



12-10-2021

Taglish: A Future Filipino-English Creole?

Doris T. Manglicmot
Western Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://cedar.wwu.edu/anthropology_scholarsweek



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Manglicmot, Doris T., "Taglish: A Future Filipino-English Creole?" (2021). *Anthropology Department Scholars Week*. 5.

https://cedar.wwu.edu/anthropology_scholarsweek/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Anthropology Department Scholars Week by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

Manglicmot, Doris T

ANTH 490/LING 402 Endangered Languages

Final Paper

December 10, 2021

Taglish: A Future Filipino-English Creole?

There are thirty-two dying languages in the Philippines (SIL). Many of these dying languages were stomped out by English and Filipino. Filipino is the standardized register of Tagalog. Growing up in the Philippines, I often observed first language Tagalog speakers ridicule those who learned it as a second language due to the accent their mother tongue contributes to the way they speak. I also experienced teachers and classmates alike laud those who spoke English fluently, especially ones with very little “Filipino” accent, and equate it with intelligence, regardless of the student’s true academic standing in other subjects. Though Filipino is the official language of the Philippines, English is taught alongside Filipino in schools. The government, business, and academia use English as means of communication. Many of the media, both printed and broadcast, as well as literature, are mostly in English (Jorolan-Quintero 761). With the rapid globalization of the Philippines, exacerbated by the colonial mentality that those who speak English are smarter and better, more and more Filipinos are favoring English over their native dialect. In fact, according to the 2016 census, out of 103.7 million population, there are roughly 50 million English as second language speakers and 28,700 English L1 speakers. In comparison, the Filipino language has 45 million L2 users, and the rest of the 184 living languages are trailing behind (SIL). With the above in mind, I became curious if there was a possibility that Tagalog will disappear in fifty to one hundred years if this trend continues. As I gathered data, read ethnographic works and research, I have found that Tagalog is not disappearing; it is giving birth to a creole language: *Taglish*.

Taglish is not only the contraction of the names of two main languages in the Philippines, Tagalog and English, but more importantly, it is the code-switching system of these two languages as it involves “the mixing of two or more language varieties within a single utterance or conversation” (Lesada 8). Though some may brush it off as simply a form of linguistic creativity, Lesada argues that it is not merely “the borrowing and Taglicization of English terms; it involves frequent, patterned, systematic alternation between the two languages, including blending characterized by affixation of Tagalog grammatical elements to English lexical items and vice versa” (ibid 11). Taglish is prevalent not only in the Tagalog-speaking regions in the Philippines but has spread throughout the country wherever the Filipino-English bilingualism is taught in schools and anywhere mass media can reach (ibid 10). Diasporic communities of Filipinos who migrated to the Anglosphere countries, including myself, converse in Taglish with families and fellow Filipino immigrants on a daily basis (ibid 8). According to Joseph Lesada, a study in 1993 “revealed that educated Filipino bilinguals ‘were employing—at the clause level—Filipino/Tagalog 23% of the time, English 27%, and Filipino-English conversational code-switching variety 50%” (Tango et al 2002, cited Lesada 11). It has not only penetrated all strata of society but has become a completely acceptable means of communication, oral and written, by the government, in schools, businesses, media, conversations around the table and even in churches. In fact, the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) recently published a Taglish version of the Bible. After sparking a debate, the CBCP responded that it was published to cater to the spiritual needs of the youth who grew up with Taglish as their mother tongue (Sampayan). Due to this phenomenon, there are those who believe Taglish is beginning to show signs of becoming a creole (Lesada 11). However, Lesada laments that though a great deal of study has been conducted on the Philippine bilingualism and its effects on the marginalized languages, very

little attention has been given to the phenomenon of Taglish (ibid 9). This inspired me to take on the subject.

As such, it is only fitting to tackle a worthy subject by first considering the rich history of the Philippines, which shaped the Filipinos into who they are today and why they speak Taglish in many parts of the archipelago. In the words of T. Ruanni Tupas: “Codeswitching need not only be described and interpreted, it must also be explained within the broadest possible framework of history and politics” (Tupas 1). As someone who was born and raised in the Philippines prior to migrating to the United States as a young adult, I share this sentiment. This paper is not polemic in any way, but I would be remiss if I did not properly include the moments in history—the dark and murky as well as the proud and victorious ones—that were pivotal to the development of the Filipino language today, as well as the spread of Taglish in the country.

