

Demographic Profile and Teachers' Language Attitudes Toward Philippine English

Joanne Echalico- Bermillo

Department of Language Education, Central Mindanao University, Maramag, Bukidnon,
Philippines

Rezeille May Calvez- Amilbahar

Department of English Language and Literature, University of Southern Mindanao, Kabacan,
North Cotabato, Philippines

Correspondence: Joanne E. Bermillo Email: jebermillo@gmail.com

Abstract: This study investigated the demographic profile of English language teachers of the two state universities in Mindanao and their language attitudes toward Philippine English. A total of 36 participants answered the Likert Scale Survey Language Attitude questionnaire adopted from Escalona (n.d) and Rillo & Alieto (2018). The demographic profile showed that most of the language teachers, about 31%, taught between 11-15 years, and 67% of them have earned their master's degrees. Furthermore, language teachers exhibited a *positive* attitude toward Philippine English. They *agree* on both the positive and negative statements about Philippine English. This conveys that teachers recognize Philippine English as one of the varieties of Standard English. However, there was no significant relationship between the demographic factors and the attitude of teachers toward Philippine English.

Keywords: Demographic profile; language attitude; Philippine English; English language teachers

1. Introduction

“The variety of English spoken by a particular people is the result of their linguistic, political, geographical, language contact, and cultural heritage and identity” Astrero (2017).

Linguistically, the Philippines has developed an autonomous variety of English with its own self-contained system understood by many Filipinos and in different language domains (McKaughan, 1993, in Escalona, n.d.). It is an English spoken in the Philippines and belongs to the New Varieties of English (Bautista, 2001). Accounting on its conception, Gonzalez (1972) cited the birth of Philippine English, which took place around 1920s when Filipinos were taught English by Filipino teachers. But it was during the late 1960s when Llamzon (1969) delved into the striking development of English that is distinctively a Filipino way. In his *Standard Filipino English* monograph, he cited three important claims stating that Philippine English as a variety distinct from American and British exists, which by then had become standardized, and that there

was a large number of native and near-native speakers of English in the country, and that a local type of English had to be taught in schools (Borlongan, 2017).

Although new, Bautista (2000) claimed that Philippine English is also a legitimate variety akin to the older varieties like British, American, Canadian, and Australian English. She cited that criteria of new Englishes as a result of colonization "are institutionalized, nativized and stable, developed through the educational system in a bilingual context, and are creative" and that only a few serious scholars have given attention to the unsuitability of new Englishes as a model for English language users that clearly put Philippine English as one of the non-native Englishes. Moreover, she advocated that it is not a badly learned English as a second language, or its distinctive features are errors committed by non-experts in American standards. It can be informally used commonly in spoken but can also be formal when used by educated speakers. The latter is considered acceptable among educated Filipinos, and prospectively recognized as the Standard Philippine English (Astrero, 2017). However, the position of Philippine English as a standard has been challenged in recent years. Borlongan (2017) cited Gonzalez (1972) and Hidalgo (1970) in their inquiry about Llamzon's claims on emerging local English as a standard kind and their argument on the sizable number of native local English speakers. Martin (2014) contended that awareness of this does not guarantee outright acceptance. Also, Gonzales (1997, cited in Escalano, n.d) remarked that between American and Philippine English, the former is recognized as legitimate and seen as ideal, while the latter is deemed illegitimate but can be tolerated by local standards.

Rillo and Alieto (2018) mentioned researchers such as Dayag (2012) and De Leon (2016) acknowledging the acceptability of nativized Philippine English (PE), which has been advocated to be included in Philippine ESL classes (Bernardo, 2017). The school environment is where speakers can have exposure to the usage of the local English variety. Although the nativized variety is not yet clearly stipulated in the current K-12 English curriculum, its distinctive features have been observed conversationally between teachers and students and in their examinations (Ibid). In an educational context, Bernardo suggests that by making syllabi that explicitly support Philippine English distinctiveness in phonological, lexical, syntactic, and sociolinguistic realities, their own pedagogy approaches may pave the way to the elevation of the local English variety. In this sense, the rise of Philippine English through education could facilitate an understanding of the exceptionality of identity and the richness of the culture of the Filipinos. Congruous to De Leon (2016), Philippine English, as a native local English variety, distinguishes Filipino as having distinct cultures and identities.

