



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

The Developments in Philippine English Research

Rollven Verdan¹

Bachelor in Secondary Education major in English
National University, Manila, Philippines.



Dr. Carlo G. Soberano²©

Assistant Professor in Secondary Education major in English
National University, Manila, Philippines.



(Received: 10 September 2023; Accepted: 24 December 2023; Published: 1 September 2024)

In this paper, the authors surveyed the developments of Philippine English literature. Particularly, this paper reports the following: (1) the emergence of Philippine English (Phile) varieties; (2) Philippine English (Phile) versus American English and other varieties; (3) Intelligibility of Philippine English (Phile); (4) Attitudes of English Language Teachers (ELTs) toward Philippine English (Phile); and, (5) Philippine English in Schneider's Dynamic Model. These thematic reviews discuss current developments of Philippine English research that opens for further discoveries of other (sub)varieties. The review on existing debates on the status of Philippine English allow potential readers to formulate trajectories and future research directions. Such review benefits English language teachers and linguistics research enthusiasts to exhaust the study of Philippine English and to (re)direct language ideologies and language policies in the Philippines. By doing so, it may result in transformations in curriculum and pedagogy, theory, and practice in English Language Teaching (ELT) and adoptions of frameworks and policies by countries which English varieties have not been documented nor studied yet.

Keywords: Philippine English, World Englishes, Language Varieties, English Language Teaching.

¹ E-mail: vrollven@gmail.com

² E-mail: cgsobrano@national-u.edu.ph © Corresponding Author

Introduction

In contemporary language variation studies, further developed by Braj Kachru (1985) in his *World Englishes* and Edgar Schneider (2003) in his *Dynamic Model*, a growing scholarship about Englishes motivated language researchers to investigate their local English variety in an attempt to locate its emergence, intelligibility, acceptability, and distinction as compared to other English varieties both in Global north and in the south. Philippine English (Phile) is one of the recognized varieties of English which, according to Kachru (1985), belongs to the “outer” concentric circle. Like the Philippines, countries that are formerly colonized are classified as outer circle where English is an official or institutional language (Kirkpatrick, 2014).

English in the Philippines was introduced by the Americans during its colonization for 48 years. The revitalization of American influence in the Philippines encompasses various endeavors, including the reconfiguration of certain areas, one of which is education. Through language contact and institutionalization of English in the Philippine education and state agencies, a variety of English emerged which scholars referred to as Philippine English, a variety of English that is debatably distinct with American English (Schneider, 2011; Collins & Borlongan, 2017; Borlongan, 2016; Suárez-Gómez & Seoane, 2013; Borlongan, 2011; Hundt, 2009); a standard variety spoken by educated Filipinos (Borlongan, 2023; Martin, 2020); and a variety of English claimed to be intelligible and acceptable by international speakers, and teachers and students in the Philippines (Dita & De Leon, 2017; De Leon, Parina, & Panopio, 2021; Tonio, 2019; De Leon, 2016; Dita, 2013; Dayag, 2007). Although these advancements were reported by remarkable linguists in the country, a dearth of review that shows the current developments and trajectory of Philippine English research remains underexplored.

In this paper, the authors survey the developments of Philippine English literature. Particularly, this paper narrates the following: (1) the emergence of Philippine English (Phile) varieties; (2) Philippine English (Phile) versus American English and other varieties; (3) Intelligibility of Philippine English (Phile); (4) Attitudes towards Philippine English (Phile); and, (5) Philippine English in Schneider’s *Dynamic Model*. These thematic reviews discuss current developments of Philippine English research that opens for further discoveries of other (sub)varieties. The review on existing debates on the status of Philippine English allow potential readers to formulate trajectories and future research directions. Such review benefits English language teachers and linguistics research enthusiasts to exhaust the study of Philippine English and to (re)direct language ideologies and language policies in the Philippines. By doing so, it may result in transformations in curriculum and pedagogy, theory and practice in English Language Teaching (ELT) and adoptions of frameworks and policies by countries which English varieties have not been documented nor studied yet.

The emergence of Philippine English varieties

The wealth of scholarship in Philippine English is attributed to the genuine efforts and painstaking research commitments of notable pioneers whose works led to the recognition of Philippine English at the international stage. This section is to recognize the birth of Philippine English (Phile) which was drawn from the

influential contributions of Bautista (1996), Llamzon (1997), Thompson (2003), Bautista (2004), Borlongan (2015), Schneider (2016), and Gonzales (2017). In what follows are the versions of Philippine English varieties that the abovementioned scholars have introduced.

