



# Re-investigating the Grammatical Features of Philippine English

Sandil, Nino

---

(Citation)

Learner Corpus Studies in Asia and the World, 2:437-451

(Issue Date)

2014-05-31

(Resource Type)

departmental bulletin paper

(Version)

Version of Record

(JaLCDOI)

<https://doi.org/10.24546/81006719>

(URL)

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/81006719>



# Re-investigating the Grammatical Features of Philippine English

Niño SANDIL

*De La Salle University*

## Abstract

This paper aims to re-investigate the grammatical features of Philippine English using the International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English (ICNALE) as corpus data. The word “re-investigate” is used in light of the fact that a prior investigation was already done. In particular, that refers to the work of Bautista (2008) entitled “Investigating the grammatical features of Philippine English” which focused on analyzing five grammatical constructions: namely, (1) one of the + singular noun, (2) *o* majority, (3) such + *o* singular noun, (4) assure + *o* indirect object, and (5) wherein. This present study intends to validate whether or not these same features, found in the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English, also significantly occurred in the ICNALE. Subsequently, the possible occurrence(s) of these five disparate grammatical elements in the other countries’ corpora - compiled through the ICNALE - will also be contrastively analyzed.

## Keywords

Philippine English, grammatical features

## 1 Introduction

In 2008, Bautista investigated the grammatical features of Philippine English and “tentatively” concluded that five grammatical constructions can be considered as distinctive features of Philippine English. They are: (1) one of the + singular noun, (2) *o* majority, (3) such + *o* singular noun, (4) assure + *o* indirect object, and (5) wherein. Her study, however, was largely based on the Philippine Component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-PH) where such use of corpus data containing one million words confirmed the results of prior studies by individual researchers using small sets of data. Today, the aim of this study is to re-investigate and/or validate the “tentative” conclusion of Bautista using a different corpus, i.e., the International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English (ICNALE) data.

The study of Philippine English essentially dates back in 1969 when Llamzon published his study on the so-called Standard Filipino English (SFE). At that time, Llamzon observed that the English language that educated Filipinos use consisted of certain expressions and features that are uniquely Filipino and could not be found among native speakers of English such as Americans and British

people. Examples of which include, but are not limited to, “close the light” and “my head is painful” (Bautista, 2001). He called these features as *Filipinisms*. Subsequently, some of Llamzon’s students as well as other linguistics scholars in the country (see enumeration of studies cited in Bautista, 2008, p. 201) continued to explore and investigate on other features of SFE. Bautista (2001) also surveyed and found 48 studies on SFE in five leading universities in Metro Manila. One of the obvious limitations of conducting an investigation of grammatical features in 1969 and some two decades after that was the absence of a large set of corpus data. Hence, the identified features of SFE in many studies were primarily based on small sets of data.

In the 1990s, as the notion about World Englishes (particularly Kachru’s concentric circles mapping varieties of English) significantly spread throughout linguistic communities across the globe, scholars started to collect both written and spoken data that were specifically intended to develop a large database of corpora to be used primarily for linguistic analysis purposes. In the Philippines, this type of undertaking was pioneered by Bautista (2004), together with Dayag and Lising, when a team was formed to organize the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (ICE). The ICE project “began in 1990 with the primary aim of collecting material for comparative studies of English worldwide” (<http://icorpora.net/ice>). And at this point, there are 26 country teams which have participated in ICE by preparing and submitting their respective electronic corpora of their own variety of English.

When the written category portion of the Philippine component of ICE was completed, Bautista (2000) presented a groundbreaking research about the Philippine variety of English in her manuscript entitled “Defining Standard Philippine English: Its Status and Grammatical Features”. She identified linguistic constructions that deviated from the norm or standard, i.e., either from the American English or British English standard. Such deviations involved subject-verb agreement, articles, prepositions, tenses, mass and count nouns, pronoun-antecedent agreement, and others.

Simultaneous to Bautista’s findings, there was also an issue on how to call or describe the variety: Will it be “Filipino English” as termed by Llamzon or will it be “Philippine English” as used by Bautista? During the latter’s 2000 book-launching, this researcher personally witnessed how Llamzon put an end to the issue by literally raising his hands in what he himself termed as an expression of “surrender” to Bautista’s explanation on why the variety should now be called as Philippine English. The explanation of Bautista in using such was “to avoid confusing this variety of English with Filipino (the name of the national language)” (*ibid.*).