In relation to acceptability, teachers' role in promoting Philippine English variety is essential. How they perceive Philippine English could influence the language attitude of their students. As language educators, they may enable or disable the interests of their learners on their acceptability of the new English variety not only as part of the teaching and learning process but also in the realization of its significance to one's individuality. In the study of

Bautista (2004), the result generated a positive attitude of language educators toward Philippine English; however, this was only limited to universities in Manila. Further, in the study of Tupas (2016) based on Rillo and Alieto (2018), the result generated a negative attitude in PE, and the respondents conceived the variety as a non-ideal model of English. These studies, however, do not provide wide-ranging results in determining language attitudes toward Philippine English, particularly among the higher education English language teachers. Bernardo (2017) mentioned that "more and more tertiary students are enticed to the ELT enterprise." This conception also presupposes awareness and acceptability of Philippine English as an emerging nativized variety, even at the tertiary level.

Hence, the purpose of this study is mainly to determine the language attitude of the tertiary English language teachers in the two universities in Mindanao, supposing striking results which may be added to the emergent research data exploring the acceptability of Philippine English. The researchers decided to conduct their study on their respective schools in Mindanao to gather substantial data representing respondents from the southern part of the country. Also, another reason is for convenience purposes to attain expedience of data collection since the study took place amidst a pandemic.

The study also explored the relationship between the demographic profile, such as years of service, educational attainment, and the respondents' language attitude toward Philippine English. Since the respondents are all professionals working in the academe, the researchers only included these variables, years of service and educational attainment perceived to be contributory to the extent of their experiences and understanding in the field of Philippine English. The result on these aspects may open further significant research on the factors that might influence the respondents' language attitudinal perspectives.

1.1. Research Questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the teachers in terms of:
 - a. Years of Service
 - b. Educational Attainment
2. What is the teachers' attitude towards Philippine English?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the demographic factors and the attitude of teachers towards Philippine English?

1.2. Hypotheses of the Study:

To predict the outcome of the study, the following null hypotheses are constructed:

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between the participants' years of service and their attitude toward Philippine English.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between the participants' educational attainment and attitude toward Philippine English.

1.3. Limitations of the Study

Although the researchers chose to have a complete enumeration, meaning taking all the samples to be considered as participants due to the small population, participants' participation is limited to those who are only willing to participate. Thus, this may affect the generalizability of the population. Another limitation of the study is the use of the online platform in the administration of the survey questionnaire; hence, it may pose some issues like participants may just hit buttons to finish answering since online mode provides less accountability or chances of somebody else will answer the question in behalf of the right participant. Moreover, participants' responses may be prompted by the idea of social norms or standards rather than by their personal attitudes and beliefs. On the other hand, the present study does not include the acceptability of Filipinism in spoken attitude towards English but focuses only on the attitude toward Philippine English in general. Lastly, the study is only limited to the years of service and educational attainment to correlate with the attitude towards Philippine English. It is in the view of the researchers that since CMO 75, s. 2017 sets a general requirement for faculty teaching at the tertiary level to be at least a master's degree. It might be worth finding its implication to their attitude in PE, considering that a graduate with a master's degree could be the highest possible educational qualification in the other educational sectors like the DepEd and TESDA. Years of service are restricted to the teaching experience in language teaching only. Some faculty members did practice the profession before entering the university and were not teaching English subjects.

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Teachers' Years of Service and Language Attitude

It was mentioned that teachers are important in the process of Philippine English acceptability. With this, the researchers explored the relationship between the CMU and USM English language teachers' language attitudes toward Philippine English and their years of service and educational attainment. While other studies on language attitudes and PE acceptability do not include much on demographic characteristics such as years of service and educational attainment for correlation, Rillo and Alieto (2018) delved into these variables comprising gender, years of service, socio-economic status, and educational attainment. On the related variables like years of service correlated to their language attitudes in Philippine English, their study revealed a meaningful correlation between them.

