President rodrigo duterte's UN speech: An analysis on L1's phonological influences on L2

Kevin Moniva[1], Angelica Garcia[1], Jennifer Diamante[1], Joemar Minoza[2*], Mayeth Avenido[1]

[1]Cebu Technological University, Tuburan, Cebu, Philippines
[2]University of the Visayas, Cebu, Philippines
[*]Corresponding author: joemarminoza9.14.92@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

DOI:10.46223/HCMCOUJS.soci.en.15.1.3139.2025

Received: December 22nd, 2023

Revised: March 11th, 2024

Accepted: March 19th, 2024

Keywords:

American English; influence; language variation; Philippine English; phonological features

ABSTRACT

This study examined the L1's phonological influences on segmental and suprasegmental traits in the selected speech of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte using a descriptive qualitative research approach, using Bautista and Gonzales's (2006) framework on the phonological features of Philippine English. It was revealed that the speaker rarely used the unaccented schwa; the speaker is devoid of stop aspirations and has realized cluster simplification at the final position and lack of aspiration; the speaker makes a series of replacements where he substitutes "[a] for [æ], [ɔ] for [o], [ɪ] for [i], and [ɛ] for [e]." Moreover, the speaker made a series of substitutions where the speaker realizes "[s] for [z], [ʃ] for [ʒ], [t] for [θ], [d] for [ð], [p] for [f], and [b] for [v]," although "[p] for [f] and [b] for [v]" were rarely committed. Moreover, the speaker follows a syllable-timed rhythm rather than a stress-timed rhythm, which pertains that the speaker's regular American English accent results in fewer erroneous word utterances and adjusts variations in accent location. The mother tongue (L1) influences the second language (L2) in creating speech sounds. The phonologically influenced segmental and suprasegmental features show that the speaker strongly prefers his mother tongue but it is not an indication that the Philippine variation is incorrect but rather a variant of the English language that supports the concept of World Englishes that recognizes the variety of English language which is brought and influenced by the first or native language of the speaker.

1. Introduction

In the Philippines, English is the second language, and it controls the nation's educational, economic, and social advancement (Coleman, 2011). The English language flourished regardless of when the nation was invaded by American colonists because it remained the primary medium of instruction in educational institutions (Tupas & Lorente, 2013). However, English has undergone changes as it spreads and dominates the speaking community of non-native speakers of English. There are two types of this phenomenon, which are referred to as "language transfer" or "cross-language influence," and is crucial to the growth of language learners interlanguage: "positive transfer and negative transfer" (Odlin, 1989, as cited in Zhao, 2019). When the desired language and mother tongue share the same learning task and are

pervasive in all facets of language, positive transfer occurs, and when the mother tongue gets in the way of learning a new language, it's referred to as negative transfer. The learner of a foreign language adopts the expression and comprehension patterns of their mother tongue in place of the foreign language when the two languages have similar but different learning tasks. In the context of language learning, transfer refers to the impact that arises from the parallels and differences between the language being learned and any previous language.

Learners of second languages employ first language structures when attempting to write or converse in the target language. When the structures diverge, a lot of mistakes occur in L1, suggesting that the first language is interfering with the second (Derakshan & Karimi, 2015). The interference of L1 to L2 caused a student to experience challenges in the second language, such as phonology, vocabulary, and grammar. According to TEFL Academy, interference refers to issues that affect learning a new language due to the learner's first language. The reason L1 usage affects L2 production is because early and late bilingual speakers who use L1 more often produce L2 speech with a greater number of L1 accents. Before there is any discernible influence on the L2, the learners need to reach a certain "threshold" of L1 use. The influence on L2 production increases with L1 consumption (Guion et al., 2000).

Karim (2015) attempts to learn more about the speaking difficulties of L2 learners. The findings revealed that some students struggle with the sounds /s/ and /f/, whereas most students struggle with the sounds /z/ and /d3/. Also, many students struggle with fluency due to difficulty recalling relevant words and mental translation. Dewi et al. (2019) revealed that Japanese students frequently misspell English words with non-existent phonemes, replacing them with similar sounds in their L1. Saranza (2019) investigated the contrastive analysis of the sound systems of the Philippine Ethnic Kinamayo and English and discovered that the lack of their native language made it difficult for Kamayo students to produce certain segmental phonemes in English. The consonant phonemes missing from Kinamayo are "/f, v, ð, Θ, s, h, z, ʒ, ʃ, ʤ, ʧ/." Moreover, Kinamayo only has five basic vowels, compared to English's fourteen; the absent vowel phonemes in Kinamayo are / e, æ, ɔ, ʌ, ə, ɝ /. In another study conducted by Arcilla et al. (2017), pronouncing English sounds that weren't included in the Visayan phonology was difficult for the participants. Despite the participants' advantages in learning English, the data acquired by the researchers demonstrated that the participant's second language sound production is by their mother tongue phonology. Two factors could explain the inaccuracies: First of all, some English consonants, like f, v, and th, are not native to the Visayan language; secondly, English phonology may not be taught in English classrooms with adequate emphasis.

In addition, a subject or a speaker is used to aid the study in elucidating the influence of the first language on the second language. The researchers' prominent subject is none other than President Rodrigo Roa Duterte who speaks a Visayan dialect as his first language. He is a former Philippine president, is one of today's generation's most well-known Filipino speakers who speaks English as a second language. He has been subject to numerous studies which investigated his use of language in his controversial discourses. Tamano et al. (2021) used critical discourse analysis on the Covid-19 speeches of Duterte and revealed that Duterte's linguistic choices proved his impartiality and highlighted that politics had no place in the current situation. Medriano and De Vera (2019) anchored on Foucauldian Discourse Analysis to analyze dominant constructions in the political speeches made by Philippine President Rodrigo Roa Duterte, and discovered that the various classes of illocutionary acts have very little to no correlation with PRRD's use of rhetorical strategies. Duran (2023) examined the linguistic

features found in President Duterte's speeches utilizing critical discourse analysis and revealed that Duterte used different linguistic features in his speeches to deliver his messages according to his intentions. Salayo (2020) studied how Philippine President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's first seven speeches on the nation's prevention efforts during the Covid-19 problem developed their ideological frames using transitivity processes and found out that Duterte's speeches are designed and delivered using the transitivity system of Halliday and Matthiessen. Ladia (2022) explained and revealed how Duterte carefully, consciously, and critically selects which social concerns to emphasize in order to influence his audience but was found not persuaded.

