English Intonation Patterns of Non-English Major Student Teachers

Dr. Emily L. Beltran

Technological University of the Philippines- Cavite

Abstract: The study described the production of intonation pattern of the Non-English major student teachers during their on-campus teaching. The qualitative research method was used to analyze the data and describe their intonation patterns. The utterances were investigated in distinction between falling and rising intonation of wh-questions and yes/no questions. In the conduct of analysis, an interview guide was used to gather data on the language profile of the student teachers. Data confirm that the student teachers' mother tongue (Filipino) was commonly used in most of their verbal exchanges activities. It is worthy to note that the utterances of the student teachers displayed evidence of intonation patterns variation on wh-questions and yes/no questions. The production of intonation patterns of the student teachers was resulted from the common linguistic phenomenon in which they tended to carry the intonation and pronunciation rules from their mother tongue (Filipino) into their English spoken discourse.This qualitative research study implies that there is an interference of first language (Filipino) in the production of the student teachers' intonation patterns which describes the Philippine English intonation pattern for wh- questions and yes/no questions. Forthcoming studies may obtain more valued insights by gathering geographically varied samples that would include student teachers across disciplines.

Keywords: Intonation Patterns, Student Teachers, Philippine English.

1.   INTRODUCTION

Utterance in spoken discourse is a dynamic method of putting up meaning which entails more than just producing and receiving of words but more of processing of information (Burns & Joyce, 1997). The form and meaning of utterance as a process are dependent on the situation in which it happens, including the participants' involvement and the motives for speaking. It has its own skills and conventions different from written language (Cohen, 1996). It is habitually spontaneous, open-ended, and progressive.

English, being the medium of instruction in education, requires all teachers across disciplines to possess the ability to use the language effectively. However, the use of the English language varies significantly all over the world. It may be a foreign language in some places, but a second language in other countries. These variations in the use of English language demonstrate the linguistic identity of English speakers in those places (Abrar-ul-Hassan, 2010).

However, this importance of spoken discourse performance is not completely acknowledged in terms of production of intonation patterns. For instance, Gussenhoven and Warner (2002) present a survey on spontaneous speech and they ascertain that little focus is paid to intonational structure. Likewise, Levis (2005), argues that the decision to focus more strongly on segmental features contrast the approach which tends to foreground the suprasegmental features such as intonation pattern.

As regards performance, the researcher visited various resources and found out that many studies have been carried out on spoken discourse. However, among a multitude of study area are of artificially created utterances, while a few have looked at the natural setting of actual spoken discourse performance of non- native speakers of English exclusively for the production of intonation pattern. In some of the foregoing studies on language system, Pennington and Ellis (2000) find that even for Cantonese speakers with advanced competence in English find difficulty recognizing the use of intonation in

cuing various meanings. These non-native speakers were able to demonstrate significant improvement in performance only after they were explicitly directed to intonation on sentences. Further research is necessary to verify the findings. Tayao (2004) on the hand, described the evolution of studies of Philippine English phonology which provided a description of distinctive phonological features. The research suggested that future studies of Philippine English intonation according to first language background.

With these related studies and limited findings on spoken discourse performance on Philippine English variety, it is uncertain if student teachers who are non- English major produce intonation patterns similar to the American Standard Pattern or of another variety of English.

 The need to describe their production of intonation pattern may provide answers to some unresolved issues concerning spoken discourse performance. Specifically, there is a need to know whether or not the English language used by student teachers constitutes another variety of English.

Taking the said concern into account, the paper aimed to describe the production of intonation patterns of student teachers in their English language use during on-campus teaching.

The research findings may contribute the following to the body of knowledge :(1) The study provides a reference of the student teachers' production of intonation patterns that may be used for utterances enhancement; (2) it presents a perspective of variousness (Kachru, 2006) in the World Englishes through a variety of the Philippine English.

Statement of the Problem:

The present study is designed to describe the production of intonation of non-English major student teachers:

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1.   What is the language profile of the student teachers?

2.   What is the production of intonation pattern of student teachers in terms of the following:

2.1   WH Questions

2.2   Yes/No Questions?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study:

The present research was conducted to describe the English intonation patterns of the student teachers during their actual practice teaching. It is limited to the analysis of the production of intonation patterns and does not include other supra-segmental features such as stress and rhythm since the present research focuses on extended utterances or intra sentential level.

One limitation of the study that must be noted is its very local in nature since it is only limited to the Industrial Education students who conducted on- campus teaching as one of their curriculum requirements. Another potential limitation of the study is the small number of participants. Such small number of participants, however, is an advantage in studies involving microanalysis of spoken discourse performance of the student teachers.

There were 18 videos that comprised the three classes which were observed and video recorded for each student teacher. Although transcriptions illustrated the entire verbal exchanges between them and their students, analysis of the data was limited to student teachers' talk, Language and gender was not part of the research since there was only one male student teacher among the six participants of the present study. However, the insights gained from this study can be worth taking into account in similar programs in other state universities and colleges.

Significance of the Study:

Research findings presented in this study anticipated the following benefits:

Primarily, results may provide a response to the actuality that production of English intonation pattern needs to be described as a situational phenomenon like in on-campus teaching for pedagogic applications on how student teachers orchestrate classroom learning.

Secondly, findings hope to help the present student teachers to have a reference of the previous student teachers' spoken discourse performance in terms of phonology. Data may lead them in realizing which need to be addressed and be improved in order to be communicatively competent teachers in the future.

Finally, no study has been conducted yet in the researcher's institution to describe the production of English intonation pattern of Filipino student teachers; therefore, this research may provide useful information to the administration for decisions on policies and practices with regard to professional industrial education curriculum development.

2.   REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

On Phonology: Intonation:

Phonology is a study of the sound systems of languages. It is distinguished from phonetics, which is the study of the production, perception, and physical properties of speech sounds; phonology attempts to account for how they are combined, organized, and convey meaning in particular languages. Only a fraction of the sounds humans can articulate is found in any particular language. As compared to morphology, syntax and vocabulary, English accent (part of phonology), according to Hudson (1996) is less liable to standardization. With this, the present study describes the spoken discourse performance on phonology of the subjects through their production of intonation patterns.