Upon the completion of the spoken category portion in 2004, the Philippine component of ICE, indeed, finally became the very first large corpora in the country made available for the study of Philippine English as a variety. It has been used as a data resource for linguistic analysis by a significant number of language researchers and graduate students (in both masteral and doctoral degrees) majoring in English language or applied linguistics. (See Biermeier, 2011; Friginal, 2011; Nelson & Hongtao, 2011; and Borlongan, 2007 for some of the most recent works.)

By 2008, Bautista published an article entitled “Investigating the Grammatical Features of Philippine English” which utilized not only the complete (i.e., both written and spoken categories of

data) Philippine component of ICE but also the other countries' components who joined the ICE project such as Hong Kong, Singapore, and India. She primarily discussed five grammatical features of Philippine English and presented how such features are absent or how such features occurred insignificantly in standard varieties such as American and British standards as well as in the varieties of English in Asia. Interestingly, Bautista described her findings as "somewhat tentative" (p. 217) and it is exactly such tentativeness that provided an impetus for this present research. Whether or not this present research can reduce/eliminate the tentativeness of her findings will form part of the conclusion of this paper.

## II Research Design

In this present investigation, the corpora used in validating Bautista's tentative findings concerning the five grammatical features of Philippine English are the International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English (ICNALE). At the outset, it should be pointed out that ICNALE, at this time of writing, only consists of one written category of text which is categorized as "essays". As such, the aim is not exactly to compare ICNALE with the International Corpus of English (subsequently, ICE) especially that, in terms of their respective corpus designs, they are relatively incomparable. One, ICE consists of both spoken and written data, while ICNALE only consists of the latter. Two, even in the written category alone, ICE consists of a number of sub-categories of written texts labelled as informational (learned), informational (popular), informational (reportage), instructional, persuasive, and creative. They were mostly written by professionals (cf. Bautista, 2000). The ICNALE texts, on the other hand, were written by learners or college students (<http://language.sakura.ne.jp/icnale>). In short, the two corpora were gathered/collected from two different types of sources and were prepared for two different purposes and/or foci. Henceforth, the re-investigation is not equivalent to a comparative analysis. Rather, what this study attempts is to replicate what Bautista did in ICE-PH using a different corpus data which is the ICNALE. What has been foregone, however, was the identification of grammatical constructions because Bautista's findings were automatically adopted here. It is initially the frequency of occurrence of the five grammatical constructions in the Philippine component of the ICNALE (subsequently, ICNALE-PHL) that will be primarily investigated.

Furthermore, 10 Asian countries contributed to the ICNALE. They are Hong Kong (HKG), Pakistan (PAK), the Philippines (PHL), Singapore (SIN), China (CHN), Indonesia (IDN), Japan (JPN), Korea (KOR), Thailand (THA), and Taiwan (TWN). And then there are also data from five countries - merged into one - where speakers are considered English Native Speakers (ENS). Given the availability of these other components, the re-investigation of the frequency of occurrence of the five grammatical constructions is extended to cover these countries and compare the results with the ICNALE-PHL.

Regarding the research tool, the free concordancing software called AntConc 3.2.4m (Macintosh OS X) 2011 and developed by Laurence Anthony was used. This tool works similar to Wordsmith



Tools that Bautista used. It is a concordancing tool that easily provides the researcher a frequency count of the features/constructions being studied. Biermeier (2011) notes that, in corpus linguistics, the term “tokens” pertains to the number of occurrences of a lexeme, while “types” pertains to a class of tokens (p. 245). In this study, therefore, each grammatical construction will be treated as one type and the number of times it occurred will be the same as its number of tokens. For example, the construction “one of the” occurs 56 times in the ICNALE-PHL and thus it has 56 tokens. From this figure, a subsequent determination has to be made to count how many “one of the + singular noun” construction occurs. In the case of ICNALE-PHL, it occurs 6 times and so the number of tokens for the said grammatical construction is also 6, thus leaving the standard construction “one of the + plural noun/collective noun/adj” to have 50 tokens in the ICNALE-PHL. Note that it is initially required to search for the “one of the” type/string alone using AntConc in order to display the real total number of tokens. After the concordancing tool successfully displayed the results, the researcher then has to manually review which among the total number of tokens refer to “one of the + plural/collective noun/adj” type and which belong to the “one of the + singular noun” type. Raw frequencies and raw percentages for the frequency of each grammatical construction per country component have been presented.

