

A framework for designing a Philippine-English-based pedagogic model for teaching English grammar

Alejandro S. Bernardo

University of Santo Tomas, Philippines
bernardo_andrew@yahoo.com

Marilu R. Madrunio

University of Santo Tomas, Philippines
malumadrunio@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper provides a framework for designing a local-variety-based pedagogic model for teaching English grammar and a specific case in which the framework may be applied – something that is missing in the literature as far as teaching English grammar *endonormatively* is concerned. Put more succinctly, this paper endeavors to offer a general blueprint for designing a Philippine-English-based pedagogic model for teaching grammar. While World Englishes (WE) and Philippine English (PhE) studies provide sound ideological and philosophical positions and propose the advancement of local varieties to a formal pedagogical agenda, it appears that literature on the actual or physical design of an endonormative pedagogic model remains scant or inadequate. It seems that both in international and local stadia, there is paucity, if not only a small amount of substantial information is available, on the evolution and effective implementation of a homegrown model of teaching English and how the test of “pedagogic acceptability” is applied to a local norm.

Keywords: Endonormative pedagogic model, Philippine English, World Englishes

1. Introduction

The discussion on how English arrived in the Philippine terrain echoes that the American colonizers bequeathed to the Philippines the English language decades ago, and since then, changes have taken place, issues have mounted, and more questions have been amplified. Moreover, to date, English has always had a privileged position in the Philippine society. In fact, from the very beginning of American colonization, the teaching of English and its use as the sole medium of instruction was met without resistance, but rather with eagerness from the Filipinos. Being colonized by native English speakers and lacking a national language, the Filipinos’ adoption of English as the primary medium of communication in almost all aspects of Philippine society was as much a practical solution as it was an inevitable outcome.

Precolonial Philippines had a wealth of indigenous languages. This wealth, however, was characterized by diversity among the many ethnic languages which, in turn, was a hindrance to effective communication among the different indigenous groups. With more than 100 local languages spoken by the different ethnic groups in the country, each of which has its own lexicon, syntax, and phonology distinct from those of the others, the language situation prior to the colonization of the Americans was complex, to say the least.

What needs to be underscored as well is that English was used in the Philippines where previously it was not spoken. English was recognized, transported, and founded in the country. Stated in another way, English in the Philippines was embraced by many Filipinos and has been widely used in various domains. Now, a good number of Filipinos speak, write, read, and listen in English. Prose and nonprose publications started to use the language, and since then “English – the means the Americans used to teach [Filipinos] via the mass media, the arts, social, business and political interaction – continues to be a strong thread that binds the two nations” (Espinosa, 1997, para. 5).

Gonzalez (1997, p. 3) describes the rapid acquisition of English in the Philippines as “an unprecedented success,” brought about by a unique combination of factors: economic and sociological, particularly the Filipino people’s receptiveness to outside influences combined with their lack of cultural accord during its colonization; the teaching of English and its use as a medium of instruction; and the eagerness of the Filipinos to learn and adopt a language whose stature, by association to its Western countries of origin, was gaining prominence.

Bolton and Butler (2008) maintain that while the American colonization of the Philippines did not involve massive settlement of the colonizers and the use and teaching of English was achieved by a small number of teaching cadres, the Americans’ attempt at establishing the first system of universal education through English was a notable success. Interestingly, while teaching cadres were present from the earliest days of colonization and throughout the first 20 years, English was spread by local tutors who outnumbered American teachers in the school system. As a result of the spread of English through the school system and its use as the sole medium of instruction and perceived value in public venues, a local variety of English was born – Philippine English (PhE, henceforth).

The perpetual use of English resulted in the propagation of a local variety, and its conception was the inevitable outcome of a confluence of several elements. It is imperative to be cognizant of PhE studies, for they attest that in the Philippines, a nativized variety of English characterized by a distinct lexicon, phonology, and variations in grammar has emerged and has thrived since English was initially diffused in the different parts of the country and used in various domains such as politics, education, economics, and trade. These past investigations would show that the presence of a localized variety of English in the Philippines is a glaring and an incontestable reality.

The studies of PhE (cf. Bautista, 2011a; Bolton & Bautista, 2008) are useful in revealing the phonological, morphological, and syntactic variations in PhE. The findings clearly show that PhE has its own unique structures and features propagated by the circle of educated Filipino speakers. The authoritative conclusions of both local and foreign researchers who devoted their time to studying PhE imply that there is a localized and indigenized variety of English that aptly mirrors the sociolinguistic and sociocultural realities in Filipino speech communities.

It is, therefore, untenable to say that the English presently used in the country is exactly the same English transported and transplanted decades ago and the same English spoken elsewhere. While it is possible that PhE has gradually gained formal and social acceptance, the next question, however, pertains to the potency of PhE to be an acceptable, appropriate, and intelligible instructional blueprint that mirrors the local speakers’ sociolinguistic character and realities. It must be (re)emphasized, however, that the variety named PhE is not the pejorative “Taglish” or “Broken English” or “Carabao English” but the “educated Philippine English,” i.e., the English used by competent Filipino speakers of the language in formal settings (Bautista, 2000a), “the type of English that educated Filipinos speak and which is acceptable in educated

Filipino circles” (Llamzon, 1969, p. 15) and the “variety propagated by the mass media, which includes not only the idiolects of its broadcasters and anchormen but likewise the idiolects of the elites and influentials of Philippine society...” (Gonzalez, 1983, p. 154). From the foregoing descriptions of three renowned Filipino linguists, it may be deduced, therefore, that PhE is a unique brand of English used by the vast majority of educated Filipinos and apparent in various forms of mass media – print or nonprint, literary, or nonliterary. Thus, Bolton and Bautista (2008) aptly put:

The distinctiveness of Philippine English as a linguistic variety has also been paralleled by the literary creativity of its novelists, short story writers, and poets, who have produced – and continue to produce – a substantial body of writing in English, aimed not only at domestic readers but also at the international audience for world literature in English. (xi)

A survey of PhE studies published in the past years would likewise echo that there has been a sustained attempt to advocate the use of local norms as a teaching model in academic and social settings. As early as the 1980s, the era when the World Englishes (WE) framework was taken more seriously, the formal recognition of the different varieties of English in the educational system, particularly in the ESL enterprise and pedagogy, has been to a great extent forwarded.

A sustained effort to veer away from an exonormative model has also been widely covered and discussed in the literature beyond the Philippine shoreline (cf. Banjo, 1993; Kirkpatrick, 2007, 2008; Matsuda, 2003). It is only just recently, however, when Filipino speakers of English, particularly those in the ESL enterprise and those who have been introduced to the WE framework, have started to realize the value of designing a PhE-based pedagogic model for teaching English. Bautista (2003), for example, wrote about the implications of the descriptive and attitude studies on New Englishes for the teaching of grammar in ELT classrooms and raised the question about adherence to an endonormative standard in teaching grammar. In another paper by Bautista (2001a), studies on the linguistic features of PhE and the attitudes toward them were surveyed, and as an offshoot of her empirical inquiry, she raised the question, “What can the classroom teacher of English take away from linguistic descriptions and attitude studies of PE?” (p. 289). Bautista, as a response, argues that PhE is a legitimate form of Standard English that can be utilized as a pedagogic model.

In his commentary, Borlongan (2011b) notes that while the existence of Philippine English cannot be contested, the establishment of a standard, endonormative model that can be used in teaching and recognized as being on the same level as other established varieties, such as American, British, and Australian Englishes, remains a challenge. After his analysis of the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (ICE), Borlongan arrived at two important points: that PhE is a variety with distinctive features and is self-regulating and that it has achieved what Schneider (2003, 2007) describes as endonormative stabilization. These findings led to the preparation and writing of a grammar of the PhE verb system in his attempt to codify the local variety. Borlongan asserts that the PhE verb system, in particular, is a distinct feature of PhE that distinguishes it from other varieties, including the more established ones. In fact, he argues that PhE has a distinct grammatical structure that can be taught and compared with other established Englishes, in particular, American English (AmE, henceforth), that currently serves as the standard in the Philippines. Designing a local model, therefore, can lead to a change from one way of thinking to another in relation to

English language teaching practices in the Philippines. Borlongan also underscores that the teaching of PhE will ultimately increase awareness, acceptance, and admiration of the local variety and that the challenges to establishing PhE as a standard of teaching include the need to retrain teachers, to develop teaching materials, and to modify instructional leadership.

