

PINOYLISH: THE AWARENESS AND NOTIONS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN NORTHERN LUZON

Joseph B. Quinto
(j.quinto@bsu.edu.ph)

*Benguet State University
La Trinidad, Benguet, Philippines*

Abstract: Pinoylish (Philippine English) has made a mark in the literature, although research on the perspectives of university students on Pinoylish is still scarce. As a result, a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design was undertaken to investigate the awareness and notions of 761 university students in Northern Luzon, Philippines. The results revealed that university students were not oblivious; however, they were marginally aware of the meanings, features, and uses of Pinoylish, implying that they do not possess a complete understanding of this variety of English. This study also unveiled that university students disagreed on negative notions while agreeing on positive notions of Pinoylish; this consensus can be interpreted as a positive attitude toward Pinoylish. Drawing on the findings, this study has implications for the pluricentric model of English Language Teaching (ELT) and suggests possible research trajectories.

Keywords: English language teaching, Philippine English, Pinoylish, pluricentric model

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v35i1/107-122>

It has been eloquently argued that the primary objective of learning the English language is typically promoted through traditional English Language Teaching (ELT) pedagogy that aims to achieve a native-like competency (Liu & Cheng, 2017). However, the English language landscape has undergone transformations due to the emergence of World Englishes' (WE) perspectives (Ates et al., 2015; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2019). A significant concept derived from World Englishes is Asian Englishes (Ahn, 2015), which includes one of the few postcolonial varieties of English, that is Philippine English (PhE) or Pinoylish (Martin, 2020). This variety of English is mostly influenced by American English (Fuchs, 2017; Munalim, 2019).

Borlongan (2016) and Esquivel (2019) asserted that English has functioned as a second language for Filipinos since the beginning of the American colonization. Filipinos have been accustomed to using English alongside their mother languages. Consequently, the inclusion of Philippine English into English as a Second Language (ESL) lessons in the Philippines has been a subject of ongoing debate (Hernández, 2020a).

According to Polzenhagen and Wolf (2009, p. 209), some speakers associate English with Western culture and fail to recognize or accept the ongoing transformations of English in non-Western settings. While a number of well-educated Filipino academics disagree with the predominance of American English in the country, others are undecided about the role of Philippine English in English language instruction (Dimaculangan, 2022; Martin, 2014). On the

other hand, multiple research studies indicated that Filipinos exhibit a positive attitude towards Philippine English (Dimangadap-Malang & Pantao, 2021; Gonzales, 2004; Martin, 2019).

Furthermore, Torres' (2019) findings insinuated that Philippine English is now widely used in both informal and formal contexts. According to Gustilo et al. (2019), English classes should embrace a paradigm shift by including local forms and meanings. Finally, Bernardo and Madrunio (2015) firmly remarked that there are unbreakable linguistic rules, but there are also grammatical structures that have been officially recognized. This suggests that not everyone is afraid of Philippine English and that it can resolutely serve as a teaching model, not only in terms of pronunciation and vocabulary but also in terms of grammar.

World Englishes

Kachru and Nelson (2006) noted that the expansion of English has been described by using two diasporas. The first emerged as a result of the immigration of English-speaking individuals from Great Britain to Australia, North America, and New Zealand. The second factor mostly arose from the spread of English language among speakers of various groups of people and languages around the world, influenced by colonialism and other political and economic factors. Percillier (2016) added that English as a Native Language (ENL), English as a Second Language (ESL), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) have historically been considered the three main categories of English varieties.

ENL countries consist of Britain and former settlement colonies, where a majority of native English speakers were permanently relocated and established. In contrast, ESL countries are comprised of former British or American exploitation colonies, where a minority of native English speakers ruled over the local population and supervised the extraction of natural resources during the colonial era. Because of its function as an international lingua franca, the EFL designation applies to the majority of other countries where English is taught as a foreign language.

Philippine English

Southeast Asia comprises nations and territories where English is spoken both as a second language and as a foreign language as a result of its complicated colonial past (Percillier, 2016). The first category includes the former British colonies, such as Singapore, Malaysia, Brunei, Myanmar (Burma), Hong Kong, and the Philippines, which were briefly placed under the control of the United States.

