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Abstract

There are two seemingly conflicting hypotheses on the status and impact of the Davao Filipino language. On one hand, Rubrico is optimistic that it could be a model variety of a more democratic and inclusive Filipino language that should be open to contributions and alterations from the other Philippine languages. On the other hand, Dolalas is giving a warning that the continued hegemony of the Tagalog/Filipino language on the Cebuano language will eventually destroy the latter. When conceptualized using the communication accommodation theory of Giles, the seemingly conflicting hypotheses would actually fit into a single construct that lines up the Cebuano language, the process of divergence, the Davao Filipino language, the process of convergence, and the Tagalog/Filipino language. Using the same communication accommodation theory, this paper assessed the validities of the two hypotheses, and attempted to formulate more acceptable hypotheses on the status and impact of the Davao Filipino language.
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1.0 Introduction

Davao City is an urban center located at the southern part of the main island of Mindanao. Figure 1 presents a map showing the province-like size of this city as surrounded by the provinces of Davao Del Sur, Cotabato, Bukidnon, and Davao Del Norte. Davao City is the biggest among the Philippine cities in terms of land area, and the third biggest in terms of population (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2016), next to Quezon City and Manila City. Since Quezon City, Manila City, and Caloocan City are all in the National Capital Region, Davao City can be said to be the biggest in terms of population among the Philippine Cities outside of the National Capital Region.
In the ethnographic map of the Philippines drawn by Blumentritt (1890), the area of what is now Davao City is said to be inhabited by the Visayans, Guiangans, and Tagabawas, who were surrounded by Kalagans, Bagobos, Mandayas, and Samals. The Visayans, a generic category that included the Cebuanos, were brought there by the Spaniards who just half a century before Blumentritt’s map was made and was able to control that region in southern Mindanao. When the colonization of the Philippine archipelago was passed from Spain to the United States of America in 1898, Japanese settlers started to dominate the development of the same region, bringing in more Visayans and other Philippine ethnolinguistic groups. During the time of the Philippine Commonwealth (1935-1946), still more Filipinos from the other parts of the country were encouraged to migrate to Mindanao to help develop the island’s economic potential.

Today, Davao City, just like most of the Philippine urban centers, is a melting pot of Philippine ethnolinguistic groups. The following table shows how the city’s current 1.6 million inhabitants are constituted by more than a dozen of these ethnolinguistic groups.

**Table 1. The Constitutive Ethnolinguistic Groups of Davao City’s About 1.6 Million Inhabitants**

| Ethnolinguistic Groups | Percentage of the Total Population of Davao City |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Cebuano                | 74.56%                                           |
| Tagalog                | 3.86%                                            |
| Hiligaynon             | 3.43%                                            |
| Bagobo, Guiangao       | 3.16%                                            |
| Tagacaolo              | 2.38%                                            |
| Manobo                 | 2.15%                                            |
| Mandaya                | 2.01%                                            |
| Maguindanao            | 1.91%                                            |
| B’laan                 | 1.67%                                            |
| Dabawenyo              | 1.26%                                            |
| Ilocano                | 1.01%                                            |
Of the country’s biggest ethnolinguistic groups, five are found in Davao City: 1) Cebuano (constituting 74.56%); 2) Tagalog/Filipino (constituting 3.86%); 3) Hiligayn (constituting 3.43%); 4) Ilocano (constituting 1.01%); and 5) Waray (constituting 0.55%). The interaction between the Cebuano ethnolinguistic group, the most powerful in the city in terms of population, and the Tagalog/Filipino ethnolinguistic group, the most powerful in the city in terms of prestige as this group represents the original inhabitants of the country’s capital and the native speakers of the country’s national language, conditioned the emergence of the Davao Filipino language.

Indeed, the Davao Filipino language is a hybrid language consisting of the Cebuano and the Tagalog/Filipino languages. Karlo Antonio Galay-David, in his master’s thesis at Silliman University “Davao Filipino and its Literary Possibilities,” made a distinction between the Davao Filipino that is being used by the city’s Cebuano population, which is sometimes called “Tagbis” (portmanteau for “Tagalog-Visayan”) or “Bislog” (portmanteau for Visayan-Tagalog), and the Davao Filipino that is being used by the city’s Tagalog/Filipino population (10-11). This paper accepts the validity of Galay-David’s distinction. But owing to the huge difference between the city’s Cebuano and Tagalog/Filipino populations, this paper is constrained to focus on the Davao Filipino language as being used by the city’s 74.56% Cebuano population.

