

ARTICLE

A Periphrastic Glance at Pre-Service and Basic Education ESL Teachers' Attitude toward PhilE and AmE

Nimfa G. Dimaculangan^{1}, Michelle B. Sarmiento², Ma. Cezanne D. Dimaculangan³*

¹ College of Teacher Education, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus, 4009, Philippines

² College of Teacher Education, Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City Campus, 4000, Philippines

³ College of Arts and Sciences, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus, 4009, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Studies on attitudes toward Philippine English and American English have been done; however, the attitudes were examined through direct methods like interviews, survey questionnaires, and acceptability tests for the new vocabularies. The present study employs indirect means, such as the Matched-Guised Technique (MGT), to determine the attitude of pre-service and high school ESL teachers toward spoken PhilE and AmE. It utilizes well acknowledged views on attitude in determining the subjects' attitudes toward the speakers. Analysis shows that the judges have positive attitudes toward the PhilE and AmE. The findings differ from the results of previous studies that utilized direct methods of determining attitudes, which revealed the subjects' ambivalent attitude towards PhilE because of their preference for AmE. The paper recommends more seminars on World Englishes (WE) and PhilE in areas where English speakers are not yet open to such language phenomena. It supports earlier scholars' recommendations of inclusion or integration of WE and PhilE in ESL and EFL classrooms and promotion of the Englishes spoken across the globe with respect.

Keywords: World Englishes; Philippine English; Language attitudes; Matched-guise technique; English language education

***CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

Nimfa G. Dimaculangan, College of Teacher Education, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus, 4009, Philippines; Email: nimfadimaculangan@lspu.edu.ph

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 9 May 2024 | Revised: 23 May 2024 | Accepted: 31 May 2024 | Published Online: 25 June 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6563>

CITATION

Dimaculangan, N.G., Sarmiento, M.B., Dimaculangan M.C.D., 2024. A Periphrastic Glance at Pre-Service and Basic Education ESL Teachers' Attitude toward PhilE and AmE. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 6(3): 74–88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6563>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2024 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The speakers of the English language worldwide have produced hybridized legitimate varieties called New Englishes (Nordquist, 2023), Global Englishes (Galloway and Rose, 2015), or World Englishes (Kachru, 2005). Various models explain the sociolinguistic phenomena of World Englishes (WEs); nonetheless, Kachru's (1992; 2005) framework of Englishes based on their history and functions seems to be the most acknowledged. His concentric circles of WEs come: 1) the first or the Inner Circle, where English emanated and spread globally and where it is the principal function of education and communication; 2) the second or Outer Circle, where varieties of English birthed due to the colonization of UK and USA, and where English is used in education, communication, and other official purposes; and 3) the third circle or the Expanding Circle, where English is used as a foreign language in education and international communication.

American English (AmE), an L1 English variety, among other mother Englishes, is in the Inner Circle of this Kachruvian paradigm whose speakers prescribe the norms, whereas Philippine English (Phile) with other ESL countries is situated within the Outer Circle, within which the speakers do not simply receive the norms but modify them resulting in an indigenized variety (Kachru, 1985; 1992). Phile has been hybridized (e.g., Bautista, 2008; Bolton and Butler, 2009; Gonzales, 2004; Tayao, 2004); thus, it is a distinct variety. It birthed and bloomed along with the educational development under American colonialism from 1898 to 1941. Consequently, Bolton and Bautista (2009) state that the language has dramatically influenced the lives of Filipinos.

Phile has been infused into the Filipinos' daily communication and has become one of the Philippine official languages of government, law, and education. Among Butler's (1999) five determinants of a variety of English, Phile appears to have met the first four requirements, i.e., it has a standard pattern of pronunciation, particular expressions that express the key features of the Phile ecology; a history of Phile

and its community of speakers; and it has rich literature and scholarship (e.g., Bernardo and Madrunio, 2015; Dita and de Leon, 2017; Salazar, 2017).

Phile/PhE/PE/Pinoylish has its phonology, lexicon, and grammar, showing endonormative features that distinguish it from AmE (e.g., Borlongan, 2009). It still competes with AmE; studies show that teachers and students of English (e.g., Gustilo, 2002; Hernandez, 2020b; Martin, 2010) manifest their preference for AmE to Phile although they practically speak Phile. Indeed, the growth and death of Phile side by side with AmE can be determined by the speakers' language attitude, primarily the teachers and students of the language. If the speakers speak it in all formal and informal domains of work, it lives and grows naturally, but if they stigmatize it, it may die a natural death despite rich literature.

A significant number of studies on Phile phonology, lexicon, and grammar and a few attitudinal studies that reveal dissimilar results have been done since the late 60s; however, a cornucopia of research that measures the Filipinos' attitude toward spoken Phile and AmE, and those that used the MGT have been recorded. Thus, this study on Pre-service and Basic Education ESL teachers' attitudes toward the varieties spoken in the Philippines was conducted to contribute to the studies exploring attitudes toward these two Englishes that utilize the Matched-Guised Technique (MGT) in determining attitudes toward the speakers.

1.1 Revisiting language attitude

Psychologists and linguists have various definitions of attitude and language attitude. Bagozzi, 1994a;1994b in Jain (2014) posit that attitude is a superordinate term for feelings, preferences, beliefs, expectations, judgments, appraisals, values, opinions, and related concepts. However, Perloff (2017, p. 87) claims that attitude is not a pure behavior but a learned evaluation of a person, place, or issue that influences thought and action. Further, Albarracin and Shavitt (2018) elucidate that attitude has a subject matter, which can be an object, a person,

or an abstract idea. They note that attitudes toward people are studied in terms of interpersonal liking, self-esteem, and values.