Countries that were once under French colonial rule, such as Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and a former Dutch colony like Indonesia, along with Thailand, which managed to avoid colonial domination, are the nations where English is spoken as a foreign language. In the Philippines, adopting the American language has resulted in a unique trajectory. Shortly after the United States' colonization of the Philippines in 1898, the language was used by an educated elite, presumably at varying levels of proficiency (Gonzales, 2008).

Around the late 1950s, a combination of three factors made English less dominant in Philippine education (Bernardo, 2008). The first factor was the successful implementation of instructional methods utilizing native languages as the primary medium. The second factor was

the proclamation by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), declaring that students should begin their education in their native language “since they understand it best and because doing so will minimize the distance between home and school” (Bernardo, 2008, p. 29).

The third factor was a suggestion that advocated for teaching English as a secondary language. Another factor is the claim that the English language creates social stratification, where English speakers constitute an elite group that has control over monetary benefits and, thereby, alienates themselves from the general population (Manarpaac, 2008). Overall, a unanimous endorsement of a native Philippine English variation is not met with a broadly favorable attitude (Bolivar, 2020).

Extensive scholarly research has already discussed the perspectives of teachers regarding Philippine English (Bernardo, 2017; Dimaculangan, 2018; Gustilo & Dimaculangan, 2018; Gustilo et al., 2019). This study specifically addresses the paucity of Pinoylish/Philippine English research in the context of university students. Particularly, the researcher focuses on the following research questions:

1. How aware are university students of Pinoylish?
2. What are the notions of university students regarding the educated form of Pinoylish?

This study is significant because it espouses the pluricentric model of English Language Teaching (ELT) which is imperative in realizing United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4.7: to ensure that all learners which includes university students acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development through global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development by 2030. Promoting Englishes that are used locally and internationally and are defined by their users, uses, and communication methods can help achieve this (Mahboob, 2014). In this regard, linguistic prejudice that people including university students cannot help having can be overcome (Adityarini, 2014; Jianli, 2015). Consequently, Hernandez (2020a) calls for the continued need for significant efforts to spread awareness of Pinoylish/Philippine English among university students because there is still a huge disparity in knowledge, acceptability, and educational implementation of its concepts and principles across nearly all spheres in the nation.

METHOD

Research Design

This study utilized a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design. The term “sequential explanatory design” denotes the systematic procedure of initially gathering quantitative data, and subsequently acquiring qualitative data (Almeida, 2018). As a result, the sequential explanatory mixed-methods design provided more precise and more comprehensive insights into the awareness and notions of university students of Pinoylish.

Site and Participants

A total of seven hundred sixty-one university students from five public and private higher education institutions in Northern Luzon, Philippines participated in the research during the

second semester of the 2022-2023 Academic Year. The researcher reached out to university instructors who were willing to participate in the collection of quantitative data from various universities (Etikan et al., 2016). The criteria used for the purposive sampling in the qualitative phase were as follows; firstly, participants took part in the quantitative data collection; and, they were willing to participate in the Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). In this regard, two FGDs were conducted: one onsite with a total of eight participants and one online with six participants via Zoom video conferencing. The average duration of the FGDs was one hour and eleven minutes.

Instrumentation

The instruments were divided into two: a questionnaire and an interview protocol. A survey questionnaire titled “Pinoylish (Philippine English) Questionnaire” was adapted and was validated by two experts. The first part, adapted from Hernández (2020a), contains 21 statements which identify how aware university students are of Pinoylish; items 1-6 (meanings of Philippine English), items 8-13 (features of Philippine English), and items 14-22 (uses of Philippine English). The first part yielded a good reliability result with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.885. There were 22 items in the original questionnaire, but one item was removed as suggested by one of the experts. A 4-point Likert scale was used ranging from very aware, aware, slightly aware, and unaware. The second part, adapted from Bautista (2001), contains 16 statements to bring out the notions of university students of educated Pinoylish; items 1-7 (negative notions with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.820 interpreted as good) and items 8-16 (positive notions with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.747 interpreted as acceptable). There were 18 items originally, but 2 items were deleted after undergoing a reliability test. A 4-point Likert scale was used ranging from strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Based on the findings of the quantitative phase, an interview protocol served as the second instrument. Nine key questions that were designed to elaborate and clarify participants' responses in the questionnaire made up the interview protocol for learners.