As observed, most of the studies concerning President Duterte's speeches focused on rhetorical and linguistic aspects utilizing discourse analysis frameworks, and none of these investigated the phonological aspects of his speeches, which is the main basis of the conduct of this study. Likewise, this study would like to add to the discussion of the phonological features of Philippine English and how L1 influences L2's phonological features. Hence, this study aims to determine and assess how the first language influences the second language in the phonological aspect, utilizing the speech of former president Duterte by identifying and analyzing the phonological influences of his L1 (Cebuano) on his L2 (English) during the 75th UN General Assembly.

This study contributes to the sustainable development of the United Nations in terms of making sure that everyone has access to high-quality, inclusive education and opportunities for continuous education. This study will most benefit students in developing their solid phonological competency, as phonological awareness is essential for understanding and segmenting the words, students desire to spell and mixing the sounds they read.

2. Theoretical basic

Bautista and Gonzales's (2006, p. 131) Phonology of Philippine English is used as one of the study's critical frameworks since it is anchored on the study's primary purpose, which is to explore the phonological influences of the mother tongue on English as a second language. This framework is appropriate for the study since this Phonology of Philippine English discusses the distinctive features of English phonology in the Philippines, such as "the absence of the schwa sound (aˈsɛmblɪ for əˈsɛmbli), the substitution of voiceless fricatives for voiced fricatives (ob for əv), the absence of aspiration of initial voiceless stops (ˈtʰɛnʧənz for tɛnʧʊnz), consonant cluster simplification in the final position (las for læst), and the syllable-timed, rather than stress-timed (all syllables are emphasized)" (Bautista & Gonzales, 2006, p. 131).

In addition, Philippine English has a vowel system with five vowels: /a/, /ɛ/, /ɪ/, /ɔ/, and /u/ (Dayag, 2007). In Philippine English, the distinction between tense and lax vowels is not maintained, and the vowels "/a/, /e/, /i/, /o/, and /u/" are instead pronounced as "[a], [ɛ], [ɪ], [ɔ], and [u]" respectively. In Philippine English, there is no vowel reduction in unstressed syllables; for example, the word-initial/ə/ in "above," "alone," and "around" is pronounced as [a] (Kachru et al., 2006). Philippine English consonant system has 18 consonants: "[p], [t], [k], [b], [p], [t], [ʧ], [k], [b], [d], [dʒ], [g], [s], [ʃ], [h], [l], [m], [n], [ŋ], [r], [w], [j]" (Dayag, 2007). The voiceless stops "/p/, /t/, and /k/" in Philippine English are unaspirated in word-initial positions and unreleased in word-final places. Furthermore, /s/ and /z/ are frequently confused, resulting in both being pronounced as [s]. The voiceless /θ/is pronounced by the speaker as the voiceless stop [t], whereas the voiced /ð/ is pronounced by the speaker as well as by the voiced stop [d] (Kachru et al., 2006). Consonant cluster reduction is also present in investigations by Gonzalez et al. (2003).

Moreover, linguistic features such as phonological, grammatical, lexical, and discourse features are at hand to define the peculiarities of Philippine English today. Teodozo Llamzon's (1997) "monograph Standard Filipino English" is the first official definition of phonetic elements of Philippine English, as well as numerous terms in its grammar and lexicon that he coined the term "Filipinism" (e.g., Close the light). The generation of vowel sounds, stress, and syllables differs between Filipino and American varieties. They list the distinctive phonological characteristics of Philippine English, including the absence of the schwa sound (e.g., balloon /balun/ for balloon /balun/), the substitution of voiceless fricatives for voiced fricatives (e.g., casual /kaeʒəwəl/ for casual /kaʃuwal/), the lack of aspiration of initial voiceless stops (e.g., appear /əphir/ for appear /apir/) (Llamzon, 1997, as cited in Regala-Flores, 2014).

3. Methodology

This study employs a descriptive-qualitative research method since the researchers focus on collecting and analyzing non-numerical data. It is used to describe the phonological influence of President Rodrigo Duterte's L1 on his English language skills during the 75th UN General Assembly.

The primary data source in this study is "75th UN General Assembly Speech on September 22, 2020," which centers on the Covid-19 pandemic, which has a duration of 22 minutes and 19 seconds, with 118 lines/sentences and 2077 words (RTVM, 2020). Since the video is on various YouTube channels such as Rappler, GMA News, RTV Malacañang, United Nations, and others, the video uploaded on "YouTube" was used by the researchers as it was complete and the exact copy of the speech.

The analytical data of the phonological influence of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's L1 on his L2 during the 75th UN General Assembly were analyzed using Bautista and Gonzales's (2006, p. 131) framework on the phonological features of Philippine English. These are: "(absence of schwa, absence of aspiration of stops in all positions, the substitution of [a] for [æ], [ɔ [for [o], [I] for [i], [ɛ] for [e]- substitution of [s] for [z], [ʃ] for [ʒ], [t] for [θ], [d] for [ð], [p] for [f], [b] for [v], and simplification of consonant clusters in final position); and (syllable-timed, rather than stress-timed, rhythm)" (Bautista & Gonzales, 2006, p. 131).

4. Result and discussion

Table 1

Segmental Features

Segmental features	Frequency	Percentage
Absence of Schwa	363	48%
"Substitution of; [s] for [z], [ʃ] for [ʒ], [t] for [θ], [d] for [ð], [p] for [f], [b] for [v]"	158	21%
"Substitution of; [a] for [æ], [ɔ [for [o], [I] for [i], [ɛ] for [e]"	105	14%
"Absence of aspiration of stops in all position"	92	12.2%
"Simplification of consonant clusters in the final position"	36	4.8%
Total	754	100%

Source. Data analysis result of the research

4.1. Absence of Schwa

The speaker infrequently used the unstressed/unaccented schwa */ə/* from his speech and pronounced the words interchangeably with other full vowel sounds, as illustrated by the data collected and the results presented above.

