Influence of Filipinism to the Spoken Discourse of Selected Grade 9 Students of Los Banos National High School-Batong Malaki, Laguna, Philippines S.Y. 2020-2021

Caezar D. Pamin, Ph. D., Jencel Laurence V. Abaño, Maria Antonette B. Araña, Nesshir K. Babaan, Romano C. Dorado, Rhona I. Gutierrez, Leira Mae B. Pomintel, Sylah P. Ramos

Graduate School, Laguna State Polytechnic University
Santa Cruz, Laguna, Philippines

Abstract:- This study determines the influence of Filipinism such as the code switching and borrowing and how these influences affect the spoken discourse at home setting and classroom setting.

The researcher sought answers to the following research problems as (1) What is the mean level of influence of Filipinism to the respondents in terms of Code switching and Borrowing (2) What is the mean level of Spoken discourse of the respondents in terms of Home setting and Classroom Setting (3) Is there a significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism to the spoken discourse of the respondents?

The researcher used forty-four (44) selected grade 9 students of Los Banos National High School- Batong Malaki as the respondents of this study. In gathering data the questionnaire was in a google form, answers were collected, tallied and tabulated. Data gathered was statistically treated using mean and standard deviation. To determine the relationship Pearson-r was used.

The influence of Filipinism on code switching is 3.80, while the mean influence of Filipinism on borrowing is 3.74, both of which are interpreted as high. The spoken discourse of the respondents in terms of Home Setting is 3.66 while in the classroom setting is 3.92 which are both High.

The calculated R-value of 0.324 for the home setting and the calculated R-value of 501 for the classroom setting show that there is a significant correlation between the influence of Filipinism on the code switching and the spoken discourse of the respondents.

In addition, the calculated R-value of 0.512 for the classroom shows a significant correlation between the influence of Filipinism on credit and the spoken discourse of the respondents. However, the calculated R value is 0.202 for the home shows that there is no significant connection between the loan and the spoken discourse of the respondents.

The researchers concluded that the respondents use Filipino and English interchangeably in everyday situations to express themselves more clearly and to enable others to understand them better. The R-value for both settings elicits the significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism and the spoken discourse.

As a result, the researchers recommend that the students should get used to reading plenty of books and other reading materials to expand their vocabulary in English or Filipino. Teachers, especially language teachers, may always remind students to use a specific language and avoid switching between languages. to another during his class to have a good command of the language.

Keywords:- Filipinism, Spoken Discourse.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The Philippines are recognized worldwide as one of the largest English-speaking nations and the majority of their population speaks at least one point where they are fluent in the language. English has always been one of the official languages of the Philippines and is spoken by fourteen million Filipinos. It is the language of commerce and law, still because it is the most important means of teaching in education (Cabigon 2015).

The Philippines is extremely rich in indigenous languages, and while these languages are related, the differences between them are also great. Even the relatively nearby lowland languages are very different and show differences in all linguistic aspects: lexicon, phonology and syntax. (McFarland 2008).

This proves that the Philippines are some 85 mutually unintelligible though genetically related languages of the Malayo-Polynesian family, such as Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Waray, and Bicol. These languages of the home serve as substrates whose features have variously influenced the development of Philippine English.

These influences such as the pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and idioms, written models, code switching, social issues and loan words contributed to the development of Philippine English.

It agrees with Bautista (2000) that Filipino English is a nativized variant of English that has the characteristics due to the influence of the first language (particularly in pronunciation, but occasionally also in grammar) due to cultural differences from American Distinguish standard English. in which the language is embedded (expressed in the lexicon and in the conventions of discourse) and due to a restructuring of some grammatical rules (manifested in grammar) Filipino English has an informal variety, particularly spoken mode, which can include many loanwords and mixing of code, and a formal variety which, when used by educated speakers and considered acceptable in educated Filipino circles, is Filipino Standard English can be referred to.

Moreover, a study of Borlongan (2017) mentioned some words of Gonzalez (1991) that Filipinos do not make any distinction among the styles they use across registers, and, put simply, they speak the way they write.