Procedure

To conduct reliability testing, a formal request letter was sent to a specific department of a state university to recruit 15 students. Since the first round of pilot testing did not yield a reliable result, a second round was necessitated with another set of 15 students in the same department. Subsequently, the researcher was required to send formal request letters to various professors in Northern Luzon in order to gather necessary data. Upon their approval, the researcher included consent letters with the Pinoylish (Philippine English) Questionnaire via a Google Form.

The qualitative part adhered to Quinto's (2022) data collection protocol. In his study, a consent letter was distributed. The FGD consisted of 6-9 members in which the researcher was acting as the facilitator and using a semi-structured interview protocol. The session lasted approximately 70-100 minutes and was transcribed. The recordings and the transcripts were then returned to the participants for member check. Following the quantitative data collection, the researcher selected one state university for the Focus Group Discussion by contacting the fourth-year level adviser of one degree program. Subsequently, a consent letter was sent to the group chat room of the fourth-year students for the purpose of conducting an FGD. Soon after, two

groups were formed; one group consisting of eight students preferred an in-person FGD, while one group of six students preferred an online FGD using Zoom video conferencing. The meetings were recorded with the permission of the recruited participants. Afterward, a member check was conducted by sending them the recordings and the transcripts. Overall, the researcher ensured that data privacy was maintained during the data collection process.

Analysis

To analyze the quantitative part, descriptive statistics was employed. On the other hand, the qualitative part of the study utilized a thematic analysis approach based on the descriptive phenomenology method developed by Sundler et al. (2019). This involved following specific steps, such as starting with the identification of themes and descriptive texts, which were then supported with quotes. The aim was to articulate the meaningful insights derived from participants' experiences. Finally, pseudonyms were used for the participants in the FGD for data privacy.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The Awareness of University Students of Pinoylish

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistical results on the awareness of Pinoylish/Philippine English meanings among university students in Northern Luzon.

Table 1. Meanings of Pinoylish/Philippine English

Meanings of Philippine English	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. There is a local English variety called Philippine English.	2.61	0.87	Aware
2. Philippine English has varieties (i.e. educated Philippine English, Colegiala Philippine English, Yaya Philippine English).	2.06	0.86	Slightly Aware
3. Philippine English is Taglish.	2.63	0.93	Aware
4. Philippine English is Carabao English.	2.21	0.96	Slightly Aware
5. Philippine English is educated Philippine English.	2.70	0.83	Aware
6. Philippine English is a mark that Filipinos have owned English and have freed themselves from the colonizing power of native speakers.	2.55	0.86	Aware
Overall Mean	2.46		Slightly Aware

The general result of the slight awareness of university students in this research was different from the study of Hernández (2020a), whose respondents were moderately aware and

were graduate students. This implies that university students have a lower awareness of the meanings of Philippine English. University students specified that they were slightly aware that Philippine English is Carabao English. The majority of students in the FGDs mentioned that they were familiar with the phrase ‘Carabao’ English, but lacked a precise understanding of its meaning. According to Porras (2022), the term ‘Carabao English,’ which refers to the Filipinos’ usage of English that is rife with grammar errors, was coined to describe Filipinos’ non-standard use of the language. This supports Les’ statement in (1):

- (1) LES: I have heard Carabao English before. I think it describes imperfect English, something like ‘broken’ English.

Also, university students were slightly aware that Philippine English has varieties; i.e. educated Philippine English, Colegiala Philippine English, and Yaya Philippine English. Tim in (2) claimed:

- (2) TIM: “I know World Englishes like American English, British English, and Indian English, but I did not really know that there are educated Philippine English, Colegiala English, and Yaya English.”

Ruiz, another student, mentioned that she knew that there is such a thing as Philippine English, but did not know the varieties, as shown in (3).

- (3) RUIZ: I am slightly aware of the different varieties of English. Since I don’t really know the names of the varieties, I just thought that Philippine English is the name.

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistical results on the awareness of Northern Luzon university students regarding the features of Pinoylish/Philippine English.