Prior to the Spanish occupation, the Philippines did not have a central government, and the more or less 7100 scattered islands separated the inhabitants into small villages and communities called *barangays* which were governed by the *datu*, or chieftains. (Republic of the Philippines). Believed to be the first to cross the then-existing land bridges, the Negritos came to the islands 30,000-50,000 years ago, from Borneo and Sumatra. The word *barangay* originated from *balangay*, the Malay name for boat, which was believed to have carried people of Malay stock who “came from the south in successive waves, the earliest by land bridges and later in boats” (ibid). In the ninth century A.D., traders and merchants from China came and settled, followed by the Arabs in the 14th century, “introducing Islam in the south and extending some influence even to the Luzon” (ibid). When Ferdinand Magellan arrived on Philippine shores in 1521, the archipelago was a wealth of various ethnic cultures with over a hundred different languages and teeming with natural resources. For more than three centuries, Spain ruled the archipelago, and

the Philippines was named as such after King Philip of Spain. During this time, “a Spanish colonial social system was developed, complete with a strong centralized government and considerable clerical influence” (ibid). Despite this, Filipinos were restive which led to several rebellions. One led by Emilio Aguinaldo in 1896 will eventually drive the Philippines to achieve independence from Spain on June 12, 1898. However, the Philippines was far from being free of colonizers. Spain “ceded the islands to the United States under the terms of the Treaty of Paris (December 10, 1898), that ended the war” (ibid). What was to be a temporary American occupation to assist their “little brown brothers” (Serquiña) into establishing a “free and democratic government” (Republic) lasted nearly five decades. Unwilling to allow another colonizer to take over their beloved land, “a war of resistance against the U.S. rule, led by Revolutionary President Aguinaldo, broke out in 1899” (ibid). This war went on for four years until Aguinaldo was captured and forced to swear allegiance to the United States. In an effort to completely subdue further rebellion, the Americans opted to seize the minds of the Filipino people. Renato Constantino—a renowned Philippine historian who challenged his fellow Filipinos to rethink their colonial past—explains that conquering a nation with sheer military might alone does not guarantee subjugation: “The moulding of men’s minds is the best means of conquest. Education, therefore, serves as a weapon in wars of colonial conquest” (Constantino 2). As long as the hearts of the countrymen remain nationalist, no victory was guaranteed to stay.

The challenge with implementing an educational system in the Philippines was that there were roughly 120-150 languages spoken by various ethnic tribes living on lands separated by water. Learning one of them was already daunting; learning over 100 in order to instruct the Filipinos will take a long time for the Americans to accomplish. In addition, not all of these languages have a written form suitable for instruction. Therefore, English was implemented as the teaching

language. In a not too distant past, the same was done to the Chickasaw and Choctaw tribes whose dominant tongue in their lands eventually became English through education. According to Jenny Davis, “over the centuries, more and more Chickasaw people came to be bilingual in English and Chickasaw; eventually, the transmission of Chickasaw from parents to children decreased to the point that the majority of Chickasaw citizens were monolingual English speakers (Davis 35). Confident of their success in educating the “allegedly primitive and savage Native Americans, African Americans and Puerto Ricans” (Serquiña 61), the Americans wasted no time in establishing public schools in the Philippines and implementing English as the teaching language. Echoing Constantino’s sentiments, Christopher Dawe argues through the framework of language governmentality (Dawe 62) that “from the arrival of the American colonizers, language policy in the Philippines has been designed to produce an ideal citizenry capable of speaking the languages seen as promoting democracy and national unity” (Dawe 62). French philosopher Michael Foucault is accredited as the first to develop the concept of “governmentality”—a concept in which “societies promote organized practices to mold citizens into the desired ideal of a particular sociohistorical context (Rose and Miller 1990)” (Dawe 62). Language governmentality is an important extension of Foucault’s concept (Pennycook, 2002; Flores, 2014, cited Dawes 62). Dawe argues that though this ideology is commendable, language governmentality equally produced damaging effects: “marginalizing minority languages and alienating their speakers from full participation in society” (ibid). In a comparative study of the Philippine education status of indigenous languages and the colonial languages, J.J. Smoliez emphasizes that “this move was directed not only against Spanish, but against all Filipino languages, which were outlawed from school (Smoliez, 53). Between the 1920s and 1930s,

English has successfully been implemented in every essential part of the school curriculum and has taken root in many Filipino's minds.

