**International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning**
2014 January, Volume 3 Number 1, 67-80


# Segmental features of English modeled by selected professors in a state university in the Philippines: Implications in teaching English

Guinto, Nicanor
*Southern Luzon State University, Philippines (nicguinto@gmail.com)*

ISSN: 2243-7754
Online ISSN: 2243-7762

**Received**: 01 June 2013 **Revised**: 22 August 2013 **Accepted**: 23 August 2013 OPEN ACCESS
**Available Online**: 30 October 2013 **DOI**: 10.5861/ijrsll.2013.475

***Abstract***

This paper is a case study that identified the segmental features observable among and modeled by three professors in a state university in the Philippines (where Tagalog is the native language), in their reading of a poem. In reference to General American English (GAE) which Filipino speakers of English attempt to approximate, generalizations out of the data and pedagogical implications were derived. The sociolectal approach in describing phonological features of a particular speech community was employed in this paper. Results revealed that substitution, addition and deletion of sound segments are governed by the interference of L1 and caused by the fossilization of pronunciation "lapses" of the participants. These lapses can therefore be regarded as defining features of the variety of English spoken by speakers in the area and perhaps its neighboring provinces since the participants serve as models in the community. In view of this, teachers of English should strengthen the Communicative Competence Model in the teaching of the language in order to make students be sensitive and appreciative of varieties of English such as the one noted in this paper.

***Keywords:*** segmental features; Philippine English; language variation; communicative competence.

# Segmental features of English modeled by selected professors in a state university in the Philippines: Implications in teaching English

## 1. Introduction

There is no doubt about the hegemony of English as the medium of communication around the world given its global dominance in business, scientific, academic, and political spheres. The dynamic nature of language caused English to spawn developments that are unique to a speech community where the language is not necessarily the primary language (Crystal, 1997; 2000). As a result, the English language was transformed and repackaged into different varieties, creating a family of Englishes that cannot be claimed to be their own anymore by the speech community presently regarded as "genetically" native speakers (Kachru, 1996).

Asian countries, among others, have been taking the center stage in the adoption and reshaping of English since the 1960s. In a compelling paper by Braj Kachru (1996), he declared that English is not just a language *in* Asia, but *of* Asia. This is evident in the fact that "Asia provides an integrated profile of English within the Concentric Circles model of the spread of English" (Kachru, 1996, p. 6), which in essence, affords credence to the notion that there are more people speaking English in Asia than the population of USA, UK, Australia, and New Zealand combined.

In the Philippines, English gained prestige both as a post-colonial tradition and as a result of "rivalry" in the selection of the national language. Prior to the 1970s, language became one of the essential indicators of socio-economic status. English became attached with the activities of the rich, the famous, and the educated, while the local vernaculars were left among the unlettered and underprivileged living in rural areas (Bolton and Bautista, 2009). At the same time, English earned greater prestige over other vernaculars due in part to the language problem in the country spurred by the 1935 constitution specifying the national language to be based on the Tagalog of Manila and other neighboring provinces. The latter generated ethno linguistic debates which eventually led to the adoption of English as the buffer language (Tupas, 2000; 2009).

As time passed by, English gradually departed from colonial standards, giving birth to a "transplanted variety" (Gonzales, 2009, p.13) of the language that is closer to the Filipino heart. Llamzon's pioneering research in 1969 proved this assumption. His major argument was a metaphorical statement: "Language is like the clothes one wears… When Filipinos speak English, they speak it the Filipino way" (2010, p. 71).

Though a numbered few refuse to accept the emergence of a variety they deem substandard in reference to American or British English, a plethora of researches in the field prove the existence of a variety of English unique to the Philippines. Among the many features of Philippine English, the uniqueness of its phonological shape would be a good gauge in identifying its individuality among other regional varieties.

### *1.1 Objectives, Scope and Limitations*

This paper attempts to identify the phonological features observable among and modeled by three professors in a state university in Quezon province in their reading of Pablo Neruda's poem entitled I do not Love You. It particularly describes the segmental features found in the reading of the poem in reference to GAE. In addition, pedagogical implications were offered to address the issue in the teaching of English.