Table 2. Features of Pinoylish/Philippine English

Features of Philippine English	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
7. Philippine English has its own accent, phonology, vocabulary, and grammar.	3.09	0.80	Aware
8. Philippine English mirrors the national and cultural identity of Filipinos.	2.85	0.83	Aware
9. Philippine English is reflected in Filipino English textbooks, Philippine English resources, and instructional materials.	2.79	0.84	Aware
10. Philippine English has been codified into dictionaries and grammars.	2.61	0.87	Aware
11. Educated Philippine English has acceptable variants (e.g. fill up, result to, based from) from American English (e.g. fill-in, result in, based on).	2.65	0.84	Aware
12. Educated Philippine English embodies appropriateness, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in communication.	2.82	0.78	Aware
Overall Mean	2.80		Aware

In general, university students were aware of the features of Philippine English. This finding contrasts with the results of Hernández’s study (2020a), where the respondents, who were graduate students, demonstrated a strong awareness (were very aware) of the features of Philippine English. This signifies that there is a gap between what university students and graduate students know about the features of Philippine English.

It is interesting to note that the university students were aware that *Philippine English has its own accent, phonology, vocabulary, and grammar*. This is partly because these pieces of information are taught in schools by educated Filipinos (Martin, 2014). Another reason for this awareness is that the Philippine English variety is acknowledged and has already achieved acceptance, which is a positive first step toward its development as a legitimate variant (Torres & Alieto, 2019). This is why it has been incorporated into the teaching curriculum.

Although the university students were generally aware of the features of Philippine English, the statement *Philippine English has been codified into dictionaries and grammars* garnered the lowest mean. Borlongan (2016) commented that the country's English has already been homogenized to the extent where dictionaries and reference grammars can now provide (initial) codification, which denotes that codification is still in its inception which may not necessarily be available to university students yet.

Table 3 displays the descriptive statistical results for the awareness of university students in the north of Luzon regarding the uses of Pinoylish/Philippine English.

Table 3. Uses of Pinoylish/Philippine English

Uses of Philippine English	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
13. Philippine English is the English variety that Filipinos often use in intranational communication (communication in the Philippines only).	2.77	0.81	Aware
14. Philippine English is the English variety that Filipinos often use in local media.	2.91	0.76	Aware
15. Philippine English has the potential to be implemented into the English language classroom as a module or unit within the compulsory or elective part of the English language curriculum.	2.68	0.83	Aware
16. Philippine English as the norm in teaching English vocabulary is used by Filipino English teachers.	2.81	0.78	Aware
17. Philippine English as the norm in teaching English grammar is used by Filipino English teachers.	2.76	0.78	Aware
18. Philippine English as the norm in testing the speaking skills of Filipino learners is used by Filipino English teachers.	2.73	0.81	Aware
19. Philippine English as the norm in testing the writing skills of Filipino learners is used by Filipino English teachers.	2.72	0.78	Aware

Uses of Philippine English	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
20. Philippine English is the English variety used by Filipino learners when performing oral communicative activities.	2.91	0.75	Aware
21. Philippine English is the English variety used by Filipino learners when responding to test questions that require sentence or paragraph writing.	2.84	0.79	Aware
Overall Mean	2.79		Aware

All in all, the finding, which points out that university students were aware of the uses of Philippine English, was different from Hernández (2020a) because the graduate students were moderately aware of the uses of Philippine English. This result entails that university students are more knowledgeable than the graduate students in terms of the uses of Philippine English. Specifically, university students were aware that *Philippine English is the English variety that Filipinos often use in local media*. Dayag (2008) construed a similar point, that Philippine English is often used by Filipinos in local media. With the same result, university students said *Philippine English is the English variety used by Filipino learners when performing oral communicative activities*. Although university students code-switch during oral communicative activities (Quinto & Kitani, 2022), Philippine English is the variety used in the classroom. Nevertheless, the statement *Philippine English has the potential to be implemented into the English language classroom as a module or unit within the compulsory or elective part of the English language curriculum* had the lowest mean albeit students' claim that they were aware of it. The current English curriculum prescribed by the Philippine Commission on Higher Education puts emphasis on honing the communicative competence of university students (Commission on Higher Education, 2013). Bernardo (2017) therefore posed the question: Are the students made aware of the communicative role of the varieties of English, Philippine English, and other types, such as those spoken in Asia, for example?

The Notions of University Students of Pinoylish

Table 4 depicts the descriptive statistical results for the negative notions of university students of Pinoylish/Philippine English in Northern Luzon.