Iconizing English as the language of democracy and national unity allowed the Americans to effectively implement it as the teaching language. Iconicity, as described by Susan Gal and Judith Irvine, “involves a transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic practices, features or varieties and the social images with which they are linked” (Gal and Irvine 973). By promoting English this way, the Americans gradually shifted the ideals of the Filipino people with each time they were praised on how well they were learning the language; each time they were lauded as instrumental to democracy; each time they were told that learning English is essential to national unity; all the while overlooking that they were not free from the grasp of colonizers and that these colonizers were forbidding them to speak their native languages in school. This is what Gal and Irvine refer to as *recursivity*—involving “the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level” (Gal and Irvine 974). Constantino's sentiments seemed to reflect recursivity: that the education system and a unifying language were America's means for pacifying the Filipinos

“who were defending their newly-won freedom from an invader who had posed as an ally. The education of the Filipino under American sovereignty was an instrument of colonial policy. The Filipino has to be educated as a good colonial. Young minds had to be shaped to conform to American ideas. Indigenous Filipino ideals were slowly eroded in order to remove the last vestiges of resistance. Education served to attract the people to the new masters and at the same time to dilute their nationalism which had just succeeded in overthrowing a foreign power” (Constantino 3).

The American colonizers had high hopes that English will transform the Philippines into a “Communicative Utopia,” a phrase coined by Oscar Tantoco Serquiña Jr. to refer to the American ideal of “bringing order to the diversity of tongues in the Philippine Islands, and converting the Filipino people into sociolinguistic subjects capable of communicating with one another and taking part in the discourse of a broader Anglophone community” (Serquiña 60). However, they were disenchanted when it resulted into a “scandalous cacophony of Filipino-speaking subjects... profusely described... [as] ‘the ugly sounds of colony’” (ibid 65). Initially, English was taught by the Americans, but were ultimately replaced by Filipinos whose English was often imperfect (Rafael 287). As a result, English was spoken in many distorted accents and pronunciations due to the various intonations and pronunciations contributed by the mother tongue languages. Hence, creating a uniformed English in the Philippines while fitting the Filipinos into a mold of a perfect colony that reflects their ruler’s image and speech (Serquiña 67) proved to be an impossible dream the Americans failed to achieve.

When the Philippines became a self-governing commonwealth in 1935, the legislative body wasted no time in mandating “the adoption of an indigenous language—Tagalog—the standard language of the Philippines” (Dawe 68). Though they believed that a national language was necessary to bind the nation, and that English proficiency was still viewed as the language of democracy, they strongly felt the need to elevate one of their indigenous languages (ibid 68). Tagalog was chosen partly because it was the language spoken by the “educated elite who formed the backbone of the rebellion against the Spanish rule” (ibid 65), though the Commonwealth funded the Institute of National Language (INL) to research seven languages and choose the most “developed in structured and literature” (ibid 68). With the elevation of Tagalog, the language governmentality shifted once more. In 1959, the Philippine national language name was changed

into Pilipino, but was still generally Tagalog in form. Dawe uses the argument of Andrew Gonzalez (1980) to explain the change in name was “to [provide a] national rather than ethnic label and connotation” (Gonzalez, 1998, p. 487, cited Dawe 70). It was then when early forms of Tagalog-English codeswitching in the Tagalog-speaking regions emerged as a product of decades of contact (Lesada 8).