Table 2 presents some examples of Davao Filipino sentence, as compared to Standard Tagalog/Filipino, Cebuano, and with the corresponding English translations.

| Davao Filipino       | Standard Filipino       | Cebuano          | English Translation                  |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Kainit masyado ngayon, uy! | Masyadong mainit ngayon! | Kainit kayo karon, uy! | It is so hot today!                  |
| Makainis talaga ‘yang El Niño ba, kay parati gacauseng brownout ditto sa Mindanao. | Nakakainis talaga ‘yang El Niño dahil palaging sanhing brownout ditto sa Mindanao. | Makalagot kayo kanang El Niño, kay kanunay bang nagpa-brownout diri sa Mindanao. | The El Niño is really irritating, as it creates power outages here in Mindanao. |
| Manghiram ka gud ng pala doon sa kapitbahay. | Humiram ka nga ng pala doon sa kapit bahay. | Manghuwam ka gud ug pala didto sa silingan. | Borrow a shovel from the neighbor. |
| Akin nalang gani yan. Madami ka na bitaw gikain na chocolate. | Akin na nga lang ‘yan. Marami kana rin namang nakain na chocolate. | Akua na lang gani na. Daghan kana bitaw nakaon nga chocolate. | Can I just have that? Anyway, you already ate a lot of chocolates. |
| Hindi niya man ako | Hindi niya naman ako | Wala man niya ko | I was not told to go to |
Conceptualizing Davao Filipino in Various Language Contact Theories

The emergence of Davao Filipino is a linguistic phenomenon that was a result of the contact of various cultures in Davao City. Mey (2007) sees that a meeting of cultures in the intercultural sphere may result to an irreversible intracultural change. Borrowing and the use of words from one language (L1) to another (L2) may also result to language adaptation and acquisition. That, in turn, will develop into a new language or dialect.

Albino, Romo, and Lovitos (2016), in their paper “The Nature of Conyo in Davao City: a Language Inquiry,” referred to the hybrid language as Davao Conyo due to the prestige and increased confidence that speakers feel when they speak it. In Davao City, speaking Davao Filipino can be a basis to show their privileged status in society. The conyo way of speaking (Tagalog-Spanish and Tagalog-English) in the Philippines has always been linked to the upper-middle class, or individuals of high socioeconomic status. This sociolect was the result to the Filipinos’ need of social power in the postcolonial era, the power that was deprived from them by the Spanish and Americans. During the colonial times, only the colonizers and a small population of Filipino elite were able to study, understand, and speak the language of their masters (Garvida, 2012). For Blumenberg (2010), this is a metaphor that show “fundamental certainties, conjectures, and judgments in relation to which the attitudes and expectations, actions and inactions, longings and disappointments, interests and indifferences, of an epoch.”

Dolalas (n.d.), in her essay “Davao Tagalog: Endangerment of Binisaya Language,” saw that the Cebuano speakers in Davao City are undergoing a process of code-switching to and borrowing words from the Tagalog language. This may be a form of language interference. As Thomason and Kaufmann (1991) put it, language interference may lead into two results: (1) dominance of the dominant language will be maintained; or (2) borrowing words, in its most general definition, is the assimilation of foreign elements in one language.

Galay-David (2014), in his master’s thesis titled “Davao Filipino and its Literary Possibilities,” attempted to theorize the hybrid language as a Filipino creole continuum. He based his analysis on Platt’s three-dimensional continuum of Singlish. A creole continuum of Davao Filipino would consider ‘standard Filipino’ at the acrolectal level, the ‘standard Filipino’ with some regional language influences at the mesolectal level, and Davao Filipino at the basilectal level. He further discussed creolization using Rickford (as cited in David) and said the sociolectal gradation of language contact is important ‘in efforts to establish a new cultural identity or forge new means of artistic expression.’ Lastly, he emphasized that the emergence of a
sociolectal dimension of Davao Filipino should be looked into using a postcolonial lens when talking about creolization, with the acrolect as the colonial language.

