

Philippine English as a linguistic variety: A review of its features and sociolinguistic attitudes

Patrick Carlos D. Famanily¹, Rosemaie A. Capili², Joseree Ann L. Ferrer³, Kenneth Cole S. Lacsina⁴, Marilou D. Licup⁵, Aileen Joy C. Sibal⁶

Pampanga State Agricultural University,
PHILIPPINES^{1,2,3,4,5,6}

¹Email: pcfamanilay3210@iskwela.psau.edu.ph

²Email: rcapilio6280@iskwela.psau.edu.ph

³Email: jaferrer1602@iskwela.psau.edu.ph

⁴Email: kclacsina0011@iskwela.psau.edu.ph

⁵Email: mlicup6169@iskwela.psau.edu.ph

⁶Email: ajsibal0043@iskwela.psau.edu.ph

Article information

Received: 21 Jul 2026

Revised: 06 Aug 2026

Accepted: 25 Aug 2026

Published: 02 Sep 2026

Abstract - This systematic review examines the linguistic and sociolinguistic characteristics of Philippine English (PhE) based on studies published from 2019 to 2026. Guided by research questions focusing on the phonological, lexical-semantic, and grammatical-syntactic features of PhE, as well as its sociolinguistic attitudes and functional roles in education, communication, and media, the study reviewed fifteen scholarly articles from credible academic databases and repositories. Findings reveal that PhE has developed into a legitimate and systematic variety of English shaped by local linguistic and cultural influences. Phonological studies identified recurring consonant substitutions, vowel mergers, and lectal variations influenced by regional and proficiency differences. Lexical-semantic features demonstrated linguistic creativity through borrowing, blending, clipping, compounding, and semantic shifts, particularly in digital communication contexts. Grammatical-syntactic analyses also revealed flexible subject-verb agreement, simplified tense marking, and localized sentence structures that reflect communicative adaptation rather than linguistic deficiency. Sociolinguistically, PhE is increasingly recognized as a marker of Filipino identity and communicative accessibility; however, native-speaker norms continue to dominate formal academic settings. The findings affirm that PhE is an evolving, rule-governed, and culturally grounded variety whose acceptance continues to expand across different social domains in the Philippines.

Keywords: Philippine English, world Englishes, language attitudes, language identity, English language variation

1. Introduction

English serves as a global language that facilitates communication, education, and intercultural exchange across diverse linguistic and cultural communities. Its worldwide expansion has led to the development of localized varieties shaped by the sociocultural and linguistic contexts of their users (Han, 2019). In multilingual societies, English interacts with indigenous languages, resulting in distinct and hybrid forms rather than functioning independently (Shakir & Deuber, 2024). In the Philippines, this process has contributed to the emergence of Philippine English (PhE) as a nativized variety. Drawing on Schneider's Dynamic Model of World Englishes, Borlongan (2016) argues that PhE



demonstrates increasing acceptance of local norms, structural stabilization, and emerging codification despite the persistence of linguistic insecurity and preference for external standards.

Although Philippine English (PhE) has gained increasing legitimacy, perceptions of the variety continue to be influenced by standard language ideologies, with many still privileging Inner Circle English and native-like proficiency (Liu & Cheng, 2017). Nevertheless, English remains highly valued in the Philippines because of its role in education, governance, business, international communication, academic achievement, social mobility, and employability (Manalastas, 2022; Sy Tamco, 2022; Pontillas & Fajardo, 2023; Melendez et al., 2025; Chavez et al., 2025). Within the country's multilingual context, English coexists with Filipino and regional languages in a complementary linguistic system, while PhE continues to gain recognition as a legitimate localized variety shaped by sustained interaction with native languages despite ongoing issues of language hierarchy and colonial influence (Lising, 2025; Lising & Bautista, 2025; Ponce, 2025; Ponce et al., 2025).

The historical development of PhE is closely linked to the Philippines' colonial and postcolonial experiences. Following the institutionalization of English during the American colonial period and its continued recognition as an official language after independence, English gradually evolved into a localized variety through sustained interaction with Filipino and other Austronesian languages (Borlongan & Lim, 2020). Scholarly recognition of PhE gained momentum through Llamzon's proposal of a standardized Filipino English and was further reinforced by Kachru's World Englishes framework, which legitimized localized English varieties beyond native-speaker norms (Rentillo et al., 2024). Although certain aspects of its phonological system, particularly its vowel inventory, remain underexplored (Lesho, 2018), recent studies indicate that PhE is progressing toward endonormative stabilization by increasingly adhering to its own linguistic norms rather than external standards (Borlongan & Lim, 2020). Moreover, historical influences from Spanish and continuous borrowing from Filipino and other regional languages have further enriched the variety, reinforcing its localized and adaptive character (Ahead Online, 2019; Borlongan & Lim, 2020; Rentillo et al., 2024).

The growing recognition of PhE is reflected not only in local scholarship but also in the international linguistic community. Danica Salazar, World English Editor of the Oxford English Dictionary, affirmed that the Philippine English accent is a legitimate variety of the English language, further validating its status within the global landscape of World Englishes (Asis, 2020). This recognition reinforces scholarly claims that PhE has evolved from being viewed as a deviation from American English into a legitimate and autonomous variety that reflects Filipino identity and linguistic realities (Borlongan & Lim, 2020; Rentillo et al., 2024).

