Micro-Level Text Contents of One- to Five-Minute News: American and Philippine English Compared

Leonardo O. Munalim

Philippine Women's University, Manila Philippine Normal University-Manila

Abstract

The number of minutes appended in headlines serves as a signpost for readers regarding the reading time. Being the first on Minute News, this present quantitative study reports the results from comparative analyses of text contents of one-to-five Minute News published by one Philippine and one American media outlet in November 2018. Selected corpus comprised the combined 86 one-minute news; 421 two-minute news; 259 three-minute news; 101 four-minute news; and 77 five-minute news articles, resulting in 944 news articles. Inferential statistics reveals that there are both similarities and differences between the two groups' micro-level properties of Minute News: total word count, total unique words, number of sentences, average sentence length, number of paragraphs, hard words, lexical density; and the seven text readability index models such as Flesch, Gunning, Flesch-Kincaid, Coleman, SMOG, Automated and Linsear. Overall, if we argue that the American writers from the Inner Circle are the model of linguistic and text contents of Minute News, then the Philippine media writers who belong to the Outer Circle do not fully benchmark the standards of the American writers' microlevel linguistic properties when producing Minute News. Universal implications for literacy in second or foreign language classes, including recommendations are offered.

Keywords: American English, headlines, Minute News (MNs), Philippine English, reading time.

Research lacuna

To my knowledge, no research on Minute News (MNs) has been done lately. This present study reports the quantitative findings from content analyses of news articles with reading time appended in headlines. It compares statistically whether or not the Filipino writers who belong to the Outer Circle show the propensity to be native-like in their MNs in terms of the micro-level properties under study: (1) total word count, (2) total unique words, (3) number of sentences, (4) average sentence length, (5) number of paragraphs, (6) number of hard words, (7) lexical density; and the (8) seven text readability index models such as Flesch, Gunning, Flesch-Kincaid, Coleman, SMOG, Automated and Linsear. Cognizance of the linguistic features of MNs and the possible difference or similarity between two cultures is crucial not

only to the readers' and students' engagement with the texts, but also in the development of reading autonomy when engaging with the news contents on social media.

On headlines and reading time/minute news

According to Blake (2013), headlines are a "summary and advertisement for a broader flow of news content" (p. 455). Blake further claims that "headlines or stories are often the primary unit of analysis" (p. 457). As a micro-genre, the headlines posted on social media have now morphed into another strategic journalistic style. Figure 1 illustrates the sample appended number of reading minutes in a headline. Arguably, the inclusion of reading time appended in the headlines is one of these strategies, which are meant to persuade social media users to read the actual news contents. The reading time serves as a signpost regarding the approximate time readers are expected to finish. The inclusion of the reading time may also relate to Trimble and Sampert's (2004) assertion that the crafting of headlines is a long-standing journalistic practice that may "quickly earn a preferential place in conscious awareness" (Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2010, p. 29) among the users.



Image ©2019ABS-CBNNews *Figure 1*. Number of reading minutes appended

Blake (2013) maintains that sensational headlines may precipitate political engagement such as interests, discussion and debate. I argue that the inclusion of reading time can precipitate readers' attention, interest and possible actual visit of the news articles. MNs may sit well with the "law of

attraction" especially when the actual site visits exact economic cost on media outlets (cf. Blake, 2013; Richardson, 2007). In fact, inherent in these headlines are economic advantages and incentives (Iyengar et al., 2010; Richardson, 2007) in the form of the number of engagement and visits that are reflected in Facebook analytics. Blake (2013) further claims that the economic incentives between "hard" and "soft" news "may also influence the micro-level relationship between news headlines and stories" (p. 459). To date, the rise of internet use (Aalberg et al., 2010) will continue to encourage media outlets to attract wide-scale audiences.

In the realm of psychology, the indication of reading time may sit well with the concepts of "demand-based decision making" (McGuire & Botvinick, 2010, p. 103) and the "pay attention" signal (Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2010). "Attention must be controlled when the stimulus the person is attending to is a stimulus the person is not otherwise inclined to attend to" (Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2010, p. 30) because it is given that reading involves mental activities and enough time for engagement. This is because "information-processing tasks vary in their associated levels of cognitive demand. Highly demanding tasks require strong input from cognitive or executive control, input typically associated with a subjective sense of mental effort" (McGuire & Botvinick, 2010, p. 103). Thus, informing readers of the possible reading time may entice and compel them to commit to engaging in close and critical readings.

Historically, Holland (2014) reviews that the trend of Minute News may have started on Twitter due to its default limited space. She reports that "in April 2009, journalist Mark Armstrong started using a #longreads hashtag on Twitter. He wanted a way for people to find and recommend long-form, "magazine-length: stories online" (para. 8). Holland further reports that "Time To Read" feature on its new Kindle Touch was appended in November 2011 and October 2012. To date, Medium.com still indicates reading time like "4 min read" and so on.

Philippine vis-à-vis American English

Philippine English is obviously anchored on American English. Tayao (2008) reports that "English was transplanted in the country as a colonial language upon the annexation of the Philippines from Spain by the United States in 1898" (p. 157). English as the medium of instruction was institutionalized through US President William McKinley's Letter of Instruction in 1900 (Bernardo, 2008). American teachers called the "Thomasites" arrived in 1901, the same year when Philippine Normal School (*now* Philippine Normal University-Manila) was opened to take care of the elementary education in the country (Bolton & Bautista, 2008).