This paper, however, was not conceived to offer an over-all generalization about the variety of English spoken in Quezon province since the potential sound units present in the poem pose as the limiting factor in the quest for profound conclusions from the gathered data. Nonetheless, the poem was deliberately chosen since it contains potential sound segments peculiar to general Philippine English as depicted in the study of Tayao (2009). At the same time, the study is treated as a case study since it tried to profile the segmental features of the three

participants based on available data. As such, this paper only seeks to describe features than to prescribe ones that are deemed "standard".

Segmental features which are common to at least two, if not all, of the participants have been highlighted in the discussion. Some features which are isolated to a single participant were discarded. Only the segmental level was analyzed in this paper, since the instrument is a pre-packaged poem that limits the analysis of prosodic features natural in spontaneous speech.

## 2. The Participants

The participants in this paper are three purposively-chosen female professors from a state university in Quezon province, Philippines. Their first language (L1) is Tagalog, specifically the dialect of the language spoken in the province and nearby towns. They have been teaching collegiate subjects, which require them to use English as the medium of instruction, since the 1980s. Participant A has Ph.D. units in Industrial Education teaching Research Methods and Creative Writing to undergraduate Communication and English-major students. Participant B has Master's units in Filipino teaching Humanities aside from Filipino. Participant C is a Ph.D. holder in Mathematics and teaches Mathematics and Research to undergraduate and graduate students. The three of them were raised in Quezon province and are presently holding important positions in a state university there. Similarly, they are recognized by the community as authorities in several respects.

The participants were selected with McKaughan's view in mind (cited by Llamzon, 1996) that educated Filipino speakers serve as model of good Philippine English. Since the three of them are some of the most respected professors in the University and in the region, their thoughts on issues are treated as authority and most likely so as the way they speak English.

## 3. The Instrument

The instrument used in this study is Pablo Neruda's poem entitled "I do not Love You". It is composed of 14 lines divided into three stanzas. However, the first stanza was dropped in the reading because the participants refused to begin reading with the negative statement "I do not love you." Nevertheless, the number of lines is sufficient enough to describe the phonological features in their reading. The poem was deliberately chosen since it contains potential sound segments peculiar to general Philippines English as depicted in the study of Tayao (2009).

The lines which were read by the participants are as follows:

1) I love you as the plant that never blooms
2) but carries in itself the light of hidden flowers;
3) thanks to your love a certain solid fragrance,
4) risen from the earth, lives darkly in my body.
5) I love you without knowing how, or when, or from where.
6) I love you straightforwardly, without complexities or pride;
7) so I love you because I know no other way
8) that this: where I does not exist, nor you,
9) so close that your hand on my chest is my hand,
10) so close that your eyes close as I fall asleep.

## 4. Methodology

This paper adopts the sociolectal approach in describing phonological features of spoken English in the selected locale based on the reading of Pablo Neruda's poem by three participants considered authorities in the locality. The sociolectal approach studies the social dialect of a language variety that is associated with a social group (i.e. - socioeconomic class, an ethnic group, an age group, etc) (Wolfram, 2004).

The respondents were given a copy of the poem and were asked to skim through it for a couple of minutes. They were instructed to read it in the way they would normally read a piece of written discourse. When they were ready, they were asked to read it once while their voice is being recorded through a cellular phone audio recorder (a My Phone BB+ Duo phone) in WAV (Windows Audio Video) format.

The recording was transcribed (see Appendix A), following phonetic transcription convention suggested by Crystal (1984) which uses the IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) symbols for notation. The 2005 revision of the IPA, as can be seen in http://www.2.arts.gla.uk/IPA/ipa.html, was adopted in the notation. The kind of transcription employed is generally called narrow transcription because what were encoded were the noticeable and detailed phonetic features found in the recording (Katamba, 1989).

To serve as explanatory framework, Noam Chomsky's (1968) Theory of Distinctive features was used in the discussion. Likewise, the discussion made references to spoken GAE because of the notion that Filipinos approximate GAE as was found in the study of Tayao (2009). The transcription of GAE was based on Merriam Webster 2012 Android Application Dictionary. In addition, discussion was also influenced by Llamzon's (1996) statement that local teachers in the Philippines "are willing to copy American English up to a point" (p. 43). In fact, they use this variety of English to suggest formality in speech.

