

Acceptability of Philippine English among English Language Teachers

[Emma Jenelyn Impas Cainta](#)

Jose Rizal Memorial State University, PHILIPPINES

Article Info:

Received: 21 October 2024

Revised: 29 October 2025

Accepted: 23 December 2025

Published Online: 26 December 2025

Keywords:

Philippine English,
World Englishes,
Acceptability,
Grammatical and Lexical Items

Corresponding Author:

Emma Jenelyn Impas Cainta

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4177-2617>

Jose Rizal Memorial State University,
PHILIPPINES

Email:

emmajenelyncainta@jrmsu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

Assimilation of new English varieties in English Language Teaching (ELT) is an important topic in contemporary applied linguistics and ELT. Whether or whether English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction in the Philippines should include Philippine English has long been a topic of discussion. Therefore, this study sought to ascertain the degree to which English language teachers found Philippine English (PhE) grammatical and lexical items acceptable. This study employed a quantitative research design using an adopted questionnaire. The findings revealed that the English teachers accepted PhE grammatical and lexical items. Teachers continued to find certain PhE lexical and grammatical issues unacceptable, though. To assist future English teachers in comprehending why Filipino ESL students produce grammatical and lexical elements that deviate from the norm in American English, World Englishes and PhE courses should be revisited within the BSEd English major curriculum.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY](#) license.



INTRODUCTION

The global spread of English has led to the emergence of diverse varieties of the language, collectively referred to as World Englishes or New Englishes. English is no longer a single, monolithic language spoken by a specific group but has evolved into a global language with numerous localized forms. Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008) use the term *World Englishes* to describe these emerging variants, emphasizing the linguistic richness and diversity that reflect different sociolinguistic contexts. They further note that no single authority governs its usage, allowing English to adapt to local norms and cultural identities.

These regional or indigenous varieties, particularly those shaped by colonial and postcolonial histories with the United Kingdom or the United States, are spoken across many countries, such as Singapore, Hong Kong, Iran, India, Malaysia, Spain, and the Philippines, where English functions as a second or foreign language. In some contexts, these local English varieties are embraced and viewed positively; in others, American or British English continues to be regarded as the standard.

In the Philippines, English has been formally introduced and institutionalized, playing a crucial role in education, governance, and communication. A significant milestone in the recognition of localized English varieties occurred in the 1990s, when the World Englishes paradigm was introduced to English educators and

Filipino scholars. This framework challenged the dominance of native-speaker norms and created a space for local linguistic identities to flourish (Martin, 2014).

As a result, a distinct variety known as Philippine English (PhE) emerged. De Leon (2016) affirmed that Philippine English is a legitimate and unique variety. Earlier, Gonzalez (1983) and Llamzon (1969), as cited in Bautista (2000), had already acknowledged it as the educated variety of English spoken in the country. Despite English not being the first language of most Filipinos, it has been successfully nativized, resulting in speech that is intelligible to native speakers. Dayag (2007, as reported in Dita & De Leon, 2017) found that more than 50% of speakers from expanding circles and over 80% from inner and outer circles understood PhE.

PhE is characterized by distinct grammar, phonology, spelling, and pronunciation features. Local scholars have explored its acceptability among both teachers and learners. As Khejeri (2014) noted, language attitudes significantly influence language usage and instructional decisions. Teachers' perceptions, in particular, can either support or hinder the use of PhE in academic settings. Torres and Alieto (2019) emphasized that teachers play a critical role in shaping students' attitudes toward English learning. Thus, their acceptance of PhE is vital in advancing its recognition and legitimacy.

While scholarly interest in World Englishes and PhE has grown, empirical studies focusing on how Filipino teachers navigate native-speaker norms alongside PhE in classroom instruction remain limited. Much of the existing literature leans toward theoretical or macro-level analyses, often neglecting practical insights gained from real-world teaching experiences.

This study seeks to address the gap in empirical research by investigating how Filipino English teachers perceive and integrate PhE in their instruction, particularly within curricula that remain largely aligned with American or British English standards. This study aims to determine the extent to which language instructors accept the grammatical and lexical features of PhE and to explore how this acceptance varies based on demographic factors such as age, gender, years of teaching experience, work status, educational attainment, and the type of English exposure during their elementary, high school, and college education. The novelty of this research lies in highlighting teachers' lived experiences and pedagogical practices amid the evolving global language norms, thereby contributing practical insights into the role of educators in legitimizing and promoting Philippine English in academic settings.