**The Rubrico Hypothesis**

Jessie Grace Rubrico is a Filipino linguist with expertise on Cebuano, Maranao, Tausug, and Yakan languages, and who is based at University College Sedaya International in Malaysia. Her hypothesis on the Davao Filipino language was first published in the essay “Filipino Davao Variety: a Linguistic Description” of 2011, and was further developed in the essay “Indigenization of the Filipino: the Case of the Davao City Variety” of 2012.

Rubrico characterized the Davao Filipino language as having clauses where most words are from the Tagalog/Filipino language, and where such Tagalog/Filipino words are processed using the Cebuano language morphosyntactic rules (2012, 14). She then rhetorically asked the question whether the Davao Filipino language is a dialect of the Tagalog or of the Cebuano languages. She answered that both the native speakers of the Tagalog and Cebuano languages would reject the Davao Filipino language as a dialect of their languages. For her, the Davao Filipino language is a “germination of the Filipino language per se evolving into a language distinct from Tagalog”. Thus, it is neither Cebuano nor Tagalog.

Rubrico’s statement (2012) is founded on a subtle assumption that the Filipino language is not the same as the Tagalog language, nor is it a dialect of the Tagalog language, and still nor is it simply the variety of Tagalog language spoken in the National Capital Region of the country. For her, the Filipino language is the language promised by the 1973 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines to be developed as the national language of the country, and that language identified by the 1987 Constitution of the same republic as the national language of the same country that is open for more development as it is used by Filipinos inclusively by Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs (Rubrico, 2012). Consequently, Rubrico stated her hypothesis: “The indigenization of Filipino is an emergent phenomenon in the Philippine linguistic landscape. (The Davao Filipino language) . . . has blazed the trail by adopting Filipino on its own terms. It has indelibly imprinted into Filipino its own features and characteristics—resulting in an innovation that is distinct and significant from the morphosyntactic domain, features that definitely sets it apart from Tagalog” (Rubrico, 2012, p. 15). She acknowledged the Filipino political scientist Francisco Nemenzo, Jr. as the originator of this insight. Nemenzo said in 2005: “The core of the real Filipino language is the Filipino as spoken in Davao and not the Balagtas Tagalog in Bulacan (Luzon). . . A language and its usage should grow and that is what is happening in Davao” (Rubrico, 2012, pp. 14-15).

**The Dolalas Hypothesis**

Leslie Love Dolalas, a geography undergraduate student of the University of the Philippines Diliman, wrote the essay “Davao Tagalog: Endangerment of Binisaya Language” in 2012 as a direct reaction against the Rubrico hypothesis as laid down in the latter’s 2011 essay. As already noted earlier “Binisaya,” or “Visayan” is a generic category that included the Cebuano language, and in the usage of Dolalas certainly pertained to the Cebuano language. The Dolalas hypothesis concerning the Davao Filipino language may
be summed up with two statements, one concerning the effect of the Tagalization of the Cebuano language on the Cebuano language, and the other concerning the effect of the Cebuanization of the Tagalog language on the Filipino language.

Dolalas' statement concerning the effect of the Tagalization of the Cebuano language on the Cebuano language drew inspiration from an essay “Kapampangan Lexical Borrowing from Tagalog: Endangerment rather than Enrichment” that was written by Michael Raymon Pangilinan in 2009. The Kapampangan ethnolinguistic group happens to inhabit an area in the island of Luzon that is adjacent to the huge area occupied by the Tagalog ethnolinguistic group. Dolalas stated: “Instead of using (the Cebuano) . . . vocabulary, Tagalog words are much preferred. Albeit inserted with some (Cebuano) . . . affixations and particles, Tagalog language is still way more utilized. Rather than enrichment and development, the emergence of this variety only promotes language shift from the less prestigious (Cebuano) . . . language to the hegemonic Tagalog (language)” (6).

Dolalas' statement concerning the effect of the Cebuanization of Tagalog language on the Filipino language is her specific direct reaction against the Rubrico hypothesis. Like Rubrico, Dolalas also assumed the subtle distinction between the Tagalog and Filipino languages. Dolalas stated: “Massive borrowing and emergence of various Tagalog-based varieties, would eventually lead to a major language shift towards the dominant language and homogenization of languages, thus, defeating the main purpose of creating a “diverse” national language” (8).