Recent studies demonstrate that language learning is closely connected with linguistic identity, social perception, environmental discourse, and educational contexts. Research on Philippine English shows that learners' attitudes are influenced by their recognition, perception, and adaptation to localized varieties of English, suggesting a gradual shift from native-speaker norms toward greater acceptance of Philippine English in educational settings (Dillera-Prejoles et al., 2025; Quiñal & Hernando, 2025). Similarly, research on the Filipino language indicates that Gen Z students' language preferences are shaped by social, cultural, and educational factors, reflecting broader changes in language use among younger generations (Lamorinas et al., 2025).

Other studies emphasize the role of language in constructing social and cultural meanings. The use of proper names in Balinese society, for example, reflects distinctions associated with birth order and gender, demonstrating how linguistic practices can encode cultural values and social identities (Wajdi et al., 2024). In tourism discourse, corpus-based analysis has also shown how linguistic patterns, particularly adjective use, contribute to the representation and promotion of Indonesian tourism destinations (Fitriyanti, 2025). Meanwhile, research on English-speaking competence highlights the importance of strategic and systematic approaches to developing learners' oral communication abilities (Zega, 2025).

The relationship between language, society, and broader social issues is also evident in studies of discourse and linguistic capital. Eco-critical discourse analysis demonstrates how social-media captions can construct environmental meanings and promote particular ecological perspectives (Fernando & Dizon Jr., 2025). English proficiency may likewise function as a form of linguistic capital, potentially influencing social stratification and educational opportunities among university students in postcolonial contexts (Jamil, 2026). In addition, research on EFL learning

identifies multiple factors affecting deep learning among vocational college students, emphasizing the importance of learning environments, learner engagement, and instructional conditions (Jiang et al., 2024).

Although these studies cover diverse contexts, they collectively indicate that language learning and language use cannot be separated from cultural identity, social structures, educational environments, and contemporary communicative practices. This body of research supports the need for further investigation into how learners negotiate language varieties, linguistic identities, and social meanings within increasingly multilingual and digitally mediated educational contexts (Dillera-Prejoles et al., 2025; Jamil, 2026).

The legitimacy of PhE is further supported by its systematic linguistic features. Long-term contact between English and Philippine languages has resulted in distinctive grammatical constructions, including localized uses of articles, prepositions, and verbs, demonstrating that PhE follows stable linguistic patterns rather than representing random deviations from Standard English. Yao and Collins (2017) further observed that PhE exhibits grammatical colloquialization in written discourse, suggesting that the localization of the variety has extended beyond spoken communication. Likewise, Gonzales (2017) argues that the naturalization of English in the Philippines has produced distinctive lexical and grammatical features through sustained interaction with local languages, supporting the classification of the Philippines within Kachru's Outer Circle of World Englishes. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that PhE is a stable, rule-governed, and continually evolving variety of English shaped by the country's historical, linguistic, and sociocultural contexts.

This systematic review is anchored on the following research questions: (1) What are the key linguistic features of Philippine English in terms of its phonological, lexical-semantic, and grammatical-syntactic characteristics as identified in existing literature? (2) What sociolinguistic attitudes and functional roles are associated with Philippine English in education, communication, and media?

2. Method

2.1 Data Base

The data for this study were gathered from credible academic databases and scholarly repositories that provide accessible literature related to Philippine English. Specifically, the researchers will utilize sources from Philippine Journal of Linguistics, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and Social Science Research Network. These databases and repositories were selected because they contain credible and relevant scholarly materials such as journal articles, theses, dissertations, and other academic publications that are essential to the analysis of the linguistic and sociolinguistic features of PhE.

2.2 Keywords

The presence of the following keywords was considered in selecting the papers to be reviewed in this study: Philippine English (PhE), English language variation, linguistic features, phonological features, lexico-semantic features, grammatical-syntactic features, sociolinguistics, language attitudes, language perception, functional roles of language, communication contexts, educational discourse, media discourse, language identity, and English usage in society.

2.3 Inclusion Criteria

The study includes scholarly materials and literature that are relevant to the analysis of Philippine English. Specifically, the selected sources must meet the following criteria:

- (1) The literature must discuss the linguistic features of PhE, particularly its phonological, lexical-semantic, and grammatical-syntactic characteristics.
- (2) The literature must contain discussions related to the sociolinguistic attitudes, perceptions, and functional roles of PhE in education, communication, and media.
- (3) The sources must be academic and credible in nature, such as peer-reviewed journal article, theses, dissertations, and scholarly publications.
- (4) The literature must be written in the English language to ensure consistency and accessibility in analysis.
- (5) The studies must have been published between 2019 and 2026.
- (6) The studies included must focus primarily on the Philippine context and on the use or development of PhE.



(7) The materials must be accessible in full text through online databases to allow comprehensive review and analysis.

2.4 Articles

The paper reviewed a total of 15 research articles anchored in the Statement of the Problem, specifically focusing on the linguistic features and sociolinguistic dimensions of Philippine English. These studies were selected based on their relevance to phonological, lexical-semantic, and grammatical-syntactic characteristics, as well as language attitudes, acceptability, and functional roles in education, communication, and media.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Theoretical Frameworks

Across the reviewed studies, World Englishes (WE) emerged as the dominant theoretical framework, providing the foundation for understanding Philippine English (PhE) as a legitimate and localized variety of English. Several studies specifically drew on Kachru's World Englishes framework and Schneider's Dynamic Model of Postcolonial Englishes to explain the development, stabilization, and recognition of PhE across linguistic and sociocultural contexts (Santos, 2022; Sy Tamco, 2022; Paz, 2022; Babanto et al., 2023; Haloc & Dita, 2024; Dimaculacan & Sarmiento, 2024; Rentillo et al., 2024; Gustilo et al., 2025; Dita, 2025; Pal-ing, 2025; Tocalo et al., 2025; Hartwell, 2026).