2.2. Teachers' Educational Attainment and Language Attitude

Rillo and Alieto (2018) conducted a study on the language attitude of English Language Teachers assigned at the secondary level of basic education. Their study investigates the relationship between language attitude and socio-demographic variables, including gender, years of service, socio-economic status, and educational attainment. Similar to the years of service, the result also obtained meaningful results, particularly on the correlation between educational attainment and the respondents' language attitude in Philippine English. The researchers recommended further exploring this aspect of the study to gather more comprehensive results concluding whether there is a correlation or none among the studied variables.

2.3. Language Attitudes towards Philippine English

A prominent study on Philippine English conducted by Bautista (2001) influenced many studies along this line. Her study utilized 86 faculty members of the English Department of the three-prominent universities in the Philippines, including the Ateneo de Manila University, De La Salle University, and the University of the Philippines. The participants were asked to answer a Likert Scale questionnaire that contained negative and positive arguments on Philippine English. It revealed that teachers had a very positive attitude toward Philippine English.

Escalona (n.d.) found sense in Bautista's study and replicated it by investigating the attitude of the English teachers of Bukidnon State University towards Philippine English. It involves 19 teachers who were asked to answer the Likert Scale survey questionnaire, which contains positive and negative statements on Philippine English. Generally, their responses revealed a *positive* attitude towards the Philippine English variety of Standard English. The participants agreed on the positive statements on Philippine English; however, negative statements were strongly disagreed. Therefore, the participants' conformity to the positive statements would mean they had a positive attitude toward Philippine English. On the other hand, participants' disagreement on most of the statements would imply that teachers favor Philippine English.

A study having a similar result was also conducted by Rillo & Alieto (2018), investigating the 52 secondary teachers of basic education. The study utilized the self-developed Language Attitude Questionnaire (LAQ). The study results displayed that participants showed a positive attitude toward Philippine English.

Another study related to the present study that deals with the attitude toward Englishes is the study of Matsuura, et al. (1994) which examined Japanese students' attitudes toward non-native varieties of English. Results revealed that the Japanese viewed American English more favorably than the other varieties. It was also found out that the Japanese prefer native varieties of English to American accents and have a negative attitude towards the non-native varieties.

While Matsuura et al. studied American and Japanese English varieties, the present study delves into Philippine English, a difference in its variety only.

Borlongan (2009) reported that the study on language use, attitudes, and identity related to Philippine English among young generation Filipinos of selected students from a Philippine private university shows that students would prefer the English language in most domains and activities. Moreover, it also depicted that English penetrates Filipino society as it is prevalently used in prayers, homes, and intimate relations. Although Borlongan's study examined the attitude of Filipino students toward Philippine English in various domains, it still has relevance to the existing study because it deals with the attitude of Filipino language teachers toward Philippine English. In other words, both studies talked about the attitudes of Filipinos toward Philippine English.

However, two studies under survey ran counter to the positive attitude towards Philippine English. One is the study by Tupas (2006) in which the pre-service teachers believed that Philippine English is not an ideal model of English. The other study was by Martin (2014) which teachers modeled American English and felt conscious or hesitant in speaking Philippine English. These recent findings are evidence of measly studies on Philippine English. Therefore, more studies on Philippine English are needed to establish the general attitude of language teachers toward Philippine English.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study employs a quantitative descriptive research design. This choice is guided by the idea of Zulueta and Costales (2003), saying that the quantitative descriptive method is a research procedure involving assigning numerical values to the variables. Furthermore, Soliven (2001), cited Navarro and Santos (2011), added that this quantitative descriptive research describes a given population's facts and characteristics. In the context of the study, the research problems will be answered using a survey questionnaire, and the data will be quantified using statistical tools, described, and interpreted. With this, the quantitative descriptive method is considered the most appropriate for this study.

3.2. Participants

The participants were chosen purposively who were English language teachers teaching at the college level. Forty participants were identified; however, only thirty-six (36) responded to participate in this research. Nineteen were from Central Mindanao University (CMU), and seventeen were from the University of Southern Mindanao (USM).