Giles Communication Accommodation Theory

Howard Giles, a British-American communication professor, framed his communication accommodation theory in 1973 as a more specific speech accommodation theory that was heavily based on some ideas from the American linguist William Labov’s works on variation social linguistics. For the next decade, Giles expanded his speech accommodation theory into his current communication accommodation theory that he believes to be capable of several cross-disciplinary and multidisciplinary applications.

Prior to his graduate studies, Giles noted how his Cardiff accent changes to a Southern Welsh intonation when in a rugby game, and then became a standard British English accent as he interacted with peers in college. He noted the changing patterns of the verbal communication of some of his college peers as they move in and out in a North Welsh pub switching to and from English and Welsh. These observations fed into his graduate research to become his significant theoretical contribution to communication theory. At the heart of his accommodation theory is the insight that individuals or social groups modify their communication processes in accordance to their perceived identity and preferences of their audience. In other words, speakers accommodate the otherness of their listeners in order to make their communication process more effective. Giles identified two basic strategies of accommodation: convergence and divergence.

“Convergence” is the “strategy whereby individuals adapt to each other’s communicative behaviors in terms of a wide range of linguistic-prosodic-nonverbal features including speech rate, pausal
phenomena and utterance length, phonological variants, smiling, gaze, and so on” while “divergence” is the strategy whereby individuals “accentuate speech and nonverbal differences between themselves and others” (Giles, Coupland & Coupland, 2010, p.7-8). Giles has established that individuals or social groups may use both strategies in order to move towards or away from a more prestigious communication pattern, just as they may also use both strategies in order to move towards or away from a less prestigious communication pattern (Giles et al., 2010, p.11).

Dougherty, Mobley, and Smith (2010) acknowledged that communication convergence and divergence are the core issues of CAT. Behavior-centered CAT conceptualized convergence as an “accommodative strategy used by individuals to identify more closely with others in the communication act.” Meanwhile, divergence is “used to differentiate one’s self from others.”

Soliz (2015) wrote a chapter solely about convergence and divergence in the International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication. Recognizing them as the major tents of CAT, he defined convergence as a representation of “behavioral strategies in which a speaker modifies his or her communication to become more similar to the communication styles of others.” On the other hand, divergence represented “strategies in which a speaker modifies his or her communication to create or amplify difference with others.”

Problematique

By using Giles’ communication accommodation theory as the analytic framework, this paper took a closer look at the conflicting hypotheses of Rubrico and Dolalas on the status and impact of the emerging Davao Filipino language. This paper assessed the validity of these hypotheses. The concluding part of this paper affirmed the valid aspects of the hypotheses under investigation and proffered more acceptable alternatives to those invalid aspects.

This paper aims to offer a more reasonable judgment on the status and impact of the emerging Davao Filipino language in relation to the national language planning in the Philippines. This paper also aims to contribute to the very limited literature on the emerging Davao Filipino language. In fact, “The Nature of Conyo in Davao City: a Language Inquiry” by Yra Albino, Kristine Romo, and Ana Helena Lovitos the only journal article published in the International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature in 2016 that studied the Davao Filipino language. While this research focused on the nature of the Davao Filipino language as it is used in Davao City, this present paper looks at the implication of the continued emergence of the same language on Filipino/Tagalog and Cebuano languages.

2.0 Methodology

This paper applied theory triangulation in the document analysis of Rubrico’s and Dolalas’ papers on Davao Filipino and Galay-David’s master’s thesis as he critiqued the arguments set by the former. Theory triangulation looks into multiple hypotheses to get a multiperspective understanding of a specific phenomenon (Carter, Bryant-Lukosius, DiCenso, Blythe & Neville, 2014). Moreover, triangulation complements document
analysis as it reduces any potential bias that may occur in a study (Bowen, 2009).