Table 4. Negative Notions of Pinoylish/Philippine English

Negative Notions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. We will not be respected by other speakers of English if we speak educated Philippine English.	1.99	0.72	Disagree
2. People from other countries will think that we are uneducated if we use educated Philippine English.	2.01	0.71	Disagree
3. Foreigners will not understand us if we talk to them in educated Philippine English.	2.14	0.72	Disagree

Negative Notions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
4. English teachers should be those who are knowledgeable about and speak American English.	2.58	0.82	Agree
5. Philippine English is actually mistakes made by people who speak poor English.	2.04	0.71	Disagree
6. The standard of spoken English in the Philippines has dropped since the implementation of Mother Tongue Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE).	2.66	0.72	Agree
7. The standard of written English in the Philippines has dropped since the implementation of Mother Tongue Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE).	2.61	0.71	Agree
Overall Mean	2.29		Disagree

The general mean of 2.29 means that university students disagreed on the negative notions of Philippine English, which implies that they have a positive attitude of Philippine English. Nevertheless, university students appeared to disagree the most on the statement *We will not be respected by other speakers of English if we speak educated Philippine English*. Many students in the Focus Group Discussions espoused that being understood is the most important factor in communication. Two students asserted that the measure of respect lies not in the usage of educated Philippine English, but rather in the manner in which an individual conducts themselves throughout a conversation, shown in (4) and (5).

- (4) CATH: I believe that the English language, or any language for that matter, is not the basis to be respected. It is really all about our actions and the way we interact with others.
- (5) CHRIS: It is not about a person’s language but how an individual projects himself/herself in conversations.

Another noteworthy disagreement of university students is on the statement *People from other countries will think that we are uneducated if we use educated Philippine English*. In the Focus Group Discussions, Jane claimed that English is not a measure of one’s intelligence, as shown in (6).

- (6) JANE: I disagree on the statement. For example, Japanese people have their own way of using the English language, but I do not think that we see them as uneducated. They have proven themselves when it comes to inventions and innovations, so it is not really about the English that somebody speaks.

On another note, university students agreed that *The standards of spoken and written English in the Philippines have dropped since the implementation of Mother Tongue Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE)*. The experiment of Mondez (2013) and the study of Apolonio (2022) proved that the use of mother tongues had a detrimental effect on the English skills of Filipino students. In the end, MTB-MLE falls short of fully achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which promise to promote high-quality education.

Table 5 denotes the descriptive statistical results for the positive notions of university students in the north of Luzon of Pinoylish/Philippine English.

Table 5. Positive Notions of Pinoylish/Philippine English

Positive Notions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
8. It is to be expected that there will be regional differences in pronunciation and vocabulary in educated Philippine English.	3.13	0.61	Agree
9. It is natural to have different varieties of English like Australian English, Singaporean English, Philippine English, etc.	3.35	0.58	Strongly Agree
10. The variety of English to be used in Philippine newspapers should be educated Philippine English.	2.90	0.59	Agree
11. The variety of English to be used on Philippine radio and television should be educated Philippine English.	2.88	0.57	Agree
12. Speaking in English should be taught in educated Philippine English in Philippine English language classes.	3.07	0.56	Agree
13. Grammar and writing in English should be taught in educated Philippine English in Philippine English language classes.	3.14	0.58	Agree
14. Vocabulary should be taught in educated Philippine English in Philippine English language classes.	3.13	0.56	Agree
15. Instructional materials (e.g. textbooks, teachers' manuals, etc.) should use educated Philippine English in Philippine English language classes.	3.06	0.58	Agree
16. Educated Philippine English needs to be promoted.	3.27	0.59	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.10		Agree

The overall mean explains that university students generally had a positive attitude on Philippine English. They even strongly agreed that it is natural to have different varieties of English like Australian English, Singaporean English, Philippine English, etc. Han (2019) clarified that various varieties naturally have different pronunciation, tone, intonation, spelling, and other characteristics, as well as differences in accent, vocabulary, grammar, discourse, and sociolinguistics. As long as globalization, international migration, and widespread social media use are evident, varieties of English will continue to inevitably exist (Siemund, 2018). Denz represented the ideas of university students in Excerpt (7):

- (7) DENZ: I am not shocked that university students strongly agreed on the statement because it is natural to have different varieties of English considering that every country has their own cultures and own ways of teaching English.

Similarly, university students strongly agreed that educated Philippine English needs to be promoted. Fresha encapsulated the reason behind it in (8).

(8) FRESHA: I strongly agree that Philippine English needs to be promoted because it is not fair to use American English if we are here in the Philippines. We are Filipinos, so we need to use Filipino English.