- 1- **Occupational-based Englishes.** Bautista (1996) asserts that English varies according to the job of the person. Some of the examples of occupational-based English are *Yaya English* which refers to the unschooled variety spoken by women that take care of a young child or old person. Another is *Bargirl English* that was spoken by female employees in red-light district bars situated in Clark and Subic bases in the Philippines. Last is the *Collegiala English* which is spoken by girls in convent schools. This variety is more about showing social class instead of being religious.
- 2- **Lectal Englishes.** Llamzon (1997) proposed the Lectal Englishes wherein it is a type of language or dialect that was clustered into three: acrolect, mesolect, and basilect. First, *Acrolect English* is claimed to closely resemble the American English in terms of phonology. This is spoken by media personalities, lectors, ministers, and English majors. Second, *Mesolect English* refers to the extensive use of language in different domains such as the workplace, institutions, and others. Additionally, it is considered as an intermediate type in the lectal continuum. It is identified to be spoken by celebrities, government officials, academia, and mass media. Third, *Basilectal English*, which is the opposite of Mesolect, is spoken by people who have a limited command of English. It is often utilized by non-professionals such as janitor.
- 3- **Taglish.** According to Thompson (2003) and Bautista (2004), Taglish is characterized as a linguistic phenomenon involving the blending of Tagalog and English codes. This particular type of variation is present in both spoken and written forms of media, such as sports commentary, advertisements, tabloids, informal conversations, and various other contexts. However, its accessibility is restricted to individuals belonging to the middle and upper socioeconomic levels, as it requires proficiency in both English and Tagalog languages.
- 4- **Conyo English.** Borlongan (2015) distinguished and coined the term *Conyo English* which defined as the codeswitching between English and Tagalog in the upper classes. He added that Conyo English is more likely to be smooth in switching languages and playful and exaggerated compared to Taglish. Additionally, Conyo English helps the upper class to be distinguishable from other classes as it is widely known for upper classes. Therefore, the presence of this variety is a mere reflection of social stratification and division of classes.
- 5- **Hybrid English.** Schneider (2016) described the phenomenon of language mixing to be hybrid varieties. He formulated 'X+English' where X is the local language mixed with English. He contend that hybrid English is a language blend produced by countries like Philippines (Taglish), Singapore (Singlish), Japan (Japlish), China (Chinglish), and many more. This form of

language mixing is characterized by lexical borrowing, code-switching, code-mixing, and contact processes which are observable in bi/multilingual contexts like the Philippines.

- 6- **Hokaglish.** Documented by Gonzales (2017) who claimed to describe hokaglish as a hybrid mix of languages such as Hokkien, Tagalog, and English. This language mix is mainly dependent on speakers than the social domain spoken by Chinese communities in the Philippines. However, Schneider clarified that Hokaglish, unlike X+English varieties, differ in terms of the degree and amount of mixing involved.

Indeed, Philippine English continue to flourish as time goes by. Through corpus research and language documentation, more varieties are emerging that described the linguistic ecology of Englishes in the Philippines. Because of globalization evident in the transformations in the way people communicate, the constant crossing of borders among workers and migrants, the economic and political alliances in Southeast Asia and Global North, and the internationalization of education in the Philippines such as student/ faculty exchange programs, international teacher-training, international research collaborations, and industry linkages and partnership are some of the research avenues and opportunities to investigate the linguistic and nonlinguistic character of Philippine English. However, the English varieties found by the abovementioned scholars are limited to the metropolitan Englishes. This does not include varieties of Englishes across the archipelago which makes it a potential research area for language researchers interested in mid and southern part of the Philippines. For instance, the Visayas and Mindanao islands are multilingual zones historically influenced by Spanish invasion and Malay and Muslim inhabitation. By exploring these multilingual zones, it may add to the rich description of Philippine English.

Linguistic characteristics of Philippine English

In this section, authors report on the linguistic characteristics of Philippine English. This involves reporting the lexico-grammatical and lexical features of Philippine English as compared to American English and other English varieties. Scholars cited in this section investigated and described the use, formation, and structure of Philippine English as the result of language contact, language learning, and language mixing.

Lexico-grammatical features of Philippine English (PhlE) as compared to American English (AmE)

Philippine English (PhlE) claimed to highly resembles American English (AmE) due to the fact the Philippines was formerly ruled by American regime, where (American) English was introduced in education and government. Later, English became the official lingua franca of the country. Below is the list of grammatic features of Philippine English as reported by Collins and Borlongan (2017). These reports were drawn from the extensive studies of local and international scholars:

- i. Particle verbs (Schneider, 2004)
- ii. Futurity expression (Nelson, 2005)
- iii. The subjunctive mood (Schneider, 2005, 2011; Peters, 2009; Bautista, 2010a, 2010b)

- iv. Agreement patterns (Hundt, 2006; Collins, 2011)
 - v. The progressive aspect (Collins, 2008; Hundt, 2009)
 - vi. Tag questions (Borlongan, 2008)
 - vii. Modals and quasi-modals (Collins, 2009; Friginal, 2011)
 - viii. Get-passive (Alonsagay & Nolasco, 2010)
 - ix. Intensifiers (Coronel, 2011)
 - x. Irregular verb morphology (Borlongan, 2011; Lim & Borlongan, 2013)
 - xi. The perfect aspect (Suárez-Gómez & Seoane, 2013)
- Recent developments not included in the report of Collins and Borlongan (2017)
- xii. Adverbials of attitude and stress (Hernandez, 2017)
 - xiii. Spelling and punctuation (Fuchs, 2019)

Lexical features and contribution of Philippine English

The notable works of Filipino linguists and scholars investigating Philippine English resulted in various national and international recognition. The potential of PhilE to produce more unique lexicons was recognized by the international corpus databases such as the International Corpus of English (ICE), the Corpus of Global Web-based in English (GloWbE), and the Oxford English Dictionary (OED). This lexical recognition brought Philippine English to become a standard English variety and a field of research.

