955 International Educators' Diary, Ann Arbor, Michigan). Samonte and Sibayan missed membership in the first Prator circle of 1950 at PNC, as Samonte was then in Iowa as Fulbright scholar for her Master's in English, and Sibayan was still in the provinces. Nor were they in the 1955 Workshop because the former was with Fries in Michigan, where Sibayan went later to finish his doctorate in linguistics. Only Secondary English personnel were enrolled with Prator, as his course prerequisite was completion of a major in English, whereas in 1949-50 the PNC prepared elementary teachers only for the two-year E.T.C.

4. OLOROSO-SAMONTE TEAMWORK AND FULBRIGHT COMMITMENT

From the beginning Oloroso and Samonte formed a strong combination. This teamwork of the national office with the Division of Manila harnessed a formidable army of English supervisors and teachers for periodic and countless rounds of workshops, seminars, and conferences. Starting with secondary level teachers, the work gradually spread to the elementary level as a result of Oloroso's effective conversion to the cause of Manila Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education Asuncion Fugoso and through Samonte's leadership as bureau supervisor, responsible nationally for elementary, secondary, and normal school levels of English teaching. Oloroso found friendship and cooperation she gained from Fugoso a balm to her suffering from the unexpected obstacles, heartbreaking frustrations, and some tearful confrontations she endured from some short-sighted superior school officials who were sometimes unsympathetic to her championship of TESOL innovation. She persevered, in cooperation with her fellow supervisors, in the task of in-service training for English teachers and in guiding them to found and maintain through the years, since December 1950, a professional vehicle of the movement. This was the MST EQ devoted to TESOL and serving as the major vehicle for the experience of the teachers and supervisors, for their individual experiments and research, for workshop, seminar, and conference proceedings, and for the papers of foreign scholars interested in language teaching in the Philippines. PJLT, founded in 1960, added its own special strength to this professional publishing promoting TESOL.

The three pillars of the TESOL innovation, as evident from its beginnings in the efforts of the Fulbright Program, the Bureau of Public Schools, the Division of Manila, UP, PNC, and other participating institutions and organizations, consisted of developmental programming and organizational planning, training, and research. Initial and basic planning was provided by the Program Proposal of 1948 of the Fulbright Board of Directors (see the Archives of the Philippine-American Educational Foundation, Manila), which includes as its first Filipino members the Secretary of Education, the UP President, and private education leaders like M.V. de los Santos and Francisca T. Benitez. It was chaired by James L. Meader, the American Embassy's Chief Cultural Officer, of earlier Philippine Civilian Assistance Unit (PCAU) fame during the days of

liberation, and former president of Russell Sage College, New York. A major component of the Proposal of 1948 was a special study on 'Improving Teaching of English'. It was this proposal that resulted in the successful recruitment of Prator, after the unavailability of Charles C. Fries, Director of the English Language Institute of Harvard University. For this project, which carried the endorsement of the national educational hierarchy, the Supervisory Office of the Instruction Division of the Bureau of Public Schools represented an implementing network of teachers and supervisors on the national level as its parallel structure in the Division of Manila did for the number one and most extensive division of schools in the country.

While recognizing the importance of the Fulbright Program's unfaltering commitment to the improvement of English language teaching during this first period of the TESOL movement, one may say from the hindsight that for the magnitude of the problem and the task, there was not enough specialization and concentration. The fact was, however, that its resources were meager. Tackling the task of over-all national educational reconstruction after the Japanese War, it was financed with a pittance from the sale of war-surplus goods. For its inaugural year, 1948, the Fulbright Program had only P243,000 to spend for American exchange professors, who worked with the Department of Education, University of the Philippines, Siliman University, Ateneo de Manila, Philippine Women's University, and Philippine Normal School. Costing an average of less than P15,000 each, there were 20 of 40 Filipinos in America that year; the funding was only for travel grants totaling P94,000. Only four out of these 40 were in English language and literature. From this beginning when it endeavored to bring assistance to almost the entire spectrum of academic discipline in higher education, including agriculture, vocational, and adult education, the annual program proposals ultimately evolved into the 1955 Program concentrating on English teaching as a second language and Asian Studies.