It is believed that intonation is an inseparable component of spoken discourse. It is a non-grammatical and non-lexical component of communication (Celik, 2001) and it refers to pitch variations in speech. Together with other non-grammatical and non-lexical components of communication, such as tempo, rhythm, loudness, and sound color. It belongs to a distinct language system which is called the vocal code. The essentials of the vocal code very rarely occur independently of the elements of the verbal code, called segments, and they almost always occur simultaneously with them. Thus, units of the vocal code are called supra segmentals (Hlebec, 2004). Intonation is extremely significant supra segmental element because a spoken discourse without it would sound monotonous. However, the present study is strictly bounded only to identifying the intonation patterns of the student teachers' utterances.

Discourse intonation views intonation as neither grammatical nor attitudinal. Brazil, Coulthard, and Johns (1980) emphasises that the significance of intonation is related to the function of the utterance as an existentially appropriate contribution to an interactive discourse. He further claimed that by making a choice in any of the intonation systems, a speaker makes an assumption about what he takes, for present purposes, to be the state of understanding between him and a hearer. Speakers thus make intonation choices according to their perception of the understandings they share with their listeners: these understandings relate to their talk in a particular context. Although syntax and intonation do have a relationship in purpose-driven talk (Brazil, 1985), they are regarded as being separate areas of choice. Thus discourse intonation holds that there is no normal relationship between tone units and clauses.

Furthermore, Halliday (1970) states that any alteration in intonation pattern signifies changes in the semantics of the ultimate message, including the speakers' attitude and the structure of information as perceived by the listeners.

Hirst and DiCristo (1998) stress the account on the intonation pattern of a specific language is a particularly not easy undertaking since it is one of the most language specific features of human language. Moreover, every language has intonation that makes it universal. In their survey of intonation systems, in many languages (English, Spanish, Romanian, Russian, Greek) the intonation of wh-questions is described as being more alike to that of statements than   that of yes-no   questions. In French, unmarked wh-questions are produced with a falling final pitch like statements but the regular rising pattern found in statements is usually replaced by the down stepping pattern observed in yes/no   questions. In Romanian and Greek, however, wh-questions are said to be more like forceful declaratives and rising intonation is said to be uncommon.

Correspondingly, Rintell (1984) found that negative L1-L2 transfer was obvious among Chinese learners of English in the production of phonology. Chinese speakers had particular difficulty in recognizing the English intonation pattern because Chinese judged the English language according to their tone language of Chinese. Thus, this transfer of phonological knowledge resulted in errors.

Grabe and Post (2002) on the other hand, examined the nuclear accents in yes/no questions in Dublin English and found that a falling pattern was the most common.

Other research studies however, have shown that hearers pay particular attention to intonation when they are trying to understand an utterance (Al-Sibai, 2009). It is, thus, necessary for non-native speakers like Filipino student teachers, to use intonation correctly if they want to be understood by their students.

Very little research has been done on the intonation patterns of Philippine English of student teachers. Mc Arthur (1998) for instance, said that Philippine English is syllable timed, following the rhythm of the local languages. The intonation is widely characterized as 'singsong'.

On the other hand, Gonzalez (1990) said that the Philippine English is revealed to be influenced by the structures of native Filipino language(s), and by the contexts in which it is learned. It is argued that Philippine English, as language diversity, is in a state of instability and is in the process of standardization, with a clear accord only on which variety is mainly acceptable for the spoken discourse and with a conservative stance taken on all other features of English spoken discourse. While American English keeps on being the reference criterion for language education, the spoken variety is tolerant of peculiar modes of stress and little focus is paid to intonation, as intonation bears little useful load for changes of essential linguistic meaning. It is also argued that spoken Philippine English stresses the need of preserving phonemic features pertaining to the vocalic system and as regards certain distinctions in the consonantal systems. Likewise, Gussenhoven and Warner (2002) present a survey of cross-linguistic variation in intonational structure on spontaneous

speech, the collection of languages of which fairly complete descriptions are available is still small. They assumed that future research is likely to bring many more tone systems to light couched in the autosegmental-metrical framework, with and without lexical tones. The present study yearns to be part of this intonation system with reference to Philippine English.

Another research study was conducted by Tayao (2008), which revealed that in Philippine English, the use of final rising intonation was favoured for all types of questions such as yes/no, alternative and wh- questions. Hence, research tells that the difficulties in the learning of second language intonation patterns are often due to the non-equivalence of the intonation of the learners' native language and the second language

The literature revealed that little research on English intonation pattern of Non-English major student teachers with reference to Philippine varieties have been performed. Accordingly, this study attempts to bridge this gap by describing the production of English intonation pattern of the student teachers during their actual on-campus teaching. The present study provides supporting data of non-native speakers of English, as an integral component for Philippine English variety.

3.   METHODOLOGY

The present study used a qualitative method research design. It takes a descriptive approach that uses the video recorded transcripts to describe the English intonation pattern of the student teachers during on-campus teaching. The student teachers' language profile was primarily established through their responses during the interview with the use of interview guide adapted from (Pareja, 2003).

A total of 69 Industrial Education students were were selected based on their scores on a language proficiency test on Transparent Language which was personally administered to them by the researcher. Those first three student teachers who got the highest scores on proficiency result in every area of specialization were taken as subjects of the research study. Hence, six student teachers were treated as participants. They were teaching freshmen and sophomore students in Industrial Technology courses as part of their on-campus teaching. These participants were homogeneous and shared common features such as age (young adults: between 19 and 21 years old), mother tongue (Filipino) and with no other foreign language except English. All in all, there were five female student teachers and only one male student teacher were employed as participants for the present research.

In the present research, the transcriptions were done by viewing and reviewing the video recorded classes of student teachers during on-campus teaching. Transcriptions were completed verbatim. The video recorded data were then transcribed manually and further validated by language experts. Thus, transcriptions were done by hand and eventually used for analysis. Words from transcripts which were highly technical, as well as the unclear names uttered, were consulted with the student teachers themselves for accuracy.

For this research, ethical considerations were closely observed hence, the identities of participants were kept confidential through the use of codenames in the analysis and reporting of data.

To ensure the credibility and validity of the findings relative to intonation, the three videos of each student teacher were reviewed, re-examined and counterchecked several times by external evaluator and the researcher herself for their uniformity in the production of intonation.

For precision, accuracy and representativeness, student teachers were requested to review the video recorded transcripts to establish "trustworthiness" (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996) of the study.

Line numbers were assigned to video transcripts for reference on phonology as the total spoken discourse performance of the student teachers.