Gonzales (2017, p. 79) reported that there is a “one-million-word Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-PH) compiled by Bautista, Lising, and Dayag (1999)”. Some words listed in the corpus are distinctive in Philippine English varieties only. For instance, the lexemes "nipa" and "carabao" are archaic loanwords denoting "a type of palm" and "water buffalo" respectively. The presence of carabao is highly prevalent in the GloWbE-PHI corpus. There is a total of 230 tokens, although certain other countries exhibit only one or two occurrences. The term "jeepney," which refers to a small bus, is well recognized and renowned. As a result, there exist several compounds that involve jeepney, like jeepney strikes and jeepney drivers. In comparison to other varieties of English spoken around the world, this particular lexeme is utilized with a notably high frequency in the GloWbE-PHI corpus, amounting to 1002 tokens.

In written and spoken discourses, PhilE has a total of 497 tokens in the term *-ship* and 136 tokens in the nouns *-hood* which ranks first among the compared Asian Englishes. The nouns *-ism* has a frequency of 557 which ranks second in the usage of it.

The lexical term "presidentiable(s)" might be seen as representative of the Philippine context. The term "presidential aspirant" pertains to an individual who is actively seeking or is regarded to possess the potential to hold the position of president. It is important to acknowledge that this construction is not supported by substantial evidence in authoritative references, with the exception of a single entry in the British National Corpus (BNC). In the Global Web-based English Corpus (GloWbE), the use of the term "almost exclusively" is mostly observed in the PhilE

subset, with a total of 17 instances. These instances are distributed throughout nine (9) general websites and eight (8) blogs.

Oxford English Dictionary (OED), as reported by Salazar (2017), added the following words since June 2015 recognizable because of its unique meanings and usage. Such words are “advanced, aggrupation, aling, ate, arnis, bahala na, balikbayan, balikbayan box, balut, baon, barangay, barkada, barong, barong tagalog, baro’t saya, batchmate, bayanihan, buko, buko juice, buko water, carnap, carnapper, comfort room, despedida, dirty kitchen, estafa, gimmick, go down, halo-halo, highblood, kare-kare, kikay, kikay kit, kilig, KKB, kuya, leche flan, lechon, lola, lolo, mabuhay, Mang, mani-pedi, pan de sal, pancit, pasalubong, presidentiable, pulutan, puto, salvage, sari-sari store, sinigang, suki, tabo, teleserye, tita, tito, utangnaloob, yaya” (see Salazar, 2017, p. 48-53).

In 2023 news report by The Philippine Star (Mangon & Lim, 2023), there are 142 recently added Filipino words and phrases in addition to the words reported by Salazar (2017) six years ago. Such words are abaca, accomplish, adobo, anting-anting, availer, bagoong, Bajau, bakla, baku, bakya, balibuntal, balisong, Batak, Batangas knife, beno, bihon, blocktime, blocktimer, bold, bolo, bongga, boondock, boondockers, breadnut, buntal, buri, butter fruit, calamansi, calamondin, calangay, caracore, carinderia, carretela, cartolina, central, cogon, colugo, corrido, dato, Datuk, dine-in, dirty ice cream, dita, ditaine, duende, dugong, ensaimada, Filipinize, Filipino, gurjun, gurjunic, Hanunoo, head-axe, head-knife, Huk, Ibanag, Ifugao, Ifuganon, Igorot, Illano, Illanoan, Ilocano, Iloko, Indian, jeepney, jusi, kamachili, Kapampangan, kumpit, Lacatan, ladronism, lauan, luzonite, macapuno, malmag, Mangyan, Manila, Manilaman, Manobo, Maranao, Marcosian, medrinaque, milkfish, monkey-eating eagle, Moro, Moro National Liberation Front, narra, Negrito, OFW, pacifico, paduak, palang, palay, Pampangan, panciteria, Pangasinan, panguingue, paraphernalia, paribuntal, pero, Philippine, Philippine mahogany, Philippinite, Pilipino, pina, pina cloth, pina muslim, Pinay, Pinoy, poblacion, pom-pom, president, querida, reconstruct, retentionist, rizalite, rotuna, s/zacate, sala, sala set, salangane, sampaguita, saya, shereef, sisig, songster thrush, sorbetes, sparrow, sparrow unit, Sulu, taclobo, Tagalog, taguan, tamarau, Tambagut, tarsier, Tasaday, Tau sug, Tinikling, topnotcher, toyo, traffic, trapo, tuba, turon, ube, unprocedural, viand, vino, vinta, ylang-ylang, ylangol, yo-yo.

Intelligibility of Philippine English

Dita and De Leon (2023) who wrote a book chapter on intelligibility of PhiE defined intelligibility as the ability of listeners “to recognize words and utterances of a speech” (p. 221). In their chapter, they traced studies that investigated the intelligibility of PhiE to speakers of other Englishes. The intelligibility of PhiE remains to be a research inquiry due to the imperialism of standard English promoted by language teachers not just in the Philippines but in other Asian countries. Despite empirical evidence suggesting that PhiE is highly intelligible to other speakers of English, Filipino English teachers still resort to the teaching of standard English. This section attempts to re-echo substantial evidence informing potential readers the intelligibility and acceptability of PhiE variety as the medium of instruction. Only through knowledge dissemination that this research area

achieves its objectives. Here, authors report three milestones that have advanced the field of PhilE, more broadly, and intelligibility, specifically.