Furthermore, teacher participants from Central Mindanao University are handling the Purposive Communication, English Graduate courses, BSEd English major subjects, and Bachelor of Arts in English Language Studies subjects. On the other hand, teacher participants from the University of Southern Mindanao are teaching language and literature subjects, English Graduate courses, and Bachelor of Arts in English Language major subjects. Their department was under the College of Arts and Social Sciences regarded as one of the service colleges in the university.

3.3. Setting of the Study

Two state universities in Mindanao served as research sites for the study. These were also the universities where the researchers were teaching. One is Central Mindanao University (CMU) founded in 1910, located at Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines. Central Mindanao University is one of the oldest premier universities in the southern Philippines. CMU is recognized by the Commission on Higher Education (Philippines) as the Center of Excellence in the field of Agriculture, Forestry, Veterinary Medicine and Biology; and Center of Development in Mathematics, Environmental Science and Teacher Education. In 2017, CMU became the first higher education institution in Mindanao to be awarded Institutional Accreditation (Level II) by the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Central_Mindanao_University). The university has nine colleges offering both undergraduate and graduate degree programs: College of Arts and Sciences, College of Agriculture, College of Business and Management, College of Education, College of Engineering, College of Human Ecology, College of Forestry, College of Nursing and College of Veterinary Medicine with approximately twelve thousand students. Presently, Central Mindanao University is an ISO-accredited school and a consistently top-performing university in the Philippines. The other university is the University of Southern Mindanao (USM). It is a premier land grant university in the southern Philippines founded in 1954. USM is one of the leading state universities in the Philippines, which achieved excellence in agriculture education and one among state-owned universities and colleges (SUCs) that earned Level IV status. USM is composed of 14 colleges that offer both graduate and undergraduate courses: College of Agriculture, College of Arts and Social Sciences, College of Science and Mathematics, College of Veterinary Medicine, College of Business, Development Economics and Management, College of Education, College of Engineering and Information Technology, College of Health Sciences, College of Human Ecology and Food Sciences, College of Trades and Industry, Institute of Middle East and Asian Studies, Institute of Sports, Physical Education and Recreation, College of Medicine and College of Law. Also, the university has expanded into five campuses: Kabacan Main Campus, Kidapawan City Campus, Libungan and Alamada Campuses, Buluan Campus, and Mlang Campus (usm.edu.ph).

3.4. Instruments

The study employed an adopted Escalona (n.d.) survey questionnaire on the Language Attitude towards Philippine English and Rillo & Alieto (2018) self-developed Language Attitude Questionnaire. A total of ten statements (items numbers 1,2,3,4,5,6, 10, 11,12,13) in the research questionnaire were taken from Escalona's research, while five items (numbers 7, 8, 9, 14,15) followed Rillo & Alieto's study.

Moreover, the questionnaire has two parts. Part 1 consists of the demographic questions where the participants chose to tick the box of their right responses. They were asked to choose years of service of five-year intervals ranging from 1- 35 years. Length of teaching experience only includes teaching experience as a language teacher, including experiences before joining the university. For educational attainment they were asked to select a baccalaureate, masters, or doctorate degree. Part 2 is composed of fifteen items Language Attitude statements. The questionnaire includes eight (8) positive statements and seven (7) negative statements to be evaluated from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" using the five-point Likert Scale where 1- strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3-neutral, 4- agree, and 5- strongly agree.

3.5. Procedure

The questionnaire did not undergo reliability testing since it was already standardized and used both by Escalona (n.d.) and Rillo & Alieto (2018) in the Philippine setting and in the context of the same human subjects, which are tertiary language teachers. For this reason, the homogeneity of the context provides confidence to the researchers to immediately adopt the instrument. Furthermore, prior to the adoption of the instrument, the researchers secure permission from the authors to adopt the instrument by sending an email.

