

## CHANGING AND CHANGED STANCE TOWARD NORM SELECTION IN PHILIPPINE UNIVERSITIES: ITS PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

By

ALEJANDRO S. BERNARDO

*Instructor, The Graduate School, Department of English, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines.*

### ABSTRACT

*This paper reports the results of a survey which involved College English teachers from three leading universities in the Philippines. The results point to one conclusion – College English teachers now have a changing and changed stance toward norm selection in Philippine Universities. The results give the impression that a good number of College English teachers now seem to gradually depart from native speakers' norms. Put in another way, they progressively place less premium on total compliance with native speakers' models. This changing and changed stance, the author argues, calls for a new pedagogical decision that involves ESL curricular changes.*

*Keywords: Norm Selection, Native Speakers' Norms, Pedagogical Decisions, Philippine English.*

### INTRODUCTION

A good number of studies that examined teachers' beliefs (cf. Young & Walsch, 2010; Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Pajares, 1982; Richards, 1996; Woods, 1996; Williams & Burden, 1997) share the same conclusion – *that teachers' beliefs significantly impact pedagogical judgments and decisions.* For this reason, a survey of Filipino college English teachers' beliefs was conducted with the aim of directly eliciting their perceptions and personal views toward the issue of norm selection and Philippine English (PhE henceforth), the local variety of English thriving in the Philippines, and the potentials and obstacles for PhE to be locally recognized and implemented into the language curriculum.

### The Survey

A questionnaire was administered to English teachers from three Philippine universities. The questionnaires designed by Borlongan (2009), Bautista (2001), He and Li (2009.), Paine (2010), and Bernardo (2011) were modified and integrated to suit the needs of the present investigation. A statistically determined set of college English teachers was involved to identify the current model used in teaching English grammar in local universities and colleges; thus, 125 English instructors from three leading universities in the Philippines were randomly selected and requested to respond to a survey. These universities were the University of Santo Tomas (UST),

Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP), and De La Salle University – Manila (DLSU). The breakdown of the respondents' population shows that there are 42 from the University of Santo Tomas (UST), 42 from the Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP), and 41 from the De La Salle University (DLSU). This number represents more than 50% of the total number of English teachers in the three universities.

In terms of age, teachers from different age brackets are represented. A majority, however, are 26-30 years old. The respondents' profile also shows that there is a preponderance of female respondents (71.20%), and only 28.80% are males. Furthermore, a majority (36.0%) are relatively young in the teaching profession, i.e., they have been teaching English for only one to five years. Only less than 20% have been teaching for either 6-10 or 11-15 years, and less than 10% have been teaching for either 16-20, or 21-25, or 26-30 years. In addition, the profile of the respondents in terms of educational attainment indicates more than half (55.20%) have master's degrees, while 26.40% hold bachelor's degrees. Those with doctorate degrees had the least percentage (18.40%).

### The Findings

#### *College English Teachers' Beliefs about English and its Varieties*

Table 1 presents the 125 teachers' reasons why English

should be taught and learned in Philippine schools. The data show that the three most important reasons are: English is very useful because: (1) it serves as the students' passport to the global workforce (76.80%); (2) it allows the learners to participate in intercultural communication (73.60%); (3) and it gives the learners a competitive edge in the global market (56.00%). These figures hint at the fact that English is learned primarily for purposes of international communication and getting better jobs outside the country.

A few respondents also forwarded varied reasons for teaching and learning English apart from the options provided. Culled verbatim, these include:

1. English serves as a tool for understanding among members of the global business arena;
2. To learn how to eventually "question" the language;
3. They need it to pass in my subject;
4. English is the gold and sure key to success;
5. English is another language that allows you to express

yourself;

6. English is very essential to a successful life; and
7. We need to study English to help our country and not to serve the multi-national companies.

When asked what Standard English is, nearly half (44.0%) of the respondents opined that it is the English used by teachers and educated Filipinos. This suggests that language users' level of educational attainment is often associated with the use of Standard English. The data also indicate that a certain percentage, 38.40% and 37.60%, as shown in Table 2, believe that Standard English is equivalent to American English (AmE), and it is the English with no grammar mistakes, respectively, an indication that correctness is still attributed to an exogenous model.