Another student even said that it has to be promoted internationally. In Excerpt (9) Jor stated:

(9) JOR: It needs to be promoted internationally so that others can have an idea of what Philippine English is. In this case, they will not find it weird to come across it when they communicate with Filipinos.

Even if university students agreed that the variety of English to be used in Philippine newspapers, radio, and television should be educated Philippine English, these items garnered the lowest means in the scale. This is in conjunction with the results in the study of Hernández (2020b) as the respondents showed a preference in Philippine English being used on Philippine media. However, it is not only on newspapers, radio, and television, but also on the internet. The expansion of Philippine English is also apparent in the digital world among younger users (Gustilo et al., 2019). However, there is a caveat. Dimangadap-Malang and Pantao (2021) cautioned that print and broadcast media should use only standard Philippine English.

Discussion

By harvesting quantitative and qualitative data, the findings revealed that public and private university students in the north of Luzon were slightly aware of the meanings of Pinoylish/Philippine English which signifies that they lack knowledge in this area. This implies that they may not be aware that the English that they use in communication or in the academia is actually a variety of Pinoylish/Philippine English. Notwithstanding, they were aware of the features and uses of Pinoylish/Philippine English. These results connote that they possess the right amount of knowledge in these areas. Overall, these university students were not clueless of Pinoylish/Philippine English, but it does not mean that they have a complete understanding of its features and uses more especially its meanings. The results of this study also unveiled that university students in Northern Luzon disagreed on the negative notions of Pinoylish/Philippine English. This simply means that they partly resonated with the negative notions. However, these university students agreed on the positive notions which exhibits their positive attitudes in the use of Pinoylish/Philippine English. Both the general disagreement and the general agreement of these university students imply that Pinoylish/Philippine English should be used in colleges and universities in the Philippines.

The results of this research have implications on English Language Teaching (ELT) in the Philippines, but these implications can also resonate with countries in which World Englishes (WE), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), and English as an International Language (EIL) are espoused (Callies & Hehner, 2023). Particularly, the findings support the pluricentric model in English Language Teaching. Adityarini (2016) implicated that the pluricentric model signifies that local varieties of English can be employed as a teaching tool in nations where English is

spoken. Promoting Englishes that are used locally and internationally and are defined by their users, uses, and communication methods can help achieve this (Mahboob, 2015). It can further help if a course in World Englishes or relevant topics in World Englishes are incorporated in the curriculum of students.

In the Philippines, these subject areas can be added in “Purposive Communication” as a course in the general education curriculum for university students (Commission on Higher Education, 2013) specifically under the topics “Local and global communication in multicultural settings and varieties and registers of spoken and written language” whereby university students are required to determine culturally appropriate terms, expressions, and images which are sensitive to gender, race, class, among others, and adopt cultural and intercultural awareness and sensitivity in communication of ideas. This way, linguistic prejudice that people cannot help having can be overcome when embracing pluricentricity in English (Adityarini, 2014; Jianli, 2015). Moreover, the following guidelines were presented by McKay (2012) for the design of EIL materials: relevance to students' local context; inclusion of a wide variety of English varieties and examples of interactions between Second Language (L2) speakers; provision for code-switching (Quinto & Kitani, 2022); and instruction that is sensitive to the local learning culture.

Ultimately, Hernández (2020a) calls for the continued need for significant efforts to spread awareness of Pinoylish/Philippine English because there is still a huge disparity in knowledge, acceptability, and educational implementation of its concepts and principles across nearly all spheres in the nation. This means that problems lie in the additional preparation for college/university professors, the resources available in the preparation, and the process of materials development. Consequently, teacher training is a crucial procedure that needs to be prioritized (Bhowmik, 2015), specifically in Pinoylish pedagogy.

CONCLUSIONS

Through a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, this study addressed the paucity of Pinoylish/Philippine English research in the context of university students in the Philippines. Particularly, the results pointed out that university students in Northern Luzon were aware, albeit not fully, of the meanings, features, and uses of Pinoylish which signifies their inadequate understanding of this English variety. Furthermore, the findings showed that university students disagreed on negative notions while agreeing on positive notions of Pinoylish which displays their positive attitude toward this English variety.