Because of the pandemic and the two universities were adopting the Work-from-Home scheme, the researchers decided to design the questionnaire using Google forms and send it to the participants' messenger accounts and email addresses. The google form contains a short orientation on what the study is about, the purpose, what it intends to measure, and why doing such a research project. The end part of the form provides the provision statement of informed consent. Should the participants wish to participate in the research, they will just click the OK button and then proceed with Part 1 and Part 2 of the questionnaire. It will take about 3-5 minutes for the participants to answer the whole questionnaire. All the responses were recorded automatically to the researchers' email id. The results were coded and interpreted using the scale:

Scale	Qualifying Statement	Qualifying Description
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	The teacher has a highly positive/negative attitude on the positive/negative statement of the Philippine English

3.41-4.20	Agree	The teacher has positive/negative attitude on the positive negative statement of the Philippine English
2.61-3.40	Neutral	The teacher has an impartial attitude on the positive/ negative statement of the Philippine English
1.81-2.60	Disagree	The teacher has positive/ negative attitude on the positive/ negative statement of the Philippine English
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	The teacher has a highly positive/ negative attitude on the positive/ negative statement of the Philippine English

3.6. Methods of Analysis

In order to identify the demographic profile of the participants, descriptive statistics, frequency counts, and percentage values were used. Moreover, the mean was computed to determine the participants' language attitudes. On the other hand, Spearman Rank Correlation was employed to find out the significant relationship between the demographic factors and the attitude of teachers towards Philippine English.

4. Findings

4.1. Demographic profile of the participants

In order to determine the years of service and the educational attainment of the participants, their responses to the survey questionnaire were tallied using frequency counts and percentage values.

Tables 1 and 2 show the results.

Table 1. The years of service of the participants

	FREQUENCY (n=36)	PERCENTAGE (%)
Years of service		
1-5 years	7	19.44
6-10 years	8	22.22
11-15 years	11	30.56
16-20 years	4	11.11
21-25 years	3	8.33
26-30 years	2	5.56
31-35 years	1	2.78

The result shows that majority of the respondents, with a frequency count of 11 or 31% have taught for 11-15 years, and only one participant has experienced 31-35 years of teaching. Globally looking at the data, more participants have taught for less than 16 years. There were 8 or 22 % taught between 6-10 years and 7 or 19% for 1-5 years, respectively. This may indicate that participants' experience is just in the average years. It maintains that the participants had enough exposure to the language, which may help shape their understanding and beliefs about using Philippine English in class. The result differs from the study of Rillo and Alieto (2018), where majority of their participants belonged to 0-9 years in service.

Table 2. The educational attainment of the participants

Educational attainment	FREQUENCY (n=36)	PERCENTAGE (%)
Baccalaureate Degree	5	13.89
Masteral Degree	24	66.67
Doctorate Degree	7	19.44

Table 2 reveals that 24 or 67% of the participants are Masteral degree holders, 7 or 19% are doctorate holders, and only 5 or 14% are baccalaureate holders. The findings indicate that the majority of the participants have obtained their master's degrees. This also reveals that the two universities adhere to the CHED mandate requiring a master's degree as the minimum qualification requirement for the faculty. Their educational attainment might have provided awareness and influenced their views and beliefs about the language as topics on Philippine English may be introduced or embedded in their courses. The result undermines Rillo and Alieto's (2018) study, which revealed that most of their participants are baccalaureate degree holders.

4.2. Teachers' Attitude towards Philippine English

Tables 3 and 4 show the attitude of the teachers toward the positive and negative statements of Philippine English.

Table 3. Teachers' Attitude of the Positive statements about Philippine English

Statements	Mean	Qualitative Description
1. It is to be expected that there will be regional differences in pronunciation and vocabulary in Philippine English.	4.50	Strongly agree
2. Using words from our own culture is a necessity	4.33	Strongly agree

in developing Philippine English.