These studies, unfortunately, we argue, provide little theoretical and conceptual support on how an endonormative model for teaching English may be specifically mapped out. Previous and present sociolinguistic discussions seem to remain afloat, and as how Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) put it, they reside at the abstract or intangible plane and fail to offer concrete, doable, and quantifiable pedagogical propositions that are theoretically tenable, informed by research, and specific enough to be practical in local ESL classrooms. Stated in another way, while WE and PhE studies provide sound ideological and philosophical positions and propose the advancement of local varieties to a formal pedagogical agenda, it appears that literature on the actual or physical design of an endonormative pedagogic model remains scant or inadequate. It seems that both in international and local stadia, there is paucity, if not only a small amount of substantial information is available, on the evolution and effective implementation of a homegrown model of teaching English and how the test of *pedagogic acceptability* is applied to a local norm.

Although it is evident that there has been a great deal of research which have successfully described the nativized variety of English in the Philippines, a local model that underpins the English language instruction in the country, to the best of our knowledge, has not been mapped out. In other words, in the Philippines, relatively little has been researched about the development of a homegrown teaching model. Thus, the development of an *endonormative pedagogic model* for English grammar teaching in Philippine universities is the central focus of this paper since English “is learned chiefly through the educational system” (Banjo, 1993, p. 264). It should be noted that grammar in this paper is regarded as a set of structural rules that govern the composition of clauses, phrases, and words in the English language.

To date, the teaching of English in the Philippines seems to be based on an exonormative model, AmE in particular. But since most schools are staffed by teachers who are local speakers and, thus, think using Austronesian instead of Germanic grammatical structures resulting from their acquisition of English as a foreign language, it is also possible that PhE *is the or one of the models* unconsciously or disavowedly employed. Studies of PhE suggest that the so-called standard variety has become more Filipinized, and it is possible that the local variety is used by those who learn English in the Philippines; and that it is not improbable that PhE is a variety being taught and used in secondary and tertiary institutions in the Philippines because, for some decades now, at the forefront of the English classrooms in most parts of the country are Filipino teachers (local speakers) who were also taught and trained by other Filipino teachers themselves and because even prominent media practitioners and educated Filipinos use the local variety. The point here is that PhE is now being taught (unconsciously) in schools and used by products of the school system, and following apparent trends in language change, it is likely to be satisfactorily different from standard American English.

If a preliminary homegrown model for teaching English will be established and formalized, the local variety of English may be considered as an integral part of the framework for an institutionalized model. The model we propose here may rouse the Philippine linguistic landscape to gradually move (although this may sound quite grand) from what Schneider (2003) calls “fossilized development” since until now, it has not taken a step forward in the internationally acknowledged Dynamic Model of New Englishes. Like Schneider, we

presuppose that the situation at present shows no sign of proceeding any further from the Nativization Phase to the Endonormative Stabilization Phase. While PhE is on its way to codification through the publication of its own dictionary, a local pedagogic model (which is still in the stage of infancy or is yet to be conceived) for teaching English is also deemed crucial in codifying the local variety.

The proposed endonormative model, if adhered to by ESL teachers and learners in the country, is hoped to significantly impact English language teaching. Drawing on PhE as *the* or *one* of the norms in teaching and learning English grammar, apart from addressing the discrepancy between the theoretical norm and the actual use of the language, may provide learners a great deal of exposure to different varieties of English. Issues material to teaching English as an inner-circle variety may be clarified if changes in relation to how English is regarded and taught in a terrain where there are more local users take effect. In addition, not all Filipino learners are trained to function in inner-circle countries; thus, imposing American English or British English alone may disregard their real linguistic needs.

The appreciation of the proposed endonormative model may aid English language teachers and learners in recognizing the pluralistic nature of English across the world today. As how Y. Kachru and Nelson (2006) put it:

It is vitally important that notions of superiority of one variety over another be weeded out of students' minds before they are turned loose to practise their profession. The former axiomatic idea that any Inner-Circle variety was 'better' in all formal and functional ways than any non-Inner-Circle variety has been empirically invalidated, but still persists. (p. 125)

It is good to note that the WE paradigm has had positive impact on various aspects of English language teaching and learning and that there is, at present, a heightened reception of local or regional norms and models (Gill, 1993). To Canagarajah (2006), "...the intensified globalization of English in postmodern society further challenges this unequal and hierarchical relationship between English varieties" (p. 558). He likewise implies that learners should be trained to shuttle between varieties and to provide them with a space where WE is recognized in the ESL classrooms. As it is, the WE framework promotes inclusion rather than exclusion.

The effective use of the proposed endonormative model may also render students chances to make sound linguistic choices, especially those which pertain to the variety that appropriately fits their linguistic needs. Finally, the endonormative model may be adapted by English language teachers and learners in different programs of studies, e.g., secondary education since the proposed model for grammar teaching cuts across curriculum years. If General English courses are taught either in the pre-university or university level, one and the same local standard may be adhered to in studying English grammar since it is deemed reflective of the actual use of the language and regarded as an appropriate yardstick for measuring or determining learners' grammatical correctness.


2. Method

The empirical and scientific evolution of the endonormative model for teaching English grammar proposed here is guided by the developmental study design. The requisite steps

undertaken are schematically presented in Figure 1, and the physical design of the proposed endonormative pedagogic model is explained in detail in the subsequent section. How the model is applied in a specific case is presented in the succeeding subparts.

Figure 1

Physical design of the proposed endonormative pedagogic model



1. **Analyze (CHED-GE and PhE Equivalence):** This phase involves an initial identification of the critical grammar components of the proposed endonormative pedagogic model. This stage required reference to the state-prescribed syllabus (Commission on Higher Education General English [CHED GE] English Plus or English 0, which are basic English courses offered to freshman college students), i.e., determining the grammatical constructs approved in the state-policy minimum requirements and juxtaposing them with the corresponding grammatical features of PhE based on the findings of studies of PhE and study corpus, thus, allowing new and specific PhE-based grammar rules to be followed.
2. **Develop (Initial Mapping):** This phase involves the initial mapping out of a local pedagogic model whose grammar components are defined by the results of the matchup between the state-prescribed contents and PhE grammatical features. PhE grammatical rules, which complement each form stipulated in the CHED GE English Plus course outline, are illustrated and spelled out in a PhE grammar-based blueprint.
3. **Evaluate (Pedagogic Acceptability Testing):** This stage requires that selected PhE features, which constitute the proposed endonormative model, be subjected to a pedagogic acceptability test. The test determines the acceptability of the grammatical features of PhE as the form to be explicitly taught in ESL classrooms. The achievement of pedagogic acceptability is a necessary precursor to mainstream

reception if teachers and students will suggest the inclusion of PhE variants in the classrooms. Based on the acceptability judgment of teachers and students, a revised blueprint of grammatical structures is produced. The results of the pedagogic acceptability test, therefore, are used as a basis when the initial model is redeveloped or revised.

4. **Revision (Final Mapping):** This includes a remodeling or modification of the local pedagogic model guided by the results of the pedagogic acceptability test. Pedagogically acceptable features of PhE grammar are retained while the unacceptable variants are discarded. A revision is done to ensure that only the pedagogically suitable model for teaching English grammar according to the “pedagogical acceptability judges” is shaped.
5. **Design (Instructional Approach Design):** This phase includes the conception of an instructional approach that may be employed in teaching English grammar, which draws normative support from PhE. A requisite step is a critical and eclectic review of literature and pertinent documents that consider the sociolinguistic, sociopolitical, and sociocultural environments, which surround the Filipino language learners.
6. **Implement (Actual Classroom Use of the Model):** This refers to the actual use of the endonormative model in tertiary ESL classroom setting, materials development, and classroom-based task design. At this point, the model serves as the actual standard in teaching, and the student performance is also tested against the proposed local model.

The figure shows the linear-sequential design that suggests a systematic, chronological approach to model development, which begins at the content-identification level and progresses through analysis, development, evaluation, revision, and design. Hence, each step is a prerequisite of the other. Content identification, which requires the matchup between the state-prescribed coverage and the PhE grammatical variants, stands as the takeoff point; hence, the succeeding stages depend on the successful conduct of the prior.

It must be noted, however, that the blueprint has a phase arrangement that significantly differs from traditional designs (for example, the ADDIE or Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate Model); that is, the development phase comes right after the analysis phase, and the model is subjected to evaluation right away. Thus, the design phase becomes the fourth phase. This is deemed necessary so that before the model is implemented, it has been evaluated; and its pedagogical acceptability has been established, and an instructional strategy has been suggested before the model is utilized. Further, an additional phase called “revision” is introduced so that a refined and highly acceptable model is arrived at. It is possible though that another form of model evaluation is conducted after it has been used in classroom teaching. While it is imperative for the model to be implemented, this paper is limited to analysis, development, evaluation, revision, and design only. The actual implementation of the model may be another area of exploration should there be a similar study undertaken by future researchers.