This study has definitely contributed to research on Pinoylish/Philippine English. However, there are still opportunities for further exploration and investigation in this field. First, involving a larger number of university students in other parts of the Philippines is suggested to identify whether students in more urban areas have a better understanding of Pinoylish. Other researchers can explore the awareness and notions of professors in higher education institutions, including public and private colleges and universities, using the research design employed in this study. In addition to professors, researchers can also explore the perspectives of other educated users of Philippine English, such as Filipino English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers, columnists, editors, and reporters.

REFERENCES

- Adityarini, H. (2016). Advocating pluricentric model for teaching English in Indonesia. In *Proceeding of International Conference on Teacher Training and Education*, 1(1), 400-405. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/289793205.pdf>
- Adityarini, H. (2014). *An examination of the suitability of a pluricentric model of English language teaching for primary education in Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://espace.curtin.edu.au/handle/20.500.11937/1337>
- Ahn, H. (2015). Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: A study of English teachers in South Korea. *Asian Englishes*, 17(2), 132-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.1036602>
- Almeida, F. (2018). Strategies to perform a mixed methods study. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 5(1), 137-151. <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/1902/4540>
- Apolonio, A. L. (2022). Mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) in the Philippines: Its implications to language learning. *Erudio Journal of Educational Innovation*, 9(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.18551/erudio.9-1.1>
- Ates, B., Eslami, Z. R., & Wright, K. L. (2015). Incorporating world Englishes into undergraduate ESL education courses. *World Englishes*, 34(3), 485-501. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12149>
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2001). Attitudes of selected Luzon university students and faculty toward Philippine English. In M. L. G. Tayao, T. P. Ignacio, & G. S. Zafra (Eds.), *Rosario E. Maminta in focus: Selected writings in applied linguistics* (pp. 236–273). The Philippine Association for Language Teaching, Inc. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346076138>
- Bernardo, A. B. (2008). English in Philippine education: Solution or problem? In M. A. L. S. Bautista & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 29-48). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/9789622099470.003.0003>
- Bernardo, A. S. (2017). Philippine English in the ESL classroom: A much closer look. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19(2), 117–144. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362689198_Philippine_English_in_the_ESL_Classroom_A_Much_Closer_Look
- 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)*, 3, 42-71. <https://doi.org/10.59960/3.a3>
- Bhowmik, S. K. (2015). World Englishes and English language teaching: A pragmatic and humanistic approach. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 17(1), 142-157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2015.1.a10>
- Bolivar, B. V. (2020). English in the Philippines: A case of rootedness and routeness. In S. Buschfeld & A. Kautzsch (Eds.), *Modelling world Englishes: A joint approach to postcolonial and non-postcolonial varieties* (pp. 133-154). Edinburgh University Press.