The present paper deals with attitudes toward liking or disliking English speakers. Three among the qualifications of language attitude are Perloff's (2017), Dragojevic's (2016), and Dragojevic, Fasoli, Cramer, and Rakić (2021), which underpin the present study. Dragojevic (2016, as cited in Li and Wei, 2022) defines language attitude as beliefs, feelings, and behavioral intentions towards different language varieties. Eventually, Dragojevic (2017) and Dragojevic, Fasoli, Cramer, and Rakić (2021) state that language attitudes are evaluative reactions to a language or its varieties. They all agree that language attitudes can be categorized into two evaluative dimensions: status and solidarity.

Reflecting on minor language attitude categorization changes, Dragojevic, Fasoli, Cramer, and Rakić (2021) hold that attitudes are salient beliefs about an object and evaluations of those beliefs. They claim that language attitude studies have been mainly focused on evaluative beliefs, which are divided into beliefs about language varieties and speakers of the language varieties. They propose the close relationship between people's beliefs about language and its speakers, explaining that beliefs about language structure correlate with speakers' status, whereas beliefs about language sound correlate with speakers' solidarity.

Baker (1992) outlines the major areas in exploring language attitudes. It encompasses perceptions towards language diversity, regional dialects, speech style, language acquisition, minority languages, linguistic communities, language instruction, language usage, and learners' language preferences. The present paper focused on the first and seventh as it measured the language attitude of ESL Pre-service and Basic Education teachers toward AmE and PhilE.

Further, a person's language attitude may be positive or negative (e.g., Albarracin and Shavitt, 2018; Bagozzi, 1994a; 1994b in Jain, 2014; Gonza'lezRian'õ, 2002 cited in Somblingo and Alieto, 2019). Dragojevic (2017) suggests that when

language users have a positive attitude toward a language, they use it in all aspects of life. Speakers with a positive language attitude readily learn that language and proudly use it in all domains of work; on the other hand, speakers with negative language attitudes distance themselves from that language and speak what they believe is more prestigious.

Dragojevic, Fasoli, Cramer, and Rakić (2021) convey that the attitudes toward languages and their varieties are tied to attitudes toward groups of people. Relatively, the speakers' choice of language is closely related to how they perceive and feel about the language Ervin and Trip (1964, cited in Nur et al., 2021). Hence, in this study, the subjects' attitudes toward the PhilE and PhE speakers are equated to their attitudes toward the two Englishes they utilize in various domains, more often in the classrooms.

McKenzie (2010) states that research on attitude has been conducted according to two psychological approaches: the behaviorist and the mentalist views, both of which consider that attitudes are learned. He discusses the mentalist tripartite concept of attitude in terms of its cognitive, affective, and conative components. The cognitive component refers to the speakers' belief toward a language; the affective component accounts for the favorable or unfavorable emotional response toward the language; and the conative component relates to the behavior of a language speaker in a particular way.

Language attitude has been assessed using various methods, and the most commonly classified are direct and indirect (McKenzie, 2010, p.42; Obiols, p.2 2002). As scholars (e.g., Chen and Cao 2013) explain, the direct method requires respondents to respond to a questionnaire or interview questions that ask their opinion about a specific language or its speakers. However, when language users are directly asked about their attitudes, they may hide their actual attitudes but go along with the stereotypes in their community; hence, there is the indirect method. The most frequently used indirect method in investigating language attitude is the Matched-Guise Technique developed by Lambert and his associates in the early 1960s.

1.2 The matched-guised technique (MGT)

The matched-guise test is a sociolinguistic research method used to determine one's true feelings toward a language. Stefanowitsch (2005) states that the matched guise technique was initially developed to investigate people's attitudes toward social, geographical, or ethnic language varieties and the languages spoken in bilingual communities. MGT permits more introspection and produces more spontaneous and sincere responses (Lambert, 1967 in Obiols 2002; Richards, Platt, and Weber, 1985 in Gaies and Beebe, 1991).

Obiols (2002, p.3) presents the relevant components of MGT, summarized as follows: The sex, age, and other variables of the recorded voices and judges evaluating the recorded voices are considered. The recorded speech or stimulus material lasts two minutes and is studied from a linguistic and stylistic point of view. The judges have no information about the voices. The deletion of suprasegmental speech features controls the recorded voices.

The MGT method involves using recorded voices of people speaking first in one language and then in another and asking the subjects, referred to as listener-judges, to evaluate the qualities of the voice owners. The recordings are played to listeners unaware that the two speeches are from the same person and judge the two guises of the same speaker as though they were judging two separate speakers (Gaies and Beebe, 1991). The judges evaluate the speakers on a bipolar semantic-differential scale with many personality traits.

The US psychologist Charles E. Osgood pioneered the semantic differential (SD). According to Ploder and Eder (2015), SD is a semantic rating scale that measures the connotative meaning of terms, ideas, activities, or concepts like language. As the earlier scholars posit, SD captures the affective and cognitive components of a subject's feelings to selected concepts on a multidimensional level. It measures associations, motivations, emotions, and attitudes for almost every concept.

Likewise, Rosenberg and Navarro (2018) explain that Osgood gives three stable dimensions

by which people can judge anything. These are 1) evaluative level, which focuses on the value of the object (e.g., good/bad), 2) potency or power (e.g., strong/weak), and 3) activity or movement (e.g., slow/fast). According to them, SD is easy to administer and code; investigations confirmed that SD scales are relatively reliable, objective, and valid ways of measuring a wide range of concepts. In the Philippines, studies on attitudes towards AmE and PhiE were conducted through direct methods only, at least those that the researchers have reviewed. Nonetheless, Fitriati and Wardani (2020) recommended the MGT in determining language attitude; hence, this attitude paper utilized the indirect method, MGT.