Other respondents gave the following descriptions of Standard English:

1. There is no such thing as Standard English!;
2. Philippine English;
3. It is the English that can be understood by any English

	UST (n=41)		PUP (n=42)		DLSU (n=42)		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. English is the students' passport to the global workforce.	30	73.17%	34	80.95%	32	76.19%	96	76.80%
2. English allows students to have access to scientific and creative publications.	7	17.07%	11	26.19%	17	40.48%	35	28.00%
3. English gives the students a competitive edge in the local job market.	25	60.98%	21	50.00%	24	57.14%	70	56.00%
4. English, as the world's lingua franca, enables the students to participate in intercultural communication.	31	75.61%	34	80.95%	27	64.29%	92	73.60%
5. English is the primary medium of instruction in the Philippines; hence, the students must learn the language to acquire knowledge in the different content areas.	18	43.90%	16	38.10%	22	52.38%	56	44.80%
6. English proficiency is a measure of a person's educational attainment.	3	7.32%	1	2.38%	4	9.52%	8	6.40%
7. English proficiency is an to a higher societal stratum.	6	14.63%	1	2.38%	2	4.76%	9	7.20%

Table 1. Teachers' reasons why English should be learned and taught

	UST		PUP		DLSU		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. English with clear pronunciation	12	29.27%	21	50.00%	14	33.33%	47	37.60%
2. English with no grammar mistakes	6	14.63%	15	35.71%	10	23.81%	31	24.80%
3. American English	18	43.90%	14	33.33%	16	38.10%	48	38.40%
4. British English	6	14.63%	2	4.76%	11	26.19%	19	15.20%
5. English used by teachers and educated Filipinos	20	48.78%	15	35.71%	20	47.62%	55	44.00%
6. Textbook English	9	21.95%	5	11.90%	6	14.29%	20	16.00%
7. English I can understand	6	14.63%	14	33.33%	9	21.43%	29	23.20%

Table 2. What Standard English is according to college English teachers

speaker; and

- English that is accepted and used by the majority in the language community.

The respondents were also asked if they have learned about the existence of World Englishes. It is worthy of note that almost all (91.2%), as shown in Table 3, have knowledge of the birth of different international varieties of English or related topics on World Englishes acquired through research, online chatting or talking to different people or races, university courses, seminars and conferences, working abroad, travels, and personal explorations. This figure suggests the sustained exposure of language teachers to linguistic phenomena, specifically the existence and emergence of World Englishes, through professional development and international linkages.

Another question asked of the respondents was about their familiarity with the local variety of English. Table 4 indicates that 96.8% are aware of the existence of PhE.

As to the teachers' perceptions of what PhE is, Table 5 shows that nearly three-fourths (71.20%) of the respondents regard PhE as a localized variety of English, and more than half (61.60%) agree that PhE is educated Filipino English. Almost insignificant are the figures representing those who look at PhE as Taglish (a codemix between Tagalog and English), Substandard English, and Carabao (Water Buffalo) English. These figures positively represent the English teachers' favorable reception of PhE.

Table 6 suggests that a large population (76.0%) of college

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Unaware	1	2.4%	6	14.3%	4	9.5%	11	8.8%
Aware	40	97.6%	36	85.7%	38	90.5%	114	91.2%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 3. Teachers' awareness of World Englishes**

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Aware	2	4.9%	1	2.4%	0	0	3	2.4%
Aware	39	95.1%	40	95.2%	42	100.0%	121	96.8%
No Answer	0	0	1	2.4%	0	0	1	.8%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 4. Teachers' awareness of the local variety of English**

English teachers use both PhE and AmE when they speak and write. Only 11.2% believe that they adhere to AmE as their model in speaking and writing in spite of the traditional perception that AmE is the lone model used in the Philippines. The figures hint at the acceptance of PhE as a recognized variety as it is now being used by educators and ELT practitioners themselves. It is interesting to note, however, that three teachers indicated that they use all three varieties – AmE, PhE, and BrE.

While a majority of the teacher-respondents use both AmE and PhE varieties, there is a predominance of English instructors who hardly strive to sound like the native speakers of English (68.0%). Table 7, however, also shows that there is a population of teachers from the three universities (31.2%) who make every effort to sound like the native speakers, in terms of pronunciation. These teachers gave the following reasons for doing so:

- Teachers who sound like native speakers are good models for their students (79.49%).
- Because native speakers are hardly seen in the country, Filipino teachers must strive to sound like them to make English language learning more appealing

	UST		PUP		DLSU		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Taglish			2	4.76%	2	4.76%	4	3.20%
2. Substandard English	1	2.44%	3	7.14%	3	7.14%	7	5.60%
3. Educated Filipino English	22	53.66%	20	47.62%	35	83.33%	77	61.60%
4. Carabao English	0	0	1	2.38%	1	2.38%	2	1.60%
5. Localized variety of English	30	73.17%	31	73.81%	28	66.67%	89	71.20%

**Table 5. What Philippine English is according to college English teachers**

	UST		PUP		DLSU		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. AmE	5	12.2%	5	11.9%	4	9.5%	14	11.2%
2. PhE	1	2.4%	4	9.5%	3	7.1%	8	6.4%
3. BrE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Both PhE and AmE	32	78.0%	31	73.8%	32	76.2%	95	76.0%
5. Both PhE and BrE	2	4.9%	0	0	2	4.8%	4	3.2%
6. Others	0	.0%	2	4.8%	1	2.4%	3	2.4%
7. No Response	1	2.4%	0	0	0	0	1	.8%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 6. Variety of English that English teachers use in speaking and in writing**

(20.51%).