The study by Dimaculangan and Gustilo (2018) shows that the PhilE lexicon is a product of the lexical creativity and innovation of Filipinos, as well as their growth and linguistic preferences as multilingual speakers. of physical and social contexts. They satisfy their self-expression by freely forming new words without paying attention to the limitations of written standards. Their vocabulary motivates them to develop words that enrich the Philippine English lexicon.

This study aims to determine the influence of Filipinism such as the code switching and borrowing and how these influences affect the spoken discourse at home setting and classroom setting.

Objectives
This research aims to determine Influence of Filipinism to the Spoken Discourse of Selected Grade 9 students of Los Banos National High School- Batong Malaki; this research sought answers   the following questions:
1. What is the mean level of influence of Filipinism to the respondents in terms of:
1.1 Code switching
1.2 Borrowing
2. What is the mean level of Spoken discourse of the respondents in terms of:
1.1. Home setting
1.2 Classroom Setting

3. Is there a significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism to the spoken discourse of the respondents?

II.   RELATED LITERATURE

Caturza (2002) mentioned variations of English in the Philippines are termed Filipinism. Philippine English is renowned as the additional and official language of the Filipinos. It has its distinct forms, features, and functions different from other Englishes (Kachru, 1992). Besides, its recognition and authenticity lie in the fact that English has infiltrated the functional, socio-cultural, historical and as well as the creative processes or contexts of the Filipinos (Kachru, 1992).

In this study, Philippine English or Filipinism are colloquial English words and phrases that are unique in the Philippines. With regards to the present study, it is found that Filipinism evolved from Filipino localization or acculturation of the English language which resulted in the creation of words, phrases or terms.

Filipinism evolved from Filipino localization or acculturation of the English language which resulted in the creation of words, phrases or terms (Jessa, 2017).

The above statement is related to the present study in a sense that language changes in time wherein Filipino learners of English form new word usage, phrases structure or even spelling. In this case, English language spoken discourse is affected when Filipino pick up new words and phrases from all the different people they talk with, and these combine to make something new and unlike any other person's particular way of speaking.

The linguistic background and colonial history of the Philippines provide an illuminating example of the development of a new variety of English (Kirkpatrick, 2007).

This study emphasizes the development of English variety that is used in spoken language. Filipinism exerts a great influence on the English language because the grammatical system changes much more rapidly, which in turn affects all other varieties of English.

The phenomenon of borrowing English seems to be inevitable nowadays as people have a greater chance to contact and communicate with people worldwide (Hamid, 2006).

In this study, borrowing and lending of words happens because of cultural contact between two communities that speak different languages. English speakers find a word in another language to describe something and to communicate well. At the same time, Filipino tend to borrow words from English that change the meaning of it.

Linguists such as Fromkin and Rodman (2010) define borrowed words as a process by which one language or dialect takes and incorporates some linguistic elements from

another. Similarly, Gal (2009) identifies loan words or borrowings as consisting of the introduction of single words or short idiomatic phrases from one language into the other.

The above statement accepts that English language changes through the creation of new terms, such that Filipino learners have pick-up the forms of English language into spoken discourse and formed new words for better communication.

Hudson (2007) says that borrowed word is a general and traditional word used to describe the adoption into a language of a linguistic feature previously used in another. Haugen (2008) states that borrowing is the adoption of a linguistic expression from one language into another language when no term exists for the new object and concept. Grosjean (2009) uses the term 'language borrowing' to refer to terms that have passed from one language to another and have come to be used even by monolingual, and he distinguishes them from instances where the bilingual borrows items spontaneously and adapts their morphology, which he calls 'speech borrowing'.

It is obvious from the above statement that loan words or borrowings are not words which formally exist in one language and are not newly created. The loan words are new words which are adopted from another language through various factors. Thus, Filipino tend to borrow words from English wherein doing this can change and influence the language itself.

According to EYD (2011), if appropriate terms are not available in Filipino, foreign languages can be used. The new terms can be formed through translation, absorption and mix of absorption and translation.

The researcher agrees that speakers try to translate or code-switch words as they are used in the original language. However, if code-switching is widely used it definitely influences the language itself.