5. NATE AND CETA

In the meantime, as far as organizational action was concerned, the English supervisory and teaching personnel of the Division of Manila took the crucial step of forming an association, the Manila Secondary English Teachers' Association, besides founding the MST EQ in 1950. The numerous successive in-service activities conducted by the national office and the Division of Manila culminated in the historic and unique national 'Seminar-Workshop Conference' from May 11-30, 1953 held at the Araullo High School. Its organizers were no other than the Samonte-Oloroso team, with the cooperation of the UP, PNC, PWU, NTC, and the Bureaus of Public and Private Schools, Fulbright Foundation, and MSA. As English Supervisor Conrado Yabut confessed to Fries in 1956, 'I had my first taste of second language teaching in the National English Workshop in 1953'. One of the recommendations at the end of the meeting was to hold this kind of seminar-workshop conference for teachers of English annually. The Proceedings included, as part of Appendix A, the text of the 'Constitution of the National Association of Teachers of English in the Philippines (NATE). Its first president was Fe Manza. Educational officials, professors, visiting scholars, supervisors, and teachers who addressed the conference, or read papers, included Directors Benito Pangilinan and Demetrio Andres, Francis Drag and Lena May Horton (MSA), Antonio Isidro, Alfredo T. Morales, Tomas Tadena, Eugene R. Fair and Helena Sims (U.S. Embassy Cultural Officers), Fulbright Professor Susan Smith, Emilio H. Severino, Purificacion Reyes, Samonte, Manza, Paterno, Oloroso, Maria C. Peralta, Amalia Montecillo, Concepcion Licsi, Pura Castrence. Lilia Villa, Superintendent Antonio Maceda, Basilisa Manhit, Belen Butuyan, Josefina D. Constantino, Tito Clemente, and Isidro Panlasigui. This list does not include the eight authors of sample workshop projects. The conferees, coming from all over the country, numbered 269 (Bureau of Public Schools, English Seminar-Workshop Conference Proceedings, Manila, 1953).

Understandably, perhaps, NATE could not survive as an organization with such a tremendous spread of membership horizontally and vertically. The single thread of one's professional work being concerned with English teaching did not alone have the strength for unifying so much diversity and geographical distance, several levels of professional and bureaucratic-differentiation, with the further impediment of extensive dependence on superior authority in the bureaucratic hierarchy. A more viable organization had come into being earlier, the College English Teachers' Association of the Philippines (CETA), organized in 1950. Its second annual national conference was held at PNC on October 20, 1951, and attended by representatives of 107 institutions from Cagayan to Zamboanga (Rigor 1952). (A search for documentation of the first conference, 1950, yielded no results.) Besides those from the provinces, these institutions included all the Manila universities and Private Schools and the Division of City Schools. The late, Col. Conrado B. Rigor, a UP English major graduate who was the former head of the Department of Languages of the Philippine Military Academy, edited the Conference Proceedings. The strong magnetic attraction and the intellectual excitement of the conference were assured by the participation and contribution of household names in education and language-literature teaching, such as Vidal Tan, Paz Marquez-Benitez, Consuelo V. Fonacier, Aurora Samonte, Antonia Altonaga, Henry L. Irwin, S.J., Teodoro M. Locsin, Col. Fred Ruiz Castor, Poet Trinidad Tarrosa-Subido, Film Director Fidel de Castro, and no less than Leon Ma. Guerrero as a toastmaster in the evening program. Superintendent Antonio Maceda, Director Benito Pangilinan, and Fulbright Smith-Mundt, Professors of English Grace S. Nutley and Harold Gray analyzed various professional and administrative topics. The panel chairmen were Pura Castrence, Jose M. Hernandez, and Alfredo T. Morales.