The end goal of this paper is a concrete endonormative pedagogic model. The model

is a product of the “matchup” between the CHED-GE English Plus/0 content expectations and their corresponding PhE grammatical variants adjudged pedagogically acceptable, thus, allowing a new and specific template (grammatical constructions or any syntactic strings of words ranging from sentences over phrasal structures to certain complex lexemes such as phrasal verbs) to be observed. Therefore, both give shape to the proposed model reflective of the educational thrusts and the variety of English used in local contexts. This, however, does not imply that similar grammatical constructs that PhE and AmE share are no longer included in the model. Pedagogical acceptability judgment is applied only to the PhE variants found significantly different from the traditionally promulgated norm, and in the end, only those pedagogically acceptable variants constituted the proposed model.

2.1 Procedure

As an initial step and for the purpose of characterizing the English taught, learned, and used by educated speakers represented by English instructors and learners at the tertiary level of education in universities in Metro Manila, Philippines, classroom interactions (i.e., teacher and student talk) were video/audio-recorded and transcribed. Undertaking this led to the identification of the model that teachers explicitly or implicitly teach and use and the model that students seem to assimilate and observe in a formal classroom setting.

Classroom observations of freshman General Education English classes in three leading universities were conducted. Transcribed spoken language was examined to characterize the grammatical features representing a particular variety(ies) of English unpremeditatedly or overtly promulgated in teacher-student and student-student classroom interactions. The unit of analysis used or the major structural entity analyzed in the study is the thought group or a group of words that go together to form a thought or an idea. One can think of thought groups in reference to sentence structure. In this way, a thought group may be a sentence, a clause, a phrase, or sometimes just one or two words. Thought groups were considered, for there were instances when in classroom interactions, exchanges of utterances were not expressed in complete sentences.

Other forms of oral productions, e.g., small-group interactional exchanges and individual speeches were also recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. The schedule of classroom observations was based on the day’s planned lesson/s since topics that center on English grammar were preferred. We closely coordinated with the concerned English instructors and their respective administrators or chairs as regards the classroom observation schedule.

Locally printed English textbooks from three universities were content analyzed to identify the model teachers adhere to in teaching the rules of English grammar (cf. Bernardo, 2013, for a comprehensive discussion of the results of textbook analysis). Following the framework used by Dayag (2010) when he examined PhE in college oral communication textbooks, this study also adopted the bottom-up approach. Dominant topics and themes, organization, inputs, examples, exercises, and method(s) for teaching grammar in the textbooks were closely examined. Textbooks on grammar were analyzed primarily because learners seem to assimilate and conform to what they promote or purport. In further examining the textbooks, Uittamo’s (2009) and Matsuda’s (2002) frameworks for analysis were followed. Hence, one very important question guided the analysis: Which varieties of English are introduced in the textbooks used by the students? Initially, the variety(ies) of English represented in the textbooks were identified and how they can be recognized were examined. Both implicit and explicit hints

of different varieties of English were studied. Grammatical rules and corresponding illustrative examples and usage preferences in these books were observed to detect if they follow an exonormative model and if distinctive features of the local variety are also apparent in them.

Major English tests (e.g., preliminary and final examinations) administered to students were analyzed to find out if they assess a student's ability to recognize and manipulate Standard American English in areas like sentence elements and sentence structure and grammar, and if the principles through which they are written are prescriptive in nature, which implies that these examinations lay down the rules for English language usage, or are descriptive in orientation that promotes the rules for English usage from the language that the test-takers actually use.

Further, a questionnaire was administered to English teachers from the three universities. All questions aimed at directly eliciting the participants' perceptions and personal views toward the issues of norm selection and PhE and the potentials and obstacles for PhE to be locally recognized and implemented into the language curriculum. The questionnaires designed by Borlongan (2009), Bautista (2001b), He and Li (2009), Paine (2010), and Bernardo (2011) were modified and integrated to suit the needs of the present investigation.

Findings generated through the above procedures, i.e., classroom observation, survey, textbook and test analysis, however, are not presented here since this paper primarily focuses on the proposed model and its acceptability. But the findings, in general, suggest one thing: the model used is a pluricentric model, i.e., both American and Philippine Englishes, which warrants the design of a concrete model that may be adopted by Filipino English teachers and learners.

The findings generated through the survey, classroom observation, and textbook and language-test analysis served as empirical bases for the decision to design an endonormative teaching model (cf. Bernardo, 2013). Because PhE grammatical features are promoted and found prevalent in this trilogy of procedures, and there exists a discrepancy between the theoretical norm and learners' actual language use, and in the absence of a clear, identifiable, and formal model used in teaching English grammar, an endonormative model of teaching grammar that fits the local context was proposed.

In drafting the proposed model, the matchup between the English Plus/Zero (a grammar syllabus prescribed by CHED) contents and the PhE grammatical variants was done by identifying specific grammatical features of PhE that complement the critical English Plus lessons. To illustrate, if prepositional phrases are taught in English Plus, illustrative examples of PhE prepositional phrases, e.g., *cope up with*, formed part the proposed endonormative model. This prepositional phrase variant was positioned against its American English (AmE) equivalent, and because usage differences exist based on Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985) English grammar description, it was subjected to a pedagogical acceptability test. It should also be noted that the works of Bautista (2000c, 2004, 2008), Biber et al., (1999), and Borlongan (2011a) were also consulted in identifying the distinctive features of English widespread in the study corpus.

All PhE grammatical variants that match the English Plus/Zero syllabus contents were plotted against their AmE equivalents and were culled from the descriptive studies of PhE grammar published from year 2000 to present and results of classroom interactions, language tests, and textbook analyses. It should be noted that only representative samples of PhE grammatical features were included in the pedagogical acceptability test because it was difficult to request the participants to accomplish a very lengthy instrument.

The drafting of the pedagogical acceptability test was guided by a review of previous

studies that examined acceptability of local Englishes and the frameworks proposed by Benson and Clark (1982) and Bratt (2009). Since, at the moment, it appears that only attitudinal surveys are available and no concrete pedagogical acceptability tests have been published, a researcher-made pedagogical acceptability test was constructed. Bautista's (2001b) instrument, for example, was an attitudinal survey or a social acceptability test but not a pedagogical acceptability test. The test designed for this study includes English teachers and college students' judgments on how pedagogically acceptable a grammar item is; that is, how much they accept an item that is illustrative of a specific grammar rule as a norm in teaching and learning English grammar. Further, Bautista's questionnaire includes lexical entries and idioms, while the pedagogical acceptability test in the present study contains purely PhE grammatical variants juxtaposed against their American English counterparts. Such a test was reviewed or evaluated by three English language practitioners/researchers from one of the leading universities in the country and one associate professor from the Department of English Language and Applied Linguistics of a foreign university. In addition, the clarity of items and instructions in the pedagogical acceptability test was ensured through pilot testing. The refined and final draft was reproduced, and soft copies were sent to the participants who preferred unprinted versions.

Private and public colleges and universities in the City of Manila that offer English Plus/Zero were identified by contacting the school registrars and other academic officials. This was done because not all colleges and universities in this area offer basic English courses, especially those granted deregulated status by CHED. The researcher personally communicated with the English teachers and students who served as study informants from each of the chosen institutions. Permission to administer the pedagogical acceptability test and to conduct interviews and classroom observations from the concerned administrative officials was sought.

Pedagogical acceptability decisions were determined statistically. The participants' responses were collated and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Conventional quantitative data-analysis techniques, such as frequency count, percentage and mean computations, standard deviation, and t-test, were used. Qualitative data generated through structured interviews and classroom observations were also analyzed and interpreted to validate the answers to the pedagogical acceptability test. The qualitative analysis involved understanding the data, focusing the analysis, categorizing information, identifying patterns and connections within and between categories, and interpreting and bringing them all together (Powell & Rennel, 2003).

All the items that passed the test of pedagogical acceptability were identified. These items comprised the proposed grammar teaching model while the pedagogically unacceptable PhE grammatical variants were discarded or excluded. It must be noted that the proposed model consisted of only 38 items culled from the entire universe of PhE grammatical features. These 38 items, however, represented 22 grammatical categories tested for pedagogical acceptability.

2.2 Data Sources and Instruments

2.2.1 PhE Grammatical Variants

The PhE grammatical features that formed part the endonormative pedagogic model and matched the requirements of the General Education English course were culled from the descriptive studies of PhE and the present study corpus – classroom interactions, English tests, and textbooks. The role of the PhE descriptive studies is to make available descriptions

of PhE possible for language teaching, and redoing the analysis or doing a similar analysis will just make things redundant. It must be noted that a majority of these studies utilized the International Corpus of English – Philippines (ICE-PHI). The ICE-PHI is a database of spoken and written texts produced by educated (18 years old and above) Filipino speakers and writers, and it follows the common design for all ICE corpora: (1) Each corpus has one million words; (2) Each corpus consists of 500 texts, each has about 2,000 words; (3) The texts are culled from specified text categories, and the number of texts in a category is also specified; and (4) The major text category division is between spoken (300 texts = 600,000 words) and written (200 texts = 400,000 words). The type of language use in the corpus ranges from direct conversations, distanced conversations, public dialogues, unscripted and scripted monologues, nonprofessional written output, correspondence, and informational, instructional, persuasive, and creative texts (Bautista, 2011b). This ensures that a common core of linguistic features, which indicates that educated PhE is a separate variety of English, is adhered to. Since the ICE-PHI corpus stores discourses not of a single group of speakers, the standard variety that constitutes the proposed pedagogic model is completely unidentifiable to a specific speech community or location.