Statement of the Problem

This study tries to address is the degree of acceptability of the grammatical and lexical features of Philippine English (PhE) among English language teachers, and how this acceptability varies based on their demographic and professional profiles, including age, gender, educational background, employment status, years of service, and the variety of English they were exposed to during their education. Specifically, this study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the respondents' profile in terms of:
 - a. age
 - b. gender
 - c. educational attainment
 - d. employment status
 - e. years of service
 - f. varieties of English used when they were students in elementary, high school and college?
2. What is the extent of acceptability of Philippine English (PhE) grammatical and lexical items among English language teachers?

3. Is there a significant difference in the extent of acceptability of Philippine English (PhE) grammatical and lexical items among English language teachers when grouped according to their profile?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Acceptability of World English Features

Research has looked at grammatical and lexical acceptability in different English varieties, which Nilsenová (2009) defines as the extent to which speakers and listeners find a sentence to be grammatically correct. Chang (2008), Sewell (2012), and Foluke (2012) investigated the acceptability of Singapore, Hong Kong, and Nigerian English accents, respectively, finding varying levels of acceptability among native and non-native speakers, with local accents generally being more acceptable.

Ting (2011) stated that Hong Kong English is in the third stage of Schneider's model but has remnants of the second stage. Wang (2009) observed that the acceptability of Chinglish in China varied depending on the features tested. The acceptance of several elements in Nigerian, Japanese, and Ghanaian English was similarly mixed in studies by Alo and Igwebuikwe (2012), Fujiwara (2007), and Nkansah (2016), demonstrating that acceptability of non-native English variations can vary among both native and non-native speakers.

Philippine English

Recognized as a unique variation of English from the outer circle countries (Kachru, 1983), PhE has evolved into a system that is widely known and utilized by Filipinos (McKaughan, 1993). According to Bautista (2000), PhE is a recognized, institutionalized, and standardized form of English that reflects the distinct cultural and linguistic context of the Philippines rather than deviating from Standard American English norms. It is occasionally influenced by the first language in pronunciation and grammar.

As stated by Bautista (2000) and Gonzalez (1983), PhE is a distinct type of English used by educated Filipinos. PhE is present in numerous forms of media (Bernardo & Madrunio, 2015). According to Llamzon (1969), as cited in Bautista (2001a), standard Philippine English is the English spoken by educated Filipinos that is acceptable in educated Filipino circles and understandable to native English speakers, confirming its status as a valid nativized variety of English.

According to Tupas (2006), PhE is a variant of English that originated in the Philippines and has since spread throughout the country. It has a unique accent, specific meanings, and creative writings by Filipino writers. According to Bautista and Bolton (2008), PhE is linked to a distinct accent, a body of creative literature, and a localized vocabulary. Dayag (2012) and De Leon (2016) acknowledged PhE as a valid nativized variety that developed from American English. Dimaculangan and Gustilo (2017) highlighted that educated speakers and writers use PhE in both intranational and international communication.

PhE was first presented by Llamzon (1969), as cited in Bautista (2000), as a legitimate variant of English in the Philippines, with an emphasis on phonetics. Since then, PhE research has progressed, and Filipino applied linguists have advocated for its development and incorporation in Philippine ESL programs (Alieto & Rillo, 2018; Bautista, 2001a, 2001b; Bernardo, 2013, 2017; Bernardo & Madrunio, 2015; Borlongan, 2009; Gustilo & Dimaculangan, 2018; Martin, 2014).

According to Gonzalez (1997, 2008), PhE emerged when Filipino teachers began teaching English to fellow Filipinos in the 1920s, gaining attention as a distinct variation in the late 1960s thanks to linguist Teodoro

Llamzon. PhE's history is closely tied to the Philippines' educational development during and after American colonial rule, falling under the World Englishes paradigm, which asserts that English belongs to all who use it (Brown, 1995). The Thomasites, or first American educators, arrived in 1901 and had a profound impact on English instruction. By 1921, 91% of teachers were Filipino natives, which laid the groundwork for PhE (Gonzalez, 1997).

According to Bolton (2008), PhE has developed into a unique World English variant with its own dialect, vocabulary, and corpus of creative writing by Filipino writers since the post-independence era after 1946. Although PhE differs from American, British, and Australian English, it is equally valid as other Englishes.

PhE is now an accepted phenomenon, with efforts to include PhE words in an Asian English Dictionary and Macquarie's collection of English works from the Philippines and other Asian countries (Bautista, 2000). PhE speakers are categorized into acrolect, mesolect, and basilect groups, with acrolect speakers being highly proficient and basilect speakers typically being non-professionals (Llamzon, 1997). Regala-Flores (2014) emphasized the phonological features of basilectal PhE among marginalized Cebuano speakers, calling for more research beyond Luzon.