Extract 1:

L113 We need to act on long-standing recommendations to improve the Security Council's composition and working methods; to strengthen the role of the General ***Assembly*** *[asɛmbli]* , etc.

L114. Indeed, to be ready for the new global ***normal*** *[nɔrmal]*, it cannot be business as usual for the UN.

L116. Let us strengthen it so it can fully ***deliver****[dılıvɛr]* its mandate to maintain peace and security, uphold justice and human rights, and promote freedom and social progress for all.

Sound change, according to Smith, occurs when there is a change in the system in which the sound resides. It may happen with other languages as well. A Filipino speaker, for example, speaks English but makes different sounds when pronouncing it. In specific phonetic contexts, it alters the sound pattern of language. According to Campbell (2018), sound change occurs whenever the sound/s that changes are encountered in circumstances or contexts that condition the change. Furthermore, according to Campbell's (2018) theory, the intended sound is shifted into another Filipino sound, which Filipino speakers create. As previously stated, weakening, or vowel reduction, is a prominent element of the standard English variety (Regala-Flores, 2014) that Llamzon (1997) characterized as a hallmark of SFE. However, most research since Llamzon's (1997) seminal work noticed the absence of unstressed schwa *[ə]* in Philippine English phonology, particularly in the various lectal variations (Jubilado, 2016), except for acrolect speakers (Tayao, 2004, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020). The speaker's interchangeably pronouncing the schwa */ə/* as a full vowel sound suggests that the speaker is influenced by his mother tongue (L1).

4.2. Absence of Aspiration

The result revealed that the speaker's speech lacked the aspirations of the stops, particularly the voiceless stops in Philippine English, which is focused on all positions.

Extract 2: *[*kɔr*] (L11); [tɛnd] (L39); [pærıs] (L64)*

L11. For the Philippines, this means putting all of the peoples of our United Nations at the ***core*** *[kɔr]* of this response.

L39. New flashpoints heighten fears and ***tend*** *[tɛnd]*to tear people apart.

L64. The Philippines joined the ***Paris****[pærıs]* Agreement to fight climate change.

Consonant sounds such as the English voiceless stops *p, t,* and *k* at the opening of words *(e.g., "pat," "top," "keel")* are considered aspirated in phonetics due to the fact that they are articulated with a strong breathing out. In Philippine English phonology, it was discovered that six of the consonant stops */p/*, */b/*, */d/*, */t/*, */k/*, and */g/*, if transcribed closely, revealed that the voiced stops */b/*, */d/*, and */g/* were not accurately voiced and thus are voiceless. Although the "initial voiceless plosives are normally aspirated" (Gussman et al., 2006, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020), the "/p/, /t/, and /k/" sounds at their initial position were not, according to the speech samples.

It is vital to consider that in standard American English, native speakers routinely produce aspiration on voiceless stops but not on voiced stops. In the same manner, Regala-Flores (2014) asserts that Filipino speakers eventually choose to interpret or communicate as their ideas, feelings, or desires rather than speaking or acting like a "native" American, which also applies to other Asian English speakers. Moreover, for this reason, general American English's and even British English's phonological system is meant to be a guide, not to be rigorously replicated or beleaguered at. Such findings support the claims of "Conversational Speech Style of Filipino Speakers in English" (Llamzon, 1969), "Speech of Media Personnel" (Gonzalez & Alberca, 1978), and "Features of Lectal Groups" (Llamzon, 1997; Tayao, 2004, as cited in Regala-Flores, 2014). Jenkins (2009) also claims that "the unaspiration of initial voiceless plosives is a feature of outer circle English varieties" such as Malaysian, Indian, Philippine, and Singaporean English (as cited in Regala-Flores, 2024, p. 129). The impact of the speakers native tongues is connected to this linguistic phenomenon, in which plosives did not aspirate in any position (Deterding, 2003, as cited in Regala-Flores, 2014). As a result, the non-aspiration characteristics of the speaker in this study may be significantly comparable to, and appear to be influenced by, the voiceless unaspirated stops in Philippine languages.

"Substitution of [a] for [æ], [ɔ [for [o], [I] for [i], [ɛ] for [e]"

During the production of vowel sounds, the speaker makes a series of replacements. The low front unrounded vowel *[æ]* was substituted by the low central unrounded vowel *[a]*, while the low back round vowel *[ɔ]* was replaced by the "mid-back round vowel" *[o]*. It is also used to replace the "high front unrounded vowel" *[i]* with the "high front lax unround vowel" *[I]* and the "mid-front unround vowel" *[e]* with the "mid-front lax unround vowel" *[ɛ]*.

[a] for [æ]

"The low-front unrounded" */æ/,* commonly realized as "low-central unrounded" */a/*, is one of this study's most inconsistently distributed vowels.

Extract 3:

L5. I am honored to address you today on ***behalf*** *[bɪˈhap]*of the Filipino people on the 75th anniversary of the United Nations.

L6. The invisible enemy that is Covid-19 has brought about an unfamiliar global ***landscape*** [*ˈlanskeɪp]*and unleashed a crisis without precedent.

Except for Llamzon's (1997) (10) SFE traits, this usage of */a/* for */æ/* has been considered a PE phonological phenomenon that is typical of the majority of new variations of English. The */æ/* is not present in the acrolectal variety's vowel inventory, which is recognized to resemble the tonality of inner circle English variants. Tayao (2008) believes that the */æ/* in PE is in unrestricted variation with */a/* since local vernaculars do not have this sound. As a result, the lack of the vowel */æ/* in Philippine languages could be an aspect in realizing it as a more central-low vowel */a/*. Additionally, the primary reason /a/ is used for /æ/ is alleged because the spelling pronunciation of /æ/ in the Philippines is graphically represented as /*a*/. Considering the way participants produce the low-front vowel /æ/, it is not surprising that speakers of the major Philippine languages share the central-unrounded / *a*/ / sound. Consequently, the result revealed that the vowel */a/* substitutes with the vowel */æ/,* implying that the speaker is bound to his mother tongue.