2.2.2 Grammatical Rules

The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) General Education (GE) English course outline for the subject *English Plus* was used as a reference document in identifying the critical grammatical structures to be taught to college learners and to be included in the proposed endonormative pedagogic model. This document serves as a memorandum order to all colleges and universities under the supervision of CHED for compliance and consideration in the writing of syllabi, course outlines, and instructional materials, such as textbooks and worktexts. Therefore, the selection of the equivalent grammatical forms in PhE was guided by this state-prescribed policy. Disparate AmE and PhE structures that belong to the same grammatical category were identified, for instance, *result in* (AmE) and *result to* (PhE). Only PhE variants that significantly vary from the exonormative standard were identified after examining them *vis-à-vis* the comprehensive grammar of the English language by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985). To us, the work of Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik is the most thorough and definitive grammar of modern English ever produced, for the authors have written an even more comprehensive and perceptive synthesis of current grammatical description. Furthermore, the works of Bautista (2000a, 2004, 2008), Biber et al., (1999), and Borlongan (2011a) were also consulted in identifying the distinctive features of English prevalent in the teaching of English grammar in Philippine universities.

2.2.3 Pedagogical Acceptability Test (PAT)

The study designed and administered a pedagogical acceptability test to investigate college English teachers and learners' judgment toward the PhE-based grammar model and their general perceptions on an indigenous model of teaching English grammar.

The types of questions varied, e.g., close-ended questions and multiple-choice items. All questions aimed at directly eliciting the participants' perceptions and personal views toward the issues of PhE and the potentials and obstacles for PhE to be locally recognized and implemented into the language curriculum. The pedagogical acceptability test, therefore, is a

researcher-made instrument that assesses how tolerable or unobjectionable PhE grammatical variants are as a standard in teaching English grammar in formal classroom setting. Put in another way, it is a tool that assesses the suitability of the proposed endonormative model within a context of use specific to the needs of the English language learners in the country.

The first part of the instrument asks for the respondents' personal information. The second part contains 38 pairs of statements and requires the participants to rate each pair in which one component is written in AmE while the other is written in PhE using a six-point Likert scale. The respondents were requested to circle the number that represents how much they accept each statement as a model sentence in teaching and learning a specific rule of the English grammar. (Legend: 1= "totally unacceptable"; 2= "unacceptable" 3= "somewhat unacceptable"; 4="somewhat acceptable"; 5="moderately acceptable"; 6="highly acceptable"). The last section of the instrument asks the participants to choose a particular model in teaching English grammar and their reasons for selecting the model they prefer.

The development of the pedagogical acceptability test followed the conventional survey methodology. Adapting Benson and Clark's (1982) and Bratt's (2009) frameworks for survey design, this study subdivided the method of pedagogical acceptability test development into four phases: Phase 1 - mapping out of initial item pool; Phase 2 - expert review; Phase 3 - pilot test; and Phase 4 - administration.

2.2.4 Participants and Sampling Technique

Two sets of respondents participated in the study. The first set was involved to empirically determine the current model used in teaching English grammar in local universities; thus, 125 English instructors from three leading universities in the Philippines were randomly selected and requested to respond to a survey. Thirteen (13) college English teachers acceded to the request of classroom observation. The number of respondents 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.

In investigating the pedagogical acceptability of PhE grammatical features, another set of respondents – a total of 42 English instructors and 242 students from 10 colleges or universities in the City of Manila that offer English Plus or English Zero or any of its equivalent and where the medium of instruction in all courses, except Filipino, is English – participated in the study. These colleges and universities are duly recognized by CHED. To identify the sample size, G*Power Software was utilized. The total number of student and teacher participants was identified after computing it at the statistical power of 0.85, alpha value of .05, and moderate effect size of .50 (Cohen, 1988). To get the sample size per respondent school, the total sample was proportionately distributed to the ten (10) schools in the City of Manila. The 42 teachers requested to participate in the pedagogical acceptability test must first fulfill three compulsory conditions: (1) they are full-time English teachers in their respective institutions, (2) they do not teach any other disciplines, and (3) their L1 is Filipino. On the other hand, the 254 students enrolled in English Plus/Zero or any of its equivalent must meet three compulsory requirements: (1) bilingual/multilingual, but their L1 is Filipino, (2) non-English majors, and (3) are 16-18 years old. It must be noted that only 242 student respondents, representing 95.28% of the target population, were considered because 12 of them had invalid and problematic answers to the pedagogical acceptability test.

3. Results and Discussion

The Pedagogically Acceptable and Unacceptable PhE Grammatical Variants

Table 1 shows that based on the mean scores, six (6) out of the eight (8) PhE prepositional phrases are found to be pedagogically acceptable by both groups of respondents. The intensities of acceptability differ, but these prepositional phrases now seem to merit formal recognition. It is interesting to note that based on the figures, except for Q4a (for your perspective) and Q6a (fill the blank), PhE prepositional phrases, such as *fill up*, *result to*, *conform to*, *in search for*, *based from*, and *cope up with*, have garnered formal recognition and now seem as suitable as their SAE counterparts based on the teachers and students' judgment.

Table 1
Acceptability of PhE prepositional phrases

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q1a: fill <i>up</i> *	3.98	1.538	somewhat acceptable	3.99	1.424	somewhat acceptable
Q1b: fill <i>out</i> *	5.07	1.237	moderately acceptable	4.71	1.423	moderately acceptable
Q2a: result <i>to</i> *	4.45	1.485	somewhat acceptable	4.97	1.257	moderately acceptable
Q2b: result <i>in</i>	4.31	1.718	somewhat acceptable	3.79	1.434	somewhat acceptable
Q3a: based <i>from</i> *	3.67	1.803	somewhat acceptable	4.69	1.362	moderately acceptable
Q3b: based <i>on</i>	5.24	0.983	moderately acceptable	4.88	1.162	moderately acceptable
Q4a: <i>for</i> your perspective*	2.07	1.332	unacceptable	2.59	1.237	somewhat unacceptable
Q4b: <i>from</i> your perspective	5.74	0.554	highly acceptable	5.53	0.779	highly acceptable
Q5a: conform <i>to</i>	4.02	1.645	somewhat acceptable	3.66	1.586	somewhat acceptable
Q5b: based <i>to</i> *	4.90	1.303	moderately acceptable	4.92	1.275	moderately acceptable
Q6a: <i>fill</i> the blank*	3.21	1.570	somewhat unacceptable	3.48	1.503	somewhat unacceptable
Q6b: <i>fill in</i> the blank	5.40	1.106	moderately acceptable	5.15	1.153	moderately acceptable
Q7a: in search <i>of</i>	4.86	1.372	moderately acceptable	4.36	1.287	somewhat acceptable
Q7b: in search <i>for</i> *	4.17	1.480	somewhat acceptable	4.79	1.185	moderately acceptable
Q8a: cope up <i>with</i> *	3.71	1.798	somewhat acceptable	4.10	1.536	somewhat acceptable
Q8b: cope <i>with</i>	5.02	1.370	moderately acceptable	4.88	1.264	moderately acceptable

In relation to unidiomatic phrases, Table 2 indicates that students and teachers consider *with regards to* pedagogically acceptable, similar to its AmE equivalent *with regard to*.

Table 2
Acceptability of PhE's "with regards to"

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q9a: with <i>regards to</i> *	3.83	1.820	somewhat acceptable	4.75	1.343	moderately acceptable
Q9b: with <i>regard to</i>	4.81	1.435	moderately acceptable	4.07	1.448	somewhat acceptable

Table 3 presents the pedagogical acceptability results for the adverb *wherein*. The table shows that it is also rated pedagogically acceptable by the teacher and student respondents.

Table 3
Acceptability of "wherein" in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q10a: in the US <i>wherein</i> they have*	3.98	1.585	somewhat acceptable	4.89	1.079	moderately acceptable
Q10b: in the US <i>which</i> they have*	4.86	1.299	moderately acceptable	4.31	1.247	somewhat acceptable

With respect to double comparatives and nongradable adjectives, it was found that *more correct* and *more cheaper*, despite their occurrences in many educated Filipinos' utterances, remain pedagogically unacceptable as shown in Table 4. It is interesting to further explore why other examples of double comparatives and graded nonscalar adjectives, such as *more clearer* and *more unique*, are often heard from Filipino speakers but are hardly pedagogically acceptable to college learners and teachers. It is possible that teachers and students are very much cognizant of the rules since they are often taken up in English classes and that the use of the above structures is a clear violation of standards.