Since then, Philippine English has experienced a fair share of improvements and stumbling blocks. The first modern short story titled, "Dead Stars" written by Paz Marquez-Benitez, one of the founders of

Philippine Women's College (*now* Philippine Women's University), which was published in 1925, "landmarked the maturity of the Filipino writer in English" (Santiago, 2015, para. 7). Toward the end of U.S. colonialism, Lumbera and Lumbera (2005) maintain that the "growth of English writing signalled the assertiveness of the Americanized intellectuals turned out by the universities" (p. 103). Babst-Vokey (1988), however, mentions three phases of English in print media in the Philippines. The first and the third phases were considered "elegant, Europeanized," characterized by correct grammar. By contrast, the second phase:

was the most dismal one of the three, covering the period of the Martial Law years. This was the time when newspapers and magazines were dominated by men and women who clearly could not write, and who obviously did not use English as their language for communicating anything but the simplest thoughts. When they tried something even just slightly more complicated, their English deteriorated into gibberish, abusing the most basic rules of grammar, unity, coherence and emphasis. (p. 88)

The discourse of world Englishes (cf. Kachru, 1985) is situated at the sociolinguistic processes of nativization, hybridization, localization, acculturation and/or indigenization (Tupas, 2004). Philippine English was first conceptualized by Llamzon (1969) in what he asserted as Filipinism with "English expressions which are neither American nor British, which are acceptable and used in Filipino educated circles, and are similar to expression patterns in Tagalog" (p. 46, as cited in Bautista, 2008, p. 219), characterized with a lack of (or faulty) subject-verb concord, inappropriate use of articles, faculty preposition usage, the incorrect pluralization of nouns, the lack of (or faulty) agreement of pronoun and its antecedent, faulty tense-aspect usage combinations (Bautista, 2000), verb-subject-object pattern; the fronting or topicalization; object deletion; and copula deletion; SV-(dis)agreement (Jubilado, 2016). Furthermore, Philippine English lexicon comes from English newspapers in the Philippines, which are the rich source of words and expressions (Dayag, 2008). According to Bautista (1997), the Philippine English lexicon can be characterized in terms of words with expanded meanings; infrequent lexical items; coinages; and borrowings. Recently, Munalim (2019) shares that "Philippine English may have morphed into the use of inverted subject-auxiliary in embedded questions, like in a sample utterance: "So we already know what's an entrepreneur" instead of "So we already know what an entrepreneur is" (p. 40). Further, he initially argued that Philippine English in terms of embedded questions may have reached the endonormative stabilization stage. Such an inversion may be considered another emerging feature of Philippine English.

What all these findings indicate is that the Philippine writers may or may not deflect from the norms of the standard (American/British) English. Such

an impressive linguistic dispersion result in the spread, status and functions (Bhatia & Baumgardner, 2008; Kachru & Smith, 2008) because of the different sphere-based functions of English. Functions include "access code, advertising, corporate trade, development, government, linguistic impact, literary creativity, literary renaissance, news broadcasting, newspapers, scientific higher education, scientific research and social interaction" (Kachru, 2001, p. 46, as cited in Kachru & Smith, 2008, p. 7). Seen from this backdrop, this paper is an attempt to see how the Filipino news story writers exhibit linguistic leanings on the Inner Circle if we argue that American English remains the global standard, at least in the micro-level properties of Minute News.

Methodology

The sources of headlines are the two media outlets which publish news articles on their Facebook pages. One local news outlet, ABS-CBN News, to represent the Philippines, is the news cluster of ABS-CBN, the undisputed number one TV network in the Philippines (www.facebook.com/abscbnNEWS/). The international news outlet, CNN, to represent the American group, is a division of Turner Broadcasting System (www.facebook.com/cnn). The personal decision for their choice is based on the massive reach through likes and followers on their Facebook pages. As of 8 February 2019, ABS-CBN News amassed 16,061,182 likers and 15,932,838 followers; CNN with 31,093,906 likers and 31,058,732 followers. As of 12 December 2019, ABS-CBN News has 17,321,574 likers and 17,595,996 followers; CNN with 31,512,738 likers and 32,149,403 followers. Likewise, the choice of these local news outlets is that among the top news media organizations in the Philippines with Facebook pages, only ABS-CBN News indicates reading time (as of the date of corpus collection). Other leading media outlet competitors in the Philippines have not employed this journalistic style on their Facebook page posts. Selected news articles with indicated reading time in the headlines were all culled in November 2018. News articles published on ABS-CBN News, but were written by native speakers (from Reuters and Agence France-Presse) were intentionally excluded. Table 1 shows that there are 944 news articles culled from these two media outlets.