Transcription and analysis of the production of intonation patterns of the student teachers were carried out. The typical manual transcription was accomplished with the large speech corpora of student teachers during on-campus teaching. The utterances of the student teachers were transcribed by the present researcher. Each student teacher's transcript was then coded and analyzed to describe the student teachers production of intonation patterns during on-campus teaching.

4.   PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered in the conduct of the study on the English intonation pattern of student teachers. It answers the specific questions earlier raised in the research. The findings are given in two sections: the language profile of the student teachers and their production of English intonation pattern.

Research Question No. 1. What is the language profile of the student teachers?

Table 1 illustrates the responses of the student teachers on the questions asked during the interview.

Table.1 Language Profile of Student Teachers

Items	Student Teacher A	Student Teacher B	Student Teacher C	Student Teacher D	Student Teacher E	Student Teacher F
Language first learned to speak	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog	Filipino	Filipino
Language most frequently used at home	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog	Filipino	Filipino/ Bicol
Language best understood in listening	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog/ English	Filipino/ English	English
Language spoke fluently	Filipino / English	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog	Filipino/ English	Filipino/ English
Language used best in writing	Filipino / English	English	Tagalog	English	Filipino	Filipino/ English
Language best understood	Filipino	English	Tagalog	Tagalog/ English	Filipino	Filipino/ English
Language usually used in thinking	Filipino / English	English	Tagalog	Tagalog/ English	English	Filipino/ English
Language most frequently used in classes	English	English	English	English	English	English
Language most frequently used outside classes	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Filipino	Filipino	Filipino

Table 1 shows that Filipino language is the prevailing verbal communication medium among the participants.

Based on the data, all of the participants claimed that Filipino is the first language they learn to speak. Although Student Teachers C and D asserted that they first learned the Tagalog language to also mean Filipino. These students believed that Tagalog and Filipino are synonyms.

Similarly, Filipino language is the most frequently used by the participants in their respective homes except for Student Teacher F who said they used Bicol (another Philippine language) as frequent as Filipino in their home especially when talking to his parents who are Bicolano (natives of Bicol province in Region V).

Likewise, Student Teachers D and E said that the language they best understood listening to was either Filipino (Tagalog) and English. Student Teacher F however, asserted that he understood English language better in listening. Nonetheless the other participants of the study admitted that Filipino language is what they best understand in listening.

As to fluency, 50% of the participants said that they spoke fluently in Filipino/Tagalog while the other 50% claimed that they spoke both Filipino and English fluently.

In terms of writing, Student Teachers B and D claimed that they were better using English language. However, Student Teachers A and F stated that they could write better, both in Filipino and English. Student Teachers C and E on the other hand, declared to be best in Filipino/Tagalog.

For the language they best understood, Student Teacher B declared that she best understood English. Conversely, Student Teachers A, C and E asserted, they best understood Filipino/Tagalog. Even so, Student Teachers D and F affirmed that both Filipino and English languages were best understood when it comes to verbal discourses.

Additionally, in their manner of thinking, Student Teachers B and E stated that they usually thought in English language while Student Teacher C pointed out that she usually did it in Filipino. Nevertheless, half of the participants stressed that they habitually thought in both Filipino and English language.

Lastly, all the participants declared that they spoke English frequently during class hours; however, they said they tended to shift to Filipino language when not in classroom or in an informal setting within the vicinity of the campus.

As respondents have claimed, they used Filipino or Tagalog in most of their discourses. The national language, Filipino, is based on a mixture of Philippine languages rather than on Tagalog alone (Morrow, 2010). It is usually called Tagalog within the Philippines and among Filipinos to differentiate it from other Philippine languages. Nolasco (2007), chair of Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (KWF), acknowledged that Filipino was simply Tagalog in syntax and grammar with as yet no grammatical element coming from any of the other Philippine languages. Although, it has come to be known as Filipino to differentiate it from the languages of other countries, the former implies a regional origin, the latter a national (Wolff, 2006). However, the participants of the present study did not differentiate the meaning of Filipino and Tagalog as they claimed they are their native language and used primarily in most of their daily utterances. They just merely interchanged the terms to mean the same. This suggests that the student teachers were not aware of the terms' differences. The researcher did not interfere to differentiate the meaning of Filipino and Tagalog so as not affect the answers of the subjects during the conduct of the interview.

With the aforementioned language profile of the student teachers of the present study, evidence confirms that their mother tongue (Filipino) seems to play a noteworthy role in using the second language (English). Bühmann and Trudell (2008) even stressed that the research evidence today clearly shows that using the learners' mother tongue is crucial to effective learning. The present study may also support the research on second language acquisition that if the child masters the first language, then learning another language becomes less problematic, in that, habits of speaking and listening can be transferred to the learning of the second language (MacLaughlin, 1987). Kroll (1990) further claims that there is an underlying cognitive or academic proficiency that is common to languages and this enables transfer of literacy related skills across languages.

Research Question No. 2. What is the production of English intonation pattern of student teachers in terms of the following:

2.1 WH Questions:

2.2 Yes/No Questions:

The following phonological description of the student teachers under study was strictly bounded to illustration of their intonation patterns within their spoken discourse during on-campus teaching.

Table.2 Student Teacher A's Observed Intonation for Wh- Questions

Table 2 presents the utterances of Student Teacher A for wh- questions. It is very much noticeable that almost all the utterances are rising intonations except in lines 93-94 "*Where are the capacitors",* which follows falling intonation of the General American Pattern. It is noteworthy that Student Teacher A was observed to produce rising intonation pattern for wh- questions despite the fact that she displayed fluency in most of her utterances in lines 1-636. She even claimed during the interview of her language profile that she speaks English fluently. It seems true that if a non-native speaker is almost fluent in the English language, she often cannot appropriately use the intonation with any reasonable degree of confidence, and this is the only way in which one can tell that she is not a native speaker of the said language.

Table.3 Student Teacher B's Observed Intonation for Wh- Questions

In Table 3, the data show Student Teacher B demonstrated a rising intonation in nearly all of her wh- questions. Line 639, "*Who's going to lead the prayer?"* and lines 981-982 *"Who can answer it on the board?"* follow the falling intonation pattern. But unlike Student Teacher A, Student Teacher B exhibited hesitancy in the use of English language in most of her utterances as further discussed in the error analysis of the present study.