[ɔ] for [o]

The mid-back round vowel */o/* is substituted by the low back round vowel */ɔ/,* which became a distinguishing trait of the speaker.

Extract 4:

L5. I am honored to address you today on behalf of the ***Filipino*** *[fɪlɪpinɔ]*people on the 75th anniversary of the United Nations.

L106. Again, Mr. President: To defeat the ***Covid****[kɔvɪd]*-19 pandemic and other challenges, etc.

L116. Let us strengthen it ***so****[sɔ]* it can fully deliver its mandate, etc.

This conclusion is in line with Llamzon's (1997) findings on SFE features and Tayao's (2008) acrolectal findings. This vowel is present in SgE and HKE varieties in the ASEAN region, according to (Deterding, 2003; Regala-Flores, 2014). Despite Tayao's (2004) claim that the low back round vowel */ɔ/* is one of the vowels that Filipinos frequently swap with other sounds in their native language, the current study's findings support its inclusion in the PE sound inventory. It may have developed as a feature due to the speakers' strong ties to their native tongue. A similar argument might be to the development of the mid-back round vowel */o/* in the mid-back region, which the speaker usually maintains. Except for the acrolect group, the PE vowel inventory is neither present (Gonzalez & Alberca, 1978) nor the lectal variations (Llamzon, 1997, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020).

/ɪ/ for [i]

According to the data, the speakers inconsistently realized the high front unrounded vowel */i/* as they swapped it for the high front lax unround */ɪ/.*

Extract 5:

L6. The invisible enemy that is Covid-***19****[naɪntɪn]* has brought about an unfamiliar global landscape and unleashed a crisis without precedent.

L8. While the United Nations has brought relief and hope to so many countries and ***peoples****[ˈpɪpols]* around the world, …

L96. Mr. President: The Philippines has a long history of opening its doors to the refugees - from the White Russians following the 19***17****[sɛvɛntɪn]* Revolution, etc.

The high front unrounded vowel */i/* is not a feature of PE in this study because the speaker exhibits such speech patterns inconsistently. This conclusion contradicts assertions by Llamzon (1969); Gonzalez and Alberca (1978); Jubilado (2016), all of whom claim the presence of a long, tense */i/* in the PE phonological vowel system. This finding contradicts claims by Llamzon(1997); Tayao (2004); Regala-Flores (2014) that */i/* is a characteristic of "acrolectal, mesolectal, and basilectal" PE variants. However, due to the speakers'native tongue, this inconsistency in the recognition of long, tense vowels */i/* is a trend in ASEAN versions of English (Kirkpatrick, 2010, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020). The participants'native tongue may be influenced by the uneven realization of the long vowel /i/ and the frequent shift toward /ɪ/ because Philippine languages deficiency in terms of differences between long/short and tense/lax vowels (Jubilado, 2016).

Similar findings were found in Llamzon's work and among acrolect (Llamzon, 1997; Tayao, 2004) and basilect speakers (Regala-Flores, 2014). This inclusion of a high front lax unround */ɪ/* in the PE vowel system differs from Gonzalez and Alberca (1978) conclusion of uneven realization of a high-front short vowel */ɪ/*. Llamzon and Tayao both documented their absence in the mesolectal and basilectal types of PE (as cited in Regala-Flores, 2014). It is regularly experienced by speakers of MaIE in other varieties of English, although it is not in the inventory of SgE. (Hung as cited in Regala-Flores, 2014).

[ɛ] for [e]

The substitution of the mid-front lax unround vowel */ɛ/* to the mid-front unround vowel *[e]* is one of the vowels in this study that is unevenly distributed, as seen in Table 1.

Extract 6:

L82. Most importantly, we ***remain****[rɪmɛn]* committed to rebuilding stricken communities and addressing the root causes of terrorism and violent extremism in my country.

The analysis confirms the presence of the vowel /e/ in PE's vowel inventory, which is also in other Philippine languages due to American and Spanish influences (McFarland, 2009). In *HKE* (Hung, 2000) and *SgE*, the vowel */e/* does not appear in ASEAN English variations (Deterding, 2003). It serves as a vowel */ɛ/* as a tense vowel (Hung, 2000, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020). Also, British English speakers commonly overlap the vowels */ɛ/* and /e/production, which might have had an impact on English speakers' uneven */e/* production in former British colonies such as Hong Kong and Singapore. In the context of this study, it appears that the mid-front lax unround vowel */ɛ/* exhibits, just as the vowel */e/*. Its widespread use is unsurprising, given that /ɛ/ is the most common version of itself (Mesthrie et al., 1995, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020).

"Substitution of; [s] for [z], [ʃ] for [ʒ], [t] for [θ], [d] for [ð], [p] for [f], [b] for [v]"

The speaker makes a series of consonant sound substitutions. The consonant *[z]* is pronounced by the speaker as *[s]*, and the speaker uses the consonant *[ʒ]* in place of the *[ʃ]*. Furthermore, the speaker pronounces the voiceless consonant [θ] as [t], and the voiced [ð] as *[d]*. In addition, based on the facts presented above, the consonant *[f]* is substituted for *[p]*, and *[v]* is replaced by *[b]*, respectively.

[s] for [z] and [ʃ] for [ʒ]

The alveolar fricative *[z]* is realized as *[s]* in all instances of the speaker's speech, while the consonant *[ʒ]* is realized as *[ʃ]*, although it is only used rarely in speech. The word is reflected in the case of *[ʃ]* for the *[ʒ]* sound, and the consonant *[ʒ]* becomes *[ʃ]* in the word-medial position since *[ʒ]* does not appear to be distinguished from *[ʃ]*. The fact that *[ʒ]* is commonly substituted by voiceless *[ʃ]* consonant sounds emphasizes the assumption that *[ʒ]* is not a component of Philippine English phonology. According to Lewis and Deterding (2009), this is not a problem because the distinction between *[ʒ]* and *[ʃ]* is unnecessary because they have little functional load and are still understood (16).