1.3 Teachers' and students' attitude toward PhilE and AmE

Sy Tamco (2022) explored the experiences, struggles, perspectives, and pedagogical practices of 10 college ESL teachers from different universities in Bulacan on using PhilE in ESL classrooms. She gathered the necessary information through in-depth interviews. When asked about their views and opinions on AmE and PhilE as the standard English, three informants stated that AmE is the standard English in the Philippines. Two participants claimed that AmE is a corporate standard English, which can be compared to British English (BrE). They acknowledged PhilE as a legitimate variety, accepted it for speaking, and believed it should be promoted; however, they viewed AmE as the standard English for writing and formal domain.

Using online comments to an online news article and an online quote card about PhilE, Paz (2022) investigated the Filipinos' mental models of PhilE. He explains that mental models operate through propositions that influence the ability to decide, accept, or reject an idea like PhilE. He gathered online comments on news posts from the social media page of the news and current affairs program of a large Filipino media and entertainment group and analyzed them using Dijk's framework of cognitive analysis. His analysis of the 65 qualities

revealed seven evaluative qualities accepting PhilE; however, 46 of 65 rejected PhilE, and 12 comments communicated the commenters' ambivalent stances.

Dimangadap-Malang and Pantao (2021) investigated the attitudes of the English teachers of Al-Kwarizmi International School on PhilE using a survey questionnaire, and their analysis revealed that the English teachers have a positive attitude towards PhilE as a variety of Standard English. They accepted most coined words and phrasal constructions used and adapted in the Philippines. Nevertheless, they did not accept what they perceived as non-standard idioms and ungrammatical constructions. Likewise, Tupas (2006) shared that seven Filipino student-teachers manifested disfavor in PhilE as communicated by their beliefs that PhilE is not an ideal model in the English language classroom and that empowering standardized English should be taught as a form.

Dimaculangan (2022) reviewed studies on Filipino ESL teachers and students' attitudes toward PhilE to integrate the course PhilE into the English Language curricula. Her analysis of Gustilo and Dimaculangan (2018), Torres and Alieto (2019), Lopez-Escalona (n.d.), Gustilo, Vergel, and Valle (2020), Hernandez (2020), and Bautista (1997, 2001) findings revealed conditional positive attitude toward PhilE. Most of their responses to the attitude questionnaire revealed positive attitudes, whereas their responses to the acceptability test for PhilE expressions revealed otherwise.

Attitudinal studies help identify speakers' views of a language's status and its role in language teaching and learning. Therefore, attitude studies on PhilE and AmE deserve equal scholarship because they offer equally significant insights into the country's language growth and implications for ELT. Bernardo (2017), Policarpio (2021), Alieto and Rillo (2018), and Rentillo (2022), for instance, recommend PhilE instruction and more research looking into attitudes toward PhilE. The present paper fills the gaps mentioned earlier by probing ESL Pre-service and Basic Education teachers' attitudes toward spoken AmE and PhilE using the

Matched-Guised Technique to confirm results from direct methods attitude data. It specifically tried to answer the following questions:

- 1) Who between the PhilE and AmE speakers would ESL Pre-service and Basic Education teachers give more favorable ratings,
 - a. Filipino speakers of English who approximate AmE,
 - b. American speakers of English who approximate PhilE?
- 2) Is there a significant difference between the ratings given by ESL Pre-service and Basic Education teachers toward the PhilE and AmE speakers?
- 3) What is the ESL Pre-service and Basic Education teachers' general attitude toward PhilE and AmE speakers, as revealed by their ratings?

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Subjects/listener-judges

The listeners, i.e., subjects who are referred to as judges, were composed of 35 (i.e., five males and 30 females) graduating Bachelor of Secondary major in English students who were having their Pre-service teaching in different High School institutions in Laguna during the Academic Year 2022-2023 and 35 Basic Education ESL teachers (i.e., eight males and 27 females) in Region IV-A. They were all born in the Philippines and speak two languages, English and Filipino (Tagalog), in most domains of work, but they speak English in ESL classrooms. They are relatively homogenous in terms of age and educational and sociolinguistic backgrounds.

The pre-service teachers are all government Basic Education school graduates and have been learning English as a medium of instruction in school and as a major course in BSEd-English. The Basic Education ESL teachers combine young and middle-aged teachers who have been in English Language Teaching (ELT) for at least three to 15 years. The pre-service teachers' ages ranged from 21 to 23 years old, whereas the teachers' ages varied from 25 to 32 years old. Apart from their maturity and smartness, they were purposively

selected because they are ESL teachers and students more familiar with AmE and PhilE.

These subjects whose attitudes to PhilE and AmE were determined through their judgment of the speakers' voices were selected through criterion sampling, the criterion of which, as elucidated in the preceding paragraph, can be summarized as ESL students and teachers and who have a close sociolinguistic background (i.e., were born in the Philippines, speak English, are into English language teaching and learning, College Education BSE-English students engaged into student-teaching and elementary or high school ESL teachers, preferably pursuing graduate studies, either master's or doctorate, those who have a background on World Englishes paradigm precisely, AmE and PhilE). Criterion sampling is a method in research in which the researcher selects participants based on predetermined criteria or characteristics. This method ensures the sample represents individuals with qualities or experiences required by the study objectives.

2.2 Text readers/speakers

Three Americans with a near native-like PhilE speech and three Filipinos with a near native-like AmE speech were selected for the study. Likewise, criterion sampling was used to identify them. The selected AmE readers of both AmE and PhilE texts were Americans who have been with Filipino friends or co-workers for five to 10 years; those whose oral English is closely similar to PhilE; those who were willing to participate in the study, and among those whom the researchers had access through their Filipino friends and former students. The Filipino readers of both AmE and PhilE were Filipina English ESL and EFL teachers with near-native American-like articulation of English. They were those who had taught EFL to Asian and American students in virtual or face-to-face mode and those who have taught elementary or secondary ESL for at least five years and are graduates of English or English language Teaching-related courses.