- Students think that teachers who can very well approximate the native speakers are better than those who cannot (20.51%).

One respondent stated that:

*'By striving to sound like a native speaker, I help the students likewise approximate the standard (correct) pronunciation and thus "preserve" correct spoken English, rather than have them speak with "native tongue influence" (my own term), thereby causing a certain "deterioration" of and deviation from what I consider standard English, as described above. I feel the need for a standard English as it will be the point of reference that may resolve or even prevent misunderstandings, especially in terms of global communications'.*

On the contrary, those who barely exert effort to sound like the native speakers forwarded the following reasons:

- Nonnative teachers sound intelligible even if they do not speak like the native speakers (56.47%).
- It doesn't matter which type of English we teach as long as students and teachers can be understood (38.82%).
- Filipino teachers trained in the Philippines teach local learners who also speak and write like them; hence, there is no need to sound like the native speakers (36.47%).

Other responses include:

- My unique Filipino way of speaking the English language makes me different from other nationalities speaking the language;
- It is my identity as a Filipino;
- I practice with a neutral accent. The intelligibility and functionality of English as a language used particularly in the field of education matters to me more;

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No	32	78.0%	21	50.0%	32	76.2%	85	68.0%
Yes	8	19.5%	21	50.0%	10	23.8%	39	31.2%
No answer	1	2.4%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.8%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 7. Teachers striving to sound like a native speaker of English

- Twang and accent are difficult to imitate if you are not exposed to it early. Also, some Western accents are hard to comprehend so clarity in pronunciation is still more important.
- No, because the notion of "nativeness" is an illusion.

### College English Teachers' Choice of Pedagogical Models

This subsection pertains to the teacher-respondents' pedagogical choices. Table 8 features the variety of English that the teacher-participants think they deliberately teach their students. The data show that a good number (65.6%) use both PhE and AmE as their pedagogical model, and only 20.8% strictly refer to AmE. Some of the respondents disclosed that they teach three varieties of English – AmE, PhE, and BrE. In addition, one respondent said that he teaches World Englishes depending on the students' context and another one aired that he promotes the two inner-circle varieties – AmE and BrE.

In addition, the data in Table 9 revealed that the respondents are of the stance that the two varieties (AmE and PhE) must also be taught and learned in all Philippine colleges and universities (65.6%). Only less than one-fifth of the total population (18.4%) promotes the use of AmE alone, and very few suggested the use of PhE and both BrE and AmE. One respondent, however, proposed that World Englishes be taught in all higher education institutions in the country.

A closer look at the survey results shows that those who favor the teaching of AmE have the following reasons:

- American English has been used in the country as the pedagogic model for decades; hence, there is no need to change the standard taught in Philippine schools (73.91%).

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. AmE	5	12.2%	11	26.2%	10	23.8%	26	20.8%
2. BrE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. PhE	1	2.4%	3	7.1%	2	4.8%	6	4.8%
4. PhE and AmE	30	73.2%	25	59.5%	27	64.3%	82	65.6%
5. PhE and BrE	3	7.3%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	2.4%
6. PhE	2	4.9%	3	7.1%	3	7.1%	8	6.4%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 8. Varieties of English taught by college English teachers

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. AmE	5	12.2%	10	23.8%	8	19.0%	23	18.4%
2. BrE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. PhE	3	7.3%	1	2.4%	3	7.1%	7	5.6%
4. AmE and PhE	27	65.9%	28	66.7%	27	64.3%	82	65.6%
5. BrE and PhE	4	9.8%	0	.0%	1	2.4%	5	4.0%
6. Others	0	.0%	1	2.4%	0	.0%	1	.8%
7. No Response	2	4.9%	2	4.8%	3	7.1%	7	5.6%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 9. Varieties of English that must be taught and learned in all Philippine colleges and universities**

- American English is easier and more convenient to learn (60.87%).
- American English serves as a unifying global language (47.83%).
- American English would be more appropriate to use for intercultural communication (34.78%).

One respondent has this to say:

*'It's not that American English must be the variety of choice for Philippine schools, but it happens to be the variety Filipinos are most exposed to and therefore the most logical standard to follow. Learning another variety will, I think, be a disaster. (Imagine if we suddenly start teaching British English, for instance!) Philippine English may be acceptable, but as I said, it may cause a certain "deterioration" of the language, and may be the cause of misunderstandings in the global context'.*

It must be noted that none of the respondents selected BrE. Those who chose PhE, on the other hand, answered:

- The use of Philippine English as the standard would be a mark that Filipinos have owned English and have freed themselves from the colonizing power of the native speakers (85.71%).
- It is high time that Filipinos regard their own variety of English as the pedagogic model in teaching the language (85.71%).
- Filipinos have the right to modify American English to make it suitable for use in the Philippines (57.14%).