Extract 7:

L11. For the Philippines, this ***means****[mɪns]* putting up all of the peoples of our united nations at the core of this response.

L14. Mr. President, in light of the realities of the present, the ***Philippines****[ˈfɪlɪˌpɪns]* grieves with all of the families all over the world who lost their loved ones to this horrible virus.

L80. Our 2020 Anti-Terrorism Act shores up the legal framework by focusing on both terrorism and the ***usual****[juʃəwal]* reckless response to it.

In the instance of *[s]* for *[z]*, however, the speaker's original language was not used to pronounce two consonants together quickly or the specific types of consonants needed, so the speaker frequently commits substitution. Furthermore, the speaker was unsure whether to produce the plural sound with *[s]* or *[z]* at the end of words. In the speech of the mesolectal group, GAE consonants *[s]* and *[*z] are coalesced as *[s]* when GAE *[z]* occurs in word-final or word medial position, which supports Tayao's (2008) results that GAE consonants *[s]*and *[z]* have coalesced as *[s]*.

"[t] for [θ] and [d] for [ð]"

The speaker substitutes the consonant *[t]* for the voiceless *[θ],* as seen in the table. Because the speaker connects to the sound system of his mother tongue, he prefers to pronounce the voiceless *[θ]* as consonant *[t]* and the consonant *[d]* over voiced *[ð]*. Furthermore, because the voiceless *[θ]* and voiced *[ð]* sounds does not exist in Philippine languages, the speaker used them interchangeably. The use of */t/* for *[θ]* and *[d]* for *[ð]* are not features of Philippine English speakers, which is different from what previous researchers determined. According to another study, the *[θ]* is the interdental fricative substituted by basilect and mesolect speakers. Additionally, the higher frequency of replacing *[ð]* with *[d]* lends support to Tayao's (2004) argument that interdental fricatives are likewise lacking in Filipino speakers.

Extract 8:

L6. **The** [da] invisible enemy that is Covid-19 has brought about an unfamiliar global landscape and unleashed a crisis ***without****[wɪˈdaʊt]* precedent.

L13. We need to ask ourselves whether or not we have remained true and ***faithful****[ˈfeɪtfʊl]* to the United Nations principles and ideals.

[p] for [f] and [b] for [v]

The speaker used the *[p]* for *[f]* interchangeably; however, it was only used rarely in the speech.

Extract 9:

L55. Unless states include all migrants in their response to this pandemic, "no one among us is ***safe****[sep]*, until everyone is ***safe****[sep]*," as the Secretary-General has said.

L56. With the poverty rate reduced at 16.6 percent; and a sustained economic growth rate ***of****[ob]* 6.4 percent between 2010 and 2019, etc.

Although it was only a minor occurrence in which the speaker substituted *[p]* for *[f]* and *[b]* for *[v]*, it still indicates that the speaker was again bound to his mother tongue and that the speaker occasionally prefers the Philippine English sound system to the standard English sound system. When pronouncing English words with the letter *[f]*, some Filipinos tend to replace *[p]* with *[f]*. Furthermore, the *[v]* sound is absent from most of the Philippines' major native languages. Some earlier Filipino generations would pronounce the letter *[v]* in all English words as *[b]*. It can adhere back to the impact of the Spanish (Philippine English - English in the Philippines, n.d.).

4.3. Simplification of consonant clusters in the final position

This study discovered instances of consonant cluster simplification caused by the speaker.

Extract 10:

L8, ... it now finds itself saddled by a virus that has taken many lives and ***wrecked****[rɛk]* economies and social order.

L70. They ***attempt****[atɛmp]* to discredit the functioning institutions, etc.

Consonant clusters in the final position are either simplified by retaining only the first in the cluster, dropping the remaining consonants, in */las/* instead of */læst/*, or structurally altered by adding a vowel in between the cluster's consonants, as in */kulaster/* instead of */kluster/* (Tayao, 2004, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020). It appears that numerous speakers of modern English varieties, such as the BrE and AmE, fail to produce word-final consonant clusters (Kirkpatrick, 2010).

Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008) report that there are three strategies used by speakers to shorten word-final consonant clusters: a. dropping a consonant; b. inserting an epenthetic vowel; and c. adding a vowel in the initial position when the initial consonant is a [s] sound, turning the word start into [istart]. It does point out that some speakers do produce clusters of consonants.

These frequent deletions in final consonant clusters are also present in existing research in the Philippines (Tayao, 2004), Singapore (Hung, 2002), Malaysia (San & MacLagan, 2009), Hong Kong (Deterding et al., 2008), and Brunei (Sharbawi & Deterding, 2013). Notably, the deletion of */t/* and */d/* is common in Inner Circle English dialects under specific circumstances. However, many people think that it should not be promoted in newly emerging English varieties because it can exacerbate spelling issues and occasionally lead to the loss of important word distinctions (Deterding, 2010).

According to Kirkpatrick (2010), Word-final consonant clusters are uncommon among ASEAN ELF speakers. Given how difficult it can be to pronounce consonant clusters, particularly in languages that are not the speaker's first language (such as the Filipino language), this is not surprising. Therefore, based on the presented features, it can be perceived that the speaker significantly relies on his first language since the speaker was influenced by his Philippine English variety rather than the American English standard.

4.4. Suprasegmental features

In general, this study's Philippine English stress pattern differs significantly from its standard American English counterpart, as evidenced by the use of three-, four-, and five-syllable words. Most of the nine four-syllabled words where the first syllable receives primary stress in the SAE pattern have primary stress on the third syllable.