The officers of the Association elected during the conference were Hernandez, President; 12 Regional vice-Presidents among whom were Rigor, Bienvenido N. Santos (Legaspi), Alfredo Gonzalez (Iloilo), Edilberto Tiempo (Siliman) and William Masterson, S.J. (Ateneo de Cagayan de Oro); and four directors—Jean Edades, N. V. M Gonzalez, Francisco Tonogbanua, and Morales. Some of the best insights on what Filipino English ought to be developed in the talk of Tan, which harmonized with the analysis made a few years later, in 1956, by Fries before a conference of educators whom Maceda called the 'aristocracy of the Philippine educational system'. In the same way, Gray made some keen observations about the approach to teaching literature in the Philippines in English, which foreshadowed some thoughts of Gonzalez in his paper, *Cultural Content in English Language Materials in the Philippines: A Case Study of Linguistic Emancipation* (1976?). The founders of CETA attribute much of its successful establishment to the hard work and charisma of Fulbright/Smith-Mundt Professor Grace S. Nutley.

6. FIRST PERIOD CLIMAX: CHARLES C. FRIES AND PAULINE ROJAS

The various activities already described show how the training in the first period of the TESOL movement took the form of twin-pronged, closely coordinated regular classes, and in-service work. All this training was made possible by the close cooperative relationship between the Bureau of Public Schools and the Department of Education, UP, PNC, and the Fulbright Program. Nationwide, the network of public normal schools, the divisions, PNC, and UP were the base of the Fulbright professors for classes, on-going in-service programs, and successive seminars, workshops, and conferences. Participation of private institutions was incorporated in these activities. Before the Philippine Center for Language Study became the specialized focus of leadership and technical work for the second period beginning in 1958, this long established pattern of in-service work was capped in October 1956, with the climactic appearance on the Philippine scene of the father of TESOL, Charles C. Fries.

Twice he spoke extensively and held long free-wheeling question and answer forums, first at PNC where the audience was said by Maceda to have numbered about '2000 from the grassroots of our educational system', and second at P. Gomez Elementary School where he said Fries faced 'the aristocracy of the Philippine educational system' (see Fries 1956a and b). Fries was preceded in Manila by Pauline Rojas for a full summer of teaching, demonstration, observation, and consultation. Like Prator, Rojas was a Michigan product. She was the supervisor in Puerto Rico of the national implementation of TESOL in the country's school children, including the preparation of English textbooks from Grade I up for the country's school children, whose first and home language is Spanish. The TESOL technologists and teachers back-stopping experts like Fries, Prator, and Rojas, were of course their students in classes held in the Philippines, the teacher-exchange students sent to various universities in America for advanced training, and these students' students. This two-way traffic had been going on since 1948. Hence, the overwhelming attendance at Fries' conferences. In the opinion of Oloroso these conferences became the turning point in the struggle for reforms in the teaching of English. According to her, 'he put forth the case for the teaching of English as a second language as only a scholar of his stature could have, and he convinced the skeptics of the need to take advantage of the findings of linguistic science in meeting the problems of language teaching in the Philippines.'

7. PCLS IS CONCERNED

All this awareness and action, training, and research on the part of Filipino English teachers and supervisors, growing through the first period of 1948 to 1956, convinced their organizational grassroots leaders of the need for more financial support and a sustained high level technical, specialized, scholarly combination of planning, management, programming, and implementation. There was undeniable urgency and gravity at this time of the widely acknowledged English language problem in the Philippines. In his address to the school superintendent at their annual convention in Baguio in May 1957, Prator regretted that

... in speaking of the deterioration of English, I am treading on dangerous ground, I may well regret using such frank words before you get through with me here. But I am simply quoting what I have heard almost universally from the scores of Filipino educators with whom I have talked about language in the past several years. Wherever one may go, from Laoag to Jolo, the refrain is the same: 'The schools just don't teach children to speak English as well as they used to.'