In the utterances *Who's going to lead the prayer?* and *"Who can answer it on the board"?,* Student Teacher B ended them with falling intonations, which is the usual ending intonation for wh –question, based on the American English intonation. The listener may infer that the speaker is not done speaking and will wait for more information if the said pattern is not used.

The falling intonation implies that Student Teacher B was confident of the validity of the proposition contained in her utterance, while the rising tone signifies that she was unsure, but enthusiastic to suspend to the supposed confidence of her student as reflected in the lines 852, 866, 883, 908 and 954.

Table.4 Student Teacher C's Observed Intonation for Wh- Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Line 1119	What ELSE?
Line 1280	What does IT MEAN?
Line 1129	So, how about THE OTHERS?
Line 1236	WHO SAID in industry?
Lines 1128-1129	So, HOW ABOUT the others?
Line 1129	What CAN YOU SAY about the FUNCTION of a transistor?
Line 1259	How ABOUT YOU, sir?
Line 1326	who CAN HELP Calora?
Line 1385	How ABOUT the other?
Line 1393	why are you LAUGHING?

Conversely, Table 4 shows that Student Teacher C exhibited a mixed up of rising and falling intonation patterns in her utterances. As observed, there are four utterances that are rising while the rest of the utterances follow the falling intonation pattern for wh -questions.

For rising intonation, Student Teacher C's utterance in lines 1128-1129 "*So, how about THE OTHERS?*" indicated she wanted more similar answers from her students and wanted to know who would like to give another acceptable answer. Similarly, Student Teacher C seemed to hold no assumption as to what her student really means when she asked in line 1280, "*What does IT MEAN?" S*he ended it in rising intonation asking her students as who would like to explain the topic she just introduced. Perhaps she wanted to check whether her students had background knowledge on the new topic. In line 1393 however, Student Teacher C appeared to be a little irritated on her students laughing on something that led her utterances to rising intonation, *"Why are you laughing?"* These observed utterances of Student Teacher C displayed deviations on the intonation patterns of most English language users who follow the acceptable intonation pattern for asking wh- questions.

Table.5 Student Teacher D's Observed Intonation for Wh- Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 1650-1651	Who among YOU are SWIMMERS?
Line 1492	Yes, what's your NAME?
Line 1455	What's your NAME?
Line 1470	What is a half ADDER?
Line 1499	So what's your name AGAIN?
Line 1591	Who can TELL ME the principle BEHIND THAT?
Lines 1676-1677	oh by the way what is a PROPAGATION DELAY?
Line 1673	What do you call THIS...?

Table 5 presents the observed utterances for wh - questions of Student Teacher D. A wh -question begins with the words *who*, *what*, *why*, *when*, *where*, and *how*. These types of questions seek information and cannot be answered with "yes" or "no." However, it might then be asked why some of the student teachers' utterances in wh -questions are accompanied by a falling intonation, if they stand for asking for information. As seen in Table 5, all the utterances illustrate wh – questions, which are accompanied by rising intonations instead of falling. As observed, Student Teacher D tended to end most of her questions (both for wh- and yes/no) in a rising intonation pattern. It seems that she was not fully aware of the rules of General American Pattern of intonation and that she probably thought, all questions follow the rising intonation pattern. These findings also support what Tayao (2008) has found out that in Philippine English the use of the final rising intonation is favoured for all types of questions such as wh and yes/no questions.

Table.6 Student Teacher E's Observed Intonation for Wh- Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Line 1993	WHAT PLATE?!
Line 2046	WHAT CAN you say?
Line 2192	How about THIS ONE?
Line 1731	wHAT?
Line 1753	Michael, WHAT CAN you say?
Line 1785	What can you say ABOUT THE STIPPLING technique?
Line 1798	And what is the shade in THE DRAWING?
Line 1811	wHY?
Line 1878	So what do you observe in HATCHING?
Line 1914	So what is STIPPLING to you?
Line 2006	So what is natural VENTILATION?
Line 2043	Yeah, what's THAT TERM?
Line 2188	What is THAT Robby?

Table 6 shows the utterances of Student Teacher E for wh - questions. Data demonstrate indistinguishable intonation pattern as compared to the utterances of Student Teacher C. They both exhibited inconsistency in the production of intonation pattern for wh -questions. However, Student Teacher E produced an up- rise intonation pattern in line 1993, "*WHAT PLATE*"? Here, she sounded as if she was suddenly reminded of asking this question that made her a little animated. Most of the utterances were rising and the remainder followed the falling intonations. The wh -questions ended with a rising or falling pitch boundary, depending on whether Student Teacher was asking a question, or was making a suggestion as a question or was confident about parts of her utterance that led her to use the falling intonation.

Table.7 Student Teacher F's Observed Intonation for Wh- Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Line 2228	So what have you NOTICED with the picture?
Lines 2312-2313	How about a CAPACITOR which has NO polarity?
Line 2422	what is MISSING in this SCHEMATIC diagram?
Line 2239	how do you DEFINE capacitors?
Lines 2411-2412	Basically, WHAT IS a transistor?
Line 2437	What do WE MEAN by NPN transistor?
Line 2659-2660	yes, Crizellene what are you DOING?

Table 7 illustrates the observed production of intonation for wh -questions of Student teacher F who exhibited a nearly General American Pattern. Only in line 2659-2660, "*what are you doing?"* showed a rising intonation. With the observed utterances, Student Teacher F looked as if he was acquainted with the tenet for wh - questions, although, he missed it in one of his utterances.

In a nutshell, on the observed intonation for wh -questions of student teachers, they all exhibited deviation from the intonation pattern for wh -questions. No one perfectly made the production of the General American Pattern for a falling intonation. Student Teacher A, for example, who claimed during the interview of her language background that she spoke English fluently produced the falling intonation pattern for most of her wh - questions utterances. Similarly, Student Teacher E, who also said she spoke English fluently, produced the intonation pattern inconsistently. In the same way, Student Teacher C randomly produced the intonation pattern for wh -questions utterances. On the other hand, Student Teacher D reversely produced the intonation pattern as rising intonation instead of falling in all of her wh - questions. It was Student Teacher F, who also claimed fluency in English, nearly produced the General American Pattern in most of his utterances.

Results show therefore, that there were inconsistencies in the production of intonation pattern for wh –questions, whether the participants claimed fluency in English or not.