3. It is natural to have different varieties of English like Australian English, Singaporean English, and Philippine English.	4.75	Strongly agree
4. Filipinos have the right to modify American English to make it suitable for use in the Philippines.	4.19	Agree
5. The variety of English that should be used in the Philippine newspaper should be educated Philippine English.	4.03	Agree
6. The variety of English that should be used on Philippine radio and television should be educated Philippine English.	4.00	Agree
7. Philippine English should be taught in school.	4.08	Agree
8. Philippine English can be used in formal academic writing.	3.75	Agree
OVERALL MEAN	4.20	Agree

Legend:

RANGE	DESCRIPTION
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree
1.81-2.60	Disagree
2.61-3.40	Neutral
3.41-4.20	Agree
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree

It can be gleaned in table 3 that teacher-participants *Agree* with the positive statements about Philippine English. Three among the eight responses rated *strongly agree*, and five on *agree*. Statements that were rated *strongly agree* include “*It is to be expected that there will be regional differences in pronunciation and vocabulary in Philippine English (4.5)*”, “*Using words from our own culture is a necessity in developing Philippine English (4.33)*” and “*It is natural to have different varieties of English like Australian English, Singaporean English, and Philippine English (4.75)*”. This implies that teachers have accepted Philippine English as one of the varieties of Standard English. As one of the varieties of English, it normally has distinct phonological, lexical, and even grammatical features. Furthermore, teachers demonstrate belief in World Englishes that different varieties of English exist (Australian, Singaporean, etc.) aside from what are considered to be the world’s prestige varieties of English (American & British). It must be recalled that Bautista and Bolton (2008) shared thoughts that Philippine English has been recognized as a variety of World Englishes having a distinct accent and localized vocabulary and has even been used by Filipino writers in English since 1946. Also, teachers are very positive that nurturing the Philippine language must be utilized to foster Filipino culture. Hence, English should be nativized to avoid borrowing from American English. As Jenkins (2003) theorizes, a New English, which includes Philippine English, has become localized and

nativized and has unique linguistic features such as sound, intonation patterns, sentence structure, and words that may be peculiar to Philippine English and yet a legitimate variety of English in the Philippines.

Additionally, this finding confirms the results of the three landmark research cited in this paper that investigated English Language Attitude. One is Bautista (2001), who reported on the positive attitude towards Philippine English of the faculty members of the three leading universities in the Philippines. Second, Escalona's (n.d.) study informed the tertiary English teachers' conformity to the positive statements of Philippine English. Lastly, Rillo and Alieto's (2018) investigation of secondary basic education teachers exhibited a positive attitude toward the Philippine English language.

However, this result undermines the findings of the previous studies that investigated the attitudes toward Philippine English. One is Tupas (2006) which the pre-service teachers consider Philippine English as not an ideal model of English. Another is the study of Martin (2014) which teachers felt hesitant to use Philippine English.

Table 4. Teachers' Attitude of the Negative statements about Philippine English

Statements	Mean	Qualitative Description
9. Teaching learners Philippine English will confuse the language learners.	2.17	Disagree
10. Philippine English is actually mistakes made by people who speak poor English.	1.86	Disagree
11. If we speak Philippine English, we will not be respected by other speakers of English.	1.58	Strongly disagree
12. If we use Philippine English, people from other countries will think we are uneducated.	1.61	Strongly disagree
13. Spoken Philippine English will be internationally accepted only if it does not show traces of regional (ethnic) pronunciation.	1.97	Disagree
14. There is no apparent benefit in learning Philippine English.	1.58	Strongly disagree
15. Philippine English is non-standard variety.	2.17	Disagree
OVERALL MEAN	1.85	Agree

Legend:

RANGE	DESCRIPTION
1.00-1.80	Strongly Agree
1.81-2.60	Agree
2.61-3.40	Neutral
3.41-4.20	Disagree
4.21-5.00	Strongly disagree

Table 4 presents the overall result of the teachers' attitude about the negative statements on Philippine English. The result suggests that generally, teachers *Agree* with the negative