For phonological studies, researchers employed lectal classification models, language transfer, and language contact theories to explain pronunciation variations influenced by speakers' first languages (Torres et al., 2021; Haloc & Dita, 2024). Studies on lexical and semantic features integrated Schneider's Dynamic Model with theories of language change, word formation, critical discourse analysis, and computer-mediated communication to account for the emergence and evolution of localized lexical innovations, particularly in digital and pandemic-related contexts (Santos, 2022; Afafe et al., 2021; Dimaculacan & Sarmiento, 2024). Investigations of grammatical and syntactic features combined World Englishes, nativization, and pragmatic linguistics to explain how local linguistic systems shape the structural characteristics of PhE (Pal-ing, 2025; Dita, 2025).

Studies examining language attitudes adopted World Englishes, Schneider's Dynamic Model, Language Attitude Theory, Standard Language Ideology, and the intelligibility-acceptability distinction to investigate perceptions of PhE and its increasing social acceptance (Rentillo et al., 2024; Gustilo et al., 2025; Hartwell, 2026). In the field of education, researchers primarily relied on World Englishes and Schneider's Dynamic Model to explain the pedagogical legitimacy of PhE and its role in developing local linguistic identity, while some studies implicitly reflected these principles despite not explicitly identifying a theoretical framework (Sy Tamco, 2022; Babanto et al., 2023; Tocalo et al., 2025). Finally, studies on communication and media applied World Englishes alongside sociolinguistic, discourse analytic, and cognitive discourse perspectives to examine the use and representation of PhE across digital and media platforms (Bautista, 2019; Paz, 2022). The reviewed literature demonstrates a strong theoretical consensus that positions Philippine English as an evolving, systematic, and socially legitimate variety shaped by linguistic, cultural, and technological influences.

3.1.2 Findings

The studies consistently showed that phonological variation is more evident among mesolect and basilect speakers, while acrolect speakers closely approximate General American English (GAE). Haloc and Dita (2024) identified features such as substitution of /θ/ and /ð/ with [t] and [d], vowel confusion between /i/ and /ɪ/, and variations in stress and intonation influenced by Ilocano. Similarly, Torres et al. (2021) found vowel reductions (e.g., /ʊ/, /ɔ/, /æ/), schwa substitution, and consonant shifts like /θ/ → [t] and /ð/ → [d]. Both studies conclude that these patterns are systematic features of Philippine English, supporting its recognition as a legitimate variety rather than a set of pronunciation errors.

Santos (2022) found that Philippine English during the COVID-19 pandemic exhibited significant lexical innovation through compounding (e.g., "community pantry," "enhanced community quarantine"), acronyms (e.g., ECQ, SAP, APOR), borrowing (e.g., "mobile palengke"), and semantic shifts such as broadening (e.g., "frontliner"), narrowing (e.g., "sanitize"), and pejoration (e.g., "lockdown"), largely driven by institutional and media discourse, while Dimaculacan and Sarmiento (2024) identified extensive lexical creativity in Facebook PhE through blending, clipping,

compounding, hypocoristic extension (e.g., “thankie”), and backward spelling (e.g., “dusty” from “study”), showing that social media accelerates informal, context-dependent language innovation, and Afile et al. (2021) found 29 Internet PhE lexical items dominated by borrowing (e.g., “adobo,” “hugot,” “balikbayan,” “bongga”), noting that while these forms are widely used in digital spaces, ESL teachers generally consider them acceptable only in informal contexts, highlighting the ongoing tension between lexical innovation and standardization in PhE.

Philippine English exhibits stable and systematic syntactic features that reflect nativization rather than error. Pal-ing (2025) found that LGU executive orders frequently use long, complex sentences with multiple embedded clauses, repetitive structures, and dense prepositional phrases, all of which function to ensure precision, clarity, and legal unambiguity in official communication. Similarly, Dita (2025) identified patterns such as flexible subject-verb agreement, variable article usage, and simplified tense marking, explaining that these features are widely used, stable, and influenced by Philippine language structures. Both studies conclude that these syntactic characteristics form a coherent grammatical system, reinforcing the view that PhE is a legitimate, fully functional variety shaped by local linguistic and socio-functional demands rather than a deviation from Standard English.

Hartwell (2026) found that Philippine English is increasingly visible and partially accepted in academic research communication, where intelligibility and clarity are prioritized over native-speaker norms, although acceptance remains selective and inconsistent due to ongoing “non-native speakerism” in scholarly publishing. Similarly, Gustilo et al. (2025) revealed that Filipino-Americans generally perceive PhE as highly intelligible but less acceptable in formal and academic contexts, strongly influenced by Standard Language Ideology and preference for American English norms, creating a gap between comprehension and social acceptance. Rentillo et al. (2024) further showed that younger Filipinos across regions generally accept and normalize PhE, especially in informal and spoken domains, although NCR respondents exhibited lower acceptability due to stronger exposure to Standard English, concluding that acceptability is highly domain- and context-dependent. Overall, the studies consistently indicate that PhE is widely intelligible and increasingly recognized as legitimate, but its acceptability remains shaped by ideology, context, and institutional standards.