Table 2

Supra-segmental Features

"SYLLABLE-TIMED RATHER THAN STRESS-TIMED RHYTHM"	
American English	**Philippine English Variety**
ˈmɪstər	mɪs-'tɛr
ˈpipəl	pi-'pɔl
'sɛvənti-fɪfθ	sɛ-'vɛn-ti-fɪfθ
ˈsɛvənti-faɪv	sɛ-'vɛn-ti-faɪv
kənˈdəʊlənsɪz	'kon-dəʊ-lɛn-sɪs
ˌkærɪktəˈrɪstɪks	ˌka-'rak-tɛ-rɪs-tɪks
ˈɛskəˌleɪtɪŋ	ɛs-ka-'leɪ-tɪŋ
ˈmɪləˌtɛri	mɪ-li-'tɛ-ri
ˈdɛvəˌsteɪtəd	dɛ-vas-'teɪ-tɛd
ənˈprɛsɪˌdɛntɪd	an-prɛ-sɪ-'dɛn-tɪd
ˌpaɪəˈnɪrd	'pa-ɪo-nɪrd
ˈsɛkrəˌtɛri	sɛ-kre-'tɛ-rɪ
ˈtɛrəˌrɪzəm	tɛ-ro-'rɪ-sɛm
ˈkɑmpləˌkeɪtəd	kɔm-plə-'keɪ-tɛd
ˈvʌlnərəbəl	vʊl-nɛ-'rɑ-bɔl
ˈpiˌskipɪŋ	pis-'ki-pɪŋ

Source. Data analysis result of the research

In addition, the two-syllabic words with *SAE* stress on the first syllable greatly differ where the speaker placed the primary stress on the second syllable rather than the first when uttering the word/s. In the case of the word *[ˌkærɪktəˈrɪstɪks] [ənˈprɛsɪˌdɛntɪd],* the primary stress was placed differently on the second syllable for the former and the fourth syllable for the latter. The same is true for the three-syllable words *[ˌpaɪəˈnɪrd]* and *[ˈpiˌskipɪŋ],* where the speaker alternately places the primary stress on the first and second syllables, respectively.

Extract 11:

L41. Given the size and ***military****[mɪ-li-'tɛ-ri]* might of the contenders, etc.

L44. Mr. President: Filipino migrant workers have been ***devastated****[dɛ-vas-'teɪ-tɛd]* by the pandemic.

Extract 12:

L17. So also do we honor and recognize the healthcare professionals who selflessly answered the call to combat the Covid-19 pandemic despite its virulence and unknown ***characteristics****[ˌka-'rak-tɛ-rɪs-tɪks]*.

L47. The Philippine Government has embarked on an ***unprecedented****[an-prɛ-sɪ-'dɛn-tɪd]* repatriation program.

It notes that the *PE* stress pattern follows a syllable-timed rhythm rather than a stress-timed rhythm since Philippine English is one of the many varieties of English (Regala-Flores, 2014). In a syllable-timed language, the duration of each syllable is approximately equal,

although the prosody affects this exact duration. Unlike *SAE*, which gives a more extended duration around vowel stress or stressed syllables, while languages that use syllable timing typically have reduced vowels and assign syllables roughly equal prominence (Conlen, 2016). Languages that use syllable-timed rhythm include French, Italian, Spanish, Icelandic, Cantonese, Mandarin Chinese, Georgian, Romanian, Armenian, Turkish, and Korean.

According to Dita (2014) on her research on the "intelligibility and comprehensibility of Philippine English to international students", the less proficient speaker used syllable-timed rhythm, whereas the more proficient speaker used stress-timed rhythm. Though it was emphasized, Dita and De Leon (2017) contend that pronunciation has little bearing on understanding a speaker's utterances because other factors can significantly contribute to intelligibility, such as familiarity with the variety and linguistic environment. In light of this, Bautista (2008) defines *PE* as a nativized variety of English because it differs from *SAE* regarding the impact of its first language (particularly on pronunciation), the cultural differences (reflected in vocabulary and discourse customs), and the reorganization of certain grammatical rules (found in the grammar).

It is worth noting that the rhythm in *PE* is frequently more monotonous because, regardless of placement or stress, syllables are always given the same length. regardless of whether stressed or unstressed, each syllable in every word is pronounced for the same length of time. The word 'military,' for example, has the phonetic transcription *[mɪ-li-'tɛ-ri]* in *PE*. In this example, each of the four syllables has the same vowel quality and length. In PE, there are only five vowel sounds that vary in quality and duration, as opposed to twenty-one in SAE. This means that even though there is only one stressed syllable, all four vowels are pronounced for the same lengths (Koyfman, 2019). Thus, it can be concluded that the speaker is significantly influenced by his mother tongue as the speaker pronounces words syllable-timed rather than stress-timed accordingly.

It is believed that speakers of different L1s in the same environment develop a shared language that simultaneously functions as a collective linguistic resource, giving rise to the PE variety (Tayao, 2004, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020). In the circles of educated Filipinos, this is the kind of English that they speak and find appropriate (Llamzon, 1997, as cited in Berowa & Regala-Flores, 2020). Since many Filipinos are multilingual, over 90% of them can understand and speak English in the Philippines (Saranza, 2019). However, the majority of speakers, especially those from ethnic groups, exhibit mother tongue interference in the sounds they produce or mispronounce, which frequently results in misunderstandings and hinders international intelligibility. In that sense, Graddol (1999), as cited in Al-Mutairi (2020), even believes that people in the Outer Circle will become more aware that they do not have to use English in the same way that people in the Inner Circle do (67). In other words, rather than being mastered by the language, people have a choice in how they use English. They may have the freedom to speak English with their local accent, style, and meaning, expressing their local identities.

Although the speaker has a strong preference for his mother tongue, as seen by the phonological-influenced segmental and suprasegmental traits, this is not a strong signal that the Philippine variety is erroneous. Furthermore, the pronunciation of the Philippines is influenced by the Spanish, who colonized the country for over three centuries Filipino, a standardized register derived from Tagalog, and English are both recognized as official languages in the Philippines (Gonzalez, 1997). It is extensively spoken as a second language throughout the country, alongside Filipino and roughly 180 other languages (Lewis et al., 2016, as cited in

Lesho, 2018). A tiny minority of Filipinos speak it at home, particularly among the upper class in Metro Manila (Gonzalez, 1997) and other urban regions. In Philippine English, there is a huge amount of literature.