statements. This means that teachers recognize Philippine English and do not agree with any of the negative statements. The table further shows that teachers *strongly disagree* on three items and *disagree* on two items. Statements that they strongly disagree include “*If we speak Philippine English we will not be respected by other speakers of English (1.58)*”, “*If we use Philippine English, people from other countries will think we are uneducated (1.61)*” and “*There is no apparent benefit in learning Philippine English (1.58)*.” Their strong disagreement on these statements would imply that they are proud and willing to promote the Philippine English variety of the English language. It can be construed implicitly that their being cognizant of the prestige of using Philippine English indicates that they embrace the pluracentricity of the language and can be used as an approach to teach it in their classes. Similarly, they might have conceded that their ability to speak Philippine English makes them employed as language teachers at the university. Indeed, many Filipinos survive their work abroad and are preferably hired as ESL/EFL teachers and in BPO companies because of their ability to speak Philippine English variety. The result was supported by the study of Escalona (n.d.), where teachers strongly disagree with the statements about Philippine English. The result of Escalona’s study dictates that the teacher participants have accepted and embraced the legitimacy of Philippine English.

4.3. Relationship Between Socio-Demographic Profile and Teachers’ Attitude Towards Philippine English

Table 5. Test of the relationship between years of service and attitude of teachers towards Philippine English

ATTITUDE	COEFFICIENT	INTERPRETATION	P-VALUE	CONCLUSION
Statement 1	-0.25	Negative weak	0.13	Not significant
Statement 2	0.01	Positive weak	0.96	Not significant
Statement 3	-0.07	Negative weak	0.67	Not significant
Statement 4	0.08	Positive weak	0.66	Not significant
Statement 5	0.11	Positive weak	0.52	Not significant
Statement 6	0.01	Positive weak	0.96	Not significant
Statement 7	-0.19	Negative weak	0.26	Not significant
Statement 8	0.00	No correlation	1.00	Not significant
Statement 9	-0.01	Negative weak	0.96	Not significant
Statement 10	-0.11	Negative weak	0.53	Not significant
Statement 11	0.08	Positive weak	0.65	Not significant
Statement 12	0.08	Positive weak	0.65	Not significant
Statement 13	-0.14	Negative weak	0.41	Not significant
Statement 14	0.00	No correlation	0.99	Not significant
Statement 15	-0.03	Negative weak	0.87	Not significant

Table 5 presents the relationship between the respondents' years of service and their attitude towards Philippine English. Correlational analysis revealed that the null hypothesis on

the relationship between all the statements on the attitude towards Philippine English and years of service was not rejected ($p\text{-value} > .05$). Hence, there is no significant relationship between years of service and the attitude of teachers towards Philippine English. The result indicates that the respondents' years of service in work do not influence their attitude toward Philippine English. The result of the study, however, contradicts Rillo and Alieto's (2018) findings in their exploration of English Language Teachers (ELTs) attitudes toward Philippine English. It was found out that the relationship between the respondents' years of service and their attitude toward Philippine English was meaningful.

Table 6. Test of the relationship between educational attainment and attitude of teachers towards Philippine English.

ATTITUDE	COEFFICIENT	INTERPRETATION	P-VALUE	CONCLUSION
Statement 1	-0.10	Negative weak	0.57	Not significant
Statement 2	0.20	Positive weak	0.25	Not significant
Statement 3	0.17	Positive weak	0.33	Not significant
Statement 4	0.05	Positive weak	0.79	Not significant
Statement 5	0.06	Positive weak	0.73	Not significant
Statement 6	0.05	Positive weak	0.76	Not significant
Statement 7	-0.09	Negative weak	0.60	Not significant
Statement 8	0.00	No correlation	0.99	Not significant
Statement 9	-0.07	Negative weak	0.70	Not significant
Statement 10	-0.27	Negative weak	0.12	Not significant
Statement 11	-0.13	Negative weak	0.46	Not significant
Statement 12	-0.04	Negative weak	0.80	Not significant
Statement 13	-0.19	Negative weak	0.27	Not significant
Statement 14	-0.12	Negative weak	0.48	Not significant
Statement 15	-0.23	Negative weak	0.18	Not significant

Table 6 shows the relationship between educational attainment and attitude of the respondents towards the acceptability of Philippine English. It was revealed that the null hypothesis was not rejected ($p\text{-value} > .05$). Hence, the two variables are not correlated. This means that the respondents' educational attainment does not affect his/ her attitude on the acceptability of the local English variety. Contrary to the result of Rillo & Alieto's (2018) study, they found that the relationship between the respondents' educational attainment and their attitude toward the acceptability of Philippine English is significant.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

In this study, most of the language teachers taught within the bracket of 11-15 years, and most obtained a master's degree. Also, it was found out that the language teachers of CMU and

USM have a positive attitude towards Philippine English as a variety of Standard English. They agree both on the positive and negative statements about Philippine English. As for the correlation between the participants' years of service and educational attainment does not correlate with their language attitude towards Philippine English. Therefore, these factors do not influence their attitude towards Philippine English.