### III Results and Discussions

The results below are presented according to the order that each grammatical feature/construction was presented in the introduction: (1) one of the + singular noun, (2) *o* majority, (3) such + *o* singular noun, (4) assure + *o* indirect object, and (5) wherein.

#### ONE OF THE + SINGULAR NOUN

The standard use of the construction involving “one of the” is: it is often followed by a plural noun, a collective noun, or an adjective (Bautista, 2008). In the ICE-PH corpus, Bautista found a deviation where the said construction was followed by a singular noun. Specifically, out of the total 383 tokens, 358 (93.5%) were found to be of standard usage, while 25 tokens (6.5%) were of non-standard usage. Further subdividing this non-standard usage figure, 18 tokens occurred during spoken interaction, while the remaining 7 tokens were found in the written component. Such frequency, plus those found in the Hong Kong and Singapore components of ICE, was described by Bautista as “fairly prevalent”. Then she posed two questions about the occurrence of the construction “one of the + singular noun”: (a) Is the presence of the singular noun influenced by the presence of the number *one*? (b) Is it due to interference from the first language (in Tagalog, for instance, the plural marker *mga* is optional in a phrase with *isa* ‘one’: *isa sa tanong ko* alternates with *isa sa mga tanong ko* ‘one of my questions?’) (p. 204).

Insofar as the first question is concerned, this researcher believes the presence of the number *one* holds little weight since Tagalog speakers often simply – and successfully – translate *one* into *isa*. Rather, it is the translation processing of the noun portion itself which seems to be influential, i.e., the

concern of the second question. Take, for example, the following: *one of the reasons*. When translated into Tagalog, it can take two forms/alternates: (a) *isa sa dahilan* and (b) *isa sa mga dahilan*. Both are acceptable. In Tagalog, a singular noun is not pluralized by adding “s” but by adding the plural marker *mga* before the noun. Therefore, if one tries to translate *mga dahilan* into English, the cognitive tendency seems to be ignoring/dropping the plural marker *mga* and simply translating the word *dahilan* (singular noun) into *reason* (singular noun).

At any rate, this present investigation using ICNALE is far more extensive in that the Philippine English has been compared to 10 other components: namely, Hong Kong (HKG), Pakistan (PAK), Singapore (SIN), China (CHN), Indonesia (IDN), Japan (JPN), Korea (KOR), Thailand (THA), Taiwan (TWN) and a mixed group of English Native Speakers (ENS). Table 1 below displays the results of the frequency count using AntConc. Raw frequencies and raw percentages have been made available. Looking at the ICNALE-PHL alone, the result is comparable to the result in the written portion of ICE-PH. The former yields six (6) occurrences, while the latter yields seven (7) occurrences of the construction “one of the + singular noun”. This can aptly reduce the tentativeness of Bautista’s conclusion. It can be affirmed with a higher degree of concreteness that this particular construction is, indeed, a grammatical feature of Philippine English.

Table 1. “One of the + Singular Noun”

Corpus	Occurrences of One of the ____	+Plural noun/collective noun/ adjective (Standard use)		+Singular noun (Non-standard use)	
		No.	%	No.	%
ICNALE-PHL	56	50	89.3	6	10.7
ICNALE-ENS	34	34	100.0	0	0.0
ICNALE-HKG	36	31	86.1	5	13.9
ICNALE-PAK	25	13	52.0	12	48.0
ICNALE-SIN	16	15	93.8	1	6.2
ICNALE-CHN	38	36	94.7	2	5.3
ICNALE-IDN	29	15	51.7	14	48.3
ICNALE-JPN	59	51	86.4	8	13.6
ICNALE-KOR	45*	37	82.2	8	17.8
ICNALE-THA	35*	30	85.7	5	14.3
ICNALE-TWN	11	9	81.8	2	18.2

In comparison with the other 10 components, however, we find that Philippine English cannot claim sole ownership of this particular feature. Indonesian English (14 occurrences) and Pakistani English (12 occurrences) topped the frequency ranking, respectively. Then Japanese English and Korean English followed with 8 occurrences each. And Philippine English only ranked fifth. This linguistic scenario suggests that the occurrence of this grammatical construction is widespread. Also

notice the result for ICNALE-ENS (i.e., native speakers of English). It has zero frequency.

Below is a list of examples of the non-standard use. Except the ICNALE-ENS where the construction did not occur, one example for each country component of ICNALE is provided.