The news articles were fed into UsingEnglish.com to generate total word count, total unique words, number of sentences, average sentence length, number of paragraphs, hard words and lexical density. On the one hand, *Readability Formulas* website was used to generate the aspects of Flesch, Gunning, Flesch-Kincaid, Coleman, SMOG, Automated and Linsear. The choice of these readability tests were solely based upon their availability on this online tool. Nevertheless, these readability formulas were considered for their merit, soundness and trustworthiness of the micro-level features of MNs. Meanwhile, there were sets of 1-Minute News which were originally part of the analysis, but were eventually excluded because they were not read by these

online tools due to the allowed word limits. No inter-raters/coders or external experts were invited because the analysis was rather quantitative, and the online tools could handle the analysis much more accurately. Finally, Oneway ANOVA through SPSS (Sedlack & Stanley, 1992) was used with the help of the statistician to report the significant differences of features under study.

Table 1
Selected corpus from two media outlets

	inute ws		inute	3-Mii Nev		4-Minute	e News	5-Mi Ne		Total
ABS- CBN News	CNN	ABS- CBN News	CNN	ABS- CBN News	CNN	ABS- CBN News	CNN	ABS- CBN News	CNN	
36	50	209	212	106	153	25	76	16	61	944
8	6	42	21	25	9	10	1	7′	7	344

Results

Level one features

The ensuing sub-sections present the two levels of content analysis. Level 1 analysis includes the total word count, total unique words, number of sentences, average sentence length, number of paragraph, hard words and lexical density. Word-discussions are presented in this section due to space constraints. Readers are advised to see Appendices A and B for accurate statistical figures.

Total word count

Total word count from two Englishes increases from 200+ words base up to 1,000+ words. From both groups, 1-Minute News and 5-Minute News are consistent with their least and most number of total words. The differences only lie in 3- and 4-Minute News. Lastly, 5-Minute News from two cohorts are both significantly higher than 1- to 4-Minute News. When two groups were compared, 1-Minute, 2-Minute, and 3-Minute News show no significant differences. They only differ significantly in the cohorts of 4-Minute News and 5-Minute News. This may convey that as the reading time increases, there is tendency that both Englishes diverge in terms of the number of total words.

From these significant differences from 3-Minute and 4-Minute News, the Philippine group has lesser total word count than the American group, but the standard deviations from the Philippine group still remain almost twice than the variability of the American counterpart. This may mean that the American writers tend to be more amenable with one another than the Filipino writers in terms of the total word count.

Total unique words

Results show that the total unique words increases from 100+ words base up to 400+ words. Looking at the variability, the Philippine group is consistent with its higher variability than the American group. That is to say that across all numbers of reading time, the American writers (editors) tend to be more homogeneous, thus, are more amenable with one another than those of the Filipino writers. From the two groups, overall, 5-Minute News is significantly higher than 1- to 4- Minute News. When these sets of reading time from two cohorts were collapsed, it was found out that only 4-Minute News has significant differences in terms of the total unique words. From this difference, the American writers tend to use more unique words than the Filipino writers, but at the same time the American writers tend to be more amenable with these words. As indicated, the variability of the total unique words from the Philippine group is almost twice higher than the Americans. The significant difference from the 4-Minute News may be predictable in nature because each event may demand choices of words in order to report the news appropriately. The presence of Tagalog/Filipino words must have also affected the counting of the total unique words. Overall, the pattern shows that both groups are statistically identical in terms of the total unique words.

Table 2 shows that the average number of sentences increases from 11 words up to 54 words. Looking at the variability, the Philippine group is consistent with its higher variability than the American group. That is to say that across all numbers of reading time, the American writers (editors) tend to be more homogeneous, thus, are more amenable with one another than those of the Filipino writers. From the two groups, overall, 5-Minute News is significantly higher than 1- to 4- Minute News. When the number of sentences was compared across types of Minute News, the same Table 2 shows no significant differences. That is to say, both groups seem to have agreed on the number of sentences. However, the Filipino writers tend to show more variability, starting from 3-Minute News up to 5-Minute News. The variability of the number of sentences from the Philippine group is in fact twice higher than that of the American group.

Table 2
Average number of sentences per group

Features/ Minute	ABS-CBN	News	CN	N	p-	Conclusion
News	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	value	
Number of Sentences						
1 Minute	11.9	6.1	13.2	7.0	0.3795	Not Significant
2 Minutes	20.3	7.7	20.1	6.5	0.7651	Not Significant
3 Minutes	30.0	12.3	28.7	8.0	0.3063	Not Significant
4 Minutes	35.2	15.8	38.7	10.7	0.2149	Not Significant
5 Minutes	54.4	31.1	52.7	13.8	0.7363	Not Significant

Average sentence length

Sentence length increases from 13 up to 52. Looking at the variability, the American group is almost consistent with its higher variability than the Philippine group. That is to say that across all numbers of reading time, the Filipino writers (editors) tend to be more homogeneous, thus, are more amenable with one another than those of the American writers. Surprisingly, the Philippine group in all types of Minute News shows no significant differences in terms of sentence length. That is to say, there is some distinction between and among the types of Minute News in terms of the sentence length from the Philippine group. On the contrary from the American group, the sentence length of 5-Minute News is significantly higher than 1- to 4-Minute News. When significant differences were computed, it turned out that the differences of sentence length only lie in 4-Minute News and 5-Minute News, as presented in Appendix B. That is to say, as the news increases in reading time, the sentence length varies significantly. From these differences, American writers tend to be more heterogeneous in 5-Minute News while Filipino writers tend to be heterogeneous in 4-Minute News.