The three Filipino speakers, i.e., readers of the two

reading scripts used for this study, were selected based on their oral skills to approximate the native-like sound of AmE. Likewise, the three American speakers were considered based on their approximation of PhilE articulation. The three Filipino teachers were born in the Tagalog region and have taught ESL there for three to ten years, whereas the American speakers have worked with Filipino teachers and employees for five to ten years. They all consented to participate in the study. However, they demand privacy and confidentiality; hence, they are named Speaker 1, Speaker 2, to Speaker 12 in the study.

The 1st Filipino speaker is a 25-year-old lady from the North. She has been teaching Asian EFL learners for three years now. The second is 23 years old and teaching in a Department of Education (DepEd) school; the third is a 32-year-old international teacher teaching grade 7 English at a Middle School in North Carolina. She taught EFL in Thailand and China prior to her American school assignment. The three teachers were selected primarily due to their apparent approximation of spoken AmE.

The first two American speakers work at a Northern High School in North Carolina and interact with Filipino teachers at the same university. One is a media center coordinator and librarian, and the other is a junior high school teacher. Both are middle-aged women who attend the same church service. The third is a fellow worker of a Filipina friend of the principal researcher who is married to an American and has lived in America for a long time. He is a 35-year-old nurse who has had contact with the Tagalog language through her Filipino co-workers at a Dialysis Center in Las Vegas, Nevada.

2.3 Instruments

The instruments utilized for this study were modified instruments used by established and well-informed authorities in language attitude studies, (i.e., Tucker, 1968; Luzares & Bautista, 1971, and Aglaura & Aliponga, 1998 cited in Dimaculangan, 2017) in their studies of attitudinal dispositions of Tagalog and non-Tagalog students toward English and Tagalog

speakers of English as cited in Dimaculangan (2017). Whereas the earlier authorities used 12 recorded voices of Tagalog and non-Tagalog speakers of English, the present researchers used **12 recorded voices** of the three American professionals and three Filipino ESL and EFL teachers as their primary instruments. Twelve because each of the six speakers was requested to read the AmE reading script and the PhilE reading script. The reading texts read by the speakers that Obiols (2002) calls stimulus material are two short texts of two and a half (2 and ½ minutes) that the speakers recorded for this purpose. The same script of 351 words used by the mentioned researchers was used to ensure the choice of standard AmE reading text. The PhilE reading script is the 364-word Philippine version of the Creation Story, downloaded from <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/12814/12814-h/12814-h.htm#d0e4072>.

The MGT is usually combined with Osgood SD scales; hence, another equally important instrument used was the **evaluation sheet** containing Tucker's (1968) series of 12 semantic-differential bipolar

adjective scales in which the subjects reflected their judgment of the voices heard. The opposite extremes of a trait (e.g., Successful _____ Unsuccessful) and (Unintelligent _____ Intelligent) are designated at the end of the scales. Numbers from one to eight are assigned to each trait; the highest/positive end of the scale has a value of eight (8), and the lowest negative/end is one (1). This instrument aimed to indirectly determine the subjects' attitudes toward spoken PhilE and AmE, which might not be obtained directly.

2.4 Data gathering and analysis procedure

The present study used the well-known indirect method in evaluating language attitude, the Match-Guised Technique (MGT), to gather data. The six speakers whose voices were grouped as follows were asked to read and record the two texts (one AmE text and one PhilE text) one at a time. They are given the following pseudonyms to keep their identities private as they agreed on.

Voices/Readers of American English Text

- Speaker 1 - American Dr. Greenhills
- Speaker 2 - Filipina/Ms. Julie
- Speaker 3 - American/Ms. Glass
- Speaker 4 - Filipina/Ms. Babe
- Speaker 5 - American/Dr. Deerwalk
- Speaker 6 - Filipina/Ms. Fely

Voices/Readers of Philippine English Text

- Speaker 7 - Filipina/Ms. Julie
 - Speaker 8 - American/Dr. Deerwalk
 - Speaker 9 - Filipina/Ms. Fely
 - Speaker 10 - American Dr. Greenhills
 - Speaker 11 - Filipina/Ms. Babe
 - Speaker 12 - American/Ms. Glass
-

Their voices were recorded and then arranged in random order so that each passage seemed to be read by a different individual. Sound tests were conducted before the subjects listened to ensure the speeches were audible. Speakers connected to the researcher's laptop were utilized. The audio file was administered to the judges in smaller groups within two months. The judges were asked to listen and judge the readers based on their voices alone and rate their characteristics as enumerated in the evaluation sheet, Tucker's 12-item SD bipolar adjective scale, which has the value of 8 at the positive end of the scale and the value of 1 at the opposing end. The subjects evaluated the personal qualities of the 12 voices heard without knowing they were only six persons.

Their favorable ratings of the judges to the speakers were equated to their positive attitude toward the variety they spoke.

Stefanowitsch (2005, p.2) suggests calculating the average judgment for each pair of traits as a simple way of statistically evaluating the results; hence, the judges' ratings for each of the 12 scales were tabulated separately. All the responses given by each subject to the 12 voice exemplars were added to get the overall rating for each pair of adjectives. It was explained to the judges that the value of eight is always the most favorable rating corresponding to the positive trait, whereas the value of one is always the least favorable rating referring to the negative trait. In this study, high ratings given by the judges are equated to their

positive attitude toward the variety, whereas low ratings are interpreted as negative attitudes toward the variety. Stefanowitsch (2005) also suggests checking whether the judgments for the groups of readers differ significantly using paired t-tests to compare group means; thus, it was also employed.