Not everyone was supportive of this change. Some saw this as elitist and propagates neocolonialism. The elevation of Tagalog as the basis for the Filipino language also marked the gradual *erasure* of the vernacular languages. Erasure in this context is not the annihilation of the speakers but “the process in which ideology... renders some persons or activities or sociolinguistic phenomena invisible” (Gal and Irvine 974). The law makers at the time may not have intended for the rest of the Philippine languages to disappear; only that their identity as Filipinos be elevated after decades of being a colony. However, they also did very little to sustain or promulgate them until those whose MT was not Tagalog grew increasingly restive, arguing that “a person could be a Filipino without speaking Pilipino” (Dawe 70). This reminded me of the Gerald Roche’s Procrustean Bed, “a rigid conceptual framework into which we squeeze reality, violently contorting and butchering until it fits” (Roche 493). According to Greek mythology, a murderer named Procrustes entices his victims into his home as guests and provides them with an iron bed. When they are fast asleep, he chops them if they were too long, or stretches them if they were too short, until they fit the bed (ibid). The Procrustean Bed was such a graphic illustration of what people often think of the People’s Republic of China’s (PRC) erasure of the 55 *shaoshu minzu*—the minority nationalities—but Roche argues that it is not a single Procrustean Bed through which all languages are molded into; it is more like a ward full of Procrustean Beds where each *minzu* language gets their own bed and are amputated, transplanted and mutilated

according to their place in the hierarchy. Some have bigger beds, some have cramped beds, but all are subjected to violence of some kind: “surgical violence, of amputations, grafts, transplants, excisions and transfusions... and yet throughout these procedures, all the patients on the Procrustean ward are sustained by a complex system of life support, their vital signs carefully monitored, each obliged to remain alive” (ibid 501). Roche uses Rob Nixon’s term “slow violence (Rob Nixon, 2011, *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*, cited Roche 500).”

Roche explains that it is slow because the violence is not evident on the surface, and the process takes time and through generations. Though there are no guns or bombs involved, it is violent because it penetrates homes, families, relationships, practices, and education, and it disturbs the process of passing on the mother tongue language through generations (Roche 500). Though the Philippine Government did not prohibit or ban certain languages when it elevated Tagalog, in Nixon’s illustration, it is violent because it provided no options for those who use non-Tagalog languages other than to abandon them and use the promoted ones in a systematic, institutional process. We know that any country, nation, or society that has been put through any institutional practice take decades and centuries, if not forever, to abandon such ingrained practices and change the way they do things.

The metaphor of the Procrustean Ward became more evident when in 1973, during Marshall Law under the Ferdinand Marcos regime, Pilipino was changed to Filipino by the supreme court, in an effort to include “those Philippine languages with the voiceless labiodental fricative” (ibid), and that both English and Filipino were to be the national languages of the Philippines (1973 Constitution). The following year, the Department of Education and Culture implemented the bilingual languages for teaching: “Pilipino in social science subjects and English in science and mathematics subjects” (Alvarez 1). After decades of being absent in classrooms,

the Filipino language was now mandated by law to be present. However, it was not as inclusive as the non-Filipino MT speakers had hoped. The policy makers took “a ‘universalist’ rather than a ‘purist’ approach of accepting phonological units and other features from other Philippine languages and from second or foreign languages, in this case, Spanish and English” (Gonzalez, 1198, p. 488, cited Dawe 70). As a result, many of the non-Filipino MT speakers continued to use their MT at home but found themselves having to set it aside once more when they step foot in schools. Dawe adds: “The language governmentality model of a Filipino speaking English and Filipino remains. This law [was] not designated to elevate the regional languages to an equal level as much as it is to increase the proficiency of English and Filipino. The law specifically transitions students out of their language and into English and Filipino” (Dawe 73). The process of strapping down hundreds of ethnic languages onto their own beds in the Procrustean ward began. Despite the protest, bilingualism was implemented in schools and it cemented English and Filipino as the nation’s official languages.