- (1) It's because for them it is ~~one of the~~ **grudge or reason** why other student cannot focus on their studies because their time is limited, divided and it is really hard to combine studies with work. (PHL\_PTJ\_015\_B1\_2.txt)
- (2) Cultural influence is ~~one of the~~ **paramount** feature in the prevailing of smoking. (HKG\_SMK\_024\_B1\_2.txt)
- (3) Challenging world needs responsible people not those who are careless and do not take any responsibility so part time job is ~~one of the~~ **best way** to cope with this world and work with responsibility. (PAK\_PTJ\_003\_B1\_2.txt)
- (4) One of the main contributors to ~~one of the most common and lethal~~ **cancer**, which is lung cancer, is smoking of cigarettes. (SIN\_SMK\_149\_B2\_0.txt)
- (5) The... ~~one of the~~ **way** to afford their college fees (CHN\_PTJ\_001\_B1\_1.txt)
- (6) ~~One of the~~ **alternative** is taking part time job because by taking part time job students can improve their ability and get many experience. (IDN\_PTJ\_041\_B1\_1.txt)
- (7) ~~One of the~~ **reason** is that college students spare a lot of money to buy some clothes and to play with friends and to do what you want to do. (JPN\_PTJ\_208\_A2\_0.txt)
- (8) College is a ~~one of the~~ **small society**. (KOR\_PTJ\_031\_A2\_0.txt)
- (9) So getting money is ~~one of the most important~~ **factor** for having a part-time job. (THA\_PTJ\_088\_B1\_2.txt)
- (10) Therefore I suggest that college students who have a part time job is ~~one of the~~ **ability** to strengthen themselves. (TWN\_PTJ\_156\_B1\_1.txt)

Indeed, it will be interesting to find out more on what aspect in each particular variety of English influences this linguistic deviation. Is it also now an appropriate time to tentatively conclude that the construction "one of the + singular noun" is not only a grammatical feature of Philippine English, but also, on a wider scale, a grammatical feature of Asian Englishes?

On a slightly different note, notice there is an asterisk in the occurrences pertinent to ICNALE-KOR and ICNALE-THA. Initially, searching through AntConc yielded 52 occurrences of the construction being analyzed for ICNALE-KOR. After a careful observation though, this researcher reduced it to 45 occurrences due to a discrepancy that was spotted. The following long sentence found in KOR\_SMK\_028\_A2\_0.txt was also found in seven other text files:

- (11) Smoking is not a good way to do the best, it is not a good way to do something help others, you can show yourself and do it in a other way, so you must do something to help others, you are ~~one of the~~ **group** and you are a part of the people you cannot do it to protect

others so you must do it in somewhere you are think you cannot do it where people are many  
so please do it when you are tired and there have nobody

The other text files involved are:

KOR\_SMK\_038\_A2\_0.txt KOR\_SMK\_105\_A2\_0.txt KOR\_SMK\_108\_A2\_0.txt  
KOR\_SMK\_122\_A2\_0.txt KOR\_SMK\_144\_A2\_0.txt KOR\_SMK\_169\_A2\_0.txt  
KOR\_SMK\_184\_A2\_0.txt

Then, in the case of ICNALE-THA, the following paragraph was found in two separate text files; namely, THA\_PTJ\_245\_B1\_1.txt and THA\_PTJ\_298\_B1\_1.txt:

(12) To make things worse, **one of the restaurant's most loyal customers** demanded to speak with my manager because she accused me of spitting in her drink. Just from this one day of working, I learned that being a waitress meant much more than taking orders. You must live by the "customers are always right" motto and good communication is a must. I obviously was not a waitress for very long. My next job was a cashier at a supermarket. The ability to communicate well with patrons here was a very vital part of my job. Currently, I am a nail technician where my development of communication skills is very useful when working with my clients. Through my part-time jobs, I have come across many real world situations that I now have knowledge of.

This has been included in this paper not to find fault but to raise an awareness on the challenges not only of analyzing a corpora but also of preparing the corpora.