## 5. Results and Discussion

Among the significant features found in the way the three participants read the poem, the most notable feature, at which other features discussed herein presumably stems from, is that the three of them seemed to try to pronounce sound segments represented by each letters they see in the poem. This attempt is reminiscent of the way the vernacular is articulated – it being syllable-timed rather than stress-timed. The former gives approximately equal time to pronounce each syllable in a segment, while the latter gives focus on syllables deemed important in an utterance (e.g. – content words). Languages in the Philippines are said to be syllable-timed, while GAE is stress-timed. With this in mind, the following segmental features found in the reading of I do not Love you by three speakers in this paper are identified in the succeeding paragraphs.

### *5.1 Consonants*

The transcription in Appendix A reveals that the labiodental fricatives (/v/) and (/f/), voiced alveolar fricative (/z/), and interdental fricatives (/θ/) and (/ð/) in GAE are problematic among the three participants.

**Table 1**

*Phonetic realization of /v/ and /f/*

| Problematic Segment | Word/s | GAE Transcription | Par. A's Reading | Par. B's Reading | Par. C's Reading | Phonetic Realization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | never | /ˈnɛvər/ | [nɛbər] | [nɛbɛr] | [nɛvɛr] | |
| /v/ | love | /lʌv/ or /ləv/ | [lav] | [lab] | [lab] | [b] |
| | lives | /livz/ | [libs] | [laIvz] | [libs] | |
| | of | /ʌv/ or /əv/ | [ʌf] | [əf] | [əp] | [f] or [p] |
| /f/ | itself | /ɪtˈsɛlf/ | [itsəlf] | [Itsɛlp] | [Itsɛlp] | [p] |

It can be noted in table 1 that the voiced labiodental fricative /v/ co-occur with the voiced bilabial plosive /b/ when /v/ is orthographically represented by the letter "v" such as in never, love, and lives. However, when /v/ is represented by the letter "f," such as in of, it becomes a voiceless bilabial plosive [p] or is devoiced to [f], not necessarily due to the phonological environment, but mainly due to orthography. Based on the data, the allophones of /v/ are in free variation, as they were found interchangeably in medial and final positions. The absence of segments beginning with the voiced labiodental fricative in the instrument makes it hard to draw conclusions whether the same happens in initial position. Nonetheless, it is safe to conclude that in the case of the participants being described in this paper, [b], [f], and [p] are allophones of /v/ in the previously-mentioned conditions.

It is interesting to emphasize that in the study of Tayao, /v/ is easily articulated by speakers in the acrolect and mesolect levels. It was in the basilect level that she found /v/ to occur interchangeably with /b/ in an utterance. Thus, L1 interference may explain the variation in the present data being examined. On the other hand, it may also be partly explained by the possible misconception of the participants of the one-to-one correspondence between letters and sounds.

Meanwhile, a segment having the voiceless labiodental fricative /f/, in final position, is realized by the voiceless bilabial plosive /p/, such as in itself. The participants did not seem to have difficulty articulating /f/ when in initial position, such as in flower, fragrance, from, and fall, and when in medial position such as in straightforwardly. Thus, the following holds true in the data being examined: /f/ → ([p]) / __# or the voiceless labiodental fricative sometimes becomes voiceless bilabial plosive when in final position.

This is supported by Tayao's conclusion that Filipino speakers tend to substitute /f/ with /p/ because of the absence of the former in their native language.

**Table 2**

*Phonetic realization of /z/*

| Problematic Segment | Word/s | GAE Transcription | Par. A's Reading | Par. B's Reading | Par. C's Reading | Phonetic Realization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /z/ | blooms | /blumz/ | [blums] | [blums] | [blums] | [s] |
| | flowers | /ˈflaʊərz/ | [flawəs] | [flawɛrs] | [flawɛrs] | |
| | because | /bɪˈkɔz/ | [bIkəs] | [bIkɔs] | [bIkɔs] | |
| | lives | /livz/ | [libs] | [laIvz] | [libs] | |
| | does | /dɔz/ | [das] | [das] | [das] | |
| | eyes | /aIz/ | [aIs] | [aIs] | [aIs] | |
| | close | /kloz/ | [klos] | [klos] | [klos] | |

Table 2 shows that the supposed voiced alveolar fricative /z/ in final position, as expected in GAE in the delivery of words such as blooms, flowers, because, lives, does, eyes, and close, which are all preceded by a voiced segment, is substituted by [s] by the participants. Thus, /z/ → [-voice] / __# or the voiced alveolar fricative is devoiced when in final position. The substitution can be mainly attributed again to the possible misconception of the participants of a one-to-one correspondence between letters and sounds, which is a common feature among languages native to the Philippines.