As mentioned earlier, in this study, the conflicting hypotheses are looked into Rubrico and Dolalas as regards the status and impact of the emerging Davao Filipino language. This study, first, established Giles’ communication accommodation theory as its analytic framework and made it as basis on the conceptualization of the Rubrico and Dolalas hypotheses. The Dolalas hypothesis and Galay-David’s critique of it was then analyzed and was given a verdict based on the framework of communication accommodation. After, the conflicting hypotheses of Rubrico and Dolalas, along with Galay-David’s interpretation of Davao Filipino in his master’s thesis, were, again, analyzed using the same framework.

These papers laid the foundations on the discussions of Davao Filipino in the field of language contact. Most of the papers written on topics about language contact in the Philippines were mostly regarding Tagalog-English contact. Davao Filipino is a relatively new topic with only the said papers as sources.

To accomplish the aims and goals, this paper was strategically designed to contain three substantive sections: 1) a conceptualization of the Rubrico and Dolalas Hypotheses using Giles’ communication accommodation theory, 2) an analysis of the first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis, and 3) an analysis of the conflicting Rubrico hypothesis and second statement of the Dolalas hypothesis.

3.0 Results And Discussions

Conceptualization of the Rubrico and Dolalas Hypotheses using Giles’ Communication Accommodation Theory

This paper is convinced that the seemingly conflicting hypotheses of Rubrico and Dolalas can be both conceptualized in a single construct using Giles’ communication accommodation theory, in particular his ideas of convergence and divergence as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Conceptualization of the Dolalas and Rubrico Hypotheses Using the Processes of Divergence and Convergence from Giles’ Communication Accommodation Theory](image)

The emergence of the Davao Filipino language can be explained under Giles’ communication accommodation theory primarily as the Davao Cebuanos’ convergence to the culturally more prestigious and economically more powerful
Tagalogs. But as the Davao Cebuanos moved towards the more desired group, they also diverged from their original Cebuano language. The process of the Davao Filipino language’s divergence from the Cebuano language is the focus of the first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis. Figure 2 shows that such process of divergence was not covered by the Rubrico hypothesis. Hence, it is clear that in so far as the first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis is concerned, there is no conflict between Dolalas and Rubrico.

However, the process of the Davao Filipino language’s convergence with the Tagalog language is the focus of both the Rubrico hypothesis and the second statement of the Dolalas hypothesis. Figure 2 shows how both Rubrico and Dolalas assumed the subtle difference between the Tagalog and the Filipino languages. It is in their forecasted impact of the Davao Filipino language on the Filipino language where their conflict is found. On one hand, Rubrico is optimistic that the emerging Davao Filipino language could be a model variety of a more democratic and inclusive Filipino language that should be opened to contributions and alterations from the other Philippine languages. On the other hand, while Dolalas admitted that the hybridization of the Cebuano and Tagalog languages in Davao City could in fact lead the way in the emergence of other Tagalog-based language varieties, she argued that such multiplication of Filipino language varieties would just be a momentary victory for the ultimate situation would still be the domination of the regional languages by the culturally powerful Tagalog language.

Based on the conceptualization laid out in Figure 2, here are the succeeding two substantive sections of this paper: 1) analyzed the validity of the first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis, and 2) determined the more tenable side of the conflict between the Rubrico hypothesis and the second statement of the Dolalas hypothesis.

**Analysis of the First Statement of the Dolalas Hypothesis**

The first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis, which gives a warning that the continued hegemony of the Tagalog/Filipino language on the Cebuano language will eventually destroy the latter, was already sufficiently critiqued by Galay-David in his master’s thesis. Galay-David noted that the first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis was done “under the assumption that Cebuano (language) will die if it is neglected” in Davao City (12). Galay-David knows that the spread of the Cebuano language is much wider than Davao City. Thus, whatever would happen to the Cebuano language in Davao City would not necessarily affect the Cebuano language as found in the other areas of the Visayas and Mindanao. Following Galay-David’s critique, Figure 2 needs to be articulated further to reflect the subtle distinction between the Cebuano language found in Davao City and the Cebuano language in general, as found in the various areas of the Visayas and Mindanao. Figure 3 reflects this articulation.
Dolalas appeared to be misled by the study of Pangilinan on the interaction between the Kapampangan and the Tagalog languages. As the Kapampangan ethnolinguistic group inhabits an area adjacent to the huge expanse of the Tagalog ethnolinguistic group, and nowhere else, the infiltration of the Tagalog language on the Kapampangan language would truly endanger the totality of the Kapampangan language. But the situation of the Cebuano language in Davao City is simply very different. While it is true that the infiltration of the Tagalog language on the Cebuano language in that city endangers the latter in the said city, such infiltration could not reasonably make a dent on the totality of the Cebuano language as found in the other areas of the Visayas and Mindanao. Giles communication accommodation theory would, in fact, not guarantee the presence of a hybrid language similar to the Davao Filipino language in most of the Cebuano areas in the Visayas and Mindanao as the theory necessitates the presence of a considerable local Tagalog/Filipino population.