Table 5 indicates that the use of *isn't it* as an invariant tag question is also found unacceptable by the student and teacher respondents. Although recent studies, such as Borlongan's (2008), claim that *isn't it* is likely to be a potential candidate for being an invariant tag question in Philippine English, its acceptability remains to be questioned. It would be advisable, however, to subject this feature to another round of pedagogical acceptability judgment using a different sentence in which it occurs. The context provided in the pedagogical acceptability test is probably unhelpful in determining the extent of acceptability of the all-purpose tag question *isn't it*.

Table 4
Acceptability of double comparatives and nongradable adjectives in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q11a: it's a <i>correct</i> answer	5.50	0.804	highly acceptable	5.50	0.873	highly acceptable
Q11b: it's a <i>more correct</i> answer*	2.93	1.568	somewhat unacceptable	2.93	1.502	somewhat unacceptable
Q12a: <i>more cheaper</i> treatment*	1.31	0.563	totally unacceptable	1.86	1.315	unacceptable
Q12b: <i>cheaper</i> treatment*	5.83	0.437	highly acceptable	5.67	0.750	highly acceptable

Table 5
Acceptability of "isn't it" as an invariant tag question in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q14a: Classes have been extended, <i>haven't they?</i>	4.45	1.864	somewhat acceptable	4.43	1.801	somewhat acceptable
Q14b: Classes have been extended, <i>isn't it?*</i>	2.86	2.03	somewhat unacceptable	3.46	1.926	somewhat unacceptable

Table 6 indicates that the use of *get*-passives is fairly acceptable. This may suggest that the use of *get* in place of *be* in a passive sentence is also suitable when speaking or writing in English. However, Alonsagay and Nolasco (2010) found that *get*-passives occur more frequently in PhE conversations or informal usage. This study, as one of its limitations, was unable to examine whether students and teachers prefer the use of *get*-passives in written register or in spoken discourse.

Table 6
Acceptability of "get-passives" in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q15a: <i>get involved</i> in tennis again*	4.05	1.561	somewhat acceptable	4.06	1.498	somewhat acceptable
Q15b: <i>be involved</i> in tennis again	4.98	1.316	moderately acceptable	4.89	1.169	moderately acceptable

Table 7 suggests that embedded questions not functioning as noun clauses, although prevalent in the study corpus, remains pedagogically unacceptable to the teacher and student judges. This illustrates another case of intolerance of a feature despite its prevalence in educated speakers' utterances.

Table 7***Acceptability of embedded questions not functioning as noun clauses in PhE***

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q16a: Will you tell me <i>what are you planning</i> to do...*	2.64	1.751	somewhat unacceptable	3.39	1.657	somewhat unacceptable
Q16b: Will you tell me <i>what you are planning</i> to do...	5.24	1.322	moderately acceptable	5.07	1.276	moderately acceptable

The acceptability of the distinctive use of articles in PhE is presented in Table 8. The figures show that omitting the definite article *the* such as in Q17b and the indefinite article *a* such as in Q18b is pedagogically acceptable. Bautista (2008) claims that the use of articles is problematic for ESL learners and posits that problems with article usage for Filipinos are evident in all the PhE studies conducted. This problematic usage, however, seems unproblematic now for teachers and students find them pedagogically tolerable. Further analysis of the figures shows that, with respect to article use, students and teachers accept both variants – AmE and PhE. It is interesting to note though that the feature *Ø majority* in PhE is more acceptable than its SAE counterpart. The same table also shows that the unnecessary addition of the article *the* such as in Q19a is acceptable only to students.

Table 8***Acceptability of the distinctive use of articles in PhE***

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q17a: <i>The</i> use of multimedia is...	5.17	1.208	moderately acceptable	5.47	0.841	moderately acceptable
Q17b: Use of multimedia is...*	3.88	1.237	somewhat acceptable	3.74	1.409	somewhat acceptable
Q18a: <i>a</i> majority of their respondents	3.60	1.639	somewhat acceptable	4.06	1.508	somewhat acceptable
Q18b: majority of their respondents *	5.19	1.042	moderately acceptable	4.69	1.389	moderately acceptable
Q19a: <i>the</i> punctuations have roles to play*	3.05	1.464	somewhat unacceptable	3.68	1.327	somewhat acceptable
Q19b: punctuations have roles to play	5.57	0.770	highly acceptable	5.13	1.053	moderately acceptable

Table 9 presents the acceptability judgment for the distinctive use of verbs in PhE. The data show that the omission of the linking verb *is* such as in Q12a, although less acceptable than its SAE counterpart, is found pedagogically sound by both student and teacher respondents. Furthermore, the use of simple past for past perfective, such

as in Q22b, is also regarded acceptable by both groups; however, the teachers' extent of acceptability is much lower than the students'. There are, however, distinctive verb usages that remain unacceptable, e.g., the use of simple past for simple present denoting a habitual action such as in Q21a.

Table 9 also shows another case of differing pedagogical judgment; that is, the teachers regard the use of present perfective for simple past unacceptable contrary to the students' belief as illustrated in Q20a.

Table 9
Acceptability of the distinctive use of verbs in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean		Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q12a: ...whatever the political cost.*	3.95	1.652	somewhat acceptable	3.80	1.483	somewhat acceptable
Q12b: whatever the political cost <i>is</i> .	5.02	1.297	moderately acceptable	5.08	1.258	moderately acceptable
Q20a: I <i>have seen</i> him yesterday.*	2.69	1.585	somewhat unacceptable	3.89	1.475	somewhat acceptable
Q20b: I <i>saw</i> him yesterday.	5.86	0.354	highly acceptable	5.66	0.689	highly acceptable
Q21a:These species usually <i>carried</i> large number of local names....*	2.36	1.511	unacceptable	2.74	1.455	somewhat unacceptable
Q21b:These species usually <i>carry</i> large number of local names....	5.69	0.715	highly acceptable	5.35	0.960	moderately acceptable
Q22a: They <i>had left</i> the Philippines before their children entered college.	5.19	1.348	moderately acceptable	4.41	1.503	somewhat acceptable
Q22b: They <i>left</i> the Philippines before their children entered college.*	3.52	1.864	somewhat acceptable	4.61	1.442	moderately acceptable

The distinctive use of *would* seems acceptable, to some extent, only to students as shown in Table 10. Their decision may be a result of what Svalberg (1998 as cited in Bautista, 2004) calls imperfect learning and Bautista's (2004) observation that modals are insufficiently covered in ESL classes. It is surprising to note that English teachers still find the distinctive use of *would* unacceptable despite its incidence in the transcriptions of classroom interactions and its grammaticality in the study of Bautista (2004).

Table 10
Acceptability of the distinctive use of “would” in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q23a: ...mass which <i>will</i> be held in...	5.24	1.165	moderately acceptable	5.20	1.075	moderately acceptable
Q23b: ...mass which <i>would</i> be held in...*	3.17	1.681	somewhat unacceptable	3.71	1.516	somewhat acceptable

Table 11 presents the results of the acceptability of PhE subject-verb agreement system. The data indicate that the use of a plural verb for a singular subject and the use of a singular verb for a plural subject in a sentence that begins with *there* as illustrated in Q24b and Q28a, respectively, are deemed pedagogically acceptable only to the student respondents. The same table shows that the use of the singular linking verb *is* separated by an intervening phrase from its subject *I* such as in Q26a is regarded acceptable by both groups of pedagogical judges. It is puzzling, however, why its SAE counterpart (Q26b) is adjudged only somewhat acceptable.