First, research on the intelligibility of PhilE was not as fruitful as compared to fifteen years ago, not until Dayag (2007) spearheaded the investigation of intelligibility of PhilE. Using Kachru's concentric circle, Dayag (2007) examined the intelligibility of mesolectal English variety of Filipino speakers to listeners from inner, outer, and expanding circles. His findings revealed that PhilE is highly intelligible (about 80%) to inner and outer circle listeners while moderately intelligible (50%) to expanding circle listeners.

Second, Dita (2013) investigated the intelligibility and comprehensibility of proficient and less proficient speakers of PhilE to Asian international students. Dita found that the English of less proficient Filipino speakers are more intelligible as compared to proficient Filipino speakers. This may be because of the speech rate and efforts of less proficient speakers as compared to accented English of proficient speakers. Even though pronunciation was not a key variable that led to such result, it is noteworthy to emphasize the intelligibility of the PhilE.

Third, De Leon (2016) followed through the investigations of Dayag (2007) and Dita (2013). After examining the intelligibility of acrolect, mesolect, and basilect speakers of English to other Asian counterparts, she concluded that mesolect English is the most intelligible as compared to acrolect and basilect speakers. Her findings re-echoed Dayag's (2007) results. That is, PhilE is highly intelligible to Filipino and other Asian speakers, except Singapore and Brunei which were not included in the ASEAN study.

These three milestones of research on intelligibility of PhilE motivated the above scholars to expand and collaborate with other researchers on the study of intelligibility of PhilE. As such, resulted in new streams of research about intelligibility of PhilE involving EFL intermediate students from seven countries (see Dita & De Leon, 2017), young and culturally-diverse international students in Thailand (see Tonio, 2019), the intelligibility of Internet Philippine English to fifty ESL teachers across three main archipelagos of the Philippines (see Gustilo, Tocalo, & Calingasan, 2019), and more recently, the inclusion of Thai's intelligibility of PhilE among ASEAN- expanding the initial intelligibility study of De Leon (2016) (see De Leon, Parina, & Panopio, 2021).

Attitudes of Filipino English Language Teachers (ELTs) towards Philippine English

The consequential outcome of World Englishes research also paved way to investigating the views of speakers to English and their local variety. Early accounts of research on the attitudes of Filipinos to English were documented by Gonzalez (1985) and compiled by Gonzales and Bautista (1986), which then further investigated by Bautista (2000), Thompson (2003), Bautista and Bolton (2008).

The extent to which attitudes are explored substantiate the vitality and legitimacy of Philippine English as a standard, intelligible, comprehensible, and acceptable variety of English (Rentillo, 2023). However, there are still speakers whose attitudes are incognizant with the use of Philippine English. Primary to this incognizance are the educators and teachers themselves who, despite research evidence, promote

standard American English. In this section, the authors report the diverse contentions among Filipino teachers and their attitude towards PhilE. It is important to scrutinize teachers' attitude towards PhilE because of the reasons not limited to the following: (1) Teachers are bearers and agents of knowledge and skills development. They hold social responsibility to spread critical awareness about language and communication. (2) Teachers inculcate attitude about PhilE to potential learners. Then, learners reproduce such attitudes. (3) Teachers are considered to be one of the movers for social change.

The study embarked by Bautista (2014) examined the attitudes of 88 faculty members towards PhilE in selected universities in the Philippines. Findings revealed that teachers expressed a positive attitude and acceptance (e.g., strongly disagreeing with the statement that "Philippine English is actually mistakes made by people who speak poor English"). Therefore, PhilE was recognized as something which is valid and significant to Standard English.

On a similar vein, 52 English language teachers (ELTs) assigned to secondary levels exhibited a positive attitude towards PhilE (Allieto & Rillo, 2018). However, after testing the variables such as gender, socioeconomic status, year/s of service, and educational attainment that, they argue, influence the attitude, only gender did play a meaningful role. Furthermore, they recommend future research on the relationship between attitudes and socio-economic status as it may be part and parcel of investigating attitudes towards language.

These positive attitudes of Filipino English teachers toward PhilE did not reflect in the latest research of Dimaculangan and Gustilo (2018) who investigated 200 English teachers from 15 public and private universities across the Philippines. They reported that only 7 lexicons were accepted by English teachers for use in formal (5) and informal (2) writing out of 99 sample lexicons. This means that despite the growing corpus of Philippine English that is claimed to be intelligible and recognizable, there is still incognizance about the existence of Philippine English and the concept of World Englishes. Dimaculangan and Gustilo (2018) expressed their disappointments for English teachers who served as the gatekeepers of standard English. Teachers are reluctant to affirm PhilE neologisms particularly those code-mixed with Tagalog elements. Hence, teachers in ESL develops a negative impression and attitudes towards PhilE as a variety of Standard English.

Borrowing the words of Rentillo (2023, p. 236), "... while scholars constantly ask themselves whether PhilE is an English *of, by, or for Filipinos*, perhaps Filipinos should rather keep asking once again a much more crucial question: English in the Philippines—to what end?" This implies that there are still more to unpack in the views and attitudes of Filipino speakers towards Philippine English. Questions such as, English as second or foreign language to Filipinos? And (Un)ownership of English among Filipinos? remain potential research inquiries to further the studies on the attitudes of Filipinos towards PhilE.