Llamzon (1996) stated that Filipinos substitute /z/, /ʃ/, and /ʤ/ for /s/ due mainly to its absence in the local vernacular.

**Table 3**

*Phonetic realization of /θ/ and /ð/*

| Problematic Segment | Word/s | GAE Transcription | Par. A's Reading | Par. B's Reading | Par. C's Reading | Phonetic Realization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | the | /ðə/ or /ðə/ | [ðə] | [d̪ə] | [d̪a] | |
| | that | /ðət/ | [ðət] | [d̪at] | [d̪at] | |
| /ð/ | without | /wɪðˈaʊt/ | [wIðaʊt] | [wId̪aʊt] | [wId̪ ̣aʊt] | [d̪] |
| | other | /ˈʌðər/ | [aðɚ] | [ad̪ɛr] | [ad̪ɛr] | |
| | this | /ðɪs/ | [ðIs] | [d̪is] | [d̪Is] | |
| /θ/ | thanks | /θæŋks/ | [θæŋks] | [t̪eŋks] | [t̪ɛŋks] | [t̪] |
| | earth | /ɛrθ/ | [ɛrθ] | [ert̪] | [ɛrt̪] | |

Table 3 indicates that two of the participants found it difficult to pronounce the interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ as expected in GAE in the delivery of the following words: the, that, without, other, this, thanks, and earth. The data shows that participants substituted the voiced interdental fricative /ð/ with a voiced dental plosive /d̪/ when in initial and medial positions. In addition, the voiceless interdental fricative /θ/ becomes a voiceless dental plosive [t̪] in initial and final position. Participant A did not have difficulty in articulating /θ/ and /ð/ possibly because she has been teaching subjects that have strong connection with English communication.

Paz, Hernandez, & Peneyra (2003) underscored that the alveolar plosives /t/ and /d/ in GAE are produced by means of dental stops in Filipino phonology. /t/ and /d/ are articulated with the tongue suppressing the flow of air in the upper teeth, as opposed to the GAE alveolar plosives where air is suppressed by the tongue in the alveolar ridge. This indicates that the participants accommodated dental stops native to Filipino phonology when they speak English utterances composed of alveolar plosives.

*5.2 Vowels*

The articulation of the participants of vowel sounds also show variations from GAE.

**Table 4**

*Phonetic realization of /æ/*

| Problematic Segment | Word/s | GAE Transcription | Par. A's Reading | Par. B's Reading | Par. C's Reading | Phonetic Realization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | plant | /plænt/ | [plant] | [plan] | [plant] | |
| /æ/ | hand | /hænd/ | [hænd]/ [hɛn] | [hæn]/ | [han] | [a]/ |
| | | | [θæŋks] | [hɛn] | | [ɛ] |
| | thanks | /θæŋks/ | | [t̪eŋks] | [t̪ɛŋks] | |

It is observable in table 4 that the low front vowel /æ/ is substituted by the participants either with the low back vowel [a] and/or mid front vowel [ɛ] when followed by nasal consonants.

The results are congruent with the findings of Tayao (2009) about GAE /æ/ when articulated by Filipinos. She posited that /æ/ is in free variation with /a/ and /ɛ/ in Philippine English due mainly to the fact that /æ/ is absent in local vernaculars.

In similar light, the lax high front vowel /I/ is substituted by the participants with its tense counterpart, /i/,

which can be seen in the examples in the table that follows.

**Table 5**

*Phonetic realization of /I/*

| Problematic Segment | Word/s | GAE Transcription | Par. A's Reading | Par. B's Reading | Par. C's Reading | Phonetic Realization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | hidden | /ˈhɪdn/ | [hidɛn] | [hidɛn] | hidɛn | [i] |
| | solid | /ˈsɒlɪd/ | [solid] | [solid] | sɔlId | |
| | complexity | /kəmˈplɛksɪti/ | [kɔmplɛksitIs] | [kompliksitis] | kɔmplɛksItIs | |
| | because | /bɪˈkɔz | [bikəs] | [bikɔs] | bikɔs | |

The data indicate that since the lax high front vowel /I/ and its tense counterpart are allophones in free variation in Filipino, they have been used interchangeably by the participants while reading the poem. However, the data also point to the preference of the participants in the use of the tense high front vowel over the other.