Number of paragraphs

The average number of paragraph increases from 7 to 31. The Philippine group seems to show higher variability than the American group. From the two groups, different types of Minute News show significant differences in terms of the number of paragraphs, with 1-Minute News as the lowest, and 5-Minute News is the highest. When compared as a whole, the difference of the number of paragraphs only lies in 5-Minute News. It means that the longer the news becomes, the higher the tendency that the two varieties of English diverge in terms of the number of paragraphs. In this case, the Filipino writers use more paragraphs than the American writers.

Hard words

The average number of hard words increases from 15 to 16, wherein the Philippine group shows the highest variability in 2- Minute News. From the two groups, different types of Minute News show no significant differences in terms of hard words. That is to say, all Minute News from two groups tend to be more identical. When compared as a whole, the differences of the number of paragraphs between the two groups lie in 1-Minute News and 5-Minute News, not in 2-, 3- and 4-Minute News.

Lexical density

The average lexical density ranges from 40 to 64, where the Philippine group shows higher variability than the American group. From both groups, there are significant differences between and among the types of Minute News in terms of lexical density. When two groups were compared, the differences of lexical density are noticed only 4-Minute News and 5-Minute News. It may mean that the longer the news becomes, the denser the lexical items become.

Level 2 features

Level 2 analysis, on the one hand, divulges the average performance of the seven different readability tests such as Flesch, Gunning, Flesch-Kincaid, Coleman, SMOG, Automated and Linsear to arrive at the overall consensus for the average and level of difficulty.

Table 3
Readability consensus from seven readability statistics

	1-Minu	te News	2-Minu	te News	3-Minu	te News	4-Minu	te News	5-Minu	te News
Features	ABS- CBN	CNN								
Flesch	48.89	55.89	52.41	54.00	52.33	51.78	55.06	51.08	57.46	50.45
Gunning	12.27	11.36	12.61	12.38	12.45	13.02	11.97	13.34	11.28	13.36
Flesch- Kincaid	11.26	9.98	10.99	10.71	11.03	11.31	10.53	11.62	10.06	11.62
Colema n	10.42	9.82	9.15	9.80	8.95	10.08	9.16	10.20	8.81	10.30
SMOG	10.83	9.42	10.17	9.97	10.04	10.41	9.79	10.55	9.32	10.68
Automa- ted	10.87	9.72	10.35	10.60	10.51	11.47	10.18	12.05	9.58	11.92
Linsear	13.04	11.47	13.37	12.83	13.55	13.81	12.91	14.32	18.26	14.23
Average	11.31	10.08	10.85	10.80	10.90	11.40	10.60	11.70	10.00	11.77
Level of difficul- ty	Fairly difficul t									

Table 3 reveals the readability consensus from seven readability statistics. By averaging from seven readability tests, although news differ from reading time, it was found out that that the level of difficulty of these new articles is all fairly difficult. Meanwhile, from the Philippine group, Table 4 shows that there are no significant differences between and among the types of Minute News, which means that the reading difficulty is identical across these types of Minute News. By contrast, the American group shows significant differences between and among the types of Minute News. That is to say, the indicated number of reading time differs from one type of Minute News to another.

Table 4
Significant differences per group

Groups	Types	Mean	SD	p-value	Conclusion
	1-Minute	16.8	0.7		
	2-Minute	17.0	2.0		
ABS-CBN	3-Minute	17.0	1.6	0.461	No significant differences
News	4-Minute	17.1	0.7		
	5-Minute	17.8	3.7		
					1 min is sig lower than 2-5
	1-Minute	16.8	0.8		min
					2 min is sig higher than 1,
	2-Minute	17.2	0.8		sig lower than 4 min
				0.001	3 min is sig higher than 1
	3-Minute	17.4	0.7	0.001	min
CNN					4 min is sig higher than 1-2
	4-Minute	17.6	0.8		min
					5 min is sig higher than 1
	5-Minute	17.5	0.7		min

When statistical treatment was sought, the Philippine group shows no significant differences between and among the types of Minute News as presented in Table 5. It means that the readabilities of all five types of Minute News are identical, which are considered fairly difficulty. On the contrary, the American group shows that there are significant differences of readability between and among the types of Minute News. When both groups were compared, Table 4 shows that the differences of readabilities lie only in 3-Minute News and 4-Minute News. Under 3-Minute News, the Philippine group is higher than the American group in terms of variability while under 4-Minute News, the American group is higher than the Filipino group in terms of variability.

Table 5
Significant difference between two groups

Minute	ABS-CB	N News	C	NN	D volue	Conclusion
News	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	P-value	Conclusion
1-Minute	16.8	0.7	16.8	0.8	0.9849	Not Significant
2-Minute	17.0	2.0	17.2	0.8	0.2355	Not Significant
3-Minute	17.0	1.6	17.4	0.7	0.0042	Significant

4-Minute	17.1	0.7	17.6	0.8	0.0025	Significant
5-Minute	17.8	3.7	17.5	0.7	0.5121	Not Significant

Overall patterns

If we argue that the American writers are the model of Minute News with indicated reading time, then the following patterns emerge from the statistical computations:

- 1. In terms of the total word count, the Filipino writers tend to pattern the Americans when writing 1-Minute, 2-Minute and 3-Minute News, but not in 4-Minute and 5-Minute News. In 4- and 5-Minute News, Filipino writers have fewer total word count than the Americans.
- 2. In terms of total unique words, the Filipino writers show the tendency to follow the American standard, with only one significant difference in 4-Minute News.
- 3. In terms of the number of sentences, the Filipino writers follow the American standard across five types of Minute News.
- 4. In terms of sentence length, the Filipino writers follow the American standard only in 1-, 2-, and 3-Minute News, but not in 4- and 5-Minute News. The Filipino writers' average sentence length from 4- and 5-Minute News is fewer than those of the American writers'.
- 5. In terms of the number of paragraphs, the Filipino writers follow the American standard in 1-, 2-, 3, and 4-Minute News, but not in 5-Minute News. The Filipino writers use fewer paragraphs than the American writers in 5-Minute News.
- 6. In terms of hard words, the Filipino writers follow the American standard in 2-, 3-, and 4-Minute News, but not in 1- and 5-Minute News. For 1- Minute News, the Filipino writers use more number of hard words than the American writers. For 5-Minute News, the Filipino writers use fewer hard words than the Americans.
- 7. In terms of lexical density, the Filipino writers follow the American standard only in 1-, 2-, and 3-Minute News, but not in 4- and 5-Minute News. For 4- and 5-Minute News, the Filipino writers have higher lexical density than the Americans.
- 8. For readability tests, the Filipino writers follow the American standards only in 1-, 2- and 5-Minute News, but not in 3- and 4-Minute News. The Filipino writers' 3- and 4-Minute News have lower readability than the American counterpart.
- 9. The overall patterns of differences tested statistically show that the Filipino writers do not fully benchmark the standard of the American writers' micro-level linguistic properties of Minute News.

One caveat should be noted, however. As I breezed through the articles from the Philippine cluster, there were inevitable inclusions of Tagalog/Filipino words. This might have affected, small or big, this comparative undertaking. At the same time, because the writers labeled them with appropriate reading time, we could also assume that they approximated the features regardless of the Tagalog/Filipino terms embedded in these news articles. Nevertheless, researchers are encouraged to employ isotextual (equal texts) comparative studies (cf. Oakey, 2009) in future studies to establish greater accuracy through compatibility (Friginal & Hardy, 2014). Lastly, Fog-Index Readability was not part of the computation because it is not reflected on the online readability tool. It would be intuitively helpful and compelling to explore this test in future studies.

Conclusion

Whether or not the final versions of these Minutes News (MNs) were those of the writers' or the editors' (Blake, 2013), the overall pattern shows that the Filipino writers do not exhibit a total independence from the norms of the Inner Circle when writing MNs. The cases of similarity are an indication of the Filipino writers' attempt not to deflect from the native writers' way of writing MNs. Understandably, the Filipino media writers may feel the need to keep a grip on and in the loop of global journalistic styles and strategies in the name of "competition culture and journalistic culture" (Popescu & Toka, 2009, p. 4) for readership. Inevitably, this appropriation, adaptation and cooptation (cf. Moeller & Lellis, 2002; cf. Sanders, 2006) with the global linguistic trends have tended to perpetuate the discourse of hegemonic power of the natives, which in itself puts the Filipino media writers at the center of critical sociolinguistic controversies about issues of postcolonial Philippines.

Implications of the results in terms of literacy in second or foreign language classes may be straightforward (cf. Aisha & Ramadhani, 2018; Maming, 2018). Media outlets which employ reading time in their headlines may believe that such an inclusion may have deleterious effect on the readers – either to read or not to read the actual news articles, in what Wagner (2009) posits that making choices is made either consciously and unconsciously. This feature may also limit the readers to visit the sites, especially when the indicated minutes reach 10 minutes and beyond. Schmeichel and Baumeister (2010) believe that the person attending to the stimulus may either shift his or her attention to it or maintain focus elsewhere. Secondly, local and international readers may expect differences and similarities of text features. Such similarities and differences will guide them as to how they will consume and engage themselves with these contents with such "prevailing external circumstances" (cf. Blais, 2010, p. 141) of MNs. For instance, students may become much more conscious of their choices and decisions when consuming these Minute News that are essential in the cultivation of the passion for reading.

There may be a mismatch between the headlines and the actual news stories. Blake (2013) has noted that public media headlines were more positive than the actual stories, while commercial headlines were more negative than the actual stories. Caulfield and Bubela (2004) also caution that although headlines can provide a glimpse of first impression, they may be inaccurate or "hyped", thus deviating from story-level depictions. With the help of the reading time appended in headlines, readers may be encouraged to read the actual articles and validate possible (mis)match. It will encourage them to view and consume media information with circumspection (Caulfield & Bubela, 2004; cf. Hancock, 2015). Finally, reading teachers may assign students some news articles with indicated and estimated reading time to downplay students' possible mental burden. In due time, reading teachers can eventually add up the number of reading time of the reading materials once the learners have demonstrated an improved reading stamina.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank the Chief Editor of EILJ and the blind expert-reviewers for looking at my paper. I would like to thank UsingEnglish.com and Readability Formulas www.readabilityformulas.com/free-readabilityformula-tests.php for their useful tools.