The studies showed a tension between recognition of Philippine English and continued reliance on American English as the standard in formal education. Sy Tamco (2022) found that ESL teachers generally accept PhE in spoken communication and informal classroom interaction but continue to prioritize American English in formal writing due to institutional standards, with limited awareness of PhE contributing to misconceptions and language anxiety among learners. Likewise, Tocalo et al. (2025) revealed that both teachers and students recognize PhE as a legitimate variety and marker of identity, but teachers demonstrate hesitation in fully legitimizing it in formal instruction due to native speakerism and the “teacher’s dilemma,” resulting in selective and cautious application of World Englishes principles in the classroom. Similarly, Babanto et al. (2023) found that ESL teachers generally hold positive attitudes toward PhE and view it as beneficial for inclusivity, communication, and learner engagement, although some concerns persist regarding pronunciation, vocabulary variation, and academic acceptability. Overall, the studies conclude that while PhE is increasingly recognized and valued in educational settings, its full integration remains limited by standard language ideologies and institutional preferences for Inner Circle norms.

Philippine English plays a significant role in communication and media while remaining subject to varying degrees of acceptance. Bautista (2019) found that PhE enhances communication by making messages more relatable, culturally grounded, and expressive, allowing speakers to maintain Filipino identity while using English, and highlighting its effectiveness in media for clarity, creativity, and entertainment, thereby supporting its acceptance as a valid variety in both media and academic contexts. Similarly, Paz (2022) found that PhE is widely used in online and digital communication; however, its legitimacy remains contested, with some users rejecting it due to perceived grammatical deviations, while others accept or partially accept it depending on familiarity and exposure. Overall, both studies conclude that PhE functions as an important communicative and identity marker in media spaces, though its acceptance is still shaped by ideological attitudes toward standard English norms.

3.2 Discussion



Across the two studies by Haloc and Dita (2024) and Torres et al. (2021), several consistent patterns emerge regarding the phonological features of Philippine English. Both studies confirm that systematic deviations from General American English (GAE) are present and are influenced by speakers' linguistic background and level of proficiency. A recurring pattern is the substitution of consonant sounds, particularly the interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/, which are commonly replaced with /t/ and /d/. Similarly, both studies highlight vowel-related variations, such as the confusion or merging of vowel sounds (e.g., /i/ and /ɪ/, and the frequent substitution or absence of the schwa /ə/). Another shared finding is that phonological variation follows a gradient, where speakers with higher proficiency (acrolect) show fewer deviations, while those with lower proficiency (basilect) exhibit more substitutions and simplifications. These patterns reinforce the idea that PhE has stable and identifiable phonological features shaped by local languages.

Despite these similarities, some contradictions can be observed between the two studies. Haloc and Dita (2024) emphasize regional and dialectal variation, showing that even speakers within the same linguistic group (Ilocano) display differences depending on geographical location. In contrast, Torres et al. (2021) focus more on lectal variation (acrolect–mesolect–basilect), suggesting a more structured progression of phonological features based on proficiency rather than location. Additionally, Haloc and Dita (2024) include suprasegmental features such as stress and intonation, revealing variation in these areas, whereas Torres et al. (2021) primarily concentrate on segmental features (vowels and consonants), with limited attention to suprasegmentals. This difference creates a partial divergence in how phonological variation is conceptualized either as geographically influenced or primarily proficiency-based.

Several gaps remain evident when the two studies are considered together. Both rely on limited sample sizes, especially Torres et al. (2021), which affects generalizability. There is also a lack of large-scale or longitudinal data, as well as limited analysis of suprasegmental features like intonation across broader groups. Additionally, sociolinguistic factors such as education and language exposure are not fully explored, leaving important influences on pronunciation underexamined.

Both studies confirm that PhE has distinct and systematic phonological features, including consonant substitutions and vowel variations influenced by proficiency and regional background. These features demonstrate that PhE is a legitimate and evolving variety, not merely a deviation from GAE. Also, the implications highlight the need to recognize and accept local pronunciation features in English teaching to reduce stigma. They also point the importance of context-sensitive instruction and further research using larger and more diverse samples to better understand phonological variation in PhE.

The selected studies provide insight into how the lexical and semantic features of Philippine English are shaped across different communicative contexts. In analyzing these features, Santos (2022) examines how pandemic-related discourse led to both lexical innovations, such as compounding, borrowing, initialisms and acronyms, as well as semantic shifts, including broadening, narrowing, and pejoration. These developments highlight how language adapts to urgent communicative needs while reflecting broader social realities during times of crisis. Similarly, Dimaculangan and Sarmiento (2024) show that PhE in social media demonstrates a high degree of lexical creativity, with users forming new expressions through processes such as blending, hypocoristic extension, anagrammatic transposition and clipping, shaped by the informal and interactive nature of digital communication. In contrast, Afable et al. (2021) focus on blog-based language use and identify borrowing as a dominant word-formation process, with lexical items reflecting strong cultural influences; however, they also emphasize that such forms are generally considered acceptable primarily in informal contexts, particularly among ESL teachers.

Across the studies, several patterns emerge. A consistent theme is the productivity of word-formation processes across diverse communicative contexts, indicating that lexical innovation is a defining feature of PhE. At the same time, semantic shifts further illustrate how meanings evolve in response to sociocultural conditions, though this dimension is addressed more explicitly in some studies than in others. However, contradictions arise in how these features are evaluated. While Santos (2022) frames these developments as functional and necessary responses to communicative demands, Afable et al. (2021) highlight limitations in their acceptability, indicating that such forms remain appropriate primarily in informal settings. This reveals an ongoing tension between linguistic

innovation and standard language norms. Despite these shared insights, gaps remain in the uneven examination of semantic features: Santos (2022) provides an explicit analysis of semantic shifts, whereas Dimaculangan and Sarmiento (2024) and Afable et al. (2021) focus more heavily on lexical innovation. There is also limited attention to how these features operate in formal or academic registers, and a narrow range of participant perspectives across the studies.