Please don't misunderstand me. Your students rank with the best European students. We have repeatedly seen that fact demonstrated at the University of California through our obligatory entrance examination in English. The same examinations have tended to show that recent Filipino graduates are inferior in their command of the language compared to graduates of ten or more years back.

It must be remembered too that Filipinos who receive most of their education in English need a command of the language many times as great as of that Frenchman or the Japanese, unless he is to be intellectually handicapped' (*Manila Secondary Teachers' English Quarterly* 1970:47-8).

In the same address, Prator narrated how the initiative had been taken by a group of Filipino educators to propose a project in answer to the English problem to Charles B. Fahs, Director of the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation (*Manila Secondary Teachers' English Quarterly* 1970:48-9). He was referring to an invitation early in 1956 to extend to Fahs by Mrs. Morales and myself, Samonte, and Oloroso, to a dinner-meeting at our home. The invitation

included Charles Ransom, the Cultural Officer of the American Embassy. Fahs was in Manila on his regular annual survey of the educational-cultural scene in the Philippines, when he would meet with outstanding writers, artists, and educators whom his foundation could help in their professional skills through fellowship for advanced study. As Prator recalled, many times in the past proposals had been made to ICA and the Embassy. Fahs had, in fact, been approached on the matter every time he came to Manila and had consistently declined participation.

The reason was that during this period the heated climate of politics and anti-American propaganda had gotten professional educational problems entangled with it. Hence, Fahs kept telling Filipino friends he would not touch the English language problem with a ten-foot pole. The height that this type of propaganda reached this period is best exemplified by the fact that Leon Ma. Guerrero, in his eulogy of Magsaysay in London in March 1957, acknowledged that this best loved of presidents by Filipinos 'was branded as an American creature and puppet' by his rivals and critics as an expression of extreme condemnation. Maybe, Fahs thought that, like Magsaysay, what was uppermost in the minds and hearts of the grassroots leaders of English teaching who tried to convince him at that dinner-meeting was simply to serve the people in solving one of the country's worst educational problems in the best professional and scholarly way without politics.

That night, Fahs took a new step forward and, reversing himself, he pledged the help of the Rockefeller Foundation. The next few days, he gathered more information from us on what had been achieved so far in the TESOL movement and asked our suggestions about experts and research centers. He also sought assurances from the Fulbright Foundation and the ICA Mission. On his return to the States, he came to an understanding with the University of California at Los Angeles, where Prator had returned from the Philippines to teach. In January 1957, Prator came with William Lucio, for consultation with the Department of Education and its bureaus and divisions, especially the Division of Manila, the National Language Institute, UP, PNC, and some private universities. Approved in principle by Philippine government officials and receiving a personal endorsement from President Magsaysay, UCLA and Rockefeller formalized their support and finalized plans for the creation of the Philippine Center for Language Study.

The center was inaugurated in Manila in 1958. It continued in existence of eight years as an autonomous institution with a Filipino and an American scholar as co-directors, and with a Philippine advisory board, enjoying cooperation from the Department of Education, and operating financially under the UCLA as the recipient of Rockefeller funds (see Sibayan 1973). This Center, the Department's English Section in the Instruction Division of the Bureau of Public Schools, the English Department of PNC, and the English Department and the Institute for Language Teaching (ILT) in UP became the major factors in TESOL movement in the Philippines. With the blessings of President Sinco of UP, the ILT was founded in 1959 within the College of Education of UP, through the combined efforts of myself as the new Dean of Education, and Samonte, who had transferred from the Bureau of Public Schools and became a professor in the College. Pre-service and in-service training and graduate education were strengthened with the College and the Institute offering a new Certificate and an M.A.T. in Second-Language Teaching, especially serving Bureau of Public Schools personnel. The first of its kind in the Philippines in 1960, the M.A.T. degree program in UP was introduced after I observed and studied its use at Yale and Harvard.