Philippine English in Schneider's Dynamic Model

This paper shows the journey of PhilE in the archipelago based on the research of various scholars in their field. With all the preponderance of their papers, several findings, similarities, and objectives, one question remained perplexed, it is *Where is*

PhilE in the Dynamic Model? This question challenges researchers to further conduct an in-depth analysis of the current state of the PhilE.

According to Schneider (2003), the Dynamic Model of language evolution is considered the most prominent framework for understanding the development of Englishes around the globe. Schneider differentiated these developments into five distinct categories, each characterized by its own unique set of features (see Schneider, 2003, p. 255)

Stage 1 Foundation stage

Stage 2 Exonormative stabilization

Stage 3 Nativization

Stage 4 Endonormative stabilization

Stage 5 Differentiation

This model serves as the framework for assessing the progress made by PhilE throughout the last decades. Interestingly, as the research development of Philippine English progresses, several scholars join scholarly debates in (re)locating Philippine English in the framework. Below are the significant debates that scholars have argued in the attempt to move forward scholarship in Philippine English. Here, authors outline two arguments from group of scholars explicating the location of PhilE in the Dynamic Model.

Arguments that PhilE is at stage 3 nativization

Schneider (2007) argued that the PhilE is situated at stage 3 and holds the potential to progress to stage 4. According to Schneider, there are indications that suggest the impending codification in stage 4, but with significant limitations. Although there are initial indications of the emergence of a corpus of Philippine literature in the English language, there have been suggestions regarding the need for standardization and formalization of language education. Additionally, there is a growing recognition of the significance of norm selection and codification in the context of language instruction. Schneider (2007) asserts the feasibility of attaining stage 4 provided that specific aspects are adequately handled. These aspects include overcoming resistance to the further expansion of English beyond its current functional strongholds, such as among upper social classes and within professional domains, as well as addressing the animosity and lack of acceptance towards English among lower social classes. The inclusion of diverse industries and social strata has the potential to facilitate the legitimization of the PhilE in multiple areas and contexts.

Joining Schneider (2007), Martin (2014) supported the claim that PhilE is still at stage 3 which is the nativization process. Martin argued that PhilE is linked chiefly within the parameter of educated elite Filipinos and it is far more likely to be accepted by the Filipino masses. Learning the Filipino language or the Tagalog was foreseen as an important skill when applying for local jobs. It was aided by the findings of Go and Gustilo (2013) who asserted that urban factory workers favored the use of Filipino language as a language for daily conversations but tend to shift when talking to middle/upper class. Empirical evidence show that even educated Filipinos express doubt and insecurity towards PhilE as recorded in several studies (Bautista, 2001; Martin, 2010; Tupas, 2006, 2010).

In terms of codification, Martin (2014) made reference to the Anvil Macquarie lexicon of Philippine English. Martin's reference to such corpus database implied the legitimacy of scope of Philippine English variety.

In conclusion, Martin (2014) argued that PhilE is not widely embraced as a representative identity among the majority of Filipinos. Despite the utilitarian motivations of desiring proficiency in the language for purposes such as higher education or international employment, it is nevertheless commonly perceived as being linked to elitism and anti-nationalist sentiments (Martin, 2014). Furthermore, Martin contends that PhilE has not yet met the necessary criteria for progressing into stage 4 or achieving endonormative stabilization.

Arguments that PhilE is at stage 4 endonormative stabilization

Contrariwise to the claims of Schneider (2007) and Martin (2014), Collins and Borlongan (2017), Bernardo (2017), and Gonzales (2017) argued that PhilE is already at stage 4, endonormative stabilization. Below are their explanations:

1. Collins and Borlongan (2017) outlined the stages in which PhilE has achieved the layers of stage 3 and stage 4. They noted three sub-arguments that aligned with the three characteristics of stage 4 namely, (1) obtaining national independence, (2) identity construction, and (3) linguistic developments.

1.1 Obtaining national independence. Collins and Borlongan (2017) asserted that the revision of identity triggers the ‘‘Event X’’ which is seen in Phase 3 and 4, had already happened in the archipelago. Schneider (2007, p. 49) defined ‘‘Event X’’ as ‘‘...makes it perfectly clear to the settlers that there is an inverse misrelationship between the (high) importance which they used to place on the mother country and the (considerably lower) importance which the (former) colony is given by the homeland’’. In this case, the Philippine independence must be obtained from the United States of America (USA), the former colonizer. Collins and Borlongan (2017) argued using the enforcement of two political acts in 1946: Tydings Rehabilitation Act and the Trade Relations Act. Although these acts, as what Collins and Borlongan reported, were covertly favored USA in trade, it is still evident of collapsed relations with the former colonizer. In addition, the Philippine Senate's rejection of the 1947 Military Bases Agreement between the Philippines and the United States in 1991, as well as the subsequent recall of a limited humanitarian mission in Iraq in July 2004, were actions that caused displeasure on the part of the United States.

1.2 Identity construction. Collins and Borlongan (2017) referred to the (re)naming of national language ‘from Filipino to Pilipino’ in the 1972 constitution, the revision of bilingual education in 1974 followed by the implementation of Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) in 2012.

These advancements in language policy and practice are indicators that Filipinos and the Philippines have developed national identity. Such characteristic indicates achievement of PhilE at stage 4 in the Dynamic Model.