The findings indicate that PhE is shaped by dynamic lexical and, to a lesser extent, semantic processes that are closely influenced by communicative context and patterns of usage. These processes reflect how speakers actively adapt language to meet practical needs across domains such as public discourse, digital communication, and culturally embedded expression. Taken together, these insights underscore the need for more inclusive and context-sensitive approaches in both linguistic research and language education, particularly in acknowledging the legitimacy of localized lexical forms and context-driven meanings. At the same time, they highlight the importance of re-evaluating rigid standards of language use, especially in determining what is considered appropriate across formal and informal settings. Ultimately, this suggests that PhE should be recognized not merely as a variation of standard English, but as an evolving and legitimate variety shaped by the sociocultural realities and communicative practices of its users.

The recent studies on the grammar of Philippine English highlights a systematic and evolving set of syntactic features shaped by both internal linguistic development and external sociolinguistic influences. Dita (2025) emphasizes that PhE has developed stable syntactic patterns that are no longer merely “errors” but are increasingly recognized as features of a localized variety. These include variation in subject–verb agreement, flexible use of articles, and the tendency toward a simplified tense marking. Dita (2025) argues that such features reflect natural processes of language nativization wherein speakers adapt English structures to align with patterns that are found in Philippine languages. This is resulting in a grammar that is both intelligible and functionally efficient within its context. Similarly, Pal-ing (2025) demonstrates that institutional and formal texts also exhibit distinct syntactic tendencies, such as longer sentences with multiple clauses and frequent use of prepositional phrases. While these structures differ from the standard norms, they serve an important purpose in governance by ensuring clarity and avoiding confusion. This suggests that PhE syntax is shaped not only by language transfer but also by the specific needs of different communication situations.

As per the research gap, previous studies have often focused only on vocabulary and pronunciation. Authors often view non-standard structures as mistakes rather than valid patterns. There is a need to update our understanding to show that these features are consistent and rule-governed, especially in formal and legal writing. Both studies reveal common patterns showing that PhE is systematic and influenced by local languages. The structures are adapted to fit the communication needs of society, whether for daily conversation or official documents. However, there is also a noticeable difference in style. Dita (2025) observes a trend toward simplicity in general use, while Pal-ing (2025) notes a preference for complexity and detail in formal texts. This shows that the language is flexible and changes depending on the situation, rather than being simple or complex all the time.

The findings confirm that PhE has a distinct and stable grammar with its own set of rules. It is characterized by features like simplified tense marking and flexible agreement in casual contexts, and detailed sentence structures in formal writing. These are not errors but natural developments that help people communicate effectively. The implications of these studies are significant for education and policy. It is important to recognize PhE as a valid and legitimate variety. Schools and institutions should move away from strict standards and instead appreciate the local variety for its clarity, function, and unique identity that is accepted and used properly in all areas of society.

Across the selected studies is a growing appreciation of Philippine English as an intelligible and functional variety of English, alongside its larger role in expressing linguistic identity. All the reviewed studies constantly show that PhE is widely known and understood easily across different groups, especially to younger Filipinos and Filipino-Americans supporting its effectiveness as a means of communication in everyday situations. In addition, there is a common view that exhibits a lower acceptance of the language in terms of formal contexts showcasing that acceptance is highly dependent on context, while informal domains exhibiting a greater flexibility, and yet formal and



academic setting still favors standardized native-speaker norms. This highlights an ongoing shift toward inclusivity, but not yet actually the full transition of the language.

However, contradictions are also apparent in the results. In the study of Rentillo et al (2024) it emphasizes a powerful acceptance and normalization of PhE among younger Filipinos, especially as a marker of identity. Meanwhile Gustilo et al (2025) found that Filipino-Americans, in spite of appreciating its legitimacy, still its formal acceptability were rated lower, due to the strong influence of standard language ideology. Similarly to the result of the study of Hartwell (2026) it shows that academic writing as a space for gradually becoming inclusive, yet still limited by institutional expectation and external norms. These results suggest that the perception in acceptance of PhE in formal settings differs significantly based on exposure, location, and sociocultural backgrounds.

In spite of these important findings provided by the selected studies, some gaps remain apparent. The studies focus on specific groups, such as students and younger generations, as evident in the study of Gustilo et al and Rentillo et al, which limits the generalizability of the results to other individuals like professionals, educators, and older people. Additionally, Hartwell examined the presence of PhE in academic publishing, there are still gaps that are unexplored like the impact on outcomes such as publication success and professional opportunities. Furthermore, the studies depend on cross-sectional design, a lack of longitudinal approach is needed that could explore how attitudes toward PhE develop over time. These gaps suggest the need for a broader and in depth research that included diverse participants and real-world implications.

The results recommend that PhE is in a moving phase, widely known and understood, and strongly linked to identity, but still treated less value due to the strong influence of language ideologies that support native norms. This highlights a broader tension between global standards and local linguistic realities. The findings of these selected studies emphasize several important implications for language education, academic institutions and broader communication practices. The need to increase a greater awareness and acceptance of World Englishes, especially in formal settings. Educators should promote awareness of World Englishes, especially the PhE variety to decrease linguistic discrimination. While, institutions and publishers may reconsider strict adherence to standard English and shift toward more inclusive language standards. It also recommends that it should be acknowledged and integrated as a legitimate language both in teaching and communication.