Meanwhile, weakening, or vowel reduction, is a significant feature in GAE. Vowel reduction in GAE is usually manifested by the collapse of vowels into /ə/ (Burzio, 2007). The participants out rightly ignored the rule of weakening while reading the poem. As has been mentioned earlier, the participants, at certain points in the reading, attempted to give equal prominence to sounds orthographically represented by letters in the poem. This resulted in the minimal presence of the schwa /ə/, as in the following string of utterance where weakening could have been applied when approximating GAE:

A: [ b^t keris In itsəlf ]

B: [ bat kerIs In Itsɛlp ]

C: [ bat kɛrIs In itsɛlp ]

In lieu of schwa /ə/, the tense mid-central vowel /^/, the front high vowels /e/ and /ɛ/, and the mid and high back vowels have been used by the participants, in the same way as they would have been articulated in isolation compared in its realization in rapid speech.

Llamzon (1996) stated that what mainly brings about the identity of Filipinos while speaking English is their careful articulation of individual syllables leading to their refusal to use vowel reduction – something which is apparent in informal conversational style of American English.

Interestingly, the participants seem to have successfully approximated GAE's mid and high back vowels in reference to the data at hand, This is in contrast with Tayao's (2009) findings that Filipino speakers of English tend to consider /ʊ/, /ɔ/, and /o/ as allophones of /u/ in free variation.

*5.3 Other observable phonological processes*

Aside from devoicing as discussed earlier, addition and deletion are the categories which are also evident in the data.

*5.3.1 Addition of /h/*

The process of adding /h/ is observable in the articulation of the word where *which* was pronounced as /hwɛr/ by the three participants. The voiceless glottal fricative /h/ is added when following a bilabial approximant /w/ in initial position. In GAE, *where* is pronounced in similar manner. However, this approximation, based on the data, only occurs when /w/ appears in a segment beginning a line, as can be seen in line 8 of the poem or when it is preceded by a bilabial nasal /m/, as can be seen in line 5. This kind of addition is

called liaison – addition which happens in word boundary.

In this case, it can be assumed that because of the speaker's anticipation of the phonetic representation of "h" in *where*, /h/ turns out to be added before /w/ for the purpose of emphasis of the sound segment and of the word boundary. However, the present data, and based on previously-discussed results, still point strongly to the notion that the addition can be attributed to the participants' attempt to produce each sound represented by the letters in a given term rather than attempting to successfully approximate GAE speakers.

*5.3.2 Addition of /ʔ/*

Another common feature observable in the transcription of participant B's and C's reading, the voiceless glottal plosive is added in the initial positions in sound segments that introduce the line, such as /ʔaI lab ju/ in lines 1, 5, and 6.

The voiceless glottal plosive is added in initial position following a vowel sound. Paz, Hernandez, & Peneyra (2003) points out that the voiceless glottal plosive is very common in Filipino phonology. In fact, it provides clue to where the stress in a word lies such as in "aso" (dog) – [ʔasɔ] and "basa" (wet) – [basaʔ]. The former is stressed on the first syllable, while the latter is on the second.

*5.3.3 Apocopeic Deletion*

There are two instances of deletion in the present data, both of which happening in the final position (apocope). The first happened with the words *exist* and *chest* found in lines 8 and 9 of the poem respectively.

The voiceless alveolar plosive /t/ is dropped when preceded by a voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ in final position, as observed in /ɛksis/ and /ʧɛs/. It is possible that the segment was deleted due to rapid speech, and because of lesser emphasis on the word.

Moreover, in the case of the word *hand*, mentioned twice in line 9, /d/ was deleted for the supposed /hænd/. Instead, the participants pronounced it as /hɛn/, /hæn/, and /han/. The voiced alveolar plosive /d/ is deleted when preceded by the alveolar nasal /n/ in final position. The deletion can be attributed to the fact that /n/ and /d/ are two voiced consonant clusters which can be hard to articulate in rapid speech.