1.3 Linguistic developments. Collins and Borlongan (2017) argued that PhilE has achieved enormous developments that qualifies for stage 4 endonormative stabilization. The growing and bolstering research about PhilE and its contribution to international recognition are significant indicators that PhilE has developed and stabilized as a new variety. The studies of Bautista (1996) on *Occupation-based Englishes*, Llamzon (1997) on *Lectal Englishes*, and Schneider (2016) on *Hybrid Englishes* morphed into a research area that led to linguistic development of PhilE. Likewise, PhilE words have also grown to the next level. PhilE has already hegemonized, making it possible for codification through reference grammar and dictionaries despite evidence of residual linguistic conservatism. Abovementioned, those sundry findings implied that PhilE continuously progresses and stabilizes endonormatively.

2. On a similar vein, Bernardo (2017) argued that PhilE is at stage 4. This is supported by the evolution of local standards that were accepted by the vast majority of ELT classrooms. Moreover, this adherence elevates the position of PhilE in the curriculum and instruction. The usage and manifestations of PhilE in Education imply that it has proven its existence. Therefore, it had finally finished the process of nativization (stage 3) and jumping to endonormative stabilization (stage 4).
3. On the viewpoint of Gonzales (2017), PhilE is at the ‘‘dawn’’ of the final stage, which is differentiation. Gonzales based his arguments on Schneider (2007) that being in stage 5 does not mean complete monolingualism; in fact, it is possible to have co-existing indigenous languages along with English. Just like in Australia and New Zealand, Philippines matched the profile. While English is spoken, Tagalog is still present. Hence, this argument suggests that PhilE has the potential to be at stage 5.

Conclusion

This paper reviewed existing literature on Philippine English, an English variety that has flourished as a research area, as a standard and intelligible variety, and as a variety of its own. The review revealed that there is a growing and expanding number of studies about Philippine English. From its pluricentric nature to its implication for glocal communication and language education. More so that the battle of Filipinos and many other former colonies for independence and nationhood are crystalized in research. The battle, though it may not be long overdue, is a reflection of unity among scholars who worked to advance local ideas from the

global south. The case of Philippine English is one momentous crusade to counter hegemonic, imperialistic, and colonial ideas which origins are likely from the global north.

The authors in this paper, together with the scholars of Philippine English, advocate and celebrate the vibrant implication of Philippine English which many Filipinos and Asian nations benefit in the present time. Indeed, the milestone effect of World Englishes and Pluri/multilingualism can now be observed in curriculum and instruction, classroom discourses, and policy implementation. While these decolonial advancements are thriving, more and more research of Philippine English and its role in media, communication technology, and other domains are some of the gaps that need to be explored. The authors recommend further investigation of Philippine English not just in the domain of education but also in governance, media, and technology.

References

- Alieto, E., & Rillo, R. (2018). Language Attitudes of English Language Teachers (ELTs) Towards Philippine English. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 13, 84-110.
- Alonsagay, I., & Nolasco, J. (2010). Adversativity and the get-passive in Philippine and British English: A corpus-based contrastive study. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 41, 1-13.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (1996). Notes on three sub-varieties of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics* (pp. 93-101). Manila, the Philippines: De La Salle University Press.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2000). *Defining standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features*. De La Salle University Press.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2001). Attitudes of selected Luzon University students and faculty towards Philippine English. In M. L. G. Tayao et al. (Eds.), *Rosario E. Maminta in focus: Selected writings in applied linguistics* (pp. 263-273). Quezon City: Philippine Association for Language Teaching.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2004). Tagalog-English code switching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5, 226-233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03024960>
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2010a). Comparing spoken and written text-types in Singapore English and Philippine English. In D. J. Y. Bayot (Ed.), *Inter/sections: Isagani R. Cruz and friends* (pp. 175-200). Manila, the Philippines: De La Salle University Academic Publications Office & Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2010b). Exemplary analyses of the Philippine English corpus. In L. Billings & N. Goudswaard (Eds.), *Piakandatu ami Dr. Howard P. McKaughan* (pp. 5-23). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines & SIL Philippines.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2014). Attitudes of English Language Faculty In Three Leading Philippine Universities Toward Philippine English. *Asian Englishes* 4(1):4-32. DOI:10.1080/13488678.2001.10801062
- Bautista, M. L. S., & Bolton, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Bautista, M.L.S., Lising, J.L.V., & Dayag, D.T. (1999). *Philippine English data for the International Corpus of English project*. Manila, Philippines: University Research Coordination Office, De La Salle University.
- Bernardo, A. (2017). Philippine English in the ESL Classroom: A Much Closer Look. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 117-144.
- Borlongan, A. M. (2008). Tag questions in Philippine English. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 39, 109-133.
- Borlongan, A. M. (2011). Some aspects of the morphosyntax of Philippine English. In M. L. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English* (pp. 187-200). Manila, the Philippines: Anvil Publishing, Inc.