- Borlongan, A. M. (2016). Relocating Philippine English in Schneider's dynamic model. *Asian Englishes*, 18(3), 232-241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1223067>
- Callies, M., & Hehner, S. (2023). Pluricentric languages in university teacher education: Towards increased curricular coherence. In M. Callies & S. Hehner (Eds.), *Pluricentric languages and language education: Pedagogical implications and innovative approaches to language teaching* (pp. 202-216). Routledge.
- Commission on Higher Education (2013). *General education curriculum: Holistic understandings, intellectual, and civic competencies, CHED memo order (CMO) no. 20, series of 2013*. <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Purposive-Communication.pdf>
- Dayag, D. T. (2008). English-language media in the Philippines: Description and research. In K. Bolton & M. L. S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English and literary perspectives* (pp. 49-65). Hong Kong University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/9789622099470.003.0004>
- Dimaculangan, N. G. (2018). Another look into Philippine English: Towards users' awareness and celebration. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 2(1), 17-22. <https://www.ijarp.org/published-research-papers/aug2018/Another-Look-Into-Philippine-English-Towards-Users-Awareness-And-Celebration.pdf>
- 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>
- Dimangadap-Malang, R., & Pantao, A. (2021). Attitude towards Philippine English: A case of Al-kwarizmi International School English teachers. *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences*, 3(4), 57-72. <https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ajress/article/view/16641>
- 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. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1244667.pdf>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fuchs, R. (2017). The Americanization of Philippine English: Recent diachronic change in spelling and lexis. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 64-87. <https://www.elejournals.com/download?code=5a03d5c12d180>
- Gonzales, A. (2008). A favorable climate and soil: A transplanted language and literature. In K. Bolton & M. L. S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English and literary perspectives* (pp. 13-27). Hong Kong University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/9789622099470.003.0002>
- Gonzales, 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., Tocalo, A. W., & Calingasan, K. A. (2019). The intelligibility and acceptability of internet Philippine English (IPE): Their implications to English language teaching in the new English varieties. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2), 83-104. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Abdul-Wahid-Tocalo/publication/333037729>
- Han, L. (2019). A review of the major varieties of English language. *International Education Studies*, 12(2), 93-99. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1204368.pdf>
- Hernández, H. P. (2020a). Awareness of Filipino graduate students towards Philippine English. *The Normal Lights*, 14(2), 1-27. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/aef6/a915ecdeb84ab2beda061353cc14c5143e0f.pdf>
- Hernández, H. P. (2020b). 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. <https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/research/journals/apssr/2020-March-vol20-1/4-filipino-graduate-students-attitudes-toward-teaching-educated-philippine-english-a-sample-from-a-premier-teacher-education-institution.pdf>
- Jianli, L. (2015). Pluricentric views towards English and implications for ELT in China. *English Language Teaching*, 8(4), 90-96. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1075238.pdf>
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Liu, P. H. E., & Cheng, Y. C. (2017). Attitudes toward English as an international language: A comparative study of college teachers and students in Taiwan. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 12(1), 66-85. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1250282.pdf>
- Mahboob, A. (2015). Identity management, language variation, and English language textbooks. In D. Djenar, A. Mahboob, & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Language and identity across modes of communication* (pp. 153-177). Walter de Gruyter.
- Manarpaac, D. V. S. (2008). 'When I was a child I spake as a child': Reflecting on the limits of a nationalist language policy. In K. Bolton & M. L. S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English and literary perspectives* (pp. 87-100). Hong Kong University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/9789622099470.003.0006>
- Martin, I. P. (2019). Philippine English in retrospect and prospect. *World Englishes*, 38(1-2), 134-143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12367>
- Martin, I. P. (2014). Philippine English revisited. *World Englishes*, 33(1), 50-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12054>
- Martin, I. P. (2020). Philippine English. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 479-500). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118791882.ch20>
- McKay, S. L. (2012). Teaching materials for English as an international language. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 70-83). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847697042-007>
- Mondez, R. (2013). Appropriateness of mother-tongue based multi-lingual education (MTB-MLE) in urban areas: A synthesis study. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 2(1), 611-620. https://www.ijsr.net/get_count.php?paper_id=IJSRON2013351

- Munalim, L. O. (2019). Micro-level text contents of one-to five-minute news: American and Philippine English compared. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 14(2), 44-71. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1244220.pdf>
- Percillier, M. (2016). *World Englishes and second language acquisition: Insights from Southeast Asian Englishes*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Polzenhagen, F., & Wolf, H. G. (2017). World Englishes and cognitive linguistics. In M. Filppula, J. Klemola, & D. Sharma (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 147-172). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199777716.013.016>
- Porras, K. I. (2022). A reflection of linguistic ideologies, inequality, and class: Language shaming practices on Facebook. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 235-243. https://ijels.com/upload_document/issue_files/30IJELS-103202241-AReflection.pdf
- Quinto, J. B., & Kitani, A. B. M. (2022). On code-switching in English major courses. *Innovations*, 71(3), 538-551. <https://journal-innovations.com/assets/uploads/doc/37599-539-551.16170.pdf>
- Quinto, J. B. (2022). Seize the day or seize theses? The challenges in undergraduate thesis writing. *Issues in Educational Research*, 32(4), 1567-1583. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier32/quinto.pdf>
- Sadeghpour, M., & Sharifian, F. (2019). World Englishes in English language teaching. *World Englishes*, 38(1-2), 245-258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12372>
- Siemund, P. (2018). *Speech acts and clause types: English in a cross-linguistic context*. Oxford University Press.
- Sundler, A. J., Lindberg, E., Nilsson, C., & Palmér, L. (2019). Qualitative thematic analysis based on descriptive phenomenology. *Nursing Open*, 6(3), 733-739. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.275>
- Torres, J. M., & Alieto, E. O. (2019). Acceptability of Philippine English grammatical and lexical Items among pre-Service teachers. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2.3), 158-181. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED596740.pdf>
- Torres, J. M. (2019). Positioning Philippine English grammar and lexicon in four discourse quadrants. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 22(1), 253-276. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Joel-Torres-8/publication/336286725>