Table 11
Acceptability of PhE subject-verb agreement system

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q24a: The teaching of critical thinking... <i>has</i> ...	5.17	1.208	moderately acceptable	5.47	0.841	moderately acceptable
Q24b: The teaching of critical thinking... <i>have</i> ...*	2.38	1.696	unacceptable	3.81	1.728	somewhat acceptable
Q25a: But as far as the use of these phrases in sentences <i>are</i> concerned...*	2.50	1.798	somewhat unacceptable	3.83	1.831	somewhat acceptable
Q25b: But as far as the use of these phrases in sentences <i>is</i> concerned...	5.31	1.405	moderately acceptable	4.26	1.685	somewhat acceptable
Q26a: I, for one, <i>is</i> an agnostic.*	3.60	2.131	somewhat acceptable	3.67	1.930	somewhat acceptable
Q26b: I, for one, <i>am</i> an agnostic.	4.33	1.857	somewhat acceptable	4.07	1.859	somewhat acceptable
Q27a: I, including my sisters, <i>are</i> not going to attend the party.*	3.43	2.062	somewhat unacceptable	4.54	1.730	moderately acceptable
Q27b: I, including my sisters, <i>am</i> not going to attend the party.	4.21	2.007	somewhat acceptable	3.25	1.834	somewhat unacceptable
Q28a: “There <i>exists</i> basic roadblocks...”*	3.02	1.893	somewhat unacceptable	4.13	1.689	somewhat acceptable
Q28b: “There <i>exist</i> basic roadblocks...”	4.90	1.559	moderately acceptable	3.95	1.608	somewhat acceptable

Further, the use of the plural linking verb *are* complementing the subject *I* but preceded by an intervening phrase as shown in Q27a received contradicting judgments from the two groups of respondents. The students regard it moderately acceptable while the teachers consider it somewhat unacceptable. It is worthy of note why the use of *am* (Q27b), which is the standard, also received opposing judgments. The teachers consider it somewhat acceptable, but the students believe otherwise. Nevertheless, the data suggest the students' acceptance of subject-verb agreement features of PhE. A number of studies (cf. Bautista, 2000b, 2003, 2008) and the transcriptions in the present investigation have shown the pervasiveness of subject-verb incongruities in PhE, signaling the constant use and acceptance of this PhE feature, particularly among the educated college learners in the present study.

The figures in Table 12 show that the students and the teachers regard the use of the plural pronoun *their* for singular antecedents and indefinite pronouns like *everyone* pedagogically acceptable as shown in Q29b. Interestingly, the students consider its SAE counterpart (Q29a) unacceptable, and only the teachers favor its use. The data also reveal that only the student judges regard the use of the pronoun *its* for inanimate plural antecedents pedagogically acceptable as illustrated in Q30a. Additionally, they regard its SAE equivalent only somewhat acceptable (Q30b).

Table 12
Acceptability of the distinctive use of pronouns in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q29a: Everyone implored the Almighty for <i>his</i> ...	4.62	1.899	moderately acceptable	3.41	1.838	somewhat unacceptable
Q29b: Everyone implored the Almighty for <i>their</i> ...*	3.67	2.044	somewhat acceptable	4.69	1.646	moderately acceptable
Q30a: Regular verbs are considered weak verbs because <i>it</i> forms <i>its</i> ...*	2.40	1.683	unacceptable	3.75	1.764	somewhat acceptable
Q30b: Regular verbs are considered weak verbs because <i>they</i> form <i>their</i> ...*	5.55	0.993	highly acceptable	4.46	1.530	somewhat acceptable

Table 13 shows another case of opposing judgments of the teachers and the students with respect to acceptability of the distinctive use of pronoun cases in PhE. A closer look at the data shows that only the student respondents accept the use of *I* in situations where *I* is required (Q31a) and the unconventional use of *who* in cases where *whom* is needed (Q32a).

Table 13
Acceptability of the distinctive use of pronoun cases in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q31a: Because of her, <i>me</i> and my siblings...*	2.81	1.685	somewhat unacceptable	4.25	1.784	somewhat acceptable
Q31b: Because of her, <i>I</i> and my siblings...*	5.26	1.191	moderately acceptable	3.83	1.820	somewhat acceptable
Q32a: ...respect the one <i>who</i> you want to have relationship with.*	3.17	1.497	somewhat unacceptable	3.59	1.629	somewhat acceptable
Q32b: ...respect the one <i>whom</i> you want to have relationship with.	5.52	0.943	highly acceptable	5.00	1.253	moderately acceptable

The acceptability of transitive verbs functioning as intransitive verbs, e.g., *assure*, is shown in the following table. As shown in Table 14, the use of the transitive verb *assure* without an indirect object is found pedagogically acceptable by both groups of respondents.

Table 14
Acceptability of “assure” as an intransitive verb

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q33a: The President <i>assured us</i> he is not...	5.19	1.065	moderately acceptable	4.46	1.491	somewhat acceptable
Q33b: The President <i>assured</i> he is not... *	3.81	1.596	somewhat acceptable	4.17	1.554	somewhat acceptable

Table 15 shows that *one of the + singular noun*, despite its frequent use by many Filipino speakers and prevalence in the ICE-PHI corpus Bautista (2008) utilized in her study, is adjudged pedagogically unacceptable by both groups of respondents. Further, unpluralizing semantically plural nouns, such as in Q35a, is somewhat acceptable only to student respondents.

Table 16 indicates that the plural noun form *advices* is believed to be pedagogically unacceptable by both groups of respondents in spite of the unpopularity of its SAE counterpart *pieces of advice*. This suggests the investigation on the acceptability of other plural noun forms in PhE such as *furnitures*, *equipments*, and *luggages*.

Table 15
Acceptability of unpluralized semantically plural nouns in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q34a: That's one of the related <i>problems...</i>	5.81	0.455	highly acceptable	5.32	1.117	moderately acceptable
Q34b: That's one of the related <i>problem...*</i>	1.86	1.095	unacceptable	2.61	1.50	somewhat unacceptable
Q35a: Make a list of words you encountered that use prefixes and suffixes then identify their <i>rootword...*</i>	3.45	1.824	somewhat unacceptable	3.73	1.789	somewhat acceptable
Q35b: Make a list of words you encountered that use prefixes and suffixes then identify their <i>rootwords...*</i>	4.83	1.545	moderately acceptable	4.56	1.556	moderately acceptable

Table 16
Acceptability of distinctive plural noun forms in PhE

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q36a: <i>advices</i> from other people*	2.81	1.877	somewhat unacceptable	3.31	1.805	somewhat unacceptable
Q36b: <i>pieces of advice</i> from other people	5.52	0.917	highly acceptable	5.17	1.191	moderately acceptable

Table 17 presents the acceptability of PhE redundant conjunctions. The table shows that *not unless* and *like for example* are regarded unacceptable by both groups of respondents. It must be noted that *like for example*, a redundant expression in which both words play the same role, appeared a number of times in the study corpus; despite that, it remains unacceptable.

Table 18 summarizes the PhE grammatical variants regarded pedagogically acceptable by the student and teacher respondents. It should be noted that not only the grammatical features in the table will constitute the proposed model, for there is a pool of other PhE grammatical structures (and their AmE counterparts) that has to be subjected to pedagogical acceptability judgments. Although they scarcely received the highest possible acceptability rating because of a number of possible reasons explained below, the tolerance of the above PhE features may still suggest the legitimacy of formally teaching them in English grammar classes. The fact that there are grammatical variants of the localized variety used by and acceptable to teachers and students signals that there is a call for teaching English grammar which is anchored on PhE as well.


Table 17
Acceptability of PhE redundant conjunctions

Items	Teachers			Students		
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Q37a: <i>not unless</i> you've mastered them*	2.38	1.361	unacceptable	3.34	1.765	somewhat unacceptable
Q37b: <i>unless</i> you've mastered them	5.74	0.544	highly acceptable	5.16	1.123	moderately acceptable
Q38a: <i>Like for example</i> , you established...*	2.62	1.592	somewhat unacceptable	3.11	1.578	somewhat unacceptable
Q35b: <i>For example</i> , you established...	5.81	0.505	highly acceptable	5.47	0.845	moderately acceptable

Table 18
Pedagogically acceptable PhE grammatical variants

Grammatical Category	Examples
A. Prepositional Phrases	fill <i>up</i> , result <i>to</i> based <i>from</i> , conform \emptyset in search <i>for</i> , cope <i>up with</i> with regards to
B. <i>Wherein</i> for <i>in which</i>	...in the US <i>wherein</i> they have
C. <i>Get</i> -passive	... <i>get involved</i> in tennis again...
D. Omitted <i>the</i> and <i>a</i>	\emptyset Use the multimedia is... \emptyset majority of their respondents
E. Omitted the Linking Verb	...whatever the political cost \emptyset
F. Simple Past for Past Present Perfective	They <i>left</i> the Philippines before their children entered college.
G. Use of <i>is</i> for the Subject <i>I</i>	I, for one, <i>is</i> an agnostic
H. Use of <i>their</i> for Indefinite Pronouns	Everyone implored the Almighty for <i>their</i> ...
I. Assured \emptyset	The President <i>assured</i> he is not...

Figure 2 represents the conceptual schema of the design of the endonormative pedagogic model for teaching English grammar. The figure identifies the inputs, its output, and the processing steps required to transform the inputs into the output. The inputs include PhE in the transcripts of students and teachers' utterances, PhE in college English textbooks and college English tests, and grammatical features of PhE culled from the recent corpus studies of PhE. The PhE grammatical features from the inputs were processed by matching them up with the contents of English Plus coverage and subjecting them to a pedagogical acceptability test after positioning them against their AmE counterparts. In the end, the output is a pluricentric model, i.e., two varieties – AmE and PhE – when English grammar teaching is concerned.