Moreover, those who favored a fusion of AmE and PhE as the pedagogical standard in all schools gave the following reasons:

- While implementing Philippine English in the curriculum and developing students' knowledge of it, students should also be advised to be "equipped" with Standard English to be literate in and conversant with lexical-grammatical features of the written standard variety in order to absorb all kinds of information in print or on the Internet (83.91%).
- Students should learn the features and characteristics of Philippine English in addition to American or British English, for this will increase their flexibility in speaking and in writing (80.46%).
- Well-defined features of Philippine English should be incorporated into the existing model, American or British English (50.57%).

Other reasons given by some of the respondents include:

- PhE is good locally but internationally it may not be intelligible;
- Most samples of English writing and speech are British or American so they are taught more or less incidentally;
- Students need to know how to shuttle from one variety to another;
- There are communication situations in which the local variety is appropriate; some situations require American variety. Students should be flexible to know how to adjust to both.

One respondent who holds that other varieties must be taught said:

*'I guess the concept of World Englishes should be taught in the academe so no variety of English would be perceived more dominant or superior'.*

The survey results presented in Table 10 also indicate that a majority of the respondents (72.68%) believe that both AmE and PhE should be used in all forms of Philippine media, e.g., newspaper, television, and radio. This may be attributed to the fact that Philippine print media, in particular, uses the so-called Filipinisms to which Filipinos are frequently exposed. Almost insignificant is the number of respondents who chose only AmE, only BrE, only PhE, and both BrE and PhE. Those who answered 'other varieties' (3.2%) suggest the use of three varieties - BrE, AmE, and PhE.

Table 11 presents the variety of English that should be used when Filipinos communicate with foreigners. Unlike the data in the previous tables, there is a lower percentage of teacher-respondents (47.2%) who favor the use of both AmE and PhE. This figure, however, ranks the highest. Table 11 also shows that in interacting with other nationalities, a smaller population of teachers (35.2%) regards AmE as the most appropriate variety for intercultural/international communication. Eight, however, forwarded different answers:

1. Philippine, British, and American English (3);
2. Standard English;
3. American and British English (3);
4. Depending on the foreigner you are trying to communicate with;
5. A combination, depending on the nationality of the foreigner; and
6. It depends on the variety used by the other interlocutor. Speaker must also adjust to the receiver's language.

For intranational or local communication, more than half of the participants (54.4%) suggest the use of AmE and PhE. It is also worthy of note that in Table 12, 35.2% of the respondents recommend that Filipinos use PhE in communicating with one another. This suggests the growing acceptance of PhE as a potent medium for local communication. Furthermore, AmE, BrE and both BrE and PhE are hardly favored by the respondents. Two, however, said that mostly AmE and the three varieties (BrE, AmE, and PhE) should be used.

When asked if they would like to implement PhE in the English language classroom as a module or unit within the

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. AmE	3	7.3%	3	7.1%	3	7.1%	9	7.2%
2. BrE	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
3. PhE	7	17.1%	6	14.3%	5	11.9%	18	14.4%
4. AmE and PhE	28	68.3%	32	76.2%	31	73.8%	91	72.8%
5. BrE and PhE	2	4.9%	0	.0%	1	2.4%	3	2.4%
6. Others	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	2	4.8%	4	3.2%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 10. Variety of English that should be used in all forms of Philippine media

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. AmE	16	39.0%	15	35.7%	13	31.0%	44	35.2%
2. BrE	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
3. PhE	4	9.8%	2	4.8%	3	7.1%	9	7.2%
4. AmE and PhE	17	41.5%	23	54.8%	19	45.2%	59	47.2%
5. BrE and PhE	3	7.3%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	2.4%
6. Others	1	2.4%	2	4.8%	7	16.7%	10	8.0%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 11. Variety of English that should be used when Filipinos communicate with foreigners

compulsory or elective part of the English Language curriculum, 60.0% of the respondents agree and 24.4% totally agree as indicated in Table 13. This suggests that nearly 75% of the total population surveyed approves the inclusion of formal PhE-related lessons in the English curriculum, e.g. lessons about the phonological, lexical, and syntactic features of PhE and issues related to birth and use of local varieties. Only one-fourth rejects the idea of formally introducing PhE to students.

As regards the use of PhE as the norm in teaching pronunciation, the respondents seem to be divided with respect to their perceptions. As Table 14 shows, only 48.8% agree that PhE must be the reference in teaching English pronunciation, and only 13.6% totally agree. However, if these figures are combined, this means more than 60.0% of the population of teachers surveyed regards the use of PhE as the model in pronunciation instruction as favorable.