Code-switching is being defined as "the mixing by bilinguals or multi-linguals of two or more languages in discourse, often with no change of interlocutor or topic" (Poplack, 2001, p. 2062) [2].

This literature is cited from "Code Switching and Students' Performance in English" by Franklin T. Castillejo, et.al (2018). Poplack, 2001 defined code switching which is about mixed languages of bilinguals or multilinguals in different contexts without the change of the speaker and the topic.

Goulet (1971, cited in Bautista, 2004) initially used the concept of intervention as the framework of her article, but in the final major chapter she gave up on that concept and stated: "Among educated Tagalogs, mixing is considered the normal acceptable conversational style of speaking and writing. The bilingual uses borrowings generously, shifts from one language to another easily and does not resist the adoption of loans" (p. 83). Goulet listed reasons, for code

switching-- for precision, for transition, for comic effect, for atmosphere, for bridging or creating social distance, for snob appeal, and for secrecy.

This statement shows that most of the Filipino bilinguals are using mixing and borrowing easily. Bilinguals considered these as a normal conversational style in speaking and writing. It seems unlikely that English language is influenced because of code-switching.

The combination of English and dialect is a common linguistic phenomenon among Filipino learners. Matila (2009) surveyed students' language preference. There are main reasons for code switching: (1) Easier self-expression; (2) loss of words (e.g. translation problems, not knowing the right words; (3) influences of people around; (4) Natural already (habit); (5) Exposure to two languages; (6) Fluency in speaking both languages; and (7) to make the speakers feel more comfortable.

This statement is connected to the latter that there are reasons why learners are using Filipino English language.

"English is now ours. We have colonized it too", declares Abad (as cited in Tupas, 2009, p.77)

This statement cited by Tupas is about a kind of English that is renowned by the Filipino. It is also stated that Filipino take possession of English language wherein they change it into Filipinism, in terms of pragmatic and sociolinguistics structuring. It is believed that there is now a new variety of English that is used by the students in school and at home and that is named as Filipinism.

Kirkpatrick (2010) advances that varieties of English adapt words that suit the culture in which they are used, and those words are enriched by words from local languages.

The above statement is related to the present study in the sense that people tend to borrow words that suit their own culture. They use a variety of languages for the enrichment of the local language, as Filipino use Filipinism for the development of the Philippine language. This adoption of loan-words from English appears likely to continue but an increasing integration of English-derived words into Filipinism.

Bugayong (2011) quoted: "A heightened awareness of Taglish can be helpful in gaining proficiency in English in that more attention will be paid to language interference. Even though the acknowledgement of Taglish might be taboo for teaching Tagalog, it would also seem an invaluable asset for learners in that Taglish, after all, represents authentic Filipino speech.
This statement shows that even though Taglish is forbidden in teaching Tagalog, still, it would help the learners in understanding more of the context and the language. Taglish can also be considered as a genuine Filipino language.

Research Design

This research utilized non-experimental quantitative methodologies. A survey is a non-experimental, descriptive research method and is best suited to collect viewpoints of respondents (Babbie, 1990). The non-experimental design was utilized because the researcher had no intent to manipulate any of the variables or subjects, as that is the objective of experimental quantitative methods (Muijs, 2011). Quantitative methods used to study the relationship between variables express variable relationships through statistical analysis (Grand Canyon University [GCU], n.d.; Patten, 2014).

While the likert scale is used to collect respondents' attitudes and opinions toward the influence of Filipinism to the spoken discourse. Typical Likert scale is a 5- or 7-point ordinal scale used by respondents to rate the degree to which they agree or disagree with a statement

III. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Level of Influence of Filipinism in Terms of Code Switching and Borrowing

In this study, this refers to the level of influence of Filipinism to the respondents in terms of code switching and borrowing.