## ø MAJORITY

This construction involving "ø majority" is generally a linguistic problem area regarding article usage. The standard construction according to Bautista (2008) is: the word "majority" is preceded by an article which is either "a" or "the". In her study, using "majority" without an article before it has been considered one of the most pronounced grammatical features of Philippine English. She likewise admitted having difficulty in accounting for the prevalent occurrence of this particular construction to the extent she also raised two questions in her article: (a) Is "majority" equated with "many" and therefore an article is not required? (b) Is "majority" so closely associated with the ready-made phrases "majority voting" or "majority decision" or "majority opinion" in the speakers' minds that they omit the article when "majority" is used as a noun? (p. 205)

Table 2. "ø Majority"

Corpus	Occurrences of Majority	With article (Standard use)	Without article (Non-standard use)



		No.	%	No.	%
ICNALE-PHL	19	8	42.1	11	57.9
ICNALE-ENS	22	22	100.0	0	0.0
ICNALE-HKG	4	4	100.0	0	0.0
ICNALE-PAK	18	11	61.1	7	38.9
ICNALE-SIN	23	16	69.6	7	30.4
ICNALE-CHN	22	19	86.4	3	13.6
ICNALE-IDN	12	8	66.7	4	33.3
ICNALE-JPN	4	2	50.0	2	50.0
ICNALE-KOR	6	4	66.7	2	33.3
ICNALE-THA	23	11	47.8	12	52.2
ICNALE-TWN	4	1	25.0	3	75.0

Insofar as the first question is concerned, the equation to “many” is, indeed, a very likely explanation. In Tagalog, the translation of “many” is *marami*. Through affixation processing, this word *marami* can be transformed into *karamihan* and this is the closest Tagalog translation of “majority”. When used in either spoken or written discourses, there can be two options: one is to add the definite article *ang* before *karamihan* and it will have been the equivalent of the grammatical construction “the majority”. Hence, if a Tagalog speaker will say *ang karamihan sa mga mag-aaral*, the equivalent of such phrase will have been “the majority of the students”. But it is also perfectly acceptable to delete the *ang* and one would simply say *karamihan sa mga mag-aaral* or, in English, “majority of the students”.

Going over Table 2, specifically at the result found in ICNALE-PHL when compared to other components, it can be posited that this construction regarding “majority”, which occurred 11 times, is something unique to ICNALE-PHL and is a confirmed grammatical feature of Philippine English. But, again, Philippine English cannot claim sole ownership of this feature because the same construction actually occurred 12 times in Thai English. In terms of raw percentages, Taiwanese English displays the highest, followed by Philippine English. Subsequent to these two, Thai English, Japanese English, and Pakistani English followed next. This is good candidate for future research.

Here are two examples of “majority” tokens found in ICNALE:

- (13) **Majority** of this college part-timers work to sustain their education. (PHL\_PTJ\_067\_B1\_2.txt)
- (14) Moreover, statistics show that **majority** of the customers say that they would come to have a meal as usual. (CHN\_SMK\_205\_B1\_1.txt)
- (15) Lung systems dominate the defect; **majority** of lung cancers are caused by smoking and also oral cancers. (TWN\_SMK\_084\_B1\_2.txt)

Furthermore, in the ENS component, there is zero token/occurrence of “ $\emptyset$  majority”. There is always the existence of the article “a” or “the”. The location of the article, however, is not always immediately preceding the word “majority”. Sometimes, an adjective immediately precedes “majority” like in the following sentences:

(16) Currently in Japan, I believe a **large majority** of students study and major in subjects that they will not be interested in at all after their graduation. (ENS\_PTJ\_096\_XX\_0.txt)

(17) I think that a **large majority** of students want to work anyway, for many reasons. (ENS\_PTJ\_096\_XX\_0.txt)

(18) As with my last response, I feel that it is much easier to rely on numbers than it is to make qualitative arguments that have no real basis. I have to admit that I am not as well educated on the subject of smoking and I have not recently read any news about the subject, but I would venture to say that an **overwhelming majority** of people think that smoking should be banned in restaurants. (ENS\_SMK\_051\_XX\_0.txt)

Still, the article “a” is present and so it should still be considered as “a majority” pattern as opposed to “ $\emptyset$  majority”.

#### SUCH + $\emptyset$ SINGULAR NOUN

The standard use of the grammatical construction involving “such”, according to Bautista, is as follows:

such + a/an + singular noun (e.g. such a movie)

such +  $\emptyset$  mass noun/plural noun (e.g. such information/such details)

modifier + such + noun (e.g. no such thing)

But what she found in Philippine English - and also in Hong Kong English and Singapore English - is that the non-standard use of “such” takes the following constructions:

such +  $\emptyset$  singular noun (e.g. such movie)

such + a/an mass noun (e.g. such an information)

In trying to count the frequency of occurrence, the string or the word “such” was searched using AntConc. One kind of construction is immediately noticeable: “such as”. This was not mentioned by Bautista, but this researcher believes it is noteworthy to mention. At the initial search for the word “such”, the number of tokens that appeared is quite huge. In ICNALE-PHL alone, for example, there are 98 tokens of the word “such”, but 63 of these tokens actually involve “such as”. This particular construction is intuitively associated to enumerating examples. There is nothing odd in this construction and so this was outrightly excluded after a concordancing list was produced. Hence, if

there are 98 tokens for “such”, 63 tokens for “such as” were subtracted; thus focusing the analysis on the remaining 35 tokens. From this resulting balance/difference, the identification of which constructions involving “such” have standard usage and which do not proceeded.