As a general suggestion, it is recommended to conduct research involving a larger population to feature investigations on the years of service and educational attainment. As reported in the other research and confirmed in this study, this demographic factor is not or rarely featured in an investigation. There is a need to establish solid literature to find out the relationships between demographic profiles and language attitudes toward Philippine English. On the other hand, the larger population on the language attitude survey may include all the teachers in various subject areas that use English as a medium of instruction in class at the tertiary level. This will provide very comprehensive results on the wide acceptance of English to all its language users as a medium of instruction. If still proven that responses will yield a positive attitude towards Philippine English, then language policymakers might consider implementing a pluricentric model in teaching ESL in the Philippines. An approach to teaching cognizant of an English variety that is cultured and realistic for Filipinos. Additionally, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) or an interview may be conducted to verify and triangulate responses from the participants.

References

- Astrero, E. (2017). *The millennials' awareness and understanding of Philippine English*. DLSU Research Congress. Retrieved from <https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conferences/research-congressproceedings/2017/LCS/LCS-I-003.pdf>
- Bautista, M. (2000). *Defining standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features*. De La Salle University Press. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346919739_Defining_Standard_Philippine_English_Its_Status_and_Grammatical_Features
- Bautista, M. (2001). World Englishes, Philippine English, and English language education in the Philippines. *Round Table on Creativity and Innovation in English Language Education in Asia and the Pacific*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.11483.39205. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346939352_World_Englishes_Philippine_English_and_English_language_education_in_the_Philippines

Bautista, M. L. S (2001). Attitudes of English language faculty in three leading Philippine

universities toward Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, 4(1), 4-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2001.10801062>

Bautista, M. L. S., & Bolton, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Hongkong University Press.

Bernardo, A. (2017). Philippine English in the ESL classroom: A much closer look. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 9, pp. 117-119. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/36290684/Philippine_English_in_the_ESL_Classroom_A_Much_Closer_Look

Borlongan, A. (2009). A survey on language use, attitudes and identity in relation to Philippine English among young generation Filipinos: An initial sample from a private university. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 9, 74-107. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED505885.pdf>

Borlongan, A. (2017). Contemporary perspectives on Philippine English. *The Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 1-9. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322628546_Contemporary_perspectives_on_Philippine_English

Escalona, S. (n.d.). Attitude towards Philippine English: A case of BSU English Teachers: Citations to Articles Posted to Academia.edu, Academia. February 18, 2022. https://www.academia.edu/27832207/Attitude_towards_Philippine_English_A_Case_of_BSU_English_Teachers

Jennifer, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

Martin, I. (2014). Philippine English Revisited. *World Englishes*, 33(4), 18-25.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12054>

Matsuura, H. & Chiba, R. (1994). Japanese college students' attitudes towards non-native varieties of English. In D. Graddol & J. Swann (Eds.). *Evaluating Language (pp. 52-61). Multilingual Matters*.

Navarro, R. L. & Santos, R. G. (2011). *Research-based teaching and learning*. Lorimar.

Rillo, R. & Alieto, E. (2018). Language attitudes of English Language Teachers (ELTs) towards Philippine English. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, pp 84- 99. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.11218.20164 Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328789176_Language_Attitudes_of_English_Language_Teachers_ELTs_Towards_Philippine_English

Tupas, R. (2006). Standards Englishes: Pedagogical paradigms and their conditions of (im)possibility. In R. Tupas & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the World; Global Rules, Global Roles* (pp. 169-185). Continuum.

Zulueta, F. M. & Costales, N.E.B. (2003). *Methods of research thesis writing and applied linguistics*. National Bookstore.