3. Results and discussion

Table 1 presents the ESL pre-service teachers' evaluation of the AmE and PhilE speakers, indirectly revealing their attitudes toward the varieties. The mean scores in **Table 1** show that the ESL pre-service teachers rated the AmE speakers slightly more favorably than the PhilE speakers in six items: personality traits, i.e., appearance (light) and pleasant; three-character traits, i.e., active, industrious, and honest; and one competence trait, i.e., intelligent. Interestingly, they rated the PhilE speakers more favorably than their AmE counterparts in three character traits: religious, self-confident, and patient; two competence-related traits, successful and reliable; and personality trait-related, which is healthy. Nonetheless, none of the mean scores for the attitude of ESL pre-service teachers toward PhilE and AmE speakers have mean differences exceeding 1.00, which means that they have the same attitudes toward PhilE and AmE speakers.

Table 1. ESL pre-service teachers' attitude toward PhilE and AmE speakers.

Qualities	AmE speakers	PhE speakers
Light	5.37	5.03
Pleasant	4.47	3.87
Religious	4.98	5.52
Active	3.77	3.17
Successful	5.23	5.50
Industrious	3.61	3.45
Reliable	5.27	5.47
Healthy	5.24	5.73
Self-confident	5.32	5.58
Intelligent	4.36	3.79
Honest	4.24	3.75
Patient	4.87	5.57
Total	4.73	4.70

Further, the total mean scores obtained from the ESL pre-service teachers' evaluation of the speakers' voices also revealed that they both have positive attitudes toward PhE and AmE speakers as registered by the 4.73 and 4.70, which exceed 4.50, the median of 8. They did not appear concerned about the varieties spoken, as suggested by their same evaluation of the speakers' traits. The findings differ from Martin's (2014) study, which revealed teachers' preference for the AmE to PhilE despite consciously using PhilE, and Tupas' (2006) study, which suggested the pre-service teachers' belief that PhilE is not an ideal model of English. They further confirm Bautista's (2004), Allieto and Rillo's (2018), Dimaculangan and Gustilo's (2018), and Mayo et al.'s (2019) finding that Filipino ESL teachers and students exhibit a positive attitude toward PhilE. However, it is not to a complete extent that they convey their notion that AmE is the standard variety.

Table 2 displays the basic education ESL teachers' evaluation of the AmE and PhilE speakers, indirectly revealing their attitudes toward the varieties. The figures from the ratings given by the more mature evaluators, the basic education ESL teacher, revealed a similar trend. As can be gleaned in **Table 2**, the Basic Education teachers rated the AmE speakers somewhat more favorably in four (4) of twelve traits, namely three character traits—active, self-confident, and patient and one personality trait, healthy. It is heartening that they rated the PhilE speakers somewhat more favorably in eight (8) out of twelve traits: light, pleasant, religious, successful, industrious, reliable, intelligent, and honest. Similar to the figures in the table, none of the mean scores for the attitude of Basic Education teachers toward PhilE and AmE speakers have mean differences exceeding 1.00, which registered their positive attitudes toward both the PhilE and AmE speakers as recorded by the total mean scores of 4.93 and 5.10 which are higher than the median 4.50.

Table 2. Basic education ESL teachers’ attitude toward PhilE and AmE speakers.

Qualities	AmE speakers	PhE speakers
Light	5.58	5.70
Pleasant	4.01	4.62
Religious	5.04	5.73
Active	3.55	3.50
Successful	5.71	5.86
Industrious	4.10	4.25
Reliable	5.44	5.73
Healthy	5.91	5.67
Self-confident	5.83	5.82
Intelligent	4.21	4.53
Honest	4.26	4.36
Patient	5.48	5.40
Total	4.93	5.10

The speakers’ choice of language is closely related to how they perceive the language and their attitude toward it (Ervin and Trip, 1964, cited in Nur et al., 2021). Thus, the results presented in **Tables 1 and 2** imply that PhilE sounded as pleasant as AmE to both the pre-service and basic education ESL teachers who unconsciously communicate positive attitudes toward the two varieties. Therefore, it can be assumed that these ESL practitioners will use and probably teach both varieties to develop their students’ communicative skills and confidence in using English. Indeed, Holmes (2001) stated that positive attitudes support efforts to use the language in various domains. In addition, Fitriati and Wardani (2020) posited that when people have a positive attitude toward a language, they will speak it in most interactions. More importantly, Bernardo (2017) conveyed that PhilE must be taught; there must be interactions in PhilE in the classroom, and it must be part of the written assessment.

The findings also hint that PhilE speakers are eventually becoming aware of the wrong notion that only near-native AmE or BrE variety is acceptable, standard, and prestigious and opposed Jenkins’ (2009) findings in her study on East Asian attitudes towards ELF, which divulged many English speakers’ perception that an English accent can only be evaluated as regards its closeness to BrE or AmE. The PhilE ESL teachers and students in the present study seem to compose a part of the competent English speakers who can survive comfortably in multilingual communication. PhilE is an Outer Circle English (Kachru, 1985; 1992) variety spoken and understood by fellow ESL and ELF speakers worldwide.

Table 3 shows the significant difference between pre-service and basic education ESL teachers’ attitudes toward PhilE and AmE speakers. A T-test for two paired samples was utilized to determine the difference between the ratings the ESL pre-service and Basic Education ESL teachers gave to the PhilE and AmE speakers. The weighted mean scores of 4.73 and 4.70 obtained from ESL pre-service teachers’ judgment of the AmE and PhilE speakers obtained a mean difference of 0.03, which is relatively small, supporting the analysis of *no significant* difference for the computed p-value of 0.8624 since the p-value is greater than the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$). Likewise, the weighted mean scores of 4.93 and 5.10 from Basic Education ESL teachers’ ratings to AmE and PhilE speakers’ traits revealed a mean difference of -0.17, which is almost insignificant, supporting the analysis of *Not Significant* difference for the computed p-value of 0.0531. The difference between the mean scores is also insignificant since the p-value is greater than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Table 3. Difference between pre-service and basic education ESL teachers’ attitudes toward PhilE and AmE speakers.