In teaching English vocabulary, 60.0% of the respondents agree and 10.4% totally agree that PhE should be used as the norm. These combined figures in Table 15, therefore, would outnumber those who completely disagree and those who disagree on the use of PhE as the standard in

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. AmE	1	2.4%	7	16.7%	1	2.4%	9	7.2%
2. BrE	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
3. PhE	16	39.0%	15	35.7%	13	31.0%	44	35.2%
4. AmE and PhE	22	53.7%	19	45.2%	27	64.3%	68	54.4%
5. BrE and PhE	2	4.9%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	1.6%
6. Others	0	.0%	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	2	1.6%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 12. Variety of English that should be used when Filipinos communicate with one another

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Completely disagree	2	4.9%	2	4.8%	2	4.8%	6	4.8%
Disagree	2	4.9%	8	19.0%	3	7.1%	13	10.4%
Agree	24	58.5%	24	57.1%	27	64.3%	75	60.0%
Totally Agree	13	31.7%	8	19.0%	10	23.8%	31	24.8%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 13. Teacher's beliefs as regards implementing PhE into the English language classroom**

	DLSU		FEU		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Completely disagree	2	4.9%	6	14.3%	2	4.8%	10	8.0%
Disagree	8	19.5%	12	28.6%	17	40.5%	37	29.6%
Agree	22	53.7%	21	50.0%	18	42.9%	61	48.8%
Totally Agree	9	22.0%	3	7.1%	5	11.9%	17	13.6%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 14. Philippine English as the norm in teaching English pronunciation**

teaching vocabulary.

When asked if PhE should be the norm in teaching English grammar, Table 16 shows that more than half (52.0%) agree and 12.0% totally agree that PhE can be a potential candidate as a norm for teaching grammar. Nearly 40.0% believe otherwise. Despite this figure, the data suggest that

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Completely disagree	1	2.4%	3	7.1%	2	4.8%	6	4.8%
Disagree	10	24.4%	9	21.4%	12	28.6%	31	24.8%
Agree	23	56.1%	28	66.7%	24	57.1%	75	60.0%
Totally Agree	7	17.1%	2	4.8%	4	9.5%	13	10.4%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 15. Philippine English as the norm in teaching English vocabulary**

	DLSU			PUP			UST			Total		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Implementing PhE into the English language classroom as a module or unit within the compulsory or elective part of the English Language curriculum	2.17	.738	Agree	1.90	.759	Agree	2.07	.712	Agree	2.05	.739	Agree
Philippine English as the norm in teaching English pronunciation	1.93	.787	Agree	1.50	.834	Agree	1.62	.764	Agree	1.68	.809	Agree
Philippine English as the norm in teaching English vocabulary	1.88	.714	Agree	1.69	.680	Agree	1.71	.708	Agree	1.76	.700	Agree
Philippine English as the norm in teaching English grammar	1.85	.760	Agree	1.67	.754	Agree	1.60	.734	Agree	1.70	.752	Agree

**Table 17. Implementation of PhE in the Curriculum and Using PhE in Teaching Pronunciation, Vocabulary, and Grammar**

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Completely disagree	1	2.4%	3	7.1%	3	7.1%	7	5.6%
Disagree	12	29.3%	12	28.6%	14	33.3%	38	30.4%
Agree	20	48.8%	23	54.8%	22	52.4%	65	52.0%
Totally Agree	8	19.5%	4	9.5%	3	7.1%	15	12.0%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 16. Philippine English as the norm in teaching English grammar**

a majority of the teachers surveyed now accept the use of PhE as a pedagogical model for teaching grammar.

The data presented in Tables 13 to 16 are summarized in Table 17. The overall picture illustrated is that the college English teachers surveyed regard PhE as a potential model or variety for teaching English pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar and that they welcome the formal inclusion of PhE in the ELT curriculum.

Table 18 shows that in preparing English tests, a majority of the participants (59.2%) responded that they adhere to both AmE and PhE varieties, which signifies that these two varieties are the most appropriate model in terms of measuring/assessing the students' answers to grammar-related test items. The same table presents that a little more than one-fourth (25.6%) of the population suggests the use of AmE only. In addition, the percentages of those who favor BrE, PhE and a both BrE and PhE are almost statistically insignificant.

When students respond to test questions that require sentence or paragraph writing, Table 19 indicates that 41.6% of the teachers asked do not prescribe a particular variety of English. More than half of the population, 58.4%

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. AmE	11	26.8%	9	21.4%	12	28.6%	32	25.6%
2. BrE	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	0	.0%	2	1.6%
3. PhE	2	4.9%	7	16.7%	2	4.8%	11	8.8%
4. AmE and PhE	23	56.1%	25	59.5%	26	61.9%	74	59.2%
5. BrE and PhE	4	9.8%	0	0	0	0	4	3.2%
6. No Answer					2	4.8%	2	1.6%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 18. Model(s) adhered to in preparing English examinations**

when the total is obtained, sometimes, often, and always do. This population of respondents, when inquired which variety they recommend, suppose that BrE (1.4%), PhE (5.5%), AmE (32.9%) and both AmE and PhE (58.9%) are the most appropriate.