Hirst and DiCristo's (1998) findings in their survey of intonation systems also showed instances of wh -questions which were produced with rising intonation rather than a falling tone as observed in some Romanians and Greeks. Their findings are similar to the present research the fact that there were also occurrences when student teachers produced rising intonation instead of falling for wh -questions.

In general, the data on the intonation patterns for wh -questions support the stand of Brazil (1985) when he said that the significance of intonation is related to the function of the utterance. He further claimed that the intonation should be existentially appropriate part of an interactive discourse such as the classroom discourse. Indeed, the student teachers have their own choice in any of the intonation systems with the assumptions of understanding from their students (Brazil, 1997).

Table 8 shows the intonation pattern produced by student teachers for yes/no questions.

Table.8 Student Teacher A's Observed Intonation for Yes/No Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 89-90	So do you have the CAPACITORS with you NOW?
Line 85	Do we have an ASSIGN**MENT**?
Line 168	Rea**DY**?
Line 228	No**BODY**?
Line 127	Are you DONE?
Lines 215-216	Are you WRITING?
Lines 236-237	is it the FIRST TIME you have heard of that forward-bias MODE?
Line 348	Guys, do YOU under STAND?
Line 362	Have you SEEN circuit BOARDS?
Lines 408-409	So have you SEEN one of these BEFORE?
Line 588	Are you DONE?

As seen in Table 8, Student Teacher A produced rising intonation pattern in all of her utterances. It appears that she could manage to produce the General American intonation pattern for utterances as a word or complete sentence of yes/ no question. Her utterance, though there was neither subject nor subject verb inversion as in the usual yes/ no questions, showed that she could handle the intonation of rising well enough. The intonation within a word changes its meaning quite a bit as in line 228, "*NoBODY?"* The intonation production of Student Teacher A shows a combination of a question

and a surprise emotion towards the reaction of her students. It is a tonic stress which she uttered with extra pitch height. It seems that she was asking for a repetition or clarification, or indicating disbelief.

Similarly, in line 85, "*Do you have an assignment*?", she overtly gave an emphasis on the word "assignment" with up-rise intonation. Perhaps she would like to make sure if her students really did their assignment. Her intonation suggests doubts towards the preparation of her students. Even so, Student Teacher A was able to produce the appropriate intonation pattern for yes/no questions.

Table 9 shows the intonation pattern of Student Teacher B for her yes/no questions.

Table.9 Student Teacher B's Observed Intonation for Yes/No Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Line 697	Can we PROCEED to the EXAMPLES I HAVE PREpared?
Lines 694-695	So, do you UNDERSTAND now?
Line 735	Is THAT CORRECT
Line 707	Are you SURE?
Line 805	So do you have ANY questions SO FAR?
Line 821	okAY?
Line 825	Do you UNDERSTAND the TRANSformer now?
Line 827	Do you HAVE any QUESTION?
Line 1018	So do you REALLY understand THE TOPIC?
Line 1020	Is there ANY quesTION?

As shown in Table 9, some of the utterances of Student Teacher B that displayed the yes/no question seem to follow the typical rising intonation pattern, although there were some that sounded differently and which led to falling intonation.

These yes/no questions of Student Teacher B sounded that she was more polite with her students when she asked if they could proceed to the examples as expressed in line 637, "*Can we PROCEED to the EXAMPLES I HAVE PREpared*"? Similarly, in lines 694-695, "*So, do you understand now?*" and in line 825 "*Do you UNDERSTAND the TRANSformer now?*", in* which she expected a yes answer from her students. Instead of the typical rising intonation for yes/no question, falling intonations were observed in her utterances.

These irregularities in the production of intonation for yes/no questions may have something to do with Cauldwell and Hewings' findings (1996). According to them, the rules of intonation given in ELT books are "inadequate descriptions of what occur in naturally-occurring speech" such as the classroom spoken discourse. They claimed that studies of yes/no questions "in authentic speech support the view that the relationship between intonation and question form is more complex than that suggested in textbook rules" (Cauldwell & Hewings, 1996). Perhaps, this is one of the reasons why erratic intonations occurred in the utterances of student teachers.

Table 10 presents the utterances of Student Teacher C displaying the intonation pattern for yes/no questions.

Table.10 Student Teacher C's Observed Intonation for Yes/No Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Line 1109	So IS IT OK with you class?
Line 1037	DO YOU HAVE ANY idea?
Line 1027	DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA about common collector?
Lines 1050- 1051	do you have YOUR HANDOUTS, class?
Line 1076	So, is it OK?
Lines 1181-1182	Are you familiar WITH THIS?
Line 1300	Isn't IT?
Line 1313	IS IT clear?
Line 1391	I AM right?

As shown in the table, there are inconsistencies again in the intonation patterns used. It should be noted that all the utterances in Table 10 are yes/no questions and yet irregularity of the production of intonation pattern is once more observed. There are only three utterances, lines 1076, 1181-1182 and 1300, which carried the rising intonation. The rest of the utterances showed the falling intonation. Moreover, this is seen in line 1109, "*so IS IT OK with you class?*" and in line 1037, "*Do YOU HAVE ANY idea?*", where the intonation patterns are falling. Utterances sound that there are something extra to the questions. Comrie (1984) referred to it as an abruptness in the utterance. In Student Teacher C's utterance, this could mean an imperative sentence addressed to her students. This yes/no question in falling intonation of Student Teacher C sounded as if she was giving a command to the students to present an idea on the introduced topic.

Table 11 illustrates Student Teacher D's production of intonation pattern for yes/no questions.

Table.11 Student Teacher D's Observed Intonation for Yes/No questions

Line No.	Utterances
Line 1478-1479	Are YOU FAMILIAR with this kind of circuit?
Line 1524	Are you CONVINCED?
Line 1434	Do I look like A MAN?
Line 1443	Do you get THIS?
Line 1481	Class do you HAVE your MANUALS WITH YOU?
Line 1508	have you read your LESSON?
Lines 1535-1536	Here, do we GET the same ANSWER?
Line 1559	Is there any QUESTION?
Line 1562	Is THIS clear?
Line 1582	Have you seen a DECODER?

As shown in Table 11, there are only two utterances of yes/ no question that are identified as falling intonation. The lines 1478-1479, "Are *YOU FAMILIAR with this kind of circuit*?" and line 1562, "*Is THIS clear?*", *a*re the utterances of Student Teacher D in which she produced falling intonation.   The other eight utterances however, followed the rising intonation pattern.