Figure 2**The pedagogically tested proposed endonormative model for teaching English grammar**

The model illustrates that pedagogically acceptable PhE variants, such as prepositional phrases like *fill up*, *result to*, *based from*, *conform \emptyset* , *in search for*, *cope up with*, and *with regards to*, the adverb *wherein* (instead of its AmE counterpart *in which*), *get-passives*, omitted definite and indefinite articles, omitted linking verb in *whatever the political cost (is)*, use of the simple past for past perfective, use of *I + intervening phrase + is*, use of *their* as an antecedent for indefinite pronouns, and use of *assure* as an intransitive verb may now be formally taught in ESL classes, for they are deemed unobjectionable. These variants, therefore, may join the AmE grammatical features, which students and teachers regard pedagogically sound; thus, the two varieties of English jointly constitute the model.

With respect to prepositional phrases, it is possible that Filipino speakers use *in regards to* and *with regards to* because of their counterpart *as regards*. “With regards to” appears to be a blend of “with regard” and “as regards.” Also, Bautista (2003) posits that *to* is collocated with *result* because of the association with destination, just as *from* is collocated with *based* because of the association with source. As regards *cope up with*, Bautista claims that the verb is regarded to be a phrasal verb *cope up* (probably on the analogy of *keep up*) used intransitively and then, if the verb is used transitively, the preposition *with* is attached.

As to the use of *conform \emptyset* , it is possible that *conform \emptyset* is taken to mean ‘obey a rule or reach the necessary stated standard, or to do things in a traditional way,’ and *obey*, when used in a sentence, e.g., *Obey the rules of your school.*, does not require any preposition at

all, only an object, thus, the use of *conform* without a preposition. Furthermore, it is possible that *in search for* is used instead of *in search of* because Filipino speakers associate *for* with the object of the search such as information, answer, someone, or something as in *in search for the truth*. It is also possible that they change *of* to *for* as a collocate of the verb *search* to highlight the verb *search* (observable action of looking for something) and not the noun *search* (act of doing something) since the former has a predetermined goal that needs to be accomplished. It is also possible that *in search for* is a result of Filipino's familiarization with the idiom *look for* which generally shares the same semantic meaning. Lastly, *fill up* (instead of *fill out*) is used to mean 'to complete by supplying the requested information.' Possibly, the use of *up* denotes that one has used or needs to use all the available space, e.g., information sheet (not a container) and to provide all the needed details there. In other words, *fill up* is used to signify to 'make a form or application full of the required information.'

Also, Bautista (2008) hypothesizes that in PhE, *wherein* is used as an all-purpose connector that takes the place of *where*, *when*, *in which*, *by which*, *through which*, and *for which*. Bautista also suggests that the distinctive use of *wherein* could be parallel to the use of the Filipino particle *na*. However, it is also possible that Filipinos use *wherein* as a direct translation of the Filipino expression *kung saan*.

In addition, the use of *assure* \emptyset may be a result of a simplification process as suggested by Bautista (2008). It is also likely that *assure* is used as an ambitransitive verb if the object, e.g., *us*, is often not needed, especially when it is obvious that *us* is being talked about. This may also be the reason why other verbs that must function as transitive verbs in the study corpus, e.g., *submit*, *commit*, *pass*, and *take*, are used in sentences without their direct objects because pragmatically speaking, these direct objects are likely to be known. It is also possible that *assure* is used as an intransitive verb if the meaning conveyed is 'to make certain or ensure' which, when used in a sentence, does not require an object.

Figure 2 also illustrates a common tendency to use the pronoun *their* as an alternative to the awkward *his/her* or *his or her*. It is also possible that *their* is used as an antecedent of *everyone* because *everyone* sounds like a number of people, although in traditional grammar, *everyone* is a singular noun and takes a singular verb. It is also likely that *their* is often used as a result of Filipino's collectivist way of communication. This is evident particularly in business writing in which "we" is used although the letter was single-handedly written by an individual.

As regards the use of *get*-passives, it appears that the verb *get* is often used as an auxiliary in place of *be* in passive sentences. However, it looks as if *get*-passives are normally fairly informal and more likely to occur in casual conversations and informal sorts of writing than in formal writing.

Furthermore, \emptyset *majority* is popular perhaps because *majority* is seen as a plural noun, i.e., a large number of people. If this is the case, the use of the article *a* before *majority* seems awkward; thus, *a* is omissible. In the case of the omitted definite article the as in ' \emptyset *Use of multimedia in distance learning is discouraged because of the expenses it entails,*' it is possible that it is another manifestation of the saliency pattern where articles are omitted more in topic position than in nontopic position (Trenkic, 2009).

In addition, the use of the simple past for past perfective may be attributed to the practice of grammatical simplification. As it is, perfect tenses seem to cause confusion among nonnative speakers of English. As a result, Filipinos rarely use the past perfective when they have been told to avoid perplexities and to simplify rules. It is also possible that the simple

past is used often out of convenience without any impact on the meaning; thus, speakers observe “interchangeability of tenses.”

With respect to the missing linking verb *is* as in ‘*We will not waver in our commitment to economic reform and fiscal discipline, whatever the political cost (is)*, it is likely that the phrase *whatever the...cost* is associated with the idiom *at all costs* which means ‘regardless of the expense or effort involved or by any means.’ This is probably the reason why the verb *is* is dropped, especially if the phrase it is attached to is found at the end of a sentence.

Finally, as regards the use of *is* in ‘*I, for one, is an agnostic*,’ it is likely that *is* is used because of the presence of *one* in the intervening phrase *for one*. Because *one* is nearer to the verb, the speakers’ attention is deviated from the subject *I*. Their attention is focused on *one*, which takes either the singular verb *is* or *was*.

With reference to AmE grammatical features, the same figure shows that *from your perspective* (not *for your perspective*); *fill in the blank* (not *fill the blank*) should be explicitly taught. On the contrary, double comparatives, grading and nongradable adjectives such as *more correct*, use of *isn’t it* as an invariant tag question, use of embedded questions not functioning as noun clauses, and other pedagogically unacceptable PhE grammatical features may not be taught at the moment, but instead what could be formally taught are their AmE equivalents. This makes the teaching of grammar AmE-and-PhE-based, thus, promoting the two varieties in ESL classrooms.

The other acceptable PhE grammatical features that will complete the model still have to undergo a separate round of pedagogical acceptability testing. The use of the proposed model, however, may increase the students’ and the teachers’ confidence level in learning and teaching English grammar. ESL teachers and learners have an acceptable model to refer to which guarantees them that what is explicitly promulgated in class are found to be unobjectionable and believed to be up to standard.

The proposed endonormative pedagogic model is a standard for teaching, reflective not only of AmE variants but also of PhE grammatical variants, i.e., its core contents are also derived from the grammatical features of the nativized variety of English. The proposed model presents and represents samples of language that stand as a benchmark of ideal or near-ideal speaking and writing format which tailor-fits the intranational communication needs and language use of Filipino learners and is acceptable as a pedagogically suitable model for teaching English grammar in the Philippine classrooms. The core of the model comprises a catalog of features of PhE grammar essential for mutual intelligibility in Filipino speakers’ communication. To reiterate a previous claim, it is a model that is *a la Filipino*, a model that has emerged from the local milieu of practice.

The above model also suggests that, at the moment, in some instances, college English teachers and students still opt for AmE grammatical variants and refuse their PhE counterparts. This is echoed in the argument of Tupas (2006), stating that World Englishes (WE) and English as an International Language (EIL) may be “sociolinguistically legitimate but they largely remain politically unacceptable to most people” (p. 180). Stated in another way, they use localized structures but deny their pedagogical suitability because of the notion and imposition that only AmE should be the target. It is, therefore, possible that teachers and students are still under the hegemonic influence of AmE, i.e., both groups think AmE is a superior variety in some cases while PhE is the inferior one in many. Another possible reason is embodied in Bamgbose’s (1998) argument:

A major factor militating against the adoption of non-native norms is the ambivalence between recognition and acceptance of such norms. This, in turn, is linked to the question of attitudes. On the one hand, non-native norms are seen as an expression of identity and solidarity, while, on the other, there continues to be great admiration for native norms. Quite often, people know of features of non-native varieties and can even see the utility of such features in the sociocultural situation, yet they are reluctant to accept the logical conclusion that such recognition implies a replacement of the native norms they have come to adore. (p. 5)

On the other hand, the pedagogical acceptance of the 16 PhE grammatical features in the proposed model is a positive sign of nonambivalence of the respondents as regards their choice of variety. Perhaps, the teachers and the students have started to disentangle contemporary beliefs about linguistic competence from association with norms of an inner-circle variety alone. The approval of PhE grammatical variants may be attributed to pragmatic factors such as appropriateness, comprehensibility, and interpretability. It is possible that the teachers and the students also use them in varied communication contexts, for they do not impede understanding in any way and that they do not look at them as grave deviations. This goes to show that PhE (although not all features) may be regarded at par with AmE and could resiliently stand as a target model together with AmE.