Further analysis of the survey results suggests that, when students write compositions, a particular variety of English to be used is hardly prescribed by 44.8% of the respondents as shown in Table 20. Also, 17.6% sometimes recommend a specific variety, and only 15.2% and 22.4% often and always prescribe a variety to adhere to, respectively. The analysis also shows that those who sometimes, often, and always recommend a particular variety in composition writing promote either BrE (1.5%), PhE (5.9%), AmE (30.9%), or both AmE and PhE (61.8%).

With respect to the selection of textbooks which serve as the

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not at all	23	56.1%	16	38.1%	13	31.0%	52	41.6%
Sometimes	9	22.0%	14	33.3%	7	16.7%	30	24.0%
Often	4	9.8%	8	19.0%	9	21.4%	21	16.8%
Always	5	12.2%	4	9.5%	13	31.0%	22	17.6%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 19. Prescription of a model in answering English tests**

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not at all	23	56.1%	19	45.2%	14	33.3%	56	44.8%
Sometimes	9	22.0%	6	14.3%	7	16.7%	22	17.6%
Often	4	9.8%	10	23.8%	5	11.9%	19	15.2%
Always	5	12.2%	7	16.7%	16	38.1%	28	22.4%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 20. Prescription of a norm in sentence or paragraph writing**

students' primary references in learning English, Table 21 indicates that a relatively small population (39.2%) of respondents sometimes participates in the selection process; only 8.0% often do, and only 18.4% always do. It is also worthy of attention that more than one-fourth of the teacher-respondents are hardly involved in English textbook evaluation. Furthermore, a small percentage of survey participants disclosed that textbooks are barely evaluated.

Those who sometimes, often, and always participate in the textbook selection process were also asked if they consider the variety of English used in writing the textbooks as a criterion. The survey results are as follows: 'not at all' (18.3%); 'sometimes' (34.1%); 'often' (15.9%); and 'always' (31.7%). These figures may suggest that the variety or varieties of English represented in the textbooks are not an exceptionally significant consideration at the moment.

Table 22 presents the respondents' preferred textbooks. The figures show that there is a preponderance (64.0%) of teachers who favor books written in both PhE and AmE. This figure is relatively higher than those who prefer books predominantly written in Standard AmE and authored by native speakers (22.4%) and those who prefer books predominantly written in PhE and authored by Filipino writers (7.2%). It must be noted, however, that the basis for deciding whether or not the book was written using Philippine English was hardly explored in the survey.

The same table also shows the only one respondent favors the utilization books written in other varieties of English. Others respondents prefer books that are:

1. predominantly written in American English and authored by Filipino writers;
2. teeming with contents which are not culture bound;

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Textbooks are not evaluated	3	7.3%	0	.0%	4	9.5%	7	5.6%
Not at all	15	36.6%	10	23.8%	11	26.2%	36	28.8%
Sometimes	16	39.0%	16	38.1%	17	40.5%	49	39.2%
Often	3	7.3%	5	11.9%	2	4.8%	10	8.0%
Always	4	9.8%	11	26.2%	8	19.0%	23	18.4%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

**Table 21. Participation in the selection of basic English textbooks prescribed for students' use**



	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Books predominantly written in Standard American English and authored by native speakers of English	9	22.0%	13	31.0%	6	14.3%	28	22.4%
2. Books predominantly written in Philippine English and authored by Filipino writers	5	12.2%	3	7.1%	1	2.4%	9	7.2%
3. Books written in both Philippine and American Englishes	24	58.5%	24	57.1%	32	76.2%	80	64.0%
4. Books written in other varieties of English	1	2.4%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.8%
5. Others	2	4.9%	1	2.4%	2	4.8%	5	4.0%
6. No Response	0	.0%	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	2	1.6%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 22. College English teachers' preferred English textbooks

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. written in different varieties including Philippine English;</li> <li>4. written in American English without any reference for the author/s' nationality;</li> <li>5. able to address the students' needs, anchored on sound learning/teaching principles/theories; regardless of whether they use a particular variety of English; and</li> <li>6. written in Standard American English (SAE) but not necessarily authored by native speakers of English.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. still follow AmE;</li> <li>2. do not have special section that acknowledges Philippine English variety;</li> <li>3. do not discuss varieties of English yet;</li> <li>4. are not prescribed but they encourage students to consult different references which is a mix of Filipino authors and foreign writers;</li> <li>5. are American textbooks; and</li> <li>6. address all of the options provided in the questionnaire.</li> </ol> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

As regards how their current textbooks and other instructional materials expose students to different varieties of English, Table 23 shows that 32.0% of the respondents declared that their textbooks incorporate lessons and issues on varieties of English, particularly PhE.