This production of intonation for yes/no questions of Student Teacher D is a bit similar to the manner of production of Student Teacher B. Both of them almost demonstrated the General American Pattern for yes/no questions except for few utterances that are falling. It can be recalled that the observed intonation for the wh- questions of Student Teacher D was as well rising for the entire utterances who commonly associated questions with rising intonations.

Table.12 Student Teacher E's Observed Intonation for Yes/No Questions

Line No.	Utterances
Line 2018	OkAY?
Line 2027	Did I make MYSELF CLEAR?
Lines 2013- 2014	Ok class, HAVE YOU encountered the word aperture BEFORE?
Line 2145	Are you ANGRY?
Lines 2171-2172	Ahh, are you ready for the QUIZ?

Table 12 presents the observed intonation for yes/no questions of Student Teacher E. As seen in the table, all the utterances followed the rising intonation. It appears that Student Teacher E was aware of the suitable intonation pattern for yes/no questions. However, the fact that she just produced limited utterances for yes/no question in her entire transcripts and with reference to her previous production of intonation for wh-questions where she demonstrated inconsistencies in the intonation pattern, the researcher then cannot instantaneously tell if she really knew the General American Pattern for yes/no questions.

Table.13 Student Teacher F's Observed Intonation for Yes/No Questions

Student Teacher F however, displayed a mixed up of intonation patterns in Table 13. Out of five utterances with yes/no questions, two of them are falling and the other three utterances follow the rising intonation. The performance of Student Teacher F appears to be comparable with Student Teacher C. They both exhibited apparent irregularities in their production of yes/no questions. This result is similar to that of Grabe and Post (2002), who found that the falling intonation was common in Dublin English in yes/no question utterances.

The results of the study showed contrary to what Crystal (1975) reported that almost majority of tones will be falls – almost in any type of discourse in spoken English and to what Celik (2011) stressed that a falling tone is by far the most common used tone of all. The present study however, shows that majority of the utterances of student teachers used rising intonation (both for wh-questions and yes/no questions). This is possibly because the participants tended to ask questions during class discussions, thus, the use of the rising intonation pattern. As Brazil, Coulthard, and Johns (1980) point out, the rising intonation is frequently used by a speaker who has a more dominant role in a conversation, which is true among student teachers for they nearly dominated the class discussion.

Intonation has been described by Grabe (2004) as the most difficult aspect of a foreign language to acquire and is held responsible for numerous instances of miscommunication between native and non-native speakers. Although the claim is in the global context, it is still an issue whether Philippine English should be mindful of the General American Pattern, the fact that Filipinos, most of the time, understand what their fellow Filipinos mean despite of the intonation variations when using the English language. This observation is at variance to what Al-Sibai, (2009) stressed that the hearers pay attention to intonation when they are trying to understand an utterance. As what Halliday (1970) states, intonation is not only a matter of making oneself understood or having a good pronunciation, but is a way of expressing various meanings. He further claims that there are at all times a variety of possible intonation patterns for utterances, and they will all bring different meanings

The findings presented in this study however, have so far shown some distinct features in the intonation patterns of student teachers' utterances. One is a rising intonation on wh-questions. Another is a falling intonation to some yes/no questions, which is normally rising. These erratic intonation patterns produced by the student teachers for wh and yes/no questions may be comparable to what Rintell (1984) found that there was a negative L1-L2 transfer in the production of phonology particular the difficulty in identifying the English intonation pattern that resulted to errors. In view of that, the present research supports what Cruz- Ferreira (1983) stressed in his study that the difficulties in the learning of second language intonation patterns are often due to the non-equivalence of the intonation structure of the learners' native language and the second language structure. Likewise, it also agrees to the claim that intonation carries little functional load for changes of basic linguistic meaning (Gonzalez, 1990). Also, as Hudson (1996) argued, intonation is less liable to standardization as compared to morphology and syntax.

Truly, every language has its own intonation system; certain correlations exist between intonation patterns with special meanings (Jiang, 2005). In fact, the utterances of the student teachers showed that their intonation patterns would indicate that they have their own choice about prominence of syllables or words within their utterances according to their perception of the understandings they share with their students (Brazil, 1997). Participants of the study may have demonstrated a variety of Philippine English, which Dayag (2003) refers to as 'localized' or 'nativized'. This is shown by adding some language features of its own, like the Philippine English intonation patterns characterized by McArthur (1998) as "sing song" intonation pattern.

Thus, the data show that there is an interference of the mother tongue of the student teachers in the production of their intonation patterns that further describes their spoken discourse performance on phonology.

Subjects' Language Profile Vis-à-vis the Spoken Discourse Performance

Student Teacher A

As presented during the interview, Filipino is the first language of Student Teacher A. She also mentioned that she belonged to a Filipino family, so Filipino was the most frequently used language at home. She understood articles and most readings materials which were written in Filipino. She was a bilingual speaker according to her; consequently she used mixed English and Filipino to express her thoughts. She found writing best in both Filipino and English. She also understood Filipino language better than English although she said she was not an expert to her own vernacular when it comes to highfalutin Filipino words. However, she did not elaborate which words in Filipino she found high sounding to her. As she mentioned further, she usually would think both in English and Filipino as well. When asked what language she frequently used in her classes, she claimed that she used English, however; during outside class hours, she habitually used Filipino language when talking with her friends and colleagues.

Student Teacher A exhibited inconsistencies in the production of the intonation patterns. She was able to produce the General American Pattern of rising intonation for yes/no questions but not to wh- questions. This is in spite of her claim of fluency based

Student Teacher B

For Student Teacher B, the language she first learned was Filipino. The same language was most frequently used at home even if she and her family sometimes had conversations in English. Although they had verbal exchanges in English, still the language she best understood in listening is Filipino which she also claimed that she spoke with it fluently. On the other hand, she believed that she could write best in English and that she understood it best when it comes to grammar and usage of words. Moreover, she usually would think in the English language, which she also frequently used in the class although she used Filipino outside class hours.

Student Teacher B's production of intonation pattern for wh-questions was mostly rising instead of falling following the General American Pattern. However, for the yes/no questions, majority of her utterances followed rising intonation.