5. Conclusion

The fact that Philippine English has a unique variant of the English language is a strong indicator that the Philippines has its own approach to the language. According to Dr. Danica Salazar, the major historical dictionary of the English language, the Philippine English accent is a legitimate variety of the language. The English spoken in the Philippines is not slang. It is not incorrect. It is not carabao English or any other pejorative term that has been used throughout the years. Philippine English, like British, American, Australian, and Singaporean variations, plays an important role in the language's historical development, which the Oxford English Dictionary aims to describe. Philippine English, like American or British English, Indian or Singapore English, is all part of the same tale.

Based on the findings, the mother tongue (L1) influences the second language (L2) in the production of speech sounds, and the speaker has a strong preference for his mother tongue, as seen by the phonological influenced segmental and suprasegmental traits. However, this is not a strong signal that the Philippine variety is erroneous but a unique variant in the English language. It is a strong indicator that the Philippines has its approach to the English language which supports the concept of World Englishes that recognizes the variety of English language, which is brought and influenced by the first or native language of the speaker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to extend their gratitude to the Languages, Literature and Communication Department faculty of CTU-Tuburan for their genuine support of the study. Furthermore, the researchers declare no conflict of interest.

References

Alberca, W. L. (1978). *The distinctive features of Philippine English in the mass media* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Santo Tomas.

Al-Mutairi, M. (2020). Kachru's three concentric circles model of English language: An overview of criticism & the place of Kuwait in it. *English Language Teaching, 13*(1), 85-88. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n1p85

Anwar, Z. (2020). *Prosodic phonology*. Linguistics Geeks. https://linguisticsgeeks.com/2020/11/prosodic-phonology.html?m=1

Arcilla, F., Soriano, E. J., & Bayeta P. (2017). First language influence on second language phonology among Visayan speakers. *International Peer Reviewed Journal, 16*(1), 18-34.

Atar, C. (2019). *Factors affecting the L2 effect on the L1*. Pesa Publications. https://researchgate.net/publication/3315905448.

Babbel Magazine. (2019). *How many vowel sounds does english have?* https://babbel.com/en/magazine/english-vowel-sounds

Bautista, M. L. S. (2000). Studies of Philippine English in the Philippines. *Journal of Linguistics, 31*(1), 39-65.

Bautista, M. L. S. (2008). Investigating the grammatical features of Philippine English. In K. Bolton & M. L. S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 201-218). Hong Kong University Press.

Bautista, M. L. S., & Gonzalez, A. B. (2006). Southeast Asian English. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. L. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world englishes* (pp. 130-144). Malden.

Berowa, A. M. C., & Regala-Flores, E. (2020). Toward an inclusive description of the segmental phonology of Philippine English. *The Asian ESP Journal*, *16*(4), 211-232.

Campbell, L. (2018). *On sound change and challenges to regularity*. Researchgate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325273474_On_Sound_Change_and_Challenges_to_Regularity

Cho, M., & Shinsook, L. (2016) The impact of different L1 and L2 learning experience in the acquisition of L1 phonological processes. *Language Sciences, 56*, 30-44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2016.02.006

Coleman, H. (2011). *Developing countries and the English language: Rhetoric, risks, roles and recommendations*. British Council.

Conlen, M. (2016). *A linguistic comparison: Stress-timed and syllable-timed languages and their impact on second language acquisition*. Digitalcommons. https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/honorstheses/30/

Daleasis. (2020). *Philippine English is legit. Oxford English dictionary says so.* https://fdnbayanihan.org/2020/08/28/philippine-english-is-legit-oxford-english-dictionary-says-so/

David, R. (2020). *President duterte's style of speaking*. Inquirer.Net. https://google.com/amp/s/opinion.inquirer.net/127722/president-dutertes-style-of-speaking/amp

Dayag, D. T. (2007). Exploring the intelligibility of Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, *10*(1), 4-23. https:/doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2007.10801197

Derakshan, A., & Karimi, E. (2015). The interference of first language and second language acquisition. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(10), 2112-2117. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0510.19

Deterding, D. (2003). An instrumental study of the monophthong vowels of Singapore English. *English World Wide*, *24*(1), 1-16.

Deterding, D. (2010). ELF-based pronunciation teaching in China. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *33*(6), 3-15.

Deterding, D., Wong, J., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). The pronunciation of Hong Kong English. *English World-wide, 29*(2), 1-59.

Dewi, R., Utami, P.T., & Hasanah, N. (2019). The influence of L1 phonological and orthographic system in L2 pronunciation: A study of brebes Javanese learners of English. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *338*(1), 21-228. https://doi.org/10.2991/prasasti-19.2019.39

Dita, S., & De Leon, K. (2017). The intelligibility and comprehensibility of Philippine English to EFL speakers. *Philippine ESL Journal*, *19*, 100-116.

Dita, S. (2014). *Intelligibility and comprehensibility of Philippine English to international students*. News Umac. http://news.umac.mo/nrs/binary?id=HvsCcPGqyuPzrQ_2F3QDIC5hEgt1dpz22xTrGtE8sfJG8JZGjdzZLN3atS_2BcDTFYOfbLug3CUlGalY_0ABSGv_2BAHTkqv_2BoX4zJaYH

Duran, E. L. L. (2023). An analysis of linguistic features in the speeches of president duterte on controversial issues. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science, 28*(3), 39-47. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2803046947

Eslit, E. (2019). *GRIN - first languages and its'impact on the (English) language competency of students. A statistical analysis*. Grin. https://grin.com/document/491327

Flores, R. (2020). *Toward an inclusive description of the segmental phonology of Philippine English*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343757030_Toward_an_Inclusive_Description_of_the_Segmental_Phonology_of_Philippine_English

Gonzalez A., & Alberca, W. (1978). *Philippine English of the mass media*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Gonzalez, A. B. (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). The Macquarie Library Pty.