Evaluators	Mean		Mean difference	t-stat	p-value	Analysis
	AmE speakers	PhE speakers				
ESL pre-service teachers	4.73	4.70	0.03	0.1174	0.86.24	Not Significant
Basic education ESL teachers	4.93	5.10	-0.17	-2.16.68	0.0531	Not Significant

Overall, the figures show that the ratings given to the PhilE and AmE speakers by the pre-service teachers and basic education ESL teachers do not differ. This study divulged a different trend from the results of the limited studies previously conducted, which Dimaculangan (2022) described as ambivalent attitude because for instance, Torres and Alieto's (2019) PhilE lexical and grammatical items questionnaires communicated their respondents' limited acceptance; while Lopez Escalona's (n.d.) BSU English teacher-participants revealed their positive attitude toward PhilE but non-acceptance of some words, idioms, and what they read as ungrammatical constructions which to WE and PhE scholars are deviations. As earlier findings show, Filipino speakers of English use PhilE in spoken informal contexts and AmE in written communication or formal contexts (e.g., Bautista 1997, 2001; Gustilo and Dimaculangan, 2018).

4. Implications for research and pedagogy

The study revealed the subjects' positive attitude toward the two Englishes used in Philippine education and local and international communications. The increasing number of research and publications on PhilE, especially Borlongan's (2024) opinion column in one of the Philippine broadsheets, *The Manila Times*, where he regularly discusses PhilE and related matters, as well as the scholars' proposal to incorporate the teaching of WE and PhilE in the Basic Education and Higher Education curricula, have probably contributed to the participants' positive attitude toward PhilE and not just toward AmE. More than that, the webinars on WE and PhilE, which have been conducted across the country, and the deliberate teaching of the courses by the principal author have possibly contributed to strengthening the subjects' positive attitude toward PhilE and not just toward AmE. The enumerated variables might have changed what Dimaculangan (2022) interpreted as Filipino's ambivalent attitude towards PhilE. Nonetheless, to ultimately claim that Filipino ESL teachers and students manifest favor

for PhilE variety, related studies employing other indirect ways of determining ESL students' and teachers' attitude toward PhilE need to be done in other regions of the country.

Earlier researchers' (e.g., Hernandez, 2020; Policarpio, 2021; Dimaculangan, 2022) recommendation to include WE and PhilE in the Basic Education and Higher Education curricula is supported, considering that the world speaks the global English understood by all of Kachru's concentric circles' speakers. The curricula will offer students opportunities to learn linguistic and cultural diversity across the globe and to develop mutual understanding and respect for WE users. Exposing the students to PhilE is essential so they can actively participate in language learning tasks without apprehension that their English will be stigmatized. The researchers' observations and casual conversations with teachers and students divulged a common reason why students remain passive inside ESL classrooms that require an "English Only" interaction, i.e., the students can not approximate the standard pronunciations that the teachers equate to BrE or AmE pronunciation. Indeed, using oral PhilE in the classroom can be a strategy to promote students' active participation in learning tasks without apprehension that their English will be stigmatized and to lessen or completely eradicate the feelings of intimidation and lack of self-confidence among learners.

Relatively, Borlongan's propositions (2011) on retraining ESL teachers, designing new instructional materials based on PhilE corpora, and recontextualizing ELT leadership are seconded and advanced, although this may require fund allocations and training time. This is because teaching PhilE is not easy, primarily due to the fact that English in the country is not a monolithic variety of English (Tupas, 2006). As he states, Filipinos speak Philippine Englishes for its use is class-inflected and ethnolinguistically-marked, among other social factors. Moreover, more seminars on WE highlighting the Englishes used in the country should be conducted in regions where teachers and students are not yet aware of PhilE's existence or not yet

open to the phenomena to raise their awareness and consequently develop appreciation and respect for their own and other English varieties. This way, ESL teachers who may have the native speaker syndrome may eventually accept PhilE, see it as prestigious as AmE, and be clear about the PhilE lessons to be taught and the distinction between formal and informal PhilE use.

In this era of globalization and internationalization, multilingualism is the norm, and the deliberate teaching of WE and PhilE is strongly recommended. As Tupaz (2023) conveyed in one of his lectures, Filipino ESL teachers should be multilingual teachers of English (i.e., they speak and teach L1 English, PhilE, their Mother Tongue, and possibly other languages in the Philippines).

Author Contributions

The principal author/author 1 conceptualized the study, including the related literature needed, conferring with the second and third co-authors and brainstorming about the study. The three co-authors divided the work equally. They all read the related literature and studies to get familiar with the topic, the trends in methodology, and findings, and then divided the work as follows: author 1 synthesized and wrote relevant literature; author 2 laid out and wrote the methodology, while author 3 finalized the research problems and gathered data. After data collection, all three researchers collaboratively made sense of the raw data, summarized and tabulated them for statistical analysis; author 2, data from DepEd teachers, and author 3, data from pre-service teachers. Together, they agreed on the statistical and textual meaning, after which they wrote the remaining parts: author 1 wrote the answer to RQ 1, author 2, RQ 2, and Author 3, RQ 3. The principal author organized the conclusion, compiled all the parts, and edited the manuscript content and language.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Department of Education teachers and LSPU College of Teacher Education pre-service teachers who participated in the study as listener judges of the voices; the Filipino ESL teachers in the country and America for reading the texts in near-native American English and Philippine English accent; and Mr. Kim Darly Bueno for having statistically treated the data for this study.