The Table 1 indicates the weighted mean, standard deviation, and the interpretation for each statement on the survey questionnaire for the Influence of Filipinism to the Spoken Discourse of Selected Grade 9 students in terms of code switching. The first statement of "Speaking in a mixed language (Tagalog and English) makes the communication clearly understood" has a mean of 4.16 and standard deviation (SD) of 0.71 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High"**. The second statement of "Expressing opinion in a tag-lish style makes it more meaningful" has a mean of 3.80 and SD of 0.88 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High"**. The third statement of "I prefer listening to my conversant who uses code-switching" has a mean of 3.43 and SD of 0.73 which can be interpreted as **"High"** using the Likert scale. The fourth statement "Mixing Tagalog and English can be a means of expressing oneself easier and more accurately" has a mean of 4.07 and SD of 0.80 has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The fifth statement "Combining my dialect and English language is natural because it is a linguistic trend and being practiced by everyone" has a mean of 3.70 and an SD of 0.85 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The sixth statement "I speak my own dialect and switch to English from time to time" has a mean of 3.84 and SD of 0.89 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale.

The overall weighted mean is 3.80 which has a **"High"** interpretation using the Likert scale.

Table 1. The Level of Influence of Filipinism to theSelected Grade 9 Students in terms of Code Switching.

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Speaking in a mixed language (Tagalog and English) makes the communication clearly understood.	4.16	0.71	**High**
2. Expressing opinion in a tag-lish style makes it more meaningful.	3.80	0.88	**High**
3. I prefer listening to my conversant who uses code- switching	3.43	0.73	**High**
4. Mixing Tagalog and English can be a means of expressing oneself easier and more accurately.	4.07	0.80	**High**
5. Combining my dialect and English language is natural because it is a linguistic trend and being practiced by everyone.	3.70	0.85	**High**
6. I speak my own dialect and switch to English from time to time.	3.84	0.89	**High**
Weighted Mean ($\bar{x}$)	**3.80**		**High**

Legend:

Rating	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.20- 5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40- 4.19	Usually	High
3	2.60- 3.39	Often	Moderately High
2	1.80- 2.59	Sometimes	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

The Table 2 indicates the weighted mean, standard deviation, and the interpretation for each statement on the questionnaire for the level of influence of Filipinism to the selected Grade 9 students in terms of borrowing.

The first statement of "Using borrowed words from other languages makes the communication effective" has a mean of 3.91 and standard deviation (SD) of 0.68 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High"**. The second statement of "Using borrowed words makes explaining concepts easier and more comprehensible" has a mean of 3.89 and SD of 0.78 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High".** The third statement of "Using borrowed words in speaking makes the communication more specific and understandable" has a mean of 3.68 and SD of 0.77 which can be interpreted as **"High"** using the

Likert scale. The fourth statement "Using borrowed words makes the conversation culture appropriate" has a mean of 3.40 and SD of 0.76 has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The fifth statement "Using borrowed words from other languages such as meokbang, oppa, anime and the like makes the conversation creative" has a mean of 3.68 and an SD of 0.91 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The sixth statement "Borrowing words from other languages cannot be avoided for these words are linguistically accepted" has a mean of 3.86 and SD of 0.67 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale.

The overall weighted mean is 3.74 which has a **"High"** interpretation using the Likert scale.

Table 2 The Level of Influence of Filipinism to the Selected Grade 9 Students in terms of Borrowing

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Using borrowed words from other languages makes the communication effective.	3.91	0.68	**High**
2. Using borrowed words makes explaining concepts easier and more comprehensible.	3.89	0.78	**High**
3. Using borrowed words makes explaining concepts easier and more comprehensible.	3.68	0.77	**High**
4. Using borrowed words makes the conversation culture appropriate.	3.40	0.76	**High**
5. Using borrowed words from other languages such as meokbang,oppa, anime, and the like makes the conversation creative.	3.68	0.91	**High**
6. I speak my own dialect and switch to English from time to time.	3.86	0.67	**High**
Weighted Mean (x̄)	**1**		**High**

Legend:

Rating	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.20- 5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40- 4.19	Usually	High
3	2.60- 3.39	Often	Moderately High
2	1.80- 2.59	Sometimes	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Level of Spoken Discourse in Terms of Home and Classroom Setting

In this study, this refers to the level of spoken discourse of the selected Grade 9 students of Los Banos National High School in terms of home setting and classroom setting.