Gonzalez, A. B., Jambalos, T. V., & Romero, M. C. S. (2003). *Three studies on Philippine English across generations: Towards an integration and some implications*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines (LSP).

Guion, S. G., Flege, J. E., & Loftin, J. D. (2000). The effect of L1 use on pronunciationin Quichua-Spanish bilinguals. *Journal of Phonetics, 28*(1), 27-42. https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.2000.0104

Hung, T. T. N. (2002). English as a global language and the issue of international intelligibility. *Asian Englishes, 5*(1), 4-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2002.10801086

Hung, T. (2000). *Towards a phonology of Hong Kong English*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227962463_Towards_a_phonology_of_Hong_Kong_English

Jubilado, R. (2016). Where is the CR? A description of Philippine English in Hawaii. *Philippine ESL Journal*, *17*, 86-99.

Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden; Blackwell.

Karim, S. (2015). *Influence of Ll on L2 in speaking English of the students of intermedirte level* (pp. 2-29). BRAC University.

Kartushina, N., Fraauenfelder, U., & Golestani, N. (2016). How and when does the second language influence the production of native speech sounds: A literature review. *Language Learning, 66*(2), 155-186. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12187

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in Asean: A multilingual model*. HongKong University Press.

Koyfman, S. (2019). *What language is spoken in the Philippines?* Babbel Magazine. https://www.babbel.com/en/magazine/what-language-is-spoken-in-the-philippines

Ladia, C. E. (2022). Contextualizing Duterte's rhetoric: The rhetorical situation of President Rodrigo Duterte's Public addresses on the Philippines' federal shift. *Humanities Diliman, 19*(1), 30-57.

Lesho, M. (2018). Philippine English (metro Manila acrolect). *Journal of the International Phonetic Alphabet, Cambridge, 48*(3), 357-370. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100317000548

Lewis, C., & Deterding, D. (2009). *Pronunciation in English as a lingua franca*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333676099_Pronunciation_in_English_as_a_Lingua_Franca

Llamzon, T. A. (1969). *Standard Filipino English*. Ateneo University Press.

Llamzon, T. A. (1997). The phonology of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context (proceedings of the conference held in Manila on August 2-3, 1996)* (pp. 41-48). The Macquarie Library Pty.

McFarland, C. D. (2009). Linguistic diversity and English in the Philippines. In M. L. S. Bautista & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 131-156). Hong Kong University Press.

Medriano, Jr. R., & De Vera, P. (2019). Dominance construction in monologic political discoursebased on selected public speeches of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte. *Asian EFL Journal, 23*(3/4), 5-21.

Melienia, I. (2021). *Vowel change of english words by Filipino speakers in 'everglow' short movie from cof studios Youtube channel*. USD Repository. https://repository.usd.ac.id/view/creators/Melienia=3AIngielly=3A=3A.html

Mendoza, H. (2020). An investigation of Filipino ESL learners' language stereotypes toward Philippine lectal speakers using a matched guise test. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies (AJELS), 8*, 1-21.

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

Pancho, R. M., & Ravina, M. C. (2009). *A critical survey of English language education in the Philippines: It's history from the American occupation to the present*. Google Scholar. https://goo.gl/E9iPcq

Philippine English - English in the Philippines. (2024). https://englishinphilippines.weebly.com/philippine-english.html

Radio Television Malacañang (RTVM) (2020). *75th session of the United Nations general assembly (Speech) 9/22/2020*. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5esB6C3sgdg

Regala-Flores, E. (2014) Phonological features of basilectal Philippine English: An exploratory study. *International Journal of English and Literature, 5*(6), 128-4 https://doi.org/10.5897/ijel2014.0586

Salayo, J. (2020). Social distancing, community quarantine and bullets: A critical discourse analysis of President Rodrigo Duterte's speeches on the war against Covid-19 pandemic. *Middle Eastern Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences, 1*(2), 233-256. https://doi.org/10.47631/mejress.v1i2.13

San, P. H., & MacLagan, M. A. (2009) Chinese Malaysian English phonology. *Asian Englishes, 12*(1), 20-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2009.10801247

Saranza, R. (2019). A phonological contrastive analysis of Philippine ethnic kinamayo and English segmental. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal*, *5*(2), 1-7.

Schwartz, G., Balas, A., & Rojczyk, A. (2015). Phonological factors affecting L1 phonetic realization of proficient polish users of English. *Research in Language*, *13*(2), 181-98. https://doi.org/10.1515/rela-2015-0014

Sharbawi, S., & Deterding, D. (2013). *Brunei English: A new variety in a multilingual society*. Academia. https://www.academia.edu/9584681/Brunei_English_A_New_variety_in_a_Multilingual_Society

Tamano, R. G., Guimba, W. D., & Disangcopan, M. M. (2021). Dissecting the Covid-19 speeches of President Rodrigo Duterte through the lens of critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *4*(4), 233-242. https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.4.26

Tayao, M. L. G. (2004). The evolving study of Philippine English phonology. *World Englishes, 23*(1), 77-90.

Tayao, M. L. G. (2008). Philippine English: Phonology. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia* (pp. 292-306). Mouton de Gruyter.

Torres, J., Matildo, R. M., Somblingo, R., Santos, M., & Alieto, E. (2021). Another look at the phonological feature of lectal speakers: Re-validation of the description of the Philippine English's phonology. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(4/3), 103-114.

Tupas, T. R. F., & Lorente, B. P. (2013). *A new politics of language in the Philippines: Bilingual education and a new challenge of the mother tongues.* Academia.edu. http://academia.edu/1456781/A_new_politics_of_languagein_the_Philippines_bilingual_education_and_the_new_challenge_of_the_mother_tongues

Vu, P. T. (2012). *English in Southeast Asian countries*. Semanticscholar. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/English-in-Southeast-Asian-countries-Vu/76dc725ccf76cbcf16de8efb0a52cffbb08b0a33

Zhao, Y. (2019). Negative transfer of mother tongue in English. *Creative Education, 10*(5), 940-946. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.105070