Student Teacher C

Pertaining to the language profile of Student Teacher C, Tagalog is the first language she learned to speak which was also the most frequently used at home. This was the same language she best understood in listening. As she mentioned she could fluently speak Tagalog as well. She could even write at her best using Tagalog language. Tagalog is the language that she best understood. She usually thought using Tagalog language. However, when in class, she frequently used

English as medium of communication, and shifted to Tagalog language when not in class. It seems that in her family, she received richer language development at home than at school. In fact she used Tagalog most of the time and the typical classroom activities provided little opportunity for interaction using English language. This only provides evidence that Student Teacher C appreciated Tagalog over English as the second language.

Concerning the performance of Student Teacher C on the production of intonation pattern, she generally mixed up the pattern for wh- questions. She had almost half of her utterances which were rising and the other half falling. Likewise, for yes/no questions, majority of the utterances were falling rather than rising.

Student Teacher D

Student Teacher D learned first how to speak Tagalog. She and her family members usually talked in that language at home. The language she best understood in listening depends upon the speaker's diction and way of speech. She used Tagalog most of the time because this is also the mother tongue of the persons whom she always talked with. She wrote better in English more than Tagalog in some instances. She always understood English directions or guidelines than Tagalog instructions but she thought in Tagalog or in Tag-lish (Tagalog and English). Possibly, this is due to the use of English as the medium of instruction with vernacular language support to facilitate teaching and learning

 Conversely, when in class, she used English most of the time but would shift to Tagalog after class.

The intonation pattern of Student Teacher D for wh-questions was all rising contrary to the General American pattern that follows falling intonation. On the other hand, for yes/no questions, she produced most of her utterances with rising intonation pattern, which is the appropriate pattern for the said type of questions based on General American pattern.

Student Teacher E

The language she learned first was Filipino, also the most frequently used language at their home. In a manner of listening, she understood best in English and Filipino. Although, she claimed that she could fluently speak both English and Filipino, she still wrote best when Filipino was used. Filipino is also the language she understood best. However, English is the language that she usually used in thinking. Likewise, English is what she frequently used in classroom but turned to speaking in Filipino when outside the classroom.

Student E appears to be bilingual for she claimed that she would speak in English and Filipino fluently.

Regarding the intonation pattern of Student Teacher E, she inconsistently produced the intonation pattern for wh-questions. In fact, majority of her utterances in wh-questions were rising and only few were falling. For yes/ no questions, she successfully produced the rising intonation, which is the fitting intonation pattern for such questions.

Student Teacher F

The language that he learned first was his mother tongue, Filipino. In their home, they normally used Filipino and their parents' regional language, Bicol. When listening, the language he best understood depends upon the topic. If technical matters were the topic, he enjoyed listening in English. He admitted that he would speak fluently in his mother tongue which is Filipino, but as he was practicing English language constantly, he could say that he is bit-by-bit developing to speak in English fluently. When he was asked to write freely, he wrote best in Filipino language. If he would write formally or technically, he used English language better. As a Filipino, he understood things clearly if it was in Filipino language although he also understood English. In most cases, he would think in Filipino but if he would speak in English, he translated these thoughts to English. Besides, he frequently used English language in the class but he enjoyed using Filipino language when outside class hours.

As regards the production of intonation pattern of Student Teacher F, he effectively produced the intonation appropriate to General American pattern for wh-questions. He produced falling intonation pattern in most of his utterances for wh-questions. However, he unsuccessfully produced the suitable pattern for yes/no questions. Actually, he had more than half of his utterances for yes/no questions, which were falling intonation.

Student teachers who claimed they spoke English fluently although they nearly produced up to standard intonation patterns still demonstrated inconsistencies. Likewise, those student teachers who asserted that they spoke Filipino fluently demonstrated more inconsistencies in the production of intonation patterns. However, student teachers, who claimed that they spoke English fluently, produced nearly General American intonation patterns than those student teachers who claimed fluency on the Filipino language. These data have similarity with Tayao's findings (2008). The findings show

that final rising intonation nearly followed the General American Pattern in yes/no question in most of the utterances of the student teachers. Data also show final rising intonation in wh- questions suggesting that the use of the final rising intonation pattern is for all types of questions.

With reference to their language background in which Filipino language takes more of their speaking time, the features of the production of intonation pattern of the student teachers seem to be very much dependent on the mother tongue. Results support the claim of Hirst and Di Cristo (1998).

Contribution to the Body of Knowledge

After conducting this study, the researcher formulated an assumption that the production of English intonation patterns of student teachers is erratic or inconsistent. This research study presumes the inclusion of the description in the production of intonation pattern to the Philippine English. As observed in the data, student teachers' spoken discourse performance on intonation pattern for wh and yes/ no questions were produced erratically. With these observations, a probable new description of Philippine English in terms of the production of intonation pattern may be considered.

5.   SUMMARY¸ CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary:

The study is a qualitative research in which it aimed to describe the English intonation pattern of the student teachers in on-campus teaching. Specifically, it aimed to describe the language profile of the student teachers and the performance of student teachers in terms of phonology.

Data from student teachers' language profile substantiate that their mother tongue (Filipino) appears to play a role in their spoken discourse performance. Filipino is the prevailing verbal communication medium among the student teachers under study. The data further show that the utterances of student teachers were accompanied by a range of intonation patterns. There was repeated use of mixture of intonations in asking wh-questions and yes/no questions. In particular, the student teachers had their ways of producing intonation in asking questions depending on what they wanted to get across. Notably, however, most of these questions were produced with rising intonation. In fact, they had the tendency to assign prominence to non-selective words. The discourse function of this intonation realization was to accentuate key ideas Brazil (1995).

Conclusions:

The student teachers' intonation patterns account for their spoken discourse performance. The student teachers demonstrated variations of intonation patterns in asking wh-questions and yes/no questions during their on-campus teaching. Their intonation patterns did not conform to the General American Pattern. Intonation patterns of student teachers for wh- and yes/no questions had rising tones. The analysis shows that the participants assigned prominence to words to highlight new information in order to expand students' shared understanding.

Thus, data of the present study reveal that there was an interference of Filipino language (L1) in the production of intonation patterns, of the utterance of English language (L2). Data further present a variety of Philippine English based on the utterances of student teachers which are patterned on the Philippine language structures.