The table below provides the frequency count for the construction involving “such”. Admittedly, among the five grammatical features analyzed in this study, this is the most difficult to count and then analyzed. Also found in the table are asterisks due to another set of discrepancies where a particular sentence in one text file seems to have been exactly copied and pasted into another file. It could not be ascertained how this incident occurred, but the fact remains that some text files have become anomalous because of these repeated occurrences. Hence, it became a bit more tedious/difficult to deal with this data.

Table 3. “Such +  $\varnothing$  singular noun”

Corpus	Tokens “Such”	Tokens “such as” (minus)	Net Tokens “such”	Use of a/an or $\varnothing$					
				Standard Use		Non-standard Use		Indeterminate Use	
				No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ICNALE-PHL	98	63	33*	18	54.5	9	27.2	6	18.1
ICNALE-ENS	103	51	46*	40	86.9	2	4.3	4	8.7
ICNALE-HKG	91	54	37	25	67.5	8	21.6	4	10.8
ICNALE-PAK	134	22	107*	78	72.9	16	14.9	13	12.2
ICNALE-SIN	285	120	165	104	63.0	11	6.7	50	30.3
ICNALE-CHN	223	150	73	60	82.2	8	10.9	5	6.8
ICNALE-IDN	143	123	20	18	90.0	2	10.0	0	0.0
ICNALE-JPN	249	90	159	121	76.1	33	20.7	5	3.1
ICNALE-KOR	128	96	32	25	78.1	5	15.6	2	6.2
ICNALE-THA	420	396	24	11	45.8	4	16.7	9	37.5
ICNALE-TWN	87	69	17*	13	76.4	3	17.6	1	5.9

Based on the frequency provided in Table 3, the construction “such +  $\varnothing$  singular noun” occurred prevalently in Japanese English with 33 tokens. A sample Japanese sentence is shown below:

(19) **Such act** makes more strict rule about smoking. (JPN\_SMK\_275\_B1\_1.txt)

Pakistani English followed next with 16 occurrences and an example is:

(20) By doing this, they have less time for their studies, they can not concentrate on their

studies, specially if their job is very hard, so it should be very important for doing part time job that they should have to choose **such type of job** which is not too much hard or time consuming. (PAK\_PTJ\_030\_B1\_2.txt)

This particular construction is somehow similar to “such kind of” which was also observed by Bautista (2008) in Hong Kong English in ICE. Further examination is required as regards the description of this kind of construction. The researcher categorized it as a non-standard in the belief that it should have been written as “such a type of job”. If the article will be omitted, then “such types of job” could have been used. Again, this construction is recommended for further analysis.

Third in frequency rank is Singapore English with the following example in its corpus data:

(21) This ultimately comes down to a cost-benefit analysis where the government has to consider the political, social and economic impact of implementing **such absolute policy**. (SDN\_SMK\_087\_B2\_0.txt)

Philippine English ranks fourth. An sample sentence is:

(22) I find **such case** alarming because for me, we are just students, and it is the job of the parents to support the studies and other education-related expenditures of their children. (PHL\_PTJ\_155\_B1\_2.txt)

Interestingly, even in the native speakers of English (ENS) component, a deviation has occurred. It may be a borderline case where it is uncertain how the writer perceived the word, i.e., if it is a count noun or a mass noun. In the following example, the word is “experience” - which in other usage can take the plural form “experiences”.

(23) I've held internships in both of my summers here at university, and I think that I am a much stronger job candidate than my classmates who do not have **such experience**. (ENS\_PTJ\_007\_XX\_0.txt)

At this stage, the results show that the occurrences of this grammatical construction are widespread. Somehow, it is difficult to fully conclude on the status of this particular feature. Finally, below are the questionable sentences that occurred more than once in the corpus data - albeit these show standard use of the construction.