- Borlongan, A. M. (2015). Conyo English: Explorations of Philippine English sociolects. In D. Salazar (Chair), *Contemporary studies of Philippine English*. Symposium convened at the 21st Conference of the International Association for World Englishes, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Borlongan, A. M. (2016). Relocating Philippine English in Schneider's dynamic model. *Asian Englishes*, 18(3), 232–241. doi:10.1080/13488678.2016.1223067
- Borlongan, A. M. (2023). Standard Philippine English. In A. M. Borlongan (Ed), *Philippine English: Development, Structure, and Sociology of English in the Philippines*, *Routledge Studies in World Englishes* (pp.109-199). DOI: 10.4324/9780429427824-20
- Collins, P. (2008). The progressive aspect in World Englishes: A corpus-based study. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 28, 225-249.
- Collins, P. (2009). Modals and quasi-modals in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 28, 281-292.
- Collins, P. (2011). Variable agreement in the existential-there construction in Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English*. (pp. 175-186). Manila, the Philippines: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Collins, P. & Borlongan, A. (2017). Has Philippine English attained linguistic independence? The grammatical evidence. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 10-24.
- Coronel, L. (2011). Patterns of intensifier usage in Philippine English. In M. L. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English* (pp. 93-116). Manila, the Philippines: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Dayag, D. T. (2007). Exploring the Intelligibility of Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, 10(1), 4–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2007.10801197>
- De Leon, K. D. (2016). *The intelligibility of Philippine English to selected ASEAN countries* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines.
- De Leon, K., Parina, J.C., & Panopio, J.M. (2021). Intelligibility of Philippine English to a Selected ASEAN Country – Thailand. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, 3(1), 31–49. <https://doi.org/10.56498/31202148>.
- Dimaculangan, N. G. & Gustilo, L. (2018). Attitudes of Filipino English Teachers Toward 21st Century Philippine English Writing. *Advanced Science Letters*, 24 (11): 8349-8352. DOI: 10.1166/asl.2018.12560
- Dita, S. N. (2013). Intelligibility and comprehensibility of Philippine English to international students. *A paper presented at the 23rd conference of the International Association for World Englishes (LAWE23)*, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, USA.
- Dita, S. N., & De Leon, K. D. (2017). The intelligibility and comprehensibility of Philippine English to EFL speakers. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19(2), 100-116.

- Dita, S. N., & De Leon, K. D. (2023). Intelligibility. In A. M. Borlongan (Ed.), *Philippine English: Development, Structure, and Sociology of English in the Philippines*, Routledge Studies in World Englishes (pp. 109-199). DOI: 10.4324/9780429427824-20
- Friginal, E. (2011). The modal verb would in spoken and written Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English* (pp. 51-74). Manila, the Philippines: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Fuchs, R. (2019). The Americanisation of Philippine English: Recent diachronic change in spelling and lexis. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 64-87.
- Go, M. A., & Gustilo, L. E. (2013). Tagalog or Taglish: The lingua franca of Filipino urban factory workers. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 10, 57-87.
- Gonzalez, A. (1985). *Studies on Philippine English*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Gonzales, W. D. W. (2017). Philippine Englishes. *Asian Englishes*. Taylor and Francis Online. 19 (1), 79-95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1274574>
- Gonzalez, A. & Bautista, M. L. S. (1986). *Language surveys in the Philippines (1966-1984)*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Gustilo, L., Tocalo, A. W. I., Calingasan, K. A. (2019). The intelligibility and acceptability of Internet Philippine English (IPE): Their implications for English language teaching in the new English varieties. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21 (2): 83-104.
- Hernandez, H. P. (2017). A (forensic) stylistic analysis of adverbials of attitude and emphasis in supreme court decisions in Philippine English. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 455-466. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8354>
- Hundt, M. (2006). The committee has/have decided...: On concord patterns with collective nouns in inner and outer circle varieties of English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 34, 206-232.
- Hundt, M. (2009). Global features – local norms? A case study on the progressive passive. In T. Hoffman & L. Siebers (Eds.), *World Englishes: Problems, properties, and prospects (Selected papers from the 13th LAWE Conference* (pp. 287-308). Amsterdam, the Netherlands & Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). World Englishes. In C. Leung and B. V. Street (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to English Studies* First edition (pp. 33-45). Abingdon: Routledge Handbooks Online.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985) Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp.11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lim, J., & Borlongan, A. M. (2013). The morphosyntax of Hong Kong and Indian Englishes: A corpus-based analysis. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 1, 20-34.

- Llamzon, T. A. (1997). The phonology of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context* (pp. 41–48). Sydney: De Macquarie Library Pty. Ltd.
- Mangon, R. & Lim, A. (2023, August 5). LIST: Filipino words and phrases that made it to the Oxford English Dictionary, *The Philippine Star- Life*. <https://philstarlife.com/gecky/413121-list-filipino-words-phrases-oxford-english-dictionary>
- Martin, I. P. (2010). Periphery ELT: The politics and practice of teaching English in the Philippines. In A. Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 247–264). London: Routledge
- Martin, I. P. (2014). Beyond nativization?: Philippine English in Schneider’s dynamic model. In S. Buschfeld, T. Homann, M. Huber, & A. Kautzsch (Eds.), *The evolution of Englishes: The dynamic model and beyond* (pp. 70–85). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Martin, I. P. (2020). Philippine English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The Handbook of Asian English First Edition* (pp.479-500). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Nelson G. (2005). Expressing future time in Philippine English. In D. T. Dayag & J. S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond: A festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista* (pp. 41-59). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Peters, P. (2009). The mandative subjunctive in spoken English. In P. Peters, P. Collins, & A. Smith, Adam (Eds.), *Comparative studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and beyond*. (pp. 125-138). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Rentillo, P. (2023). Attitudes. In A. M. Borlongan (Ed), *Philippine English: Development, Structure, and Sociology of English in the Philippines, Routledge Studies in World Englishes* (pp. 109-199). DOI: 10.4324/9780429427824-20
- Salazar, D. (2017). Philippine English in the Oxford English Dictionary: A recent advancements and implications for ESL in the Philippines. *Philippine ESL Journal*. Vol. 19, pp. 45-59.
- Schneider, E. W. (2003). The dynamics of new Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, 79, 233-281.
- Schneider, E. W. (2004). How to trace structural nativization: Particle verbs in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 23, 227-249.
- Schneider, E. W. (2005). The subjunctive in Philippine English. In D. T. Dayag & J. S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond: A festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista* (pp. 27-40). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Schneider, E. W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties of English around the world*. Cambridge, the United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. W. (2011). Colonization, Globalization, and the Sociolinguistics of World Englishes. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of*