A clear pattern across the selected studies is the general recognition of World Englishes and the legitimacy of Philippine English (PhE), alongside a persistent reliance on Inner Circle standards. Sy Tamco (2022) shows that ESL teachers acknowledge language variation as natural and accept PhE, particularly in spoken communication, yet still prioritize American English (AmE) in formal writing due to its perceived prestige and historical authority. A similar pattern is observed in Tocalo et al. (2025), where both teachers and students recognize PhE as a marker of Filipino identity and a coexisting variety, but teachers continue to orient themselves toward American and British English as standards in education. Babanto et al. (2023) likewise report positive attitudes toward PhE, with teachers recognizing its pedagogical value in fostering inclusivity, engagement, and communicative competence. Across all three studies, there is a consistent theme of acceptance of PhE in principle, particularly in informal or spoken contexts, combined with cautious or limited application in formal academic settings.

Despite these shared patterns, contradictions emerge in how acceptance translates into practice. Sy Tamco (2022) highlights a tension where teachers support communicative flexibility yet restrict PhE in writing, reinforcing standardized norms. Tocalo et al. (2025) further complicate this by showing that even increased awareness of World Englishes does not necessarily lead to greater acceptance of PhE in practice, especially among tertiary educators who become more conservative despite their knowledge. In contrast, Babanto et al. (2023) present a more optimistic view, where teachers are not only open to PhE but also actively recognize its benefits in improving motivation, cultural relevance, and classroom interaction. However, even in this study, some hesitation remains regarding pronunciation, vocabulary, and academic reliability. These differences suggest that while attitudes are generally positive, the degree of willingness to integrate PhE varies depending on context, level of education, and perceived academic standards.

Several gaps are evident across the studies. Sy Tamco (2022) identifies limited awareness and understanding of PhE features among both teachers and learners, which leads to misclassification of localized forms as errors and contributes to language anxiety. Tocalo et al. (2025) point to a gap between theoretical knowledge and classroom implementation, indicating that awareness of linguistic frameworks does not automatically result in pedagogical change. Babanto et al. (2023), while highlighting positive attitudes, reveal lingering doubts about the empirical foundation and wider applicability of PhE. Taken together, these gaps suggest a need for more systematic integration of PhE into teacher training, curriculum design, and assessment practices, as well as further research on its codification and standardization.

The findings collectively indicate that PhE is increasingly recognized as a legitimate and functional variety of English, yet its status in formal education remains contested. Sy Tamco (2022) emphasizes the coexistence of acceptance and restriction, where PhE is used to support fluency but not formal accuracy. Tocalo et al. (2025) frame this as a “teacher’s dilemma,” reflecting the struggle between acknowledging local identity and adhering to established norms. Babanto et al. (2023) extend this by demonstrating that PhE can enhance teaching effectiveness and learner outcomes when integrated meaningfully. These findings converge on the idea that PhE occupies a transitional space between recognition and full legitimization in educational contexts.

The implications of these patterns highlight the need for a shift toward more inclusive and context-sensitive language teaching practices. Sy Tamco (2022) suggests that reducing strict adherence to native norms can help lower language anxiety and encourage participation. Tocalo et al. (2025) advocate for a pluricentric approach that values multiple English varieties and promotes intercultural competence, while also calling for stronger curricular integration of PhE across educational levels. Babanto et al. (2023) reinforce this by showing that incorporating PhE can create more engaging, culturally relevant, and empowering learning environments. Together, these studies imply that advancing the status of PhE requires not only theoretical acceptance but also concrete pedagogical shifts, increased awareness, and institutional support to bridge the gap between recognition and practice.

One pattern that stands out from the above researches is the dual role of Philippine English in both communication and media. According to Paz (2022) and Bautista (2019), PhE contributes to the clarity and relatability of communications and media while being associated with one's national identity. At the same time, there is a contradiction in terms of the language's acceptance as a legitimate means of communication. Even though Bautista (2019) gives a rather positive assessment of the efficiency of PhE as a means of communication, Paz (2022) notes that people still question and oppose it due to the language's lack of accuracy and grammar.

One important gap in the research on PhE is related to the low level of PhE acceptance in the academic world despite its extensive use in other spheres of communication. It can be said that despite being effective in conveying information, PhE still is not considered a legitimate way of communication in the eyes of society. It can be concluded that PhE proves to be a very useful language variety that can help people improve their communication skills if introduced properly into education and media.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Conclusion

Across the reviewed studies, Philippine English (PhE) consistently emerges as a legitimate, systematic, and evolving variety of English shaped by local linguistic, cultural, and communicative influences. Phonological research identifies recurring consonant substitutions, vowel mergers, and lectal and regional variation, with more proficient speakers exhibiting fewer deviations. Lexical and semantic studies highlight the productivity of borrowing and other word-formation processes, as well as semantic shifts driven by sociocultural and digital contexts, although the acceptability of these forms varies according to context and formality. Grammatical and syntactic investigations demonstrate that features such as flexible subject-verb agreement, simplified tense marking, and distinct sentence structures are systematic adaptations influenced by local languages rather than random errors. Studies on language attitudes reveal increasing recognition of PhE, particularly in informal and identity-related contexts, while native-speaker norms continue to influence perceptions in formal



academic and institutional settings. Similarly, research in education shows that although teachers and learners acknowledge the legitimacy of PhE, American and British English remain the preferred standards for instruction and assessment. In communication and media, PhE contributes to clarity, accessibility, and the expression of Filipino identity despite ongoing debates regarding its legitimacy in formal domains. These findings affirm that PhE is a rule-governed and continually developing variety whose acceptance varies across social, educational, and professional contexts.