Recommendations:

The study puts forward the following recommendations as a result of the conclusions:

There is an evidence of a need to generalize the results to other populations, it is necessary to have geographically diverse samples that would include student teachers across disciplines from different colleges and universities.

In addition, it is deemed necessary that the findings of the present research should be explored further. In particular, it would be interesting to more directly investigate production of English intonation pattern through a descriptive-quantitative longitudinal research which warrants both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Thus, it is hoped that the study of production of intonation pattern among non - English major student teachers presented here will serve as a stimulus for further research in this area.

REFERENCES

[1] Abrar-ul-Hassan, S. (2010). Nativized varieties of English and the linguistic identity: A Case of Indian English Speakers. The Journal of Asia TEFL (7) 2, 29-68.

[2] Al-Sibai, D. (2009). Structure of English testing Saudi English collocational competence and its development. King Saud University. http://docs.ksu.edu.sa/PDF/Articles06/Article060208.pdf.

[3] Brazil, D., Coulthard M., & Johns, C. (1980). Discourse intonation and language teaching. London:Longman.

[4] Brazil, D. 1985. The communicative value of intonation in English. Birmingham: Bleak House Books.

[5] Brazil, D. (1997). The communicative value of intonation in English. [2nd Edition] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[6] Bühmann, D., & Trudell B. (2008). Mother tongue matters: Local language as a key to effective learning. UNESCO. Place de Fontenoy, Paris, France. http://unesdoc.unesco. org/images/0016/001611/161121e.pdf

[7] Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). Focus on speaking. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.

[8] Cauldwell, R. & Hewings, M. (1996). Intonation rules in ELT textbooks. ELT Journal, 50(4): 327–334.

[9] Celik, M. (2001). Teaching English intonation to EFL/ESL students. TESL Journal, 7 (12). Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Celik-Intonation.html.

[10] Cohen, A. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18 (2), 253-267.

[11] Comrie, B. (1984). Interrogativity in Russian. The Modern Standard Language. Amsterdam, Philadelphia.

[12] Cruz-Ferreira, M. (1983). Non-native comprehension of intonation patterns in Portuguese and in English, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Manchester. Retrieved from http://www.academia. edu/922723/Portuguese_and_English_intonation_in_contrast

[13] Crystal, D. (1975). The English tone of voice. London: Edward Arnold.

[14] Dayag, D. (2003). English as an international language and the sociolinguistics of the Philippine English as a legitimate indigenized variety of English. Waseda University Digital Campus Consortium.http://www.waseda.jp/ ocw/AsianStudies

[15] Gall, M., Borg, W., & Gall, J. (1996). Educational research: An introduction. White Plains, NY: Longman.

[16] Gonzalez, A. (1990). Evaluating bilingual education in the Philippines: Towards a model of evaluation in language planning. In R. Baldauf Jr. & A. Luke (Eds.), Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific, (pp. 319-334). Clevedon, Avon: MultilingualMatters Ltd.

[17] Grabe, E., & Post, B. (2002). Intonational variation in the British Isles. In Proceedings of the Speech Prosody Conference. Aix-en- Provence: Laboratoire Parole et language, (pp. 343-346).

[18] Grabe, E. (2004). Intonational variation in urban dialects of English spoken in the British Isles. In Gilles, P. and Peters, J. (eds.) Regional Variation in Intonation. Linguistische Arbeiten, Tuebingen, Niemeyer, (pp. 9-31).

[19] Gussenhoven, C., & Warner, N. (2002) Laboratory Phonology 7, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

[20] Halliday, M. (1970). A course in spoken English: Intonation. London: Oxford University Press.

[21] Hirst, D., & Di Cristo, A. (1998). Intonation systems: A survey of twenty languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[22] Hlebec, B. (2004). A textbook of English phonology. Belgrade: Cigoja.http://www.transparent.com/

[23] Hudson, R. (1996). Sociolinguistics. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

[24] Jiang, P. (2005). Application of the optimality theory to the study of Chinese dialects. Suzhou University, Suzhou, China.

[25] Kachru, B. (2006). World Englishes and culture wars. In Kachru, Kachru, and Nelson, The handbook of World Englishes (pp. 446-471). UK: Blackwell Publishing.

[26] Kroll, B. (1990). Second language writing research. Insights for the classroom. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

[27] Lee, J. (2012). Teaching Hong Kong L2 learners wh-questions – Using a Learning Study approach. The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9(1), 171-191.

[28] Levis, J. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. TESOL Quarterly Forum— The Lingua Franca Core, 39(3) 369-377.

[29] Mc Arthur, T. (1998). Concise Oxford companion to the English language. Oxford University Press.

[30] Morrow, P.(2010). The Filipino language that might have been. Pilipino Express. Retrieved fromhttp: //www .pilipino-express.com/history-a-culture/in-other-words/911-the-filipino-language-that-might-have-been.html.

[31] Nolasco, R. (2007). Filipino and Tagalog, not so simple / how to value our languages. Retrieved from dalityapi.com./2007 _08_01_archive.html.

[32] Pareja, T. (2003). Selected Students' Oral Proficiency in Storytelling. Sinag. 2(2).

[33] Pennington, M., & Ellis, N. (2000). Cantonese speakers' memory for English sentences with prosodic clues. The Modern Language Journal, 84, 372-389.

[34] Rintell, E. (1984). But how did you feel about that? The learner's perception of emotion in speech, Applied linguistics 5, 255- 264.

[35] Tayao, L. (2004). The evolving study of Philippine English phonology. World Englishes, 23:77-90. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-71X.2004.00336.x

[36] Tayao, L. (2008). A lectal description of the phonological features of Philippine English. In Bautista , L., and Bolton, K. Philippine English: Linguistic and Literary Perspectives. Anvil.

[37] Wolff, J. (2006). Tagalog. Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/article/pii/

Author's Profile:

Dr. Emily Beltran is currently a Professor of Liberal Arts Department, Technological University of the Philippines, Cavite, Philippines. Dr. Beltran was educated at Philippine Women's University and graduated Bachelor of Arts in Communication Arts. She took her Master of Arts in Education Major in English Language Teaching at Philippine Normal University. For her doctoral degree, Dr. Beltran took the Doctor of Philosophy in Language Education at De La Salle University – Dasmariñas. She was formerly the department head of Liberal Arts before she became the Assistant Director for Academic Affairs and now the Head of Student Affairs. .She has been in the academe for 22 years.