References

- Albarracin, D., Shavitt, S., 2018. Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 69, 299–327. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011911>
- Alieto, E., Rillo, R.M., 2018. Language attitudes of English language teachers (ELTs) towards Philippine English. 84–110.
- Attitude towards Philippine English: A Case of BSU English Teachers. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/27832207/Attitude_towards_Philippine_English_A_Case_of_BSU_English_Teachers
- Baker, C., 1992. *Attitudes and language*. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon.
- Bautista, 2001. *World Englishes, Philippine English, and English language education in the Philippines*. Available online: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346939352_
- Bautista, M.L.S. (1997). *The lexicon of Philippine English*. English Asian language: The Philippine context. The Macquarie Library Pty., Ltd.: NSW, Australia. pp. 49–72.
- Bernardo, A., 2017. Philippine English in the ESL classroom: A much closer look. *Philippine ESL Journal*.
- Bernardo, A.S., Madrunio, M.R., 2015. A framework

- for designing a Philippine-English-based pedagogic model for teaching English grammar. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies (AJELS)*.
- Bolton, K., Bautista, M.L.S., 2009. *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Anvil: Manila.
- Bolton, K., Butler, S., 2009. *Lexicography and the description of Philippine English Vocabulary*. *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Hong Kong University Press: Hong Kong. pp. 174–200.
- Borlongan, A.M., 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*. 3, 74–107.
- Borlongan, A.M., 2011. Editorial commentary: The preparation and writing of the grammar of the verb in Philippine English and the teaching of the English verb system in Philippine schools. *Philippine ESL Journal*. 7(2), 120–123.
- Borlongan A.M., 2024. *Grammatical Change in Philippine English over Time*. Available online: <https://www.manilatimes.net/2024/03/10/opinion/columns/grammatical-change-in-philippine-english-over-time/1936099>
- Butler, S. 1999. The needs of dictionary users in South-East Asia. In: M. Newbrook (Ed), *English is an Asian language: The Thai Context*. New South Wales: The Macquarie Library. pp. 80-94.
- Falomir, L.P, 2015. Multilingualism and very young learners: An analysis of pragmatic awareness and language attitudes. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin, München, Boston. pp. 77–104.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501500022-007>
- Chen, H., Cao, C., 2013. *Matched-guised experiment and its application to measure Uygur Trilinguals' language attitudes*. Atlantis Press: Amsterdam.
- Cole M.C., 2008. *Philippine Folk Tales*. Available online: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/12814/12814-h/12814-h.htm#d0e4072>
- Criterion Sampling (n.d.). Available online: <https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/methods/criterion-sampling>
- Criterion Sampling, 2024. Available online: https://teflpedia.com/Criterion_sampling#:~:text=Criterion%20sampling%20is%20a%20purposive,relevant%20to%20the%20research%20objectives
- Dela Cruz, Y., 2022. On the status of English in the Philippines. *UP Working Papers in Linguistics*. 1(1).
- Dimaculangan, N., 2018. Another look into Philippine English: Towards users' awareness and celebration. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*. 2(8), 17–22.
- Dimaculangan, N.G., 2022. Speakers' ambivalent attitude toward Philippine English: An issue for integrating the variety into ESL instruction. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*. 4(2), 97–104. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2022.4.2.8>
- Dimaculangan, N.G., Pasion, M.C., 2017. Would be teachers' attitude towards the Philippines' official languages. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*. 5(4), 712–720.
- Dimangadap-Malang, R., Pantao, A.G., 2021. Attitude towards Philippine English: A case of Alkwarizmi international school english teachers. *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences*. 3(4), 57–72.
- Dita, S.N., De Leon, K.D., 2017. The intelligibility and comprehensibility of Philippine English to EFL speakers. *Philippine ESL Journal*. 19(2), 100–118.
- Dragojevic, M., 2016. *Language attitudes*. The Oxford encyclopedia of intergroup communication.

- tion (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press: Oxford. pp. 263–278.
- Dragojevic, M., Fasoli, F., Cramer, J., et al., 2021. Toward a century of language attitudes research: Looking back and moving forward. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 40(1), 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20966714>
- Esquivel, O.J.D., 2019. Exploring the Filipinization of the English Language in a Digital Age: An Identity Apart from Other World Englishes. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 14(1), 58-72.
- Fitriati, A., Wardani, M.M.S., 2020. Language attitudes and language choice among students in Yogyakarta: A case study at Universitas Sanata Dharma. *International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS)*. 3(2), 239–250.
- Gaies, S., Beebe, Jacqueline, D. (1991). *The Matched-Guise Technique for Measuring Attitudes and Their Implications for Language Education: A Critical Assessment*. Available online: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED367168.pdf>
- Galloway, N., Rose, H., 2015. *Introducing global Englishes*. Routledge: London.
- Gonzales, A., 2005. The history of English in the Philippines. *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context*. The Macquarie Library Pty Ltd.: NSW, Australia. pp. 25–40.
- Gonzales, W.D.W., 2017. Philippine Englishes. *Asian Englishes*. 19(1), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1274574>
- Gonzalez, A., 2004. The social dimensions of Philippine English. *World Englishes*. 23(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2004.00331.x>
- Gustilo, L., Dimaculangan, N., 2018. Attitudes of Filipino English teachers toward 21st century Philippine English writing. *Advanced Science Letters*. 24(11), 8349–8352. <https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2018.12560>
- Gustilo, L., Vergel, M.I., Valle, A., 2020. Digital Writing and English Teachers' Attitudes towards its Non-standard Conventions. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/43625601/Digital_Writing_and_English_TeachersAttitudes_towards_its_Non_standard_Conventions
- Gustilo, L.E., 2002. A contrastive analysis of American English and Philippine English news leads. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. 33(2), 53–66.
- Hernandez, H.P., 2020. Filipino graduate students' attitudes toward teaching educated Philippine English: A sample from a premier teacher education institution. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*. 20(1), 31–42.
- Holmes, J., 2001. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Jain, V., 2014. 3D model of attitude. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*. 3(3), 1–12.
- Jenkins, J., 2009. Exploring attitudes towards English as a lingua franca in the East Asian context. *Global Englishes in Asian contexts: Current and future debates*. Palgrave Macmillan UK: London. pp. 40–56.
- Kachru, B.B., 1985. Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. pp. 11–30.
- Kachru, B.B., 1992. *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press: Champaign.
- Kachru, B.B., 2005. *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong University Press: Hong Kong.
- Li, C., Wei, L., 2022. Language attitudes: Construct, measurement, and associations with language achievements. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2137516>