Table 3 presents the level of spoken discourse of the respondents in terms of home setting.

The first statement of "I often borrow a Filipino word when speaking English (vice-versa) at home" has a mean of 3.80 and standard deviation (SD) of 0.82 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High".** The second statement of "UI use borrowed words in class when having difficulty continuing a conversation in the target language" has a mean of 3.98 and SD of 0.70 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High"**. The third statement of "I often combine words in English and Filipino when I converse with my family" has a mean of 3.72 and SD of 0.79 which can be interpreted as **"High"** using the Likert scale. The fourth statement "I switch codes at home to help my family members understand what I am saying" has a

mean of 3.77 and SD of 0.74 has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The fifth statement " Without intending to, I sometimes produce the English word faster in front of my family" has a mean of 3.66 and an SD of 0.81 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The sixth statement "Code switching helps me

to save time in expressing what I want in front of my family" has a mean of 3.05 and SD of 1.16 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale.

The overall weighted mean is 3.66 which has a **"High"** interpretation using the Likert scale.

Table 3. The Level of Spoken Discourse of Selected Grade 9 Students in terms of Home Setting

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I often borrow a Filipino word when speaking English (vice-versa) at home.	3.80	0.82	**High**
2. I used borrowed words in class when having difficulty continuing a conversation in the target language.	3.98	0.70	**High**
3. I often combine words in English and Filipino when I converse with my family.	3.72	0.79	**High**
4. I switch codes at home to help my family members understand what I am saying.	3.77	0.74	**High**
5. Without intending to, I sometimes produce the English word faster in front of my family.	3.66	0.81	**High**
6. Code switching helps me to save time in expressing what I want in front of my family	3.05	1.16	**Moderately High**
Weighted Mean ($\bar{x}$)	**3.66**		**High**

Legend:

Rating	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.20- 5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40- 4.19	Usually	High
3	2.60- 3.39	Often	Moderately High
2	1.80- 2.59	Sometimes	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

The table 4 indicates the level of spoken discourse of Selected Grade 9 students from Los Banos National High School in terms of classroom setting.

The first statement of "I converse with my classmates using borrowed words and English during our casual conversation" has a mean of 3.93 and standard deviation (SD) of 0.63 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High".** The second statement of "During group activities, I use the combination of Filipino and English because it is allowed by my teacher" has a mean of 3.98 and SD of 0.70 which can be interpreted using the Likert scale as **"High".** The third statement of "I intentionally borrowed words to address a particular audience in my class reports" has a mean of 3.78 and SD of 0.74 which can be interpreted

as **"High"** using the Likert scale. The fourth statement " I usually maintain the English terminology but use Filipino to give further explanation" has a mean of 4.02 and SD of 0.70 has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The fifth statement "In my English subject, I speak in English and switch to my own dialect from time to time" has a mean of 3.71 and an SD of 0.75 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale. The sixth statement " I switch code (from English to Filipino or vice versa) while speaking about a particular topic to explain my point better" has a mean of 4.11 and SD of 0.75 which has an interpretation of **"High"** using the Likert scale.

The overall weighted mean is 3.92 which has a **"High"** interpretation using the Likert scale.

Table 4. The Level of Spoken Discourse of Selected Grade 9 Students in terms of Classroom Setting

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I converse with my classmates using borrowed words and English during our casual conversation.	3.93	0.63	**High**
2. During group activities, I use the combination of Filipino and English because it is allowed by my teacher.	3.98	0.70	**High**
3. I intentionally borrowed words to address a particular audience in my class reports	3.78	0.74	**High**
4. I usually maintain the English terminology but use Filipino to give further explanation.	4.02	0.70	**High**
5. In my English subject, I speak in English and switch to my own dialect from time to time.	3.71	0.75	**High**
6. I switch code (from English to Filipino or vice versa) while speaking about a particular topic to explain my point better.	4.11	0.75	**High**
Weighted Mean (x̄)	**3.92**		**High**

Legend:

Rating	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.20- 5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40- 4.19	Usually	High
3	2.60- 3.39	Often	Moderately High
2	1.80- 2.59	Sometimes	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Significant Relationship Between the Influence of Filipinism to the Spoken Discourse

In this study, this refers to the significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism to the spoken discourse of the selected Grade 9 students of Los Banos National High School.