A number of teachers (31.2%) also believe that their textbooks contain explicit cultural information and have definite vocabulary and syntactic hints that would make it possible to determine if the variation used was AmE or PhE, and 27.2% aired that their textbooks contain cultural information of both the native and nonnative speakers of English. Others answered that their textbooks:

### The Implications

The survey whose results are presented above was conducted to find out whether and to what extent English teachers in three Philippine Universities desire to conform to native speakers' models only or whether and to what degree they intend to rely on localized varieties of English as well, not just with respect to pronunciation but also in relation to traditional written-based grammar. While the survey may not provide a statistically accurate representation of all English teachers' perceptions and beliefs because the population surveyed is simply a small

	DLSU		PUP		UST		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. The textbooks used by the students incorporate lessons and issues on varieties of English, particularly Philippine English.	20	48.8%	11	26.2%	9	21.4%	40	32.0%
2. The textbooks contain information of both the native and nonnative speakers of English.	8	19.5%	10	23.8%	16	38.1%	34	27.2%
3. The textbooks contain cultural information and have definite vocabulary and syntactic hints that would make it possible to determine if the variation used was American or Philippine English.	10	24.4%	19	45.2%	10	23.8%	39	31.2%
4. Others	3	7.3%	1	2.4%	5	11.9%	9	7.2%
5. No Response	0	.0%	1	2.4%	2	4.8%	3	2.4%
Total	41	100.0%	42	100.0%	42	100.0%	125	100.0%

Table 23. How current textbooks and any other instructional materials expose students to different varieties of English

fraction of the total populace of English language practitioners in the Philippines, the above findings may still give the picture that a good number of college English teachers, borrowing the words of Timmis (2002), now seem to gradually depart from native speakers' norms'. It seems reasonable to argue now that, based on the patterns that emerge from the samples of opinions, English teachers progressively place less premium on total compliance with native speakers' models – in the case of the Philippines, American English. While there is still a prevailing stance among a number of teachers that native speakers' competence should be the yardstick of correctness, it seems reasonable to posit that based on the data presented, a greater population of teachers favor not only one variety of English as *the* pedagogical model in Philippine schools and not only one variety as *the* model for local usage but two varieties– *one* inner-circle variety, i.e., American English and *the* local and nativized variety, i.e., Philippine English.

The preponderance of those who favor the use of both AmE and PhE in daily communication and in the ESL classrooms may be explained by the fact that AmE is the default model used in the Philippines for years and is looked at as the norm-provider for Filipino speakers of English, but because of its continued nativization and modification, PhE vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar emerged, which Filipinos have been using in and for local communication situations. Because PhE seems intelligible and more practical for Filipinos, PhE is used alongside AmE, and reference to the two and the acquisition of these two varieties may allow them to successfully engage in meaningful exchanges that transpire internationally and intranationally.

However, the seemingly divided opinion with respect to the choice of pronunciation model may be attributed to the traditional notion that correct pronunciation is captured only in inner-circle varieties of English. Several studies particularly that of Timmis (2002), showed that teachers from across the globe consider the native speakers' model as the yardstick for faultlessness and achievement, specifically with respect to pronunciation.

The findings of the present study seem to be in consonance

with other studies that explored perceptions and beliefs about English and Englishes, e.g., Kim (2007), Siregar (2010), Nair-Venugopal (2000), and more particularly Bautista's (2003) investigation, suggest that teachers project very positive attitudes towards PhE. However, contrary to Bautista's findings, a larger percentage of English teachers in the present study welcome the use of PhE not only in teaching English pronunciation and vocabulary but also in teaching English grammar. Furthermore, based on the data shown, it may be reasonable to posit now that a mass of college English teachers may no longer be torn between two norms and ambivalent in their choice of norms to teach. A majority have been explicit that they do use, promote, and teach AmE, an outside variety, and PhE, a nonnative English variety, as models for grammar teaching in ESL classrooms.

Ketabi (2007) asserts that to language users "English is not 'English' in the restricted sense...but just a useful tool for communication between people of varying linguistic and cultural backgrounds in a variety of communicative contexts" (p.177). To many of the English teachers surveyed in this study, AmE is not the only English acceptable and appropriate. Thus, both "English" (an inner-circle variety) and "english" (a local variety) are of equal footing and must co-exist. Furthermore, it seems that the birth of World Englishes has made the teachers more receptive to newer paradigms, making them more critical and responsive to the demands of the present-day language instruction. Their exposure to World Englishes framework has probably prompted them to shift from a traditional way of thinking to a newer perspective, which is more accommodating and considerate to other varieties of English. Thus, on a closer look, it would be pedagogically inappropriate to insist solely AmE to students educated in the Philippines and to English teachers from the local setting. The results have shown that many teachers, in the axiomatic or theoretical level, seem to use, teach, and idealize not only the native speakers' variety but also the PhE variety, which, as the results have shown, is not just a localized version of English but also the English of educated Filipinos.