4. Conclusion

What this paper has proposed is a framework for designing a local-variety-based model for teaching English grammar and a specific case in which the framework is applied – something that is missing in the literature as far as teaching English grammar endonormatively is concerned. This paper offers a general blueprint for designing a Philippine-English-based pedagogic model for teaching English and its application has led to significant findings.

The results hint at the fact that there are PhE grammatical features that deserve formal recognition and that there is no reason to be afraid of them, i.e., formally teaching acceptable grammatical features of PhE may no longer be regarded as ‘forbidden’ and ‘illegal.’

The PhE-based model proposed in this paper describes how language is actually used and accepts the patterns a Filipino speaker of English actually uses and tries to account for them. The model highlights the important fact that the grammatical system of a language should be described on the basis of what people actually say, not what the idealized norm dictates. Furthermore, in the proposed model, grammar consists of those constructions judged acceptable by local speakers’ intuitions.

Overall, it is fair to say that PhE thrives in ESL classrooms, and a good number of PhE grammatical variants are now deemed pedagogically acceptable to be a model for teaching and learning English grammar – a model that is approvable as an ESL instructional support, a model that is reflective of how language is actually used in the local ESL territories, and a model that takes into account the sociolinguistic issues that encase ESL practitioners and learners.

The data obtained specifically for this study signify that American or British English alone may not even be the best possible assemblage of linguistic features available and that

it is the pedagogical acceptance of the educated users of the language that determines how standard a specific variety is. The results also signify that an indigenous linguistic norm is gradually adopted and accepted in the home ESL setting. In other words, there is now official recognition of new linguistic norms, i.e., the local form of English becomes accepted as the new local norm. PhE variety is regarded in a more positive light as compared with what it was in its initial evolutionary stages, which implies that PhE is gradually taking a forward step toward a new period in the life of new Englishes.

McKaughan (1993) maintains that it is imperative to start teaching English using Standard Philippine English as the norm. Widdowson (1994) also asserts that through the use of a local model, modern-day speakers of English may appropriate English at the grammatical level to fit their own local contexts, purposes, and cultures while Hung (2009) emphasizes that both the localized and the so-called “standard” forms should be explicitly highlighted in the language classrooms. Also, local researchers, such as Bautista (2001a), Bernardo (2011), and Borlongan (2011b), have echoed the significance of teaching English using the local variety as a framework. Interestingly, the results have shown that, at present, a greater population of educated Filipino speakers of English has responded to the call of relying on local linguistic models. However, similar to what Kaushik (2011) found in his study of Indian English, the results indicate that the respondents welcome the inclusion of PhE variants in formal instruction, but not all are willing to accept just any and every feature of PhE. This unwillingness may be attributed to the intrinsic differences between American English and Philippine English, which make the ESL teachers and learners feel that some PhE features are still uncomfortable and strange.

Despite the fact that there still remain inviolable rules, the acceptance of PhE as a model for teaching English grammar may be a result of increased linguistic tolerance or approbation of other varieties. The pedagogical acceptance of PhE variants gives the impression that the “de-Anglo-Americanization” of ESL teaching and learning has commenced to take effect. Although there are unbreakable linguistic rules, there are grammatical structures that have gained formal recognition – an indication that not all are afraid of Philippine English and that Philippine English may also stoutly stand as a model for teaching, not only with respect to pronunciation and vocabulary but also with respect to grammar. This echoes that Filipino speakers of English are open to new ways of “linguistic thinking” and to different ways of looking at the varieties of English.

References

- Alonsagay, I., & Nolasco, J. (2010). Adversativity and the get-passive in Philippine and British English: A corpus-based contrastive study. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 41, 1-13.
- Bamgbose, A. (1998). Torn between the norms: Innovations in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 17(1), 1-14.
- Banjo, A. (1993). An endonormative model for the teaching of English language in Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 261-275.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2000a). *Defining standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features*. Manila: De la Salle University Press.

- Bautista, M.L.S. (2000b). The grammatical features of educated Philippine English. In M.L.S. Bautista, T. Llamson, & B. Sibayan (Eds.), *Parangal Cang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his sixtieth birthday* (pp. 146-158). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2000c). Studies of Philippine English in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 31(1), 39-65.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2001a). Studies of Philippine English: Implications for English language teaching in the Philippines. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 2(2), 271-295.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2001b). Attitudes of English language faculty in three leading Philippine universities towards Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, 4(1), 4-32.
- 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.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2004). The verb in Philippine English: A preliminary analysis of the modal would. In M.L.S. Bautista, & K. Bolton (Eds.), *World Englishes*, 23(1), 113-128.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2008). Investigating the grammatical features of Philippine English. In M.L.S. Bautista, & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 201-218). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2011a). *Studies of Philippine English. Exploring the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English*. Manila: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (2011b). Introducing the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English circa 2010. In M.L.S. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English* (pp. 3-22). Manila: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Benson, J., & Clark, F. (1982). A guide for instrument development and validation. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 36(12), 789-800.
- Bernardo, A.S. (2011). De-hegemonizing the hegemonized: An exploratory study on the dominion of American English in the oldest University in Asia. *imanager's Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(3), 1-23.
- Bernardo, A.S. (2013). Toward an endonormative pedagogic model in the teaching English of grammar in Philippine Higher Education Institutions. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Santo Tomas, Manila.
- Biber, D. et al. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bolton, K., & Bautista, M.L.S. (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Bolton, K., & Butler, S. (2008). Lexicography and the description of Philippine English vocabulary. In M.L.S. Bautista, & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 175-200). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Borlongan, A.M. (2008). Tag questions in Philippine English. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 39(1-2), 109-34.
- 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*, 3, 74-107.
- Borlongan, A.M. (2011a). A grammar of the verb in Philippine English. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University, Manila.
- Borlongan, A.M. (2011b). The preparation and writing of a grammar of the verb in Philippine

- English and the teaching of the English verb system in Philippine schools. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 7, 120-123.
- Bratt, S.E. (2009). Development of an instrument to assess pedagogical utility in e-learning systems. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Simon Fraser University.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *CCC*, 57(4), 586-619.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dayag, D.T. (2010). Philippine English and college textbooks in oral communication: Exploring the link between the World Englishes paradigm and L2 pedagogy. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 41, 63-75.
- Espinosa, D. (1997). *English in the Philippines. Global issues in language education* (Language Institute of Japan) (26): 9. Retrieved from <http://jalt.org/global/26Phil.htm>
- Gill, S.K. (1993). Standards and pedagogical norms for teaching English in Malaysia. *World Englishes*, 12(2), 223-38.
- Gonzalez, A. (1983). When does an error become a feature of Philippine English? In R. Noss (Ed.), *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia. Anthology Series No. 11*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, 150-72.
- Gonzalez, A. (1997). The history of English in the Philippines. In M.L.S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context* (pp. 25-40). Australia: The Macquarie Library Pty., Ltd.
- He, D., & Li, D. (2009). Language attitudes and linguistic features in the China English debate. *World Englishes*, 28(1), 70-89.
- Hung, T. (2009). Hong Kong English or language error? Message posted to Language Learning Forum of Language Centre of HKBU. Retrieved from <http://lc.hkbu.edu.hk/sall/forum/forumdisplay.php?fid=3>
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian context*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kaushik, S. (2011). Teaching English in Indian contexts: Toward a pedagogic model. *World Englishes*, 30(1), 141-150.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes. Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). Theoretical issues. In A. Hashim, & L.E. Ling (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Llamzon, T. (1969). *Standard Filipino English*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Matsuda, A. (2002). Representation of users and uses of English in beginning Japanese EFL textbooks. *JALT Journal*, 24(2), 80-98.
- Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 483-496.
- Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 332-344.
- McKaughan, H. (1993). Toward a standard Philippine English. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 24(2), 41-55.
- Paine, M. (2010). *Standard vs. non-standard Englishes: Which model are we teaching and why?* Retrieved from <http://www.eilj.com/Thesis-Paine.pdf>

-
- Powell, E., & Renner, M. (2003). *Analyzing qualitative data*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Schneider, E.W. (2003). The dynamics of new Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, 79(2), 233-281.
- Schneider, E.W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties of English around the world*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Trenkic, D. (2009). Accounting for patterns of article omissions and substitutions in second language production. In M.G. Mayo, & R. Hawkins (Eds.), *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications* (pp. 115-146). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tupas, T.R.F. (2006). Standard Englishes, pedagogical paradigms and their conditions of (im) possibility. In R. Rubdy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 169-185). London: Continuum Press.
- Uittamo, H. (2009). Global English: Varieties of English in textbooks. (Unpublished thesis). University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 377-388.