Table 5 shows the relationship between Influences of Filipinism in terms of code switching and borrowing to the spoken discourse in terms of classroom and home setting.

Code Switching has a significant relationship to the home setting and classroom setting of the respondents. Code switching has a computed r- value of 0.324 for home setting

and a computed r- value of 0.501. Both of the computed r-value are greater than the critical r-value of 0.304, therefore the hypothesis is rejected.

Borrowing has a computed r-value of 0.202 for home setting and computed r-value of 0.512 for classroom setting. Borrowing has no significant relationship to the home setting for its computer r-value is less than the critical r-value of 0.304. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, Borrowing has a significant relationship to the school setting of the respondents for its computed r-value is greater than the critical r- value of 0.304. Therefore the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 5. Relationship between the Influence of Filipinism to the Spoken Discourse of the Respondents

Influence of Filipinisms	Spoken Discourse of Grade 9 Students					
	Home Setting			Classroom Setting		
	Computed r- value	Critical r-value	Interpretation	Computed r- value	Critical r-value	Interpretation
Code Switching	0.324	0.304	**Significant**	0.501	0.304	**Significant**
Borrowing	0.202	0.304	**Not Significant**	0.512	0.304	**Significant**

IV.   SUMMARY

The gathered data were tallied, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted. The analysis of data revealed the following results:

RQ1: What is the mean level of influence of Filipinism to the respondents in terms of:
1.1 Code switching
1.2 Borrowing

The mean level of influence of Filipinism in terms of Code Switching is 3.80 while the mean level of influence of Filipinism in terms of borrowing is 3.74 both interpreted as High.

This indicates that the respondents use both Filipino and English language and mix them together in their daily conversations.

RQ2: What is the mean level of Spoken discourse of the respondents in terms of:
1.1. Home setting
1.2 Classroom Setting

The mean level of Spoken Discourse of Selected Grade 9 Students in terms of Home Setting is 3.66 while in the classroom setting is 3.92 which are both interpreted as "High."

The data reveals that the respondents were influenced by Filipinism in their daily conversations whether they are at home, conversing with their family and friends or when they are at school participating in a class discussion.

RQ3: Is there a significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism to the spoken discourse of the respondents?
The computed R-value 0.324 for the Home Setting and computed R-value 0.501 for the Classroom Setting show

that there is a significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism in terms of code switching and the spoken discourse of the respondents.

Additionally, the computed R-value 0.512 for the classroom setting also shows a significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism in terms of borrowing and the spoken discourse of the respondents.
However, the computed R-value 0.202 for the home setting shows that there is no significant relationship between borrowing and the spoken discourse of the respondents.

V.   CONCLUSION

Based on the data analyzed and findings of the study, it can be deduced that:
1. The respondents use Filipino and English interchangeably in daily situations to express themselves clearer and let others understand them better.
2. The computed R-value for the different settings show the significant relationship between the influence of Filipinism and the spoken discourse of the respondents rejecting the research hypothesis

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusion, the researchers hereby present the following recommendations:
1. Students must make it a habit to read lots of books and other reading materials to widen their vocabulary whether it is English or Filipino.
2. Teachers, especially language teachers, must always remind students that they must use a specific language and avoid switching from one language to another during their class to have a good command of the language.
3. Schools must adopt or develop a program/ action plan that encourages students to use formal English in communication to help avoid or at least minimize the habit of Filipinism.

Proposed Action Plan

Programs/ Projects	Objectives	Strategy/Activity	Person(s) Involved	Source of fund	Time frame	Success Indicators
ORIENTATION ON THE USE OF FORMAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE: A Learning Action Cell (LAC)	Raise awareness about the importance of using formal english	Webinars	Department Head English Teachers Students	Local funds, canteen funds or departmental funds.	Monthly	
	Expose students to the use of formal english language	Watching formal debates, symposium,international conferences	English Teachers Students	Local funds, canteen funds or departmental funds.	Monthly	100 % involvement of students and teachers involved.