sociolinguistics (pp. 335–354). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511997068.025>

- Schneider, E. W. (2011). The subjunctive in Philippine English: An updated assessment. In M.L. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English* (pp. 159-173). Manila, the Philippines: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Schneider, E. (2016). Hybrid Englishes: An exploratory survey. *World Englishes*, 35, 339–354.
- Schneider, E. W. (2017). Philippine English on the Move: An Afterword. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 145.
- Suárez-Gómez, C., & Seoane, E. (2013). “They have published a new cultural policy that has just come out”: Competing forms in spoken and written New Englishes. In K. Bech & G. Andersen (Eds.), *English corpus linguistics: Variation in time, space and genre* (pp. 163- 182). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Rodopi.
- Thompson, R. M. (2003). *Filipino English and Taglish: Language switching from multiple perspectives*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands & Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins
- Tonio, J. (2019). Intelligibility of Philippine English to Young International Students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 25 (5.1), 427 - 452.
- Tupas, T. R. F. (2006). Standard Englishes: Pedagogical paradigms and their conditions of (im)possibility. In R. Rudby & M. Saracen (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, Global Rules*. (pp. 168-185). London, the United Kingdom: Continuum.
- Tupas, T. R. F. (2010). Which norms in everyday practice and why? In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 567-579). London, the United Kingdom: Routledge

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Soberano, C., & Verdan, R. (2024). The Developments in Philippine English Research. *LANGUAGE ART*, 9(3): 89-106. Shiraz, Iran.

DOI: 10.22046/LA.2024.18

URL: <https://www.languageart.ir/index.php/LA/article/view/402>





تحولات در پژوهش زبان انگلیسی فیلیپینی

رولون وردان^۱

دانشجوی کارشناسی آموزش متوسطه با گرایش زبان انگلیسی، دانشگاه ملی،
مانیل، فیلیپین.

دکتر کارلو جی. سوبرانو^۲

استادیار گروه آموزش متوسطه با گرایش زبان انگلیسی، دانشگاه ملی،
مانیل، فیلیپین.

(تاریخ دریافت: ۱۹ شهریور ۱۴۰۲؛ تاریخ پذیرش: ۳ دی ۱۴۰۲؛ تاریخ انتشار: ۱۱ شهریور ۱۴۰۳)

در این مقاله، نویسندگان به بررسی تحولات ادبیات مرتبط با انگلیسی فیلیپینی پرداخته‌اند. به طور مشخص، این مطالعه به موارد زیر می‌پردازد: (۱) پیدایش گونه‌های انگلیسی فیلیپینی؛ (۲) مقایسه انگلیسی فیلیپینی با انگلیسی آمریکایی و سایر گونه‌ها؛ (۳) قابلیت درک انگلیسی فیلیپینی؛ (۴) نگرش مدرسان زبان انگلیسی نسبت به انگلیسی فیلیپینی؛ و (۵) جایگاه انگلیسی فیلیپینی در مدل پویای شنايدر. این مرور موضوعی، تحولات جاری در پژوهش‌های انگلیسی فیلیپینی را مورد بحث قرار داده و زمینه را برای کشف هرچه بیشتر زیرگونه‌های (یا گونه‌های فرعی) آن فراهم می‌آورد. همچنین، مرور مناقشات موجود بر سر وضعیت انگلیسی فیلیپینی به خوانندگان پژوهشگر امکان می‌دهد تا مسیرها و جهت‌گیری‌های آتی تحقیقات را ترسیم کنند. چنین مروری برای مدرسان زبان انگلیسی و پژوهشگران حوزه زبان‌شناسی که در پی مطالعه جامع انگلیسی فیلیپینی و (باز) جهت‌دهی به ایدئولوژی‌های زبانی و سیاست‌های زبانی در فیلیپین هستند، سودمند خواهد بود. این امر می‌تواند به دگرگونی‌هایی در برنامه درسی و روش‌شناسی تدریس، نظریه و عمل در آموزش زبان انگلیسی، و همچنین پذیرش چارچوب‌ها و سیاست‌هایی از سوی کشورهای فیلیپینی که گونه‌های زبانی آن‌ها تاکنون مستند یا مطالعه نشده است، بینجامد.

واژه‌های کلیدی: انگلیسی فیلیپینی، انگلیسی‌های جهان، گونه‌های زبانی، آموزش زبان انگلیسی.

^۱ E-mail: vrollven@gmail.com

^۲ E-mail: cgsobrano@national-u.edu.ph