## 6. Conclusions

From the careful examination of the data gathered from three participants, the following conclusions, which hereafter may be regarded as features of their variety of English, are hereby offered:

1. In reference to General American English (GAE), which Filipinos approximate, the labiodental fricatives /v/ and /f/, voiced alveolar fricative /z/, and interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ are problematic among the three participants. The participants substitute /b/ for /v/, /p/ for /f/, /θ/ for /t̪/ and /ð/ for /d̪/.

2. Vowel sounds such as /æ/, /I/, and /ə/ are substituted with /a/ and /ɛ/ for /æ/, /i/ for /I/ and /ʌ/, /e/ and /ɛ/, for /ə/. This can be attributed to the idea that the local vernacular has a few vowel sounds compared to English. As a result, vowel sounds inherent to GAE are substituted for vowel sounds that are native to the first language (L1) of the participants.

3. Instances of devoicing, addition and deletion were observed through consistent patterns present in the data. /z/ is devoiced when found in final position, /h/ is added through liaison to word-initial position following /w/, /ʔ/ is added in initial position following a vowel sound, and /t/ and /d/ are deleted in word-final position when preceded by /s/ and /n/ respectively.

4. The substitution of sound segments is assumed to be governed by the possible interference of L1 and caused by fossilization of pronunciation "lapses" of the participants. Based on available data, the

participants transfer their manner of articulating the local vernacular into English resulting in variations from GAE. They attempt to give equal prominence to each sound in the utterance, which may be due to the misconception of a one-to-one correspondence between letters and sounds. These lapses in reference to GAE became their defining feature as an ethno linguistic group speaking a variety of English unique to them, and possibly, the community in general given their influence as respected educators in the locality.

It is therefore suggested that this study be replicated using more number of participants and utilizing spontaneous speech to draw profound conclusions on the variety of English spoken by the speech group and the locality in general.

*6.1 Implications in the teaching of English*

Teachers have the power to influence every aspect of the community for they are viewed as authoritative figures on significant matters and affairs. It is no wonder that aside from media (Dayag, 2009), educators significantly play a prominent role in the modeling of the generally accepted variety of English in the Philippine classroom. In this case, the general American English is regarded as the widely-accepted variety of English which sprang as a post-colonial effect of the American occupation. It is thus the expected variety spoken in class where English is the medium of instruction (MOI) (Gonzales, 2009). But the question is: Could all teachers of subjects that require English as MOI successfully approximate GAE in the classroom?

Despite the fact that recent developments in language pedagogy promote the notion of the teacher serving merely as facilitator of knowledge (Savignon, 2006) especially in collegiate classrooms, the idea that the teacher still dominates much of the talking is not a strange case in the Philippine setting. Regardless of the nature of the subject being taught, except perhaps those which are to be taught in the local vernacular, English is still the expected medium of instruction and communication in (and sometimes out of) the classroom. Hence, language purists would suggest that as models in the community, teachers of subjects that require English as medium need to carry the responsibility of approximating GAE side by side with the teacher of English.

However, Gonzales (2009) claims that little hope can be expected from teachers whose form of English departs from GAE. Short term trainings and programs that aim at “improving the quality” of English proficiency among teachers (who may have been in the profession for decades now) will never be enough to undo fossilized lapses and idiosyncratic grammar that are apparent in their speech. For some of them, the responsibility of modeling the generally accepted variety rests on the shoulders of the English teacher.

It is at that note that the advocacy of language purists can be viewed as an ambitious, if not an impossible task. Even more, the emergence of the English paved the way to the tolerance on varieties considered “deviant” in reference to the more prominent variety of Englishes in certain locale. Deviance, as has been noted in this paper, is significantly manifested in pronunciation lapses, among others, in reference to the prominent variety. But such deviant forms in the study of new Englishes are treated not as “errors” but as “features” of the speech community in question.

This leads to the problematic case of whether modeling a foreign tongue in the Philippine classroom and community should be imposed, or whether adhering to the local flavor when delivering lectures should be opted instead, as a gesture to partake in advocating national identity. With the two opposing views of the use of English in the classroom: one from the purists and one from what is regarded as the reality in the field, it is at this end that the noble duty of the English teacher should come in with the adoption or strengthening of communicative competence model in the teaching of English.