Thus, the verdict of this paper is that the first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis is partly valid, in the sense that the Davao Filipino language would, indeed, endanger the Cebuano language in Davao City; and that the said first statement is also partly invalid, in the sense that the Davao Filipino language would not have an impact on the Cebuano language as found in the other areas of the Visayas and Mindanao.

Analysis of the conflicting Rubrico Hypothesis and Second Statement of the Dolalas Hypothesis

The Rubrico hypothesis, that optimistically forecasted that the emerging Davao Filipino language could be a model variety of a more democratic and inclusive Filipino language that should be opened to contributions and alterations from the other Philippine languages, was directly critiqued by the second statement of the Dolalas hypothesis. The critique of Dolalas reveals another subtle distinction assumed by the Rubrico hypothesis, which is about the difference between the Filipino language and the varieties of the same Filipino language. Following Dolalas’ critique, Figure 3 needs to be articulated still further to reflect the subtle distinction between the Filipino language and the varieties of Filipino language. Figure 4 reflects this articulation.
Dolalas questioned the validity of the claim that if the Davao Filipino language can serve as a model for the emergence of the other varieties of Filipino language, this will eventually contribute to the development of the Filipino language as the national language. However, the 1973 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines does not mention the proliferation of the varieties of the national language as an ideal: “The Batasang Pambansa (the National Legislative Assembly of the Republic of the Philippines at that time) shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino” (“The 1973 Constitution”, n.d.). The current 1987 Constitution of the said republic does not mention as well that such proliferation is also an ideal: “The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages. . . . The Congress shall establish a national language commission composed of representatives of various regions and disciplines which shall undertake, coordinate, and promote researches for the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages” (“The 1987 Constitution”, n.d.). The only ideal mentioned in the relevant sections of both constitutions is the development of the national language based on the existing Philippine languages and other languages. Giles communication accommodation theory would in fact not guarantee the emergence of hybrid languages similar to the Davao Filipino language in most of the regions of the Philippines as the theory necessitates the presence of a considerable local Tagalog/Filipino population. This trend is usually seen in migrant communities such as the South African-Bhojpuri-Hindi language in South Africa (Mesthrie, 2017) and the emergence of the Fiji Hindi hybrid language among the Indian diaspora in the Polynesian country of Fiji (Kerwswill, 2006).

Galay-David defended the Rubrico hypothesis by citing the much older initiative of the multilingual writer and critic Leoncio Deriada who encouraged his students to write in a Filipino language that is generously spliced with terms and conventions from their regional languages (8). There is, however, a subtle difference between the Rubrico hypothesis and the Deriada initiative. Rubrico is merely hoping for the proliferation of hybrid languages...
that are anchored on the Tagalog language. Deriada is intent on using literature as a vector that would carry the writers’ regional terms and conventions into the system of the national language. While Rubrico is expecting a multiplication of varieties of the Filipino language, Deriada is hoping for a single national language that is enriched by the regional languages. Deriada’s initiative is the one that is aligned with the 1973 and 1987 Constitutions of the Republic of the Philippines.

Thus, the verdict of this paper is that the Rubrico hypothesis is invalid, in the sense that the proliferation of the varieties of Filipino will not necessarily strengthen the Filipino as a national language, and in the sense that the Davao Filipino language’s emergence will not necessarily trigger the emergence of Tagalog-based hybrid languages elsewhere in the country in as far as Giles communication accommodation theory is concerned; and that the second statement of the Dolalas hypothesis is partly valid, in the sense that it was able to pinpoint the disconnection between the proliferation of the varieties of the Filipino language and the development of the Filipino language itself; and partly invalid, in the sense that it accepted the assumption of the Rubrico hypothesis that the emergence of the Davao Filipino language will trigger the emergence of Tagalog-based hybrid languages elsewhere in the country.