Features of the Philippine English (PhE) Variety

Bautista (2008, as cited in De Leon, 2016) synthesized key studies on Philippine English, examining its linguistic features across phonology, grammar, and overall structure. Her observations greatly advance our knowledge of PhE, which is important for guiding English language instruction in the country and providing thorough dialect descriptions for the current study.

Grammar

Numerous linguists, including Alberca (1978, summarized in Gonzalez & Alberca, 1978, and restated in Gonzalez, 1985), Aranas (1988), Bautista (2000), Casambre (1986), Gonzalez (1983, 1991, 2004), Jambalos (1989), Romero (1993) have undertaken extensive research on the grammar of educated PhE. The pedagogical acceptability of PhE grammatical features has also been studied (e.g., Bernardo & Madrunio, 2015; Martin, 2014; Tupas, 2006).

Gonzales and Alberca (1978) and Bautista (2000) documented significant deviations from Standard American English (SAE) in grammar, including variations in word order, article usage, noun sub-categorization, pronoun-antecedent agreement errors, tense-aspect usage, and subject-verb agreement across their analyses of various texts. According to De Leon (2016, as cited in Torres, 2019), PhE has various grammatical characteristics. For example, the usage of majority not led by an article and wherein, which is the same as in which, by which, and through which in other varieties, are examples.

Bautista (2000) outlined the development of the PhE lexicon, categorizing words into four types, i.e. normal expansion, preservation, coinage, and borrowings, through processes such as coinage, abbreviation, compounding, and extensions of meaning. Dimaculangan and Gustilo (2017) identified persistent unidiomatic verb-preposition combinations in PhE since the 1990s.

Acceptability of the Philippine English (PhE) Variety

Several Filipino scholars have explored the grammatical features and acceptability of PhE. Bautista (2000) found that acceptability hinges on positive attitudes toward specific lexicons, while Martin (2014) emphasized

diverse perceptions and factors influencing acceptability, highlighting varying cultural and contextual considerations among different groups. Dimaculangan and Gustilo (2017) examined word-formation processes in PhE, advocating for constant attention and appreciation of linguistically suitable PhE lexicons, which they evaluated based on a 50% approval threshold among selected Filipino English language users.

Bernardo and Madrunio (2015, as cited in Torres & Alieto, 2019) assessed the pedagogical acceptability of 35 grammatical variations of PhE among 242 students from 10 colleges and universities in Metro Manila and 42 English instructors. The results showed that 16 of the variants were deemed pedagogically appropriate. Rosales and Bernardo (2017) used the same tool to assess the 38 questions created in accordance with established PhE conventions. Using a six-point Likert scale, participants assessed the pedagogical acceptability of the items. The findings revealed a slight variation in the approval of some products, which turned out to be more significant than those previously deemed acceptable.

Although many teachers in Martin's (2014) survey spoke Filipino English, they primarily preferred American English as their instructional model. Gustilo et al. (2019) found 47 new Internet Philippine English (IPE) words in a 50,000-word corpus, demonstrating great comprehension among younger instructors. They also examined the acceptability and intelligibility of IPE keywords among ESL teachers. Gustilo and Dimaculangan (2018) advocated for the appreciation and celebration of PhE within the World Englishes paradigm and drew attention to the pervasive lack of knowledge among Filipino ESL/EFL teachers in the provinces with the holiday.

The acceptability of PhE among students was investigated in two studies. In informal and formal spoken contexts, 135 pre-service English instructors in Central Luzon accepted a broad range of grammatical and lexical characteristics unique to the Philippine English language. Nevertheless, in formal written contexts, almost all of them were rejected (Torres, 2019). Torres and Alieto (2019) confirmed these findings using 400 pre-service teachers from Mindanao and Luzon. They found that acceptance varied by location, curriculum type, high school gender, and pre-service primary teachers who were more open to PhE features.

METHOD

In an attempt to determine the acceptability of English language teachers toward the grammatical and lexical features of the Philippine English variety, as well as their differences based on age, gender, educational attainment, employment status, years of service, and the variety of English used when they were students in elementary, high school, and college, this study provides a detailed description of the research design, setting, respondents and participants, instrumentation, procedure, and data analysis.