In 1960, the Institute spearheaded the organization of the Philippine Association for Language Teaching (PALT) which began publication of the *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching* in 1961 (see 1.1 & 1.39-41). At this time, we in the Institute succeeded in obtaining the expert assistance of the well-known linguistic and Philippine studies scholar, Howard MacKaughan, as a Fulbright Professor, who later became Dean of the Graduate School and Chairman of Linguistics at the University of Hawaii. We also obtained the cooperation of the famous international Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) and its staff for instruction and

research. In this connection, it may be recalled that SIL was later picked as a Ramon Magsaysay Awardee. SIL has continued to cooperate actively with ILT and PALT.

Thus, before and in preparation for the PCLS to start its work in 1958, marking the beginning of a new period of TESOL in the Philippines, the movement had developed a considerable degree of familiarity among supervisors and teachers in the schools and among college English faculty throughout the country. The over-all guiding spirit of PCLS, Prator himself started the ball rolling when he first came in 1949 as a Fulbright professor teaching TESOL in his classes at PNC and in the Bureau of Public School's in-service program, and when he produced the classic report, *Language Teaching in the Philippines*. The students he and other Fulbright/Smith-Mundt professors taught spread the gospel to their own students. To these one also adds the score of US-trained Filipino exchange teacher-grantees since 1948 in the field of language teaching and linguistics at such universities as Michigan, California, Cornell, Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, and many others, and their own students when they came back to the Philippines. Besides pre-service and in-service teaching, seminars, workshops, and conferences, regular specialized professional publications, like the MST EQ and the *PJLT* dealt with varied and all possible aspects of TESOL in actual school work and with broad theoretical and policy consideration of the language teaching problem.

8. TESOL AND FILIPINO ENGLISH

One continuing deep concern about English in the Philippines necessarily involving TESOL, conspicuous in the evolution of the TESOL movement in the country, but even preceding its introduction and transcending its scope, has been the notion of Filipino English. Apart from the strictly scientific descriptive research by linguists like Teodoro Llamzon and Andrew Gonzalez on whether there is, and how one identified, Filipino English, this notion has a normative aspect crucial to the objectives and quality of instruction and to criteria of performance. Discussing this subject in his 1950 Report, Prator averred that 'Philippine English' according to Philippine rather than international standards correctness, or we may say, usage, would end as a jargon, defined by Bloomfield as 'nobody's native language, but only a compromise between a foreign speaker's version of a language and a native speaker's version of the foreign speaker's version and so on, in which each party imperfectly reproduces the other's reproduction.' Prator predicts that in this process there would not be a single Philippine English but more probably many different regional versions, a Tagalog English, a Bisayan English, even an Igorot English. 'Even now Manila teachers state that the English of a pupil who transfers, for example, from Ilocano region sounds very strange to them (Prator 1950:54)

The question here is not simply one of recognizing and accepting a brand of English we may identify and differentiate as Filipino, in the same way some people do, in comparison, with American, Canadian, British, and Australian English. In common, however, these latter groups are all an indigenous and first and home language code, and they belong to a broadly homogenous culture and history, in contrast to English spoken by Indians, Singaporeans, Malaysians, Sri Lankans, Chinese, Indonesians, Filipinos, and Japanese. The common sense demand made of performance by an individual or any group, whatever national identity attachment they have, is whether it is good or bad English. For example, writing about the August 28 mutiny led by Honasan, a (1) Manila Sunday paper at the head of its editorial, (2) a well-known Filipino columnist, and (3) *Asiaweek* all expressed their commonly shared condemnation, respectively: (1) 'Throw the Books on Them', (2) 'throw the book at them', and (3) 'throw the book at them'. Number (1) is a terrible wrenching of an English idiom by a Filipino writer, which (2) and (3) use correctly. Number (1) is Filipino English which is bad, while (2) and (3) are good Filipino and Asian English.