4.2 Implications

The findings suggest that Philippine English should be recognized as a legitimate variety with its own systematic phonological, lexical, and grammatical rules rather than being treated as incorrect or deficient English. They also imply the need for reforms in language education, particularly in challenging the dominance of Inner Circle norms and incorporating World Englishes perspectives into teaching practices. Curriculum development should reflect real language use in the Philippines, especially in spoken and communicative contexts, to better prepare learners for actual language environments. The studies further highlight the importance of addressing sociolinguistic awareness, as negative attitudes toward PhE in formal settings reflect strong language ideologies that may contribute to linguistic stigma. In addition, the use of PhE in communication and media emphasizes its functional role in promoting clarity and identity, suggesting that it holds practical value in public discourse.

4.3 Recommendation

It is recommended that Philippine English (PhE) be more fully integrated into language education by incorporating its phonological, lexical, grammatical, and discourse features into classroom instruction while recognizing localized forms as systematic linguistic variations rather than errors. Language standards, teacher training, and language awareness initiatives should likewise be strengthened to promote greater understanding of World Englishes, reduce stigma toward PhE, and encourage more inclusive and context-sensitive language policies in academic and professional settings. Future research should broaden the scope of PhE studies by involving more diverse participants, conducting longitudinal investigations, and exploring underexamined areas such as suprasegmental features, pragmatics, discourse patterns, and comparative analyses with other World Englishes. Further studies should also examine the role of PhE in formal domains, including academic publishing, professional communication, and the workplace, to better inform language policy and practice.

References

- Afable, C. B., Austria, H. N. M., & Evidente, J. D. (2021). Lexical Features of When in Manila Blogs: IPE Word-Formation Processes and their Acceptability to ESL Teachers. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, 3(1), 50–67. <https://doi.org/10.56498/31202149>
- Ahead Online. (2019). Philippine English: What Sets it Apart. <https://www.online.ahead.edu.ph/philippine-english-what-sets-it-apart/>
- Asis, D. (2020). Philippine English is Legit. Oxford English Dictionary Says So. Bayanihan Foundation Worldwide. <https://fdnbayanihan.org/2020/08/28/philippine-english-is-legit-oxford-english-dictionary-says-so/>
- Babanto, M. G., Babanto, M. D., Bante, M. A., Camua, R. D., de Leon, M. A. S., Guinto, G. G., Macalino, M. S., Mangulabnan, G. O., Mercado, M. F. A., Natividad, R. R., Fabian-Perona, E., Santos, P. J. P., Torres, M. L. B., & Anicas, R. P. (2023). Attitudes Towards Philippine English: The Case of ESL Teachers in Selected Provinces in Central Luzon, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(7), 2525 – 2534. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.04.07.29
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2019). Acceptability of Philippine English among English language teachers. *Kata: A Biannual Publication on the Study of Language and Literature*. K@ta. 21(2), 85–97. <https://kata.petra.ac.id/index.php/ing/article/view/19798>
- Borlongan, A. M. (2016). Relocating Philippine English in Schneider's dynamic model. *Asian Englishes*, 18(3), 232–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1223067>
- Borlongan, A.M. & Lim, J.H. (2020). Philippine English. Freiburg Institute for Advance Studies. <http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/75>
- Chavez, K. L. et al. (2025). English Language Confidence and Employability in the Tourism Industry. Bilingual Publishing Group. <https://journals.bilpubgroup.com/index.php/fls>
- Dillera-Prejoles, M. J. P., Quiñal, P. O., Jr., & Gomez, M. J. A. (2025). Shifting tides: ESL learners' attitude towards Philippine English. *International Journal of English Teaching and Applied Sciences*, 5(1), 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.5.1.SC-0325-011>