References

- Aalberg, T., van Aelst, P., & Curran, J. (2010). Media systems and the political information environment: A cross-national comparison. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 15(3), 255-271.
- Aisha, S., & Ramadhani, N. (2018). Improving students' reading comprehension achievement through preview, question, read, reflect, recite and review technique. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(11), 132-136.
- Babst-Vokey, A. (1988). Patterns of language use in the print media. In A.B. Gonzales (Ed.), *The role of English and its maintenance in the Philippines: The transcript, consensus, and papers of the solidarity seminar on language and development* (pp. 87-90). Manila, Philippines: Solidaridad Publishing House.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (1997). The lexicon of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context: Proceedings of the conference held in Manila on August 2-3, 1996* (pp. 49-72). Manila: The Macquarie Library Pty.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2000). *Defining standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features*. Manila, the Philippines: De La Salle University Press.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2008). Investigating the grammatical features of Philippine English. In B. Kingsley & M. L. S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English:*

- *Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 201-218). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Bernardo, A.B.I. (2008). English in Philippine education: Solution or problem? In B. Kingsley & M. L. S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 29-48). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Bhatia, T. K., & Baumgardner, R. J. (2008). Language in the media and advertising. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru & S. N. Sridhar (Eds.), *Language in South Asia* (pp. 377-394). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blais, C. (2010). Implicit versus deliberate control and its implications for awareness. In B. Bruya (Ed.), *Effortless attention: A new perspective in the cognitive science of attention and action* (pp. 141-157). London: MIT Press.
- Blake, A. (2013). Political journalism represented headline news: Canadian public and commercial media compared. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 46(2), 455-78.
- Bolton, K., & Bautista, M. L. S. (2008). Introduction. In B. Kingsley & M.L.S. Bautista. (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp.1-9). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Caulfield, T., & Bubela, T. (2004). Media representations of genetic discoveries: Hype in the headlines? *Health Law Review*, 12(2), 53-61.
- Dayag, D. T. (2008). English-language media in the Philippines: Description and research. In B. Kingsley & M. L. S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 49-65). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Friginal, E., & Hardy, J. A. (2014). *Corpus-based sociolinguistics: A guide for students*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hancock, W. (2015). The role of neutral projecting frames in the quest for media objectivity. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 10(2), 86-116.
- Holland, A. (2014, April 14). How estimated reading times increase engagement with content. *Marketing Land*. Accessed 2019 February 11 from https://marketingland.com/estimated-reading-times-increase-engagement-79830
- Iyengar, S., Curran, J., Lund, A. B., Salovaara-Moring, I., Hahn, K. S., & Coen, S. (2010). Cross-national versus individual-level differences in political information: A media systems perspective. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 20(3), 291-309.
- Jubilado, R. C. (2016). Where is the CR? A description of Philippine English in Hawaii. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 86-101.
- Kachru, B.B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge, the United Kingdom: Cambridge

- University Press.
- Kachru, Y. (2001). Discourse competence in world Englishes. In E. Thumboo (Ed.), *The three circles of English* (pp. 341–355). Singapore: UniPress, The Centre for the Arts, National University of Singapore.
- Kachru, Y., & Smith, L. E. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and world Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Llamzon, T. A. (1969). *Standard Filipino English*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Lumbera, B., & Lumbera, C. N. (2005). *Philippine literature: A history and anthology* (English ed.). Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Anvil Publishing.
- Maming, K. (2018). Helping the EFL learners in reading class: Learning by interacting with social media-related topics through pre-question way. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(11), 205-223.
- McGuire, J. T., & Botvinick, M. M. (2010). The impact of anticipated cognitive demand on attention and behavioral choice. In B. Bruya (Ed.), *Effortless attention: A new perspective in the cognitive science of attention and action* (pp. 103-122). London: MIT Press.
- Moeller, H. B., & Lellis, G. (2002). *Volker Schlöndorff's cinema: Adaptation, politics, and the "movie-appropriate"*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Munalim, L. O. (2019). Subject-auxiliary inversion in embedded questions in spoken professional discourses: A comparison of Philippine English between 1999 and 2016-2019. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 14(1), 40-57.
- Oakey, D. (2009). Fixed collocational patterns in isolexical and isotextual versions of a corpus. In P. Baker (Ed.), *Contemporary corpus linguistics* (pp. 140-158). London: Continuum.
- Popescu, M., & Toka, G. (2009). Public television, private television and citizens' political knowledge. *EUI Working Papers RSCAS*, 66, 1-32. Accessed 2018 November 13 from http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/13008/RSCAS_2009_66.pdf ?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sanders, J. (2006). *Adaptation and appropriation: The new critical idiom*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Santiago, L. Q. (2015). Philippine literature during the American period. National Commission for Culture and the Arts. Accessed 2018 November 13 from http://ncca.gov.ph/subcommissions/subcommission-on-the-arts-sca/literary-arts/philippine-literature-during-the-american-period/
- Schmeichel, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2010). Effortful attention control. In B. Bruya (Ed.), *Effortless attention: A new perspective in the cognitive science of attention and action* (pp. 29-49). London: MIT Press.