(24) I think it's definitely not a wise option to take a part-time job in exchange of losing some parts of **such important opportunities** of education. (Found in both PHL\_PTJ\_127\_B1\_2.txt and PHL\_PTJ\_158\_B1\_2.txt)



(25) When there is no appreciation of their talent, no jobs, no place, continuously failure its leads for suicide commitment, robbery, addiction or **such immoral activities**. (Found in PAK\_PTJ\_101\_B1\_1.txt, PAK\_PTJ\_181\_B1\_1.txt, PAK\_PTJ\_197\_A2\_0.txt)

(26) It reduces financial burden of **such large families**. (Found in PAK\_PTJ\_037\_B1\_2.txt and PAK\_PTJ\_119\_A2\_0.txt)

(27) Secondly, cigarettes, and numerous compounds, will seriously pollute our air quality, if smoking in restaurants and other indoor areas, the pollution caused by certain more serious **such an outcome** will not only affect the power of the other guests do not smoke will pollute our food. (Found in TWN\_SMK\_200\_B1\_1.txt and TWN\_SMK\_035\_B1\_1.txt)

#### ASSURE + $\emptyset$ INDIRECT OBJECT

Accordingly, the standard use of this construction is: the verb must be followed by an indirect object. However, in the study of Bautista (2008), there were a number of tokens found in the ICE data where the indirect object is absent. Strikingly, not much can be discussed using the ICNALE data because the frequency of the word “assure” occurred very rarely. It occurred once in ICNALE-PHL in the following sentence:

(28) Restaurants, on the other hand, are the place which we must **assure for our health** because it is where we are eating. (PHL\_SMK\_136\_B1\_2.txt)

The other and last occurrence in ICNALE-PHL is in the form of a past tense, i.e. “rest assured”. The same past tense form appeared once in ICNALE-TWN as in the following example:

(29) I am quite **assured** that getting a part-time job is important for college students. (TWN\_PTJ\_115\_B1\_2.txt)

Lastly, it appeared once in ICNALE-HKG and once in ICNALE-CHN too.

(30) Secondly, some jobs, such as a family tutor, are different from other part-time jobs, these jobs doesn't only help others' study, but also **assure the students** themselves review the knowledge that has been told. (CHN\_PTJ\_179\_B1\_1.txt)

In the very rare instances that they occurred, excluding the past tense, their usage is standard. Therefore, insofar as the ICNALE data is concerned, Bautista's tentative conclusion concerning “assure +  $\emptyset$  indirect object”, this researcher affirms its tentativeness.

#### WHEREIN

Among the five grammatical constructions re-investigated here, the word “wherein” is the most certain that this researcher can fully conclude to be a feature of Philippine English. It occurred 14

times in the ICNALE-PHL. Below are all the instances that the word occurred:

- (31) A part-time job refers to an employment position or job posting **wherein** fewer hours are put in per week by an individual than a full-time job. (PHL\_PTJ\_019\_B1\_2.txt)
- (32) In living the college life, students are gradually trained to become actual citizens of the country **wherein** they practice their chosen profession. (PHL\_PTJ\_039\_B1\_2.txt)
- (33) Probably the most common type is the ones **wherein** students study during the day and work at night. (PHL\_PTJ\_049\_B1\_2.txt)
- (34) In today's time **wherein** the cost of living here in our country is rising every now and then as always, practicality shall be applied by all. (PHL\_PTJ\_058\_B1\_2.txt)
- (35) It is a very flexible working hour **wherein** one can go to work during his or her convenient time. (PHL\_PTJ\_077\_B1\_2.txt)
- (36) Some schools even offer scholarships **wherein** students will serve time in the school, a sign that even the schools have joined in providing jobs for the students. (PHL\_PTJ\_087\_B1\_2.txt)
- (37) It is the point **wherein** the students will be trained to act like adults. (PHL\_PTJ\_097\_B1\_2.txt)
- (38) College, on the other hand, is the preparation stage **wherein** it helps you land in a good job. (PHL\_PTJ\_110\_B1\_2.txt)
- (39) Smoking cigarettes in the public place must be strictly prohibited and especially to the restaurants **wherein** people are eating foods. (PHL\_SMK\_023\_B1\_2.txt)
- (40) We know that, restaurant is almost an extension of our house, **wherein**, there are children that gives allergy to them. (PHL\_SMK\_034\_B1\_2.txt)
- (41) A law has already been implemented in the Philippines **wherein** people are designated smoking areas, especially in public places. (PHL\_SMK\_039\_B1\_2.txt)
- (42) Smoking, nowadays, is considered as a major vice, **wherein** majority of the users are teenagers. (PHL\_SMK\_057\_B1\_2.txt)
- (43) Smoking is an act **wherein** the person smoking is actually slowly killing himself by inhaling those harmful substances that are in the cigarette. (PHL\_SMK\_097\_B1\_2.txt)
- (44) I have always been part of the scene **wherein** smokers are in here and in there. (PHL\_SMK\_147\_B1\_2.txt)