The overall results, therefore, call for a different pedagogical decision that involves ESL curricular changes

and shifting from an idealized default norm to a different instructional anchor which perceptibly meets the teachers' (and eventually the students') aspirations. This will be a reflection of Bautista's (2003) declaration that:

[Teachers] should go to [their] grammar classes with the target to teach the exonormative standard, but also with the awareness that the New Englishes are restructuring some of the grammar rules and that more descriptions of such restructuring are being prepared. (p.25)

A majority of the teachers surveyed in this study, however, seem to be not only aware of the restructured grammar rules apparent in PhE but are also "silent promoters" of the New English born out of the constant use of the English language in various local contexts.

The present results are also suggestive of the strengthened attempt to incorporate World Englishes in the present ELT curriculum. The teachers' preference for instructional materials that mirror a myriad of sociolinguistic issues, e.g., choice of varieties, may be considered an antecedent for a more relevant and appropriate design of learning tools. Matsuda (2003 as cited in Coskun, 2010) suggests that the present-day ELT curriculum model should incorporate teaching materials mirroring different varieties and cultures of the English-speaking people to heighten students' awareness of the role and place of English in different geographical locations. Through this, World Englishes will be linked to the local ESL context, which may result in the making of ESL learners who are more linguistically prepared for intercultural and international or intranational communication.

## References

- [1]. **Bautista, M.L.S. (2001)**. "Attitudes of English language faculty in three leading Philippine universities towards Philippine English". *Asian Englishes*, Vol. 4(1), pp.4-32.
- [2]. **Bautista, M.L.S. (2003)**. "The new Englishes and the teaching of grammar". In J.E. James (Ed.), *Grammar in the language classroom: Changing approaches and practices*, pp. 62-90. Anthology Series 43. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- [3]. **Bernardo, A.S. (2011)**. "De-hegemonizing the hegemonized: An exploratory study on the dominion of American English in the oldest University in Asia". *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, Vol. 1(3), pp.7-22.
- [4]. **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". *The Philippine ESL Journal*, Vol. 3, pp.74-107
- [5]. **Coskun, A. (2010)**. "Whose English should we teach? Reflections from Turkey". *ESP World*, Vol. 1(27), pp. 1-20.
- [6]. **He, D. & Li, D. (2009)**. "Language attitudes and linguistic features in the China English debate". *World Englishes*, Vol. 28(1), pp. 70-89.
- [7]. **Ketabi, S. (2007)**. "Native speaker norms and teaching English as an international language". *Iranian Journal of Language Studies (IJLS)*. Vol. 1(3), pp. 171-180.
- [8]. **Kim, Y.S. (2007)**. "Korean adults' attitudes toward varieties of English. (Unpublished MSc in Applied Linguistics)". The University of Edinburgh. Retrieved from dissertations and theses database.
- [9]. **Nair-Venugopal, S. (2000)**. "English, identity and the Malaysian workplace". *World Englishes*, Vol. 19(2), pp. 205-213.
- [10]. **Paine, M. (2010)**. *Standard vs. non-standard Englishes: Which model are we teaching and why?* Retrieved from <http://www.eilj.com/Thesis-Paine.pdf>
- [11]. **Pajares, M.F. (1992)**. "Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct". *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 62(3), pp. 307-332.
- [12]. **Richards, J. (1996)**. "Teachers' maxims in language teaching". *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30(2), pp. 281-296.
- [13]. **Shavelson, R.J. & Stern, P. (1981)**. "Research on teachers' pedagogical judgements, decisions, and behavior". *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 51(4), 455-498.
- [14]. **Siregar, F. (2010)**. "The language attitudes of students of English literature and D3 English at Maranatha Christian University toward American English, British English and Englishes in Southeast Asia, and their various contexts of use in Indonesia". *Philippine ESL Journal*, Vol. 4, pp. 66-91.

## RESEARCH PAPERS

[15]. Timmis, I. (2002). "Native-speaker norms and international English: A classroom view". *ELT Journal*, Vol. 56(3), pp. 240-249.

[16]. Williams, M., & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[17]. Young, T.J. & Walsh, S. (2010). "Which English? Whose

English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties". *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, Vol. 23(2), pp. 123-137.

[18]. Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

*Alejandro S. Bernardo is currently the Instructor in English at The Graduate School, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines.*