Communicative competence initially proposed by Dell Hymes (1972) and later refined by Swain and Canale in 1980 (cited in Savignon, 1997) highlights the ability of the speaker to be adaptive to his speaking environment. Contrary to linguistic competence, which was formerly given prime spot in the language classroom,

communicative competence takes the ability to discriminate linguistic units just as a skill partnered with three others that are context-dependent.

The Communicative Competence model posits that for a speaker to be communicatively competent, he also needs to be discourse competent, socio-culturally competent, and strategically competent. Discourse competence is concerned with the ability to connect a series of utterances, written words, and/or phrases to form a meaningful text. Socio-cultural competence is the ability to discriminate social rules of language use when exposed to different contexts. Finally, strategic competence manifests the ability to compensate for imperfect knowledge of linguistic rules that may be caused by distractions, fatigue and inattention.

With the notion of the Englishes in mind, the fundamental task of present English teachers therefore is to deliberately attempt to expose the students not only to the prominent variety, but also to other dominant, dominating, standard and standardizing varieties in order for them to be socio-culturally aware of strategies that would enable their discourse to make sense when exposed to speakers of a different variety of English, or perhaps other languages different from theirs. Through this, language stereotypes and discriminatory remarks against speakers of other languages who attempt to use English for international communication will not be subjects of comic relief anymore. Instead, this will open doors to better understanding and appreciation of differences and will invite the celebration of uniqueness in the world where people rapidly break geographical boundaries.

Together, the four components, including linguistic or grammatical competence, will, in turn, produce responsive global citizens among students to different varieties of English spoken by a wide array of people. By adhering to the principles of the model, language teachers will not only be able to produce the much-needed citizens who are globally-prepared for international communication using the language, but they will likewise be able to give birth to a generation of people who are more culturally-sensitive and adaptive to the demands of their dynamic environment.

**Acknowledgement**

I wish to extend my heartfelt gratitude for the help offered by the people behind the completion of this paper. To Dr. Maria Corazon S.A. Castro of the University of the Philippines-Diliman whose expertise in phonology and phonetics, encouragements and motivation inspired the researcher to pursue this topic. To Prof. Carmelita C. Placino, Prof. Shiela M. Manzanilla, and Dr. Marissa L. Cadao of Southern Luzon State University for always being supportive to my research endeavors. To Dr. Cecilia N. Gascon, President of Southern Luzon State University, for approving the scholarship grant, without which I wouldn't have written this paper. And to the editor, readers and reviewers who provided valuable feedback for the improvement of this paper, your priceless support and kindness will forever be etched in my heart.

## 7. References

Bolton, K. & Bautista, M. (2009). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Burzio, L. (2007). Phonology and phonetics of English stress and vowel reduction. *Language Sciences*, 27(1), 154-176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2006.12.019

Chomsky, N. & Halle, M. (1968). The phonetic framework. *The sound pattern of English* (pp. 295-329). New York: Harper & Row.

Crystal, D. (1984). Things to remember when describing speech. *Child language teaching and therapy* (pp. 235-239). UK: University of Reading.

Crystal, D. (1997). *The English language: A guided tour of the language*. NY, USA: Penguin.

Crystal, D. (2002). *The English language*. UK: Penguin books.

Dayag, D.T. (2009). English-language media in the Philippines: Description and research. In M. S. Bautista & K.

Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 49-66). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Gonzales, A. (2009). A favorable climate and soil: A transplanted language and literature. In K. Bolton & M. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp.13-27). Hong Kong University Press: Hong Kong.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics: selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Llamzon, T. (1996). The phonology of Philippine English. In M. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context* (pp. 41-48). Sidney, Australia: The Macquarie Library.

Llamzon, T. (2010, Dec). Riding the tiger in the new millennium: Philippine English and Filipino. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching, L*(1), 68-73.

Kachru, B. (1996). English is an Asian language. In M. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context* (pp. 1-23). Sidney, Australia: The Macquarie Library.

Katamba, F. (1989). *Introduction to phonology*. New York, USA: Addisson Wesley Longman.

Maminta, R. (2010, Dec). Complementary relationships of the Global language and the local language education. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching, 1*(1), 53-59.

Paz, C., Hernandez, V., & Peneyra, I. (2003). *Intro sa pag-aaral ng wika*. Quezon City: UP Press.

Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative competence theory and classroom practice*. USA: McGraw-Hill.

Savignon, S. (2006). Communicative language teaching for the twenty-first century. In M. Cerce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 13-28). Singapore: Heinle & Heinle.

Tayao, M. (2009). A lectal description of the phonological features of Philippine English. In K. Bolton & M. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 157-174). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Tupas, R. (2000, Jan-March). Language studies in English in the Philippines: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of English and Comparative Literature, 6*(1), 1-17.

Tupas, R. (2009). Language as a problem of development: Ideological debates and comprehensive education in the Philippines. *AILA Review, 24*(1), pp. 23-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/aila.22.03tup

Wolfram, W. (2004). Social varieties of American English. In E. Finegan and J. R. Rickford. *Language in the USA: Themes for the twenty-first century*. USA: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809880.006

# Appendix A
# TRANSCRIPTION

***Participant A***

1. əI lav ju az ðə plant ׀ ðət nɛbər blums ׀
2. b^t keris In itsəlf ׀ ðə laIt ׀ ^f hidɛn flawɚs ‖
3. θæŋks tə jər la:v ə sərtəd solid fregrəns ׀
4. risɛn frɔm də ɛrθ ׀ libs darkli ət maI bɛli ‖
5. aI lav ju ׀ wIdət nɔwIŋ haʊ ɔr wɛn ɔr frɔm hwɛr ׀
6. aI lav ju stretfɔrwɚdli ׀ wIðaʊt kɔmplɛksitIs ׀ ɔr praId ‖
7. sɔ aI lav ju ׀ bikəs aI no ׀ nɔ aðɚ we b^t ðIs ׀
8. hwɛr aI das nat ɛksis ׀ nɔr ju ׀
9. so klos ðat jər hænd ən maI ʧɛst ׀ Iz maI hɛn ׀
10. so klos ðat jər aIs klos ׀ as If aI ׀ fɔl ׀ əslip #

***Participant B***

1. ʔaI lab ju əs d̪ə plan d̪at nɛbɛr blums ׀
2. bat kerIs In Itsɛlp d̪a laIt əf hidɛn flawɛrs ׀
3. t̪eŋks tʊ jʊr la:b ׀ a sɛrten solid fragnans ׀
4. rɛjsIn fram d̪a ert̪ ׀ laIvz darkli In mai badI ‖
5. aI lab ju wid̪aʊt nɔwiŋ haʊ ׀ ^r wɛn ׀ ^r frɔm hwɚ ׀
6. ʔaI lab ju stre:jtfɔrwardli ׀ wid̪aʊt kompliksitis ׀ ^r fraId ׀
7. sɔ aI lab ju bikɔs ׀ aI no ׀ nɔ ad̪ɛr we ׀ d̪at d̪is ׀
8. hwɛr aI d̪as nat eksIt nɔr ju ׀
9. so klos ׀ d̪at jʊr hæn ɔn maI ʧɛs ׀ Is maI hɛn ׀
10. sɔ klos d̪at jʊr aIs ׀ klos ׀ as aI fɔl ׀ azlIp #

***Participant C***

1. aI lav ju as d̪a plant ǀ d̪at nɛvɛr blums ǀ
2. bat kɛrIs In itsɛlp ǀ d̪a laIt əp hidɛn flawɛrs ‖
3. t̪ɛŋks tʊ jʊr laːb ǀ a sɛrtɛn sɔlId fregrans ǀ
4. risɛn fram d̪I ɛrt̪ ǀ libs darkli In maI badI ‖
5. ʔaI lab ju wId̪ ˌaʊt nɔwiŋ haw ǀ ɔr wɛn ǀ ɔr fram hwɛr ǀ
6. ʔaI lab ju stretfɔrwardli ǀ wid̪ ˌaʊt kɔmplɛksItIs ɔr praId ‖
7. sɔ aI lav ju ǀ bikɔs aI nɔ ǀ no ad̪ɛr we ‖ d̪at d̪Is ǀ
8. hwɛr aI d̪as nat ɛksIs nɔr ju ǀ
9. sɔ klos d̪at jur han ən maI ʧɛst Is maI han ǀ
10. sɔ klɔs d̪at jur aIs ǀ klos as aI fɔl aslip #