The only instance that “wherein” occurred in the other components of ICNALE was in ICNALE-THA. But the sentence where it occurred is not even comprehensible that it can be disregarded.

- (45) Part-time job have many type; sample, work in restaurant, help at office, help at university and sales of fussy In Kasetsart University Chalemprakiat Sakonnakhon Province Campus, most students like help at university. Because working at university is **wherein**. Sample part-time job in university; at library (Helping librarian cull books, check books), at

laboratory and etc. I think working part-time is good. (THA\_PTJ\_337\_A2\_0.txt)

In the rest of the ICNALE components, “wherein” did not exist/occur. This is a very conclusive indication that the use of the word “wherein” is unique to Philippine English. It is a highly formal or legalistic word. Bautista associated it to the all-purpose linker *na* in Tagalog. But this researcher is inclined to associate it with the Tagalog phrase *na kung saan* which is usually uttered by Tagalog speakers especially when they try to explain or elaborate an issue. The word *kung* in the said phrase means “if”, while the word *saan* means “where”. The linker *na* plus “if where” do not add up to a meaningful construction; but in Tagalog *na kung saan* - which is considerably informal or a casual utterance - will be the closest translation of “wherein” and so it appears that L1 interference is the influence behind the prevalence of this grammatical feature of Philippine English.

#### IV Conclusion

This re-investigation has yielded the following conclusions: One, in regard to the construction “one of the + singular noun”, it can be asserted that it has become a grammatical feature of Philippine English - albeit it cannot be solely claimed by the variety precisely because it occurred in other Asian Englishes. Two, as regards the construction “ $\emptyset$  majority” is likewise a conclusive feature of Philippine English but it should be noted that Thai English shares this feature. Three, about the “such +  $\emptyset$  singular noun” construction, further examination is recommended because there seems to be a mixture of other features involved here. The mere counting of frequency is a daunting and tedious task, and the analysis requires more specific methods. But it is interesting to note that this construction is more prevalent in Japanese English, Pakistani English, and Singapore English than in Philippine English. Four, concerning the “assure +  $\emptyset$  indirect object” construction, the tentative conclusion of Bautista remains tentative since ICNALE data showed a frequency that is considerably equal to none. And fifth, among the five grammatical constructions studied here, the word “wherein” can be regarded as an absolute grammatical feature unique to Philippine English since it only validly occurred in the ICNALE-PHL.

#### References

- Bautista, M. L. S. (2008). Investigating the grammatical features of Philippine English. In M. L. Bautista & K. Bolton (Eds.), *International corpus of Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 201-218). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Bautista, M. L. S., Lising, J. L., & Dayag, D. T. (2004). The Philippine corpus (International corpus of English). Manila: Department of English and Applied Linguistics, De La Salle University-Manila.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2001). 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. (2000). Defining standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features.

- Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Biermeier, T. (2011). Lexical trends in Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the international corpus of English* (pp. 223-247). Manila: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- Borlongan, A. M. (2007). Innovations in standard Philippine English. In C. C. Mann (Ed.), *Current Research on English and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1-36). Manila: Department of English and Applied Linguistics, De La Salle University.
- Friginal, E. (2011). The modal verb would in spoken and written Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the international corpus of English* (pp. 51-74). Manila: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- International corpus of English. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://ice-corpora.net/ice/>
- Llamzon, T. (1969). Standard Filipino English. Quezon City: Ateneo University Press.
- Nelson, G. (2005). Expressing future time in Philippine English. In D. T. Dayag & J. S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista* (pp.41-59). Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Nelson, G. & Hongtao, R. (2011). Philippine English, among others: An exploration of grammatical 'keywords' in the ICE-Philippine corpus. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine component of the international corpus of English* (pp. 201-222). Manila: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- The international corpus network of Asian learners of English. (2011). Retrieved from <http://language.sakura.ne.jp/icaale/>