4.0 Conclusion

First, this paper was able to successfully conceptualize the conflicting Rubrico and Dolalas hypotheses under a single construct with the use of Giles’ communication accommodation theory. Figure 5 shows the complete appearance of such construct:

![Figure 5. Full Conceptualization of the Rubrico and Dolalas Hypotheses under a Single Construct Using Giles’ Communication Accommodation Theory](image)

This paper has shown that the first statement of the Dolalas hypothesis is partly valid and partly invalid. It is valid in the sense that the Davao Filipino language would indeed endanger the Cebuano language as it exists in Davao City. It is
alternative to the partially invalid first
statement of the Dolalas hypothesis: the
Davao Filipino language may eventually
replace the Cebuano language as the
dominant language of Davao City.
The alternative hypothesis refrained from
using Dolalas’ term “endanger” as it is
aware of the fact that language change is a
historical given. Just a little over a century
and a half ago, the area that would become
today as Davao City was inhabited by
Guiangans and Tagabanwas, as surrounded
by Kalagans, Bagobos, Manayays and
Samals. When the Cebuanos arrived in their
area, the languages of these earlier
inhabitants were overpowered by the
Cebuano language. If the current Cebuano
language in Davao City would change
towards the Davao Filipino language, then
that is merely an affirmation that language
change is a historical given.

In the genesis of New Zealand
English (Trudgill, Gordon, Lewis, &
Maclagan, 2000), the researchers discussed
that the formation of contact languages or
dialects are “not haphazard processes.”
With the amount of linguistic information
about Davao Filipino which contribute to its
formation as a hybrid language, and the
adequate demographic statistics about the
percentages of speakers of the different
languages in Davao City, just like in the
study of Trudgill, Gordon, Lewis, &
Maclagan, it is possible to create predictions
about the would-be results or effects of
Davao Filipino will be.

This paper has shown that the
Rubrico hypothesis is invalid on two counts:
first, in the sense that the proliferation of
the varieties of Filipino will not necessarily
strengthen the Filipino as a national
language; and second, in the sense that the
Davao Filipino language’s emergence will
not necessarily trigger the emergence of
Tagalog-based hybrid languages elsewhere
in the country as these places may not have
a significant Tagalog population that could
cause the convergences and divergences of
languages.

Consequently, this paper proffers
the following hypothesis as an alternative to
the invalid Rubrico hypothesis: the Davao
Filipino language is a variety of the Filipino
language that emerged in Davao City
because of the communication
accommodation that happened between its
Cebuano and Tagalog/Filipino population.
Its impact on the Filipino language may be
limited to a small dent on the historic
resistance of the Cebuano ethnolinguistic
group’s resistance against the establishment
of a Tagalog-based national language.
Historically speaking, it was the Cebuanos
who raised the loudest objection to the
selection of the Tagalog language as the
base of the Philippine national language. At
that time, the Cebuano ethnolinguistic
group outnumbered the Tagalog
ethnolinguistic group.

This paper has shown that the
second statement of the Dolalas hypothesis
is partly valid and partly invalid. It is partly
valid in the sense that it was able to
pinpoint the disconnection between the
proliferation of the varieties of the Filipino
language and the development of the
Filipino language itself. It is partly invalid in
the sense that it accepted the assumption of
the Rubrico hypothesis that the emergence
of the Davao Filipino language will trigger
the emergence of Tagalog-based hybrid
languages elsewhere in the country.
Consequently, this paper proffers the
following hypothesis as an alternative to the
partially invalid second statement of the
Dolalas hypothesis: If at all the Davao
Filipino language will trigger the emergence
of Tagalog-based hybrid languages
elsewhere in the country, something which is not guaranteed in as far as Giles’ communication accommodation theory is concerned, such multiplication of Filipino language varieties would just be a momentary victory for the ultimate situation would still be the domination of the regional languages by the Tagalog language as the base and bearer of the Philippine national language.
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