Design

This study employed a quantitative research design in order to determine the respondents' acceptance of the grammatical and lexical characteristics of PhE variety. A survey method was used to gather numerical data from a large group of participants, allowing for the objective measurement of their levels of acceptance. This design is appropriate because it enables the researcher to quantify patterns, trends, and differences in respondents' perceptions using statistical analysis. By converting subjective opinions into measurable data, the quantitative approach ensures that the research questions and objectives, centered on identifying the extent and nature of acceptance, are addressed systematically and reliably. The survey results were collected, summarized, and analyzed to draw meaningful conclusions based on observable evidence.

Respondents

The survey was administered to 50 English language teachers from various colleges of Jose Rizal Memorial State University, representing permanent, temporary, and visiting lecturers across its five campuses. The respondents were purposively selected on the basis of their academic qualifications, teaching experience, and awareness of English language varieties, ensuring that they could meaningfully assess the acceptability of Philippine English features. All participants hold relevant degrees such as Doctor of Philosophy in English Language, Doctor of Education, and Master of Arts in English, indicating their scholarly and professional background in the study and teaching of English. Their inclusion was intentional to ensure that the respondents were not only competent in English instruction but also knowledgeable about the different English varieties to which they were exposed as students in elementary, high school, and college. To maintain focus on participants with direct expertise and awareness of English language use and variation, teachers outside the English discipline and off-campus instructors were excluded from the study.

Data Collection

Prior to data collection, a letter requesting ethical clearance was written to the chair of the university research ethics committee. After receiving ethical clearance, the researcher sent it to the office of the Graduate School Dean at Jose Rizal Memorial State University, Main Campus, Dapitan City, to request approval for using the study's instrument. The researcher received approval to perform the study across five campuses (Dapitan, Dipolog, Katipunan, Tampilisan, and Siocon) from the President of Jose Rizal Memorial State University after receiving the endorsement of the Dean of the Graduate School. A request for authorization to administer the instrument was made in a letter to the president of the university and the administrators of the five campuses.

After receiving permission to administer the instrument to the teachers, the researcher asked for a list of certified English teachers for the study. Those who agreed to participate were asked to sign consent letters, and a meeting was set up to explain the nature and goals of the study. Subsequently, a date was set for administering the questionnaire. On the appointed day, before administering the 50 questionnaires, the respondents were reminded that participation was voluntary and would not affect their ratings in any way. Furthermore, respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their provided information.

Google Forms was used to build the questionnaire, which was then made available online. The researcher made sure that the instruments were free of errors such as missing numbers, duplicate entries, or other problems that would prevent them from being used for analysis. The online survey was completed by 50 English instructors from Jose Rizal Memorial State University. All university faculty members, including those who teach English linguistics, language, and literature at the tertiary level in different institutions of higher learning, were sent an email with a link to the questionnaire. The researcher mostly shared the questionnaire link on her Facebook page and sent it to English teachers through Facebook. The respondents willingly provided their responses.

Data Analysis

After the survey, the raw data was totalled, organized, and examined. Descriptive statistics were used to assess the acceptance of PhE among Jose Rizal Memorial State University's English instructors. Frequency counts and percentages were calculated based on the respondents' characteristics. To explain the degree to which English teachers find PhE acceptable, the overall mean across questions in the questionnaire was computed, and the mean for each item was also counted. The Chi-square test was employed because of the notable

variation in teachers' acceptance across age, gender, educational attainment, employment position, years of service, and type of English used while they were students in elementary, high school, and college.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Acceptability of PhE Grammatical and Lexical Items

The teachers in the study completed a profile questionnaire that included questions about their age, gender, level of education, work position, years of service, and type of English they had used in elementary, high school, and college. The primary goal of the profiling process was to gather key demographic data from the respondents in order support the analysis of their acceptability of PhE and to identify any notable discrepancies between respondents' profile and the variety's acceptability.

Table 1. Respondents' profile in terms of age and gender

Age	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female		F	%
	F	%	F	%		
22-28	6	12.0	18	36.0	24	48.0
29-38	4	8.0	12	24.0	16	32.0
39-55	1	2.0	6	12.0	7	14.0
56-76	0	0	3	6.0	3	6.0
TOTAL	11	100.0 (22.0)	39	100.0 (78.0)	50	100.0 (100.0)

As shown in Table 1, 39 out of 50 respondents are female, making up about 80% of the sample, and most of them are between the ages of 20 and 40. This indicates that the majority of those surveyed are in the early stages of maturity (Kogan, 1979). Furthermore, it shows that, in this study, relatively young women predominate in the English teaching profession, with nearly all of the English faculty and instructors in the research setting being female.