There is Japanese English (cf. *Asiaweek*, August 9, 1987) which bombards every visitor to Japan in billboards, T-shirts, and all sorts of advertisements. Whatever the ploy behind its use, this Japanese English ‘is simply error’, and amounts to the ‘linguistic disorientation of a visitor to Japan’. Like our favorite Filipino columnist, however, we have a number of friends whose Japanese English is good English. over and above any national identity, including native speakers, there is always a differentiation between good and bad English—there is a standards and model of a good quality, national and international. Nick Joaquin tells the story of the Chinese invoking the name of a saint and being saved from being swallowed by a crocodile in Pasig River. The saint must have understood him all right even though he exclaimed ‘San Nicolasi! San Nicolasi!’ A Tagalog, Visayan, or other Filipinos would have said it properly as ‘San Nicolas! San Nicolas!’ without the terminal ‘-si’.

When Fries was asked whether he would consider acceptable the Filipino English he heard in the conference room, he replied that ‘there are a great many people here who speak English excellently—very many who get along very well, very well. But many find themselves in difficulty’. He also said:

...What is your purpose in teaching English? If your purpose is to put the Filipino people in touch with the English speaking world, then of course, in so far as you develop a Filipino English, you are defeating that purpose. That is, if you come in contact with English speaking people, it would be extremely difficult to understand Filipino English. In any case, you’ll be misunderstood. Trouble and misunderstanding will arise.

The world is getting smaller physically and you have to participate in conferences with people from a variety of nations. You will find it of great help to come in contact with a group of nations of Southeast Asia to discuss the problems of teaching English. You have growing contacts with each of these areas. In most of these cases, conferences will be in English. To make them successful you must use a brand of English that is understood throughout the entire English-speaking world. (Fries 1956:63)

At the CETA Conference, advocating Filipino English, Vidal Tan, President of UP, described it as follows:

The Filipino English that I am advocating is not to be confused with ‘pigeon’ English or the bamboo English which foreign observers unkindly write about in magazines as the English spoken by the average Filipino. I am not championing this kind of generation. I am not sponsoring ungrammatical English. By Filipino English I mean English that has the stamp of Filipino personality and describes accurately Filipino feelings, moods, and thoughts....

My friends, let us develop our own Filipino English, but it must be correct English; it must be the English that conveys accurately our Filipino characteristics, spoken with the melody of our native languages. And let us not be ashamed of it. (in Rigor 1952:3-4)

To conclude briefly, and to reiterate in the words of Paz Marquez-Benitez spoken at the same CETA conference: ‘... this Filipino English will be correct English, intelligible to other English-speaking groups; it will be differently modulated, and it will be rich in new idioms expressive of our peculiar ways of looking at things’ (in Rigor 1952:15). In sum, whether a first language used by native speakers, or a second language in the case of non-native speakers, there has to be a standard of quality, inextricable from either or both national and international use, of

whether language we may talk about or attempt to identify and differentiate with some national label. This principle applies to Filipino English.

REFERENCES

- Fries, C. C. (1956a). The teaching of English as a second language. *Manila Secondary Teachers' English Quarterly*, 6(3-4), 6-13.
- Teaching and learning English as a foreign language. (1956b). *Manila Secondary Teachers' English Quarterly*, 6, 54-70.
- Manila Secondary Teachers' English Quarterly. (1970). *Twentieth anniversary issue*, 20(3).
- Morales, A. T. (1955). Language arts for development and responsibility in a free society. *Manila Secondary Teachers' English Quarterly*, 5, 6-30.
- Philippine Journal for Language Teaching*, 1(1&2). (n.d.).
- Prator, C. (1950). *Language teaching in the Philippines: A report*. Manila: United States Educational Foundation in the Philippines.
- Rigor, C. B., (Ed.). (1952). *Proceedings of the second annual convention of the College English Teachers Association*. Manila.
- Sibayan, B. P. (1973). Language teaching in the Philippines, 1946-1973. In A. Gonzalez, FSC (Ed.), *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez* (pp. 283-291). Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

*originally published in
Philippine Journal of Linguistics, Volume 20, Numbers 1 & 2 (June - December 1989)*