- Sedlack, R.G., & Stanley, J. (1992). *Social research, theory & methods*. MA, USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tayao, M. L. G. (2008). A lectal description of the phonological features of Philippine English. In Bolton, Kingsley and M.L.S. Bautista (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 157-174). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Trimble, L., & Sampert, S. (2004). Who's in the game? Framing of the Canadian election 2000 by The Globe and Mail and The National Post. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 37(1), 51–71.
- Tupas, R. (2004). The politics of Philippine English: Neocolonialism, global politics, and the problem of postcolonialism. *World Englishes*, 23(1), 47-58
- Wagner, A. (2009). *Paradoxical life: Meaning, matter, and the power of human choice*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Note on Contributor

Dr. Leonardo O. Munalim obtained his PhD in Applied Linguistics from Philippine Normal University-Manila, 1743 Taft Avenue, Malate, 1004 Metro Manila. He is currently an Associate Professor at Philippine Women's University (104 Taft Ave, Ermita, 1000 Metro Manila) where he teaches Spanish and English. He also serves the Editorial Board of the *Journal of English as an International Language* as an Editor. He has published in local outlets as well as in Scopus- and ISI-indexed journals. Email: lomunalim@pwu.edu.ph

Appendices

Me	Level	1 N	Iin	2 N	Ain	3 N	I in	4 N	Ain	5 N	Ain	p	
dia Out lets	Featu res	M ea n	S D	M ea n	S D	M ea n	S D	M ea n	S D	M ea n	S D	va lu e	Concl usion
AB S-CB N Ne ws	Total Word Coun t	20 9. 4	9 3. 1	37 0. 1	11 8. 5	57 6. 7	18 9. 5	65 3. 5	28 1. 3	90 5. 6	42 7. 6	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lowes t 2 Min is sig lower than 3-5 in, highe r than 1 min 3 Min highe r than 1-2, lower on 5 Min 4 Min highe r than 1-2, lower on 5 Min 5 Min 5 Min 5 Min sig Highe r than 1-4 min
CN N		22 0. 6	9	36 8. 6	98 .7	56 4. 8	12 3	79 1. 1	16 5. 9	10 74	24 3. 9	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lowes t 2 Min

													is sig lower than 3-5 in, highe r than 1 min 3 Min highe r than 1-2, lower on 4-5 Min 4 Min highe r than 1,2,3 lower on 5 Min 5 Min sig highe r than 1-4 min
AB S- CB N Ne ws	Total Uniq ue Word s	13 1. 9	4 5. 1	20 2. 8	52 .5	28 6. 2	76 .8	31 7. 8	10 7. 9	42 9. 8	16 6. 6	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lowes t 2 Min is sig lower than 3-5 in, highe r than 1 min 3 Min highe r than 1-2,

												1
												lower
												on 5
												Min
												4 Min
												highe
												r than
												1-2,
												lower
												on 5
												Min
												5 Min
												sig
												Highe
												r than
												1-4
												min
												1 Min
												sig
												lowes
												t
												2 Min
												is sig
												lower
												than
CN												3-5
N												in,
												highe
												r than
	12	3	20		28		36		47		0.	1 min
	8.	9.	1.	42	1.	49	4.	62	1.	96	00	3 Min
	6	2	5	.3	9	.9	5	.8	3	.9	1	highe
											_	r than
												1-2,
												lower
												on 4-
												5 Min
												4 Min
												highe
												r than
												1,2,3
												Min
												lower
												on 5
												Min

													5 Min sig highe r than 1-4 min
AB S- CB N Ne w	No. of Sente nces	11 .9	6. 1	20 .3	7. 7	30	12 .3	35 .2	15 .8	54 .4	31 .1	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lowes t 2 Min is sig lower than 3-5 in, highe r than 1 min 3 Min highe r than 1-2, lower on 5 Min 4 Min highe r than 1-2, lower on 5 Min 5 Min 5 Min sig Highe r than 1-4 min
		13 .2	7	20 .1	6. 5	28 .7	8	38 .7	10 .7	52 .7	13 .8	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lowes t 2 Min is sig

CN													lower than 3-5 in, highe r than 1 min 3 Min highe r than 1-2, lower on 4-5 Min 4 Min highe r than 1-3, lower on 5 Min 5 Min sig highe r than 1-4 min
AB S- CB N Ne ws		18 .8	4. 4	19 .5	8. 2	20 .3	4. 4	19	3. 5	18 .5	4. 4	0. 69 6	No Signif icant Differ ence
CN N	Aver age Sente nce Lengt h	17 .4	3. 7	19 .2	4. 6	20 .4	4. 2	21 .2	4. 1	21	4. 1	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lower than 3-5 Min 2 Min sig lower than 4 min

				I	I	l	I	I	I	I	I	I	235
													3 Min
													is sig
													highe
													r than
													1 min
													4 min
													is sig
													highe
													r than
													1-2
													min
													5 min
													is sig
													highe
													r than
													1 min
AB													1 Min
S-													sig
CB													lowes
N													t
Ne													2 Min
WS													is sig
													lower
													than
													3-5
													in,
													highe
													r than
													1 min
	No.	7.	4.	12	8.	1.5	6.	1.0		20	1.0	0.	3 Min
	of	5	1	.7	1	17	4	19	11	20	12	00	sig
	Parag					.3		.6	.3		.5	1	highe
	raphs												r than
													1 and
													2 min
													4 Min
													sig
													highe
													r than
													1 and
													2 min
													5 Min
													sig
													highe
	j												r than