When the Marcos regime was overthrown, the Marshall Law ended following the assassination of Benigno Aquino Jr. in 1983. His wife, Corazon Aquino, was elected as the 11th President of the Philippines. Aquino worked to restore the legislative branch and the 1987 Constitution was passed. The People Power Revolution emerged from the Filipino people’s utmost desire to resist years of martial law coupled with nationalistic rhetoric. The new constitution, according to Dawe, “was very specifically written to reflect the nation’s new shift in governmentality, one that favored broad participation and was suspicious of strong centralized government” (Dawe 71). They believed that Filipinos should still be fluent in Filipino and English, but included provisions stating that “the regional languages are the auxiliary official languages in the regions and shall serve as auxiliary media of instruction therein” (Constitution of

the Republic of the Philippines, 1987). This was a commendable move, considering the history of the country. However, by this time, Filipino and English as national languages have pushed several of the indigenous languages aside and many of the younger generation no longer speak their parents' mother tongue. The presidential administrations following Aquino were a mishmash of supporters and oppositions of this policy which aggravated the situation: they either ratified policies favoring Filipino and the indigenous languages or strengthened the Philippine English. Finally, in 2012 the Philippine Department of Education issued Order No. 16, series of 2012, known as the Mother Tongue Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) policy involving the "implementation of local mother tongues as the language of instruction in Kindergarten to year three (K -3), with the official languages (Filipino and English) being introduced as the language of instruction after grade three" (Williams et al). This policy aims to "improve the pupil's language and cognitive development, as well as his/her socio-cultural awareness" (DepEd 2012, cited Jorolan-Quintero 762). One challenge with this policy is that the schools were not equipped with the proper materials for instruction. "For instance, the lack of suitable textbooks is becoming a major concern for teachers. Although the Department of Education has provided some reading materials, these are either in English or Filipino, and require translation into the mother tongue, which teachers have to do themselves" (Jorolan-Quintero 759), says Genevieve Jorolan-Quintero who documented oral traditions of indigenous languages in the Philippines in support of the policy. Despite the efforts and provisions of the government, this policy may still prove ineffective in reviving the mother tongues because after the third grade, children were to learn Filipino. Leaving it to the schools to revive MT may prove ineffective. In his book, *Reversing Language Shift*, (1997), Joshua Fishman argues:

“The assumption that ‘proper schooling’ can really help a threatened ethnolinguistic entity to break out of this vicious cycle (the cycle of running harder and harder in order to finally end up, at best, in the same, or nearly in the same, place, generation after generation) is quite widespread, particularly among educators and other language-conscious segments of the lay public, and even among many sociolinguistics too, although the latter should really know better” (Fishman 1997).

Unfortunately, even if the Philippine Department of Education intervened and produced materials in indigenous languages, the young generation raised in Filipino-English bilingualism in their later childhood can barely understand, let alone speak, their mother tongue.

With the constant push and pull between national languages and indigenous mother tongues over the years, one proved to steadily spread across the country. Taglish has penetrated different levels of the sociopolitical strata in many different regions of the archipelago. However, to propose that Taglish can potentially become a creole is a hefty claim. After all, it is by no means a pidgin today, therefore, a creole cannot possibly emerge from it because most Filipinos who speak Taglish are fluent in both English and Filipino and are codeswitching. Frankly, the idea of a creole becoming the language of the future Filipino generations may not be a welcomed thought for many because of the stigma around creole. Sandro Sessarego addresses this thirty-year “Creole Debate” which “focuses on the structural and typological status of creole languages” (McWhorter, 2018b, cited Sessarego 2). According to Sessarego, on the one hand, scholars argue that creoles can be classified according to their structural properties or typological class: “(1) minimal inflection affixation; (2) minimal use of tones; and (3) semantically transparent derivation” (ibid) and can be considered as “the world’s simplest grammars” since they recently

developed from pidgins and did not have enough time to develop complex systems. On the other side of the debate, there are those who argue that this logic is racially biased because it is often associated with black slavery and alludes to the colonial mentality that Africans are cognitively lacking and incapable of learning their colonizers' languages. Sessarego asserts that "creoles are not the simplest languages in the world, since in the other aspects of their grammars (e.g., syntax, phonology and semantics) they may inherit a fair number of overt distinctions, which make them quite complex, from an overall comparative perspective" (ibid). To depict creole as something of lower class is debasing and strips the speaker of identity. Haitians understand this dilemma. In 1987, Haitian Creole became an official language of Haiti, alongside French. However, not all were thrilled having the word "creole" attached to the language name. Jean Previllon recommends detaching the word "creole" from the language name, not because he thinks the word itself is bad, but it is for Haitians to better "appreciate their distinctive linguistic contribution to the world, to recognize their membership in the family of world languages, and to proudly acknowledge Creole as a family of language with equal ranking to other language families" (Previllon 11). He argues that though in the past, the word had a negative connotation, it has gone through many sociological changes. According to Previllon, to remove the term "Creole" from the language name "elevates Haitian from the status of adjective (a qualifier) to that of noun (a substantive). By giving Haitian an independent status, we bring it fully into the family of official languages such as English, German, French and Spanish" (ibid 9). To Previllon, adding the word "creole" to the language name of Haiti is to be apologetic that it is a creole—a second class language. He argues that the word "creole" itself need not be treated as a mere descriptive word; it should be treated as a noun, worthy of the status of any other languages in the world. To remove the term "creole" from Haitian Creole means to "lift the torch a little higher" (ibid 12) for both Haitian as a