- Dimaculangan, N. G., & Sarmiento, M. B. (2024). A corpus-based study of word-formation creativity in Facebook Philippine English. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 13(2), 1252. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i2.26182>
- Dita, S. N. (2025). The grammar of Philippine English: An update. In *World Englishes in the 21st century: New perspectives and challenges to the dynamic model*. Oxford Academic, 103–121. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781399527842.003.0006>
- Fernando, J. C. R., & Dizon Jr, R. P. (2025). Ecopost: Eco-critical discourse analysis of wwf-Philippines' captions. *Journal of Education, Social & Communication Studies*, 2(3), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.71028/jescs.v2i3.132>
- Fitriyanti, A. I. (2025). The adjective concordances on the tourism brochure “wildiaries Indonesia”: Corpus linguistics-based analysis. *Journal of Education, Social & Communication Studies*, 2(1), 30–38. <https://doi.org/10.71028/jescs.v2i1.25>
- Gonzales, W. D. W. (2017). Philippine Englishes. *Asian Englishes*, 19(1), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1274574>
- Gustilo, L., Dumanig, F., & Jubilado, R. (2025). General Attitudes, Intelligibility, and Acceptability: How Philippine English Is Perceived by Filipino-Americans. MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages10060124>
- Haloc, L. I., & Dita, S. N. (2024). Selected features of Philippine English pronunciation among three groups of Ilocano speakers. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 34(2), 4–23. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jml.vol34no2.2>
- Han, L. (2019). A review of the major varieties of English language. *International Education Studies*, 12(2), 93. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n2p93>
- Hartwell, N. M. (2026). Acceptability of Philippine English in academic research communication: Challenging ‘non-native speakerism’ in published research. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17697355>
- Jamil, M. T. (2026). English language proficiency as linguistic capital: A mixed-methods study of social stratification among university students in postcolonial Bangladesh. *European Journal of English Language Studies*, 6(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ejels.6.1.1>
- Jiang, L., Lv, M., Cheng, M., Chen, X., & Peng, C. (2024). Factors affecting deep learning of EFL students in higher vocational colleges under small private online courses-based settings: A grounded theory approach. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 40(6), 3098–3110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.13060>
- Lamorinas, D. D., Luna, L. A., Lai, M. N. D., Magno, J. M., Saporno, R. N., Reyes, R. B. D., & Chavez, J. V. (2025). A General Perspective on the Factors Influencing the Low Preferences of Gen Z College Students towards the Filipino Language. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(3), 451–466. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8482>
- Lesho, M. (2018). Philippine English (Metro Manila acrolect). *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*, 48(3), 357–370. doi:10.1017/S0025100317000548
- Lising, L. (2025). Global English in multilingual Philippines: Language practices in government communications. In *World Englishes in their local multilingual ecologies*. Hamburg Studies on Linguistic Diversity, 91–115. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hslid.9.05lis>
- Lising, L., & Bautista, M. L. S. (2025). A tale of language ownership and identity in a multilingual society: Revisiting functional nativeness. *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.59588/2961-3094.1000>
- Liu, J., Wang, Y., Li, Y., Peñuelas, J., Zhao, Y., Sardans, J., Tetzlaff, D., Liu, J., Liu, X., Yuan, H., Li, Y., Chen, J., & Wu, J. (2023). Soil ecological stoichiometry synchronously regulates stream nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations and ratios. *CATENA*, 231, 107357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2023.107357>
- Liu, P. E., & Cheng, Y. (2017). Attitudes toward English as an International Language: A Comparative Study of College Teachers and Students in Taiwan. *Tamkang University Institutional Repository (TKUIR)*, 12(1), 66–85. <https://tkuir.lib.tku.edu.tw/dspace/handle/987654321/123232>
- Manalastas, N. E. L. (2022). The Good and the Bad: The Social Role and Position of English In the Philippines. Department of Linguistics- UP Diliman <https://share.google/CroUh6MG4ajuPKNxQ>
- Melendez, A. B. et al. (2025). Employment status of the Bachelor of Arts in English language graduates: Insights for curriculum enhancement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90300105>
- Pal-ing, M. P. (2025). A Syntactic Analysis of English in LGU Executive Orders: A Philippine English Perspective. Iligan Institute of Technology. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32045.76009>
- Paz, R. M. (2022). Mental models on Philippine English in online spaces: Challenges and opportunities. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 28(2), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2022-2802-02>
- Ponce, A. R. C. (2025). Colonial mindset, appropriation, and emotion: Language attitudes towards English of multilingual speakers in southern Philippines. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2475371>



- Ponce, A. R., Tocalo, A. W. I., Dita, S. N., Mayo, F., Sarigan, J., & Abo, H. (2025). Language attitudes towards L1-accented English in a multilingual ecology: The case of Philippine English. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 25, 935–954. <https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.25..202507.935>
- Pontillas, G. H., & Fajardo, I. J. (2023). Employability status of English language studies graduates in a polytechnic state college in the Philippines. *English Journal Literacy Utamna*. <https://doi.org/10.33197/ejlitutama.v8i1.229>
- Quiñal, P. O., Jr., & Hernando, M. J. (2025). Students' perception, recognition and adaptation of Philippine English in higher education. *Pedagogy Review*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.6.1.SC-0425-004>
- Rentillo, P., Casalan, M., & Gustilo, L. (2024). Regional variability and domain-specific acceptance of Philippine English expressions among younger Filipinos. *Languages*. MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9120376>
- Santos, R. I. (2022). Community Pantry, ECQ, and Social Distancing: Linguistic Innovations in Philippine English during the COVID-19 health crisis. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 53, 88–106. https://www.pjl-phil.com/_files/ugd/afc4df_bfbf6e799fe4429187873cocad8ee87e.pdf
- Shakir, M., & Deuber, D. (2024). Code-switching in South Asian English CMC. *English World-Wide a Journal of Varieties of English*, 45(3), 311–341. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.23068.sha>
- Sy Tamco, A.B.R. (2022). Philippine English in the ESL Classroom: A Study of English Teachers' Beliefs and Pedagogical Practices in Higher Education. *Globus*. 10.46360/globus.edu.220221020
- Tocalo, A.W., Albores, A., Zalzos, R., Fernandez, M.C., & Ponce, A.R. (2025). Legitimizing Philippine English: Attitudinal Differences between Multilingual Teachers and Students of English. *MEXTESOL Journal*. 49. 2025. 10.61871/mj.v49n3-2.
- Torres, J.M., Matildo, R.M.E., Somblino, R.A. & Alieto, E.O. (2021). Another look at the phonological features of lectal speakers: Re-validation of the description of the Philippine English's phonology. *TESOL International Journal*, 16 (4.3), 103-114. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3897300
- Wajdi, M., Sanjaya, I. N. S., Suputra, G. K. A., Sarmi, N. N., & Andyana, I. K. S. (2024). Linguistic landscape of Balinese society: Birth order and gender distinctions in proper names. *Journal of Education, Social & Communication Studies*, 1(1), 20–27. Retrieved from <https://ojs.ptmjb.com/index.php/JESCS/article/view/2> (Original work published January 15, 2024)
- Yao, X., & Collins, P. (2017). Exploring grammatical colloquialisation in non-native English: A case study of Philippine English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 22(3), 457–482. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674316000599>
- Zega, Y. S. (2025). Effective strategies for enhancing English speaking competence among learners in English education study programs. *Journal of Education, Social & Communication Studies*, 2(2), 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.71028/jescs.v2i2.27>