													1 and
													1 and 2 min
													1 Min
													sig
													lowes
													t
													2 Min
													is sig
													lower
													than
													3-5
CN													in,
N													highe
													r than
													1 min
													3 Min
													sig
													highe r than
													1 and
													2, sig
		7.	3	12	3.	18	8.	22	6. 3	31	8.	0.	lower
		9	3	.2	7	.2	7	.9	3	.8	8	00	than
								.,				1	4-5
													min
													4 Min
													sig
													highe
													r than
													1-3
													min,
													sig
													lower
													than
													5 min 5 Min
													5 Min sig
													highe
													r than
													1 to 4
													min
AB													No
S-	Hard	10	4.	23	97	1.5	4.	1.5	3.	1 4	3.	0.	Signif
CB	Word	19	6	.4	.1	15	4	15	4	14	3	90	icant
N	S					.8		.5		.4		3	Differ

Ne													ence
ws CN N		15 .3	4. 1	15 .6	4. 2	16 .1	3. 7	15 .8	3. 6	16 .5	3. 2	0. 32 9	No Signif icant Differ ence
AB S- CB N Ne ws	Lexic al Densi ty	64 .7	5. 8	56 .4	8. 2	51 .7	7.	52 .1	9. 6	51	8. 6	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lowes t 2 Min is sig lower than 1 min, highe r than 3 min 3 Min sig lower than 1 and 2 min 4 min sig lower than 1 min
CN N		62 .2	6. 6	55 .6	5	50 .5	4. 6	46 .4	5. 1	44 .4	3. 8	0. 00 1	1 Min sig lowes t 2 sig lower than 1 min,

						but
						sig highe
						mgne
						r than
						3-5
						min
						3 min
						sig
						lower
						than
						1-2
						min,
						sig
						highe
						r than
						4-5
						min
						4 min
						sig
						lower
						than
						1-3
						min
						5 min
						sig
						lower
						than
						1-3
						min

Appendix B

Features/ Minute	ABS-CBN	News	CN	N	p-	Conclusion	
News	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	value		
Total Word Count							
1 Minute	209.4	93.1	220.6	91.0	0.5772	Not Significant	
2 Minutes	370.1	118.5	368.6	98.7	0.8863	Not Significant	
3 Minutes	576.7	189.5	564.8	123.0	0.5401	Not Significant	
4 Minutes	653.5	281.3	791.1	165.9	0.0036	Significant	
5 Minutes	905.6	427.6	1074.0	243.9	0.0422	Significant	
Total Unique Words							
1 Minute	131.9	45.1	128.6	39.2	0.7200	Not Significant	
2 Minutes	202.8	52.5	201.5	42.3	0.7823	Not Significant	
3 Minutes	286.2	76.8	281.9	49.9	0.5876	Not Significant	
4 Minutes	317.8	107.9	364.5	62.8	0.0092	Significant	
5 Minutes	429.8	166.6	471.3	96.9	0.1990	Not Significant	
Number of Sentences							
1 Minute	11.9	6.1	13.2	7.0	0.3795	Not Significant	
2 Minutes	20.3	7.7	20.1	6.5	0.7651	Not Significant	
3 Minutes	30.0	12.3	28.7	8.0	0.3063	Not Significant	
4 Minutes	35.2	15.8	38.7	10.7	0.2149	Not Significant	
5 Minutes	54.4	31.1	52.7	13.8	0.7363	Not Significant	
Average Sentence							

Length						
1 Minute	18.8	4.4	17.4	3.7	0.1037	Not Significant
2 Minutes	19.5	8.2	19.2	4.6	0.6578	Not Significant
3 Minutes	20.3	4.4	20.4	4.2	0.7964	Not Significant
4 Minutes	19.2	3.5	21.2	4.1	0.0334	Significant
5 Minutes	18.5	4.4	21.0	4.1	0.0386	Significant
Number of Paragraphs						
1 Minute	7.5	4.1	7.9	3.0	0.5411	Not Significant
2 Minutes	12.7	8.1	12.2	3.7	0.4427	Not Significant
3 Minutes	17.3	6.4	18.2	8.7	0.3661	Not Significant
4 Minutes	19.6	11.3	22.9	6.3	0.0690	Not Significant
5 Minutes	20.0	12.5	31.8	8.8	0.0001	Significant
Hard Words						
1 Minute	19.0	4.6	15.3	4.1	0.0002	Significant
2 Minutes	23.4	97.1	15.6	4.2	0.2430	Not Significant
3 Minutes	15.8	4.4	16.1	3.7	0.5368	Not Significant
4 Minutes	15.5	3.4	15.8	3.6	0.6793	Not Significant
5 Minutes	14.4	3.3	16.5	3.2	0.0212	Significant
Lexical Density						
1 Minute	64.7	5.8	62.2	6.6	0.0682	Not Significant
2 Minutes	56.4	8.2	55.6	5.0	0.2465	Not Significant
3 Minutes	51.7	7.6	50.5	4.6	0.1251	Not Significant
4 Minutes	52.1	9.6	46.4	5.1	0.0002	Significant
5 Minutes	51.0	8.6	44.4	3.8	0.0001	Significant