language and Creole as a family of languages. I believe that if the critics of Taglish becoming a Creole will hear Sessarego and Previllion's arguments, they may see it in a different light and change their minds the way it has changed mine.

Opponents of Taglish will advocate for speaking pure Filipino—one that existed prior to contact with English. However, this purity is no longer possible; it may not have necessarily been present then. With nearly four centuries of Spanish rule prior to American occupation, many of what we consider Tagalog words were, in fact, borrowed from Spanish: *lamesa, pantalon, abodago, banyo, calle, cochero*, etc. In reality, Tagalog has, in fact, been peppered with Spanish slang that have “accrued enormous interest over time, investing vernacular languages with something in common. What was once the language of imperial authority has come to be parceled and circulated, borrowed and shared to provide ‘the foundation of national language’” (Rafael 297). In his article entitled “The War of Translation: Colonial Education, American English and Tagalog Slang in the Philippines,” Vicente L. Rafael highlights the work of Nick Joaquin in 1963: “The Language of the Streets.” According to Rafael, Joaquin found it amusing that the national language of the Philippines, was based on borrowed words and slangs (Rafael 296); that Tagalog slang and non-Tagalog languages, are “the proper heir to what he calls ‘Spanish,’ but what historically was *espanol de Parian*” (ibid 297). Joaquin adds that if there is fluidity between local languages, invented on the streets by “anonymous word coiners” (ibid 298) who spread it like wildfire faster than the schools can, and has neither a source or directive, then the foundational status of the Filipino languages will have to be qualified not as the “firm bedrock on which the national language is built, but shifting and contingent nodes linking various languages as in a network” (ibid 298). Rafael expounds that during the lengthy Spanish rule, “many Castilian words have seeped through the vernaculars, becoming indistinguishable parts of their vocabulary” (ibid

297). Referencing the works of Emanuel Luis Romanillos (1992, “El Chabacano de Cavite: Crepusculo de un Criollo Hispano-Filipino?”) and Benedict Anderson (2008, *Why Counting Counts: A Study of Forms of Consciousness and Problems of Language in Noli me Tangere and El Filibusterismo*), Rafael explains that by the late nineteenth century, creole languages emerged in the Philippines. They were languages based on Spanish or Chinese, like Hokkien, fused together with vernaculars. Some of these were *chabacano* (or *chavacano*), a mix of Spanish and indigenous languages; Philippine Hokkien, an amalgamation of Chinese and Filipino; and *español de Parian*, or Spanish language of the marketplace. Initially, these languages were used in Manila and surrounding port cities, but quickly spread throughout the streets, in various levels of the social strata, and “egalitarianly shared by poor vendors and their elite student customers. A patois... but also an instrument of social communication, *not an emblem of political shame* (emphasis added)” (Anderson 2008, cited Rafale 297). Today, if one flips through Filipino television channels or thumbs through social media, they may find shows, videos and posts of Filipinos speaking in Filipino slang. Similar to other cultures, slangs can signify hipness, coolness, modernity, and placement in the social strata. If Filipinos accept this version of Tagalog without so much of a protest, why is Taglish any different?