- Lopes-Escalona, S.M. (n.d.). Attitude towards Philippine English: A Case of BSU English Teachers. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/27832207/Attitude_towards_Philippine_English_A_Case_of_BSU_English_Teachers (cited on May 10,2024)
- Martin, I.P., 2010. Periphery ELT: The politics and practice of teaching English in the Philippines. The Routledge handbook of world Englishes. Routledge: London.
- Melander, L., 2003. Language Attitudes: Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Language. Available online: <https://typeset.io/pdf/language-attitudes-evaluational-reactions-to-spoken-language-4ygtjlr185.pdf>
- McKenzie, R., 2010. The study of language attitudes. Springer: New York.
- McLeod, S., 2023. Components of Attitude: ABC Model. Available online: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/attitudes.html>
- Molina, 2009. Definitions and Critical Literature Review of Language Attitude, Language Choice and Language Shift: Samples of Language Attitude Surveys. Available online: <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/3785/Definitions-Critical-Review-of-Topics-in-Sociolinguistics.pdf?sequence=1>
- Monfared, A., Khatib, M., 2018. English or Englishes?: Outer and expanding circle teachers' awareness of and attitudes towards their own variants of English in ESL/EFL teaching contexts. Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online). 43(2), 56–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.4>
- Murata, K., Jenkins, J., 2009. Introduction: Global Englishes from global perspectives. Global Englishes in Asian contexts. Palgrave Macmillan: London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230239531_1
- Nordquist, R., 2023. New Englishes: Adapting the Language to Meet New Needs. Available online: <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-are-new-englishes-1691343>
- Nur, T., Lukman, Kaharuddin, et al., 2021. Language attitudes of Betawi teenagers toward their mother tongue: A sociolinguistic perspective. TESOL International Journal. 16(1).
- Obiols, M.S., 2002. The Matched Guise Technique: A Critical Approximation to a Classic Test for Formal Measurement of Language Attitudes. Available online: https://www.gencat.cat/llengua/noves/noves/hm02estiu/metodologia/a_solis.pdf
- Orikasa, M., 2017. Effectiveness of implementing world Englishes in English language curricula. Journal of English as an International Language. 12(2), 73–88.
- PAZ, R.M., 2022. Mental models on Philippine English in online spaces: Challenges and opportunities. 3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature. 28(2).
- Pefianco Martin, I., 2014. Philippine English revisited. World Englishes. 33(1), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12054>
- Perloff, R.M., 2017. The Dynamics of Persuasion: Communication and Attitudes in the 21st Century. Available online: https://wartafeminis.files.wordpress.com/2020/07/routledge-communication-series-richard-m.-perloff-the-dynamics-of-persuasion_-communication-and-attitudes-in-the-21st-century-routledge-2017.pdf
- Philippine English (n.d.). Available online: <https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/philippine-english>
- Ploder, A., Eder, A., 2015. Semantic differential, international encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences (second edition). Elsevier: Amsterdam. pp. 563–571.
- Policarpio, P.H., 2023. Several bases for integration of Philippine English into the English curriculum of the Philippines. Asian Englishes. 25(3),

- 499–506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1873031>
- Preston, D.R., 2013. Language with an Attitude. Available online: https://www.blackwellpublishing.com/content/bpl_images/Content_Store/WWW_Content/9780631218036/05Chap02.pdf
- Quinto, J.B., 2024. Pinoylish: The awareness and notions of university students in Northern Luzon. *TEFLIN Journal*. 35(1), 107–122.
- Rentillo, P., 2022. Attitudes. *Philippine English*. Routledge: London. pp. 231–241.
- Rosenberg, B.D., Navarro, M.A., 2018. Semantic differential scaling. *The SAGE encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation*. SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks. pp. 1504–1507.
- Salazar, D., 2017. Philippine English in the Oxford English Dictionary: Recent advancements and implications for ESL in the Philippines. *Philippine ESL Journal*. 19, 45–59.
- Somblingo, R.A., Alieto, E.O., 2019. English language attitude among prospective Filipino teachers: An analysis through the Mentalist theoretical lens. *The Asian ESP Journal*. 15(2), 23–41.
- Stefanowitsch, A., 2005. The Matched Guise Technique. Available online: http://socialperspectives.pbworks.com/f/exp_matchedguise.pdf
- Sy-Tamco, A.B.R., 2022. Philippine English in the ESL classroom: A study of English teachers' beliefs and pedagogical practices in higher education. *Globus Journal of Progressive Education*. 12(1), 152–170.
- Tayao, M.L.G., 2008. *Philippine English: Phonology*. 4 Africa, South and Southeast Asia. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin, New York. pp. 292–306. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208429.1.292>
- Tonio, J.Z., Zuñiga-Tonio, J., 2019. Intelligibility of Philippine English to young international students. *Asian EFL Journal*. 25(5).
- Torres, J.M., Alieto, E.O., 2019. Acceptability of Philippine English grammatical and lexical items among pre-service teachers. *Online Submission*. 21, 158–181.
- Tupas, R., 2006. Standard Englishes: Pedagogical Paradigms and Their Conditions of (Im)Possibility. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/1149953/Standard_Englishes_pedagogical_paradigms_and_their_conditions_of_im_possibility
- Tupas, T.R.F., 2004. The politics of Philippine English: Neocolonialism, global politics, and the problem of postcolonialism. *World Englishes*. 23(1), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2004.00334.x>