REFERENCES

[1]. Ana Huerta Macias, Elizabeth Quintero. (2010). Code-Switching, Bilingualism, and Biliteracy: A Case Study. *Bilingual Research Journal.*

[2]. Bautista, M. L. (2004). Tagalog-English Code Switching as a Mode of Discourse . *Asia Pacific Education Review.*

[3]. Bautista, M. L. S. (1979). Patterns of speaking in Pilipino radio dramas: A sociolinguistic analysis. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University for Foreign Studies.

[4]. Bautista, M. L. S. (1995). Tagalog-English code-switching revisited. Philippine Journal of Linguistics, 21 (2), 15-29.

[5]. Bautista, M.L.S. (2000c). The grammatical features of educated Philippine English. In M.L.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.

[6]. Bautista, M. L. (2004). *Tagalog-English Code Switching as a Mode of Discourse.* Retrieved from Internet Archive: https://archive.org/stream/ERIC_EJ720543/ERIC_EJ720543_djvu.txt

[7]. Benson, E. (2001). The Neglected Early History of Code-switching Research in the United States. Language & Communication, 21, 23-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(00)00012-4

[8]. Borlongan, A. M. (2016). Relocating Philippine English in Schneider's dynamic model. Asian Englishes, 18(3), 1-10. Retrieve from file:///C:/Users/USER/Downloads/35506100.pdf

[9]. Borlongan, A.M. 2017.Contemporary Perspective on Philippine English.Retrived from. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322628546_Contemporary_perspectives_on_Philippine_English

[10]. Cook, Vivian. 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. Canadian Modern Language Review, 57(3): 403-423.

[11]. Dimaculangan N., & M.A. Dimaculangan C. "A Look into EFL Issues in ESL Ecology" Vol 7, Issue 2 pp. 1285-1294, 2018. Infonomics-society.org. DOI: 10.20533/ijtie2047.0533.2018.0156

[12]. Dimaculangan, Nimfa G. (2018). Another Look Into Philippine English: Towards Users" Awareness And Celebration. International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications. Volume 2 Issue 8, August 2018.

[13]. Doms, D. (2003). Roles and impact of English as Global language. Applied Psycholinguistics, 2, 217-239. Retrieved October 10, 2017, from: https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/

[14]. Eslit, E. R. 2019. First Languages and Its´ Impact on the (English) Language Competency of Students. A Statistical Analysis. Retrieve from https://www.grin.com/document/491327

[15]. Esquivel, Orlyn Joyce D. (2019). Exploring the Filipinization of the English Language in a Digital Age: An Identity Apart from Other World Englishes. Central Luzon State University, the Philippines. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1244667.pdf

[16]. Flores, E. (2014). Phonological features of basilectal Philippine English: An explanatory study. International Journal of Language and Literature, 6(5), 128-140. Retrieve

[17]. Grosjean, F. 2009. Life with Two Languages. London and Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.

[18]. Hudson, R. A. 2007, Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[19]. Kachru, B. (1992). Whose English is it? Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

[20]. Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching. English World-Wide, 30(1), 99-102. Retrieved October 10, 2017, from: https://benjamins.com/.

[21]. Kirkpatrick, 2010. English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. Lang. Teach. 1-13 Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/S0261444810000145 available at http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/42297/73943_1.pdf July 14, 2015

[22]. Llamzon, T. A. (2005). Standard Filipino English. Quezon City, Manila: Ateneo University Press.

[23]. Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. M. (2008). World Englishes: The study of new linguistic varieties. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[24]. Malicsi, J. (2007). Philippine English: A case of language drift. Ritsume, 22(1), 29-58. Retrieved November 14, 2017, from: http://www.ritsumei.ac.jp/

[25]. Muysken, P. (2000). Bilingual Speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing. Cambridge: CUP

[26]. Tupas, R. T. F. (2009). Second language teaching. Quezon City, Philippines: UP Open University Press.

[27]. Wardhaugh. (2000). An introduction to sociolinguistics. Beijing: Foreign language teaching and Research Press.