I have always wondered why most Filipinos I know do not—rather, will not—converse solely in English or solely in Filipino or Tagalog with another Filipino who speaks either language fluently. Instead, it is always some form or degree of Taglish. Tupas explicates: “If we set this fact against the homogenizing discourses of globalism, nationalism, and ethnicity, it is not difficult to surmise that codeswitching is the Filipino’s resistance—tacit though this may be—to the homogenizing tendencies of these discourses” (Tupas 2). The discourse here pertains to the argument between those who align their national identity with the unifying national languages—

English and Filipino—and those who advocate for the non-Tagalog MT, by removing the English and Tagalog from the pedestal and reintroducing the other languages in schools. Tupas asserts that if viewed this way, “codeswitching, partly or largely, defines Filipinos and helps constitute their reality” (Tupas 1). He echoes Monica Heller’s sentiments (1992) that a language choice is a political choice. Choosing to use Taglish allows the speaker to become an agent of him or herself and not a victim of sociopolitical constructs (Tupas 4). Therefore, Tupas advocates that the future generation to document English-Filipino codeswitching: “To codify codeswitching in the Philippines is to codify a history where Filipinos are finally the active shapers of their own experiences, the agents of their own struggles towards knowing who they are” (Tupas 4). If Taglish were to someday become a creole, documenting codeswitching today will empower the future generation.

CONCLUSION

The Philippine historical and political past is tumultuous. Having been subjected to colonization for hundreds of years, this greatly affected not only the culture, politics, and mindset of the Filipino people, but has dramatically changed their languages. Today, education is taught in two languages—English and Filipino, Filipino being the standardized register of Tagalog—and it has been inculcated in the minds of the young ones that English is the language of democracy and progress while Filipino is of nationality and patriotism. Eventually, codeswitching between these two languages, called Taglish, became prevalent that there are children in the Metro Manila, and possibly in other regions of the Philippines, who either only speak English as their mother tongue, or have embraced Taglish instead of being fluent in Filipino.

Growing up, I generally avoided using Taglish because of the connotation that it was elitist and worshiper of colonialism. However, after poring through studies and articles, I am beginning to see Taglish in a different light. As much as I want to salvage Tagalog to its purest form, it is no longer possible because of years of colonization which has dramatically changed, augmented, and amputated the language in many ways. In Lesada's words, "all in all, we conclude that Taglish is a product of a histories and complex language situation, juggling shifting language attitudes, policies, domains, and cultural phenomena. It is likely that a systematic Tagalog-English code-switching system might have never emerged had there been a change in one or several of these major contributing factors" (Lesada 22). Thanks to Lesada's extensive work, Taglish codifying has begun, but it is far from the documentation it deserves. The difficulty lies in the fact that English did not develop uniformly across the nation, and Filipino learned by different non-Tagalog native speakers is of varying gradient across the archipelago. As such, I have yet to see an extensive study, even at least in the Metro Manila region, of the percentage of the population whose children are growing up speaking Taglish as their mother tongue. Should there be no change in the language governmentality of the Philippines favoring the English-Filipino bilingualism and should there be no additional efforts in salvaging the marginalized languages and reinforcement of mastering Filipino, I suspect that in a century or so, today's codeswitching youth will produce children who will no longer be codeswitching but will embrace Taglish as their mother tongue. To this, I recommend that the Filipino people brace themselves and engage in surveys, research, and proper documentation in order to match the pace of language evolution and to enable the next generation become their own agents: to choose for themselves the mother tongue they will love and a nationality they will be proud of.

Bibliography

- Alvarez, Anicia A. 1991. "Pilipino or English in Science Learning? The Case of Bilingual Education in the Philippines." A paper presented at the International Conference on Bilingual and National Development (Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei, December 9-12, 1991). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED357622>
- Constantino, Renato. 1996. "The Miseducation of the Filipino." *Malaya Books*, 1966, pp. 39-65
- "Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines, The, 1987." *Official Gazette*, 1987. Retrieved December 9, 2021, <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1987-constitution/>
- Davis, Jenny L. 2018. *Talking Indian: Identity and Language Revitalization in the Chickasaw Renaissance* (Arizona, The University of Arizona Press, 2018).
- Dawe, Christopher. 2014. "Language Governmentality in Philippine Education Policy." *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)*, University of Pennsylvania, Vol. 29, No. 1, Spring 2014, pp. 61-77. <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol29/iss1/4/>
- Fishman, Joshua A. "Limitations on School Effectiveness in Connection with Mother Tongue Transmission." *Reversing Language Shift*, (Clevedon, [England]; Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters, 1997).
- Gal, Susan and Judith T. Irvine. 1995. "The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How

Ideologies Construct Difference.” *Social Research*, Vol. 62, No. 4, Defining the Boundaries of Winter 1995: pp. 967-1001. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40971131>

Jorolan-Quintero, Genevieve. 2018. “Oral Traditions: An Aid to Implementation of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education in the Philippines’ Basic Education Programme.” *International Review of Education/ Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, Vol. 64, Issue 6, December 2018: pp. 759-777.

Lesada, Joseph. 2017. “Taglish in Metro Manila: An Analysis of Tagalog-English Code-Switching.” *University of Michigan*, 2017.

<https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/139623/jlesada.pdf>

“1973 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines.” *Official Gazette*. Retrieved December 9, 2021, <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1973-constitution-of-the-republic-of-the-philippines-2/>

Previllon, Jean. 1993. “What’s In a Name: An Awakening of the Haitian Linguistic Consciousness (An Argument for Haitian as the Native Language of Haitians), *Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*, April 1993. Retrieved December 10, 2021, <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Previllon+Haitian&id=ED367179>

Rafael, Vicente. 2015. “The War of Translation: Colonial Education, American English, and Tagalog Slang in the Philippines.” *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 74, no. 2, May 2015: pp. 283-302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911814002241>

“Republic of the Philippines.” 2003. *Background Notes on Countries of the World 2003*.

<https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.library.wvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&d>

[b=a9h&AN=11208051&site=ehost-live](https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.library.wvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&d)

Roche, Gerald. 2019. “Articulating Language Oppression: Colonialism, Coloniality and the

Erasure of Tibet’s Minority Languages.” *Patterns of Prejudice*, Vol. 53, No. 5, October 29,

2019: pp. 487-514, doi:10.1080/0031322X.2019.1662074.

Sampayan, Jacs T. 2020. “A Taglish version of the New Testament was just made available—and

some people are angry.” *ABS-CBN ANCX*, August 16, 2020. Retrieved December 10,

2021. [https://news.abs-cbn.com/ancx/culture/books/08/16/20/a-taglish-version-of-the-](https://news.abs-cbn.com/ancx/culture/books/08/16/20/a-taglish-version-of-the)

[new-testament-was-just-made-availableand-some-people-are-angry](https://news.abs-cbn.com/ancx/culture/books/08/16/20/a-taglish-version-of-the)

Serquiña, Jr. Oscar Tantoco. 2020. “Communicative Utopias.” *Performance Research*, Vol. 25,

Issue 8, December 2020: pp. 60-68. DOI: 10.1080/13528165.2020.1930782

Sessarego, Sandro. 2020. “Not All Grammatical Features are Robustly Transmitted During the

Emergence of Creoles.” *Humanities and Social Science Communications* Vol. 7, no. 130,

(2020). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-00611-x>

SIL International. 2021. “Philippines”. *Ethnologue: languages of the world*. Accessed

November 8, 2021. <https://www.ethnologue.com/>

Smoliez, J.J. "National Language Policy in the Philippines: A Comparative Study of the Education Status of 'Colonial' and Indigenous Languages with Special Reference to Minority Tongues." *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 12, no. 2, 1984: pp. 51-67. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24490825>

Tupas, T. Ruanni F. 1998. "Code-switching as Resistance: A Philippine Experience." A Paper presented during the International Conference on Language Education, Language Education Council (LEDCO) of the Philippines and the Language Study and Research Center, Inc (LSRCI). Manila Midtown Hotel, April 34, 1998.
https://www.academia.edu/39950723/CODESWITCHING_AS_RESISTANCE_A_PHILIPPINE_EXPERIENCE

Williams, Alan Dr., Dr. Romylyn Metila, Lea Angela Pradilla, Melissa Marie Digo. 2014. "Understanding Best Practices in Mother Tongue Based-Multilingual Education in the Philippines." *Assessment, Curriculum and Technology Research Centre*, 31 July 2014. Retrieved December 9, 2021 <https://actrc.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/mtb-mle-booklet.pdf>.