Table 2. Respondents' profile in terms of highest educational attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
BS Holder	12	24.0
CAR (MS/MA)	21	42.0
MS/MA Degree Holder	6	12.0
CAR (PhD/EdD)	6	12.0
PhD/EdD Degree Holder	5	10.0
TOTAL	50	100.0

Table 2 shows that over 25% of the respondents have earned only a bachelor's degree, and roughly 40% have completed the requirements for graduate studies (MA/MS). 10% hold a doctorate, and about 10% have completed a master's degree. Since holding a full master's degree is one of the conditions for eligibility for employment, most English instructors in the study have completed their master's degree requirements.

Hernandez (2020) conducted a similar survey with 95 graduate students enrolled in doctoral and master's programs at a prestigious Teacher Education Institution (TEI) in the Philippines. The students were enrolled in Applied Linguistics, English Language Education, English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Reading. The study found that they generally held positive views toward teaching PhE, suggesting that higher educational attainment may play a role in a language variety's acceptability.

Table 3. Respondents' profile in terms of years of service and employment status

Years of Service	Employment Status						Total	
	Visiting Lecturer		Temporary		Permanent		F	%
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Less than 5 years	20	40.0	2	4.0	5	10.0	27	54.0
5 - 10 years	3	6.0	3	6.0	5	10.0	11	22.0
11 - 15 years	0	0	0	0	2	4.0	2	4.0
16 - 20 years	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Above 20 years	0	0	0	0	9	18.0	9	18.0
TOTAL	24	(48.0)	5	(10.0)	21	(42.0)	50	(100.0)

As noted in Table 3, many respondents had served for fewer than five years, and nearly 50% were still on contractual status. About 32% held permanent status, and roughly 42% of the total had served for more than five years (six years and above). Notably, slightly over half of the respondents had served for fewer than five years, while over a quarter had served for 10 years or longer. This suggests that many of the English teachers were either recent graduates or relatively new to the teaching field.

According to Alieto and Rillo (2018), studies on linguistic attitudes seldom take years of teaching experience into account. In addition, at the university, an instructor's employment position is influenced by educational attainment. Alieto and Rillo (2018) also noted that English teachers' attitudes toward Philippine English are shaped by their level of education. It is therefore recommended that a similar study be conducted on a larger scale to examine more conclusively the influence, or lack of influence, of educational attainment. With regard to differences in language attitudes, educational attainment appears to be a meaningful factor.

Table 4. Respondents' profile in terms of variety of English used during elementary, high school and college

Variety of English Used	Educational Level					
	Elementary		High School		College	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
American English	17	34.0	12	24.0	3	6.0
British English	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.0
Philippine English	15	30.0	15	30.0	9	18.0
American English and British English	1	2.0	4	8.0	4	8.0
Philippine English and American English	9	18.0	10	20.0	10	20.0
American English, British English and Philippine English	8	16.0	9	18.0	22	44.0
TOTAL	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0

Table 4 shows that, from elementary school to college, respondents came across a variety of English dialects. In elementary school, more than 30% of students spoke American English. In high school, they switched to Philippine English (PhE). At the college level, over 40% of respondents encountered American, British, and PhE, reflecting the emphasis on these varieties in the curriculum. This highlights early exposure to both American and PhE at the elementary level, which is consistent with theories suggesting that children acquire second languages more easily at a younger age (Elliot, 1981; Halliwell, 1993).

American and PhE are also the most commonly encountered varieties in secondary school. According to Alieto and Rillo (2018), secondary school teachers are largely supportive of PhE. According to Martin (2014, as cited in Torres & Alieto, 2019), a substantial number of English teachers in public schools prefer teaching students in American English. This preference continues in higher education, where instructors frequently include

American, British, and Philippine English into their lessons, reflecting a range of pedagogical viewpoints (Bautista, 2001a; Escalona, 2018). College students are exposed to all three varieties of English during their education, while some instructors seem to favour American and British English over Philippine English (Gustilo & Dimaculangan, 2018).

Extent of Acceptability

This section presents the extent of acceptability of the PhE grammatical and lexical items among English language teachers.

Table 5. Extent of acceptability of the Philippine English (PhE)

Statement	Mean	SD	Description
1. Failure to return borrowed books from the library on time can <u>result to</u> fines and other penalties.	3.20	±1.00	Somehow Accepted
2. Many classic movies are <u>based from</u> popular novels.	3.28	±0.92	Accepted
3. My perspective is sometimes different <u>for</u> your perspective.	1.98	±1.17	Somehow Unaccepted
4. During quizzes, students are asked to <u>fill</u> the blanks.	2.32	±1.16	Somehow Unaccepted
5. Students should learn to <u>cope up with</u> the challenges in their studies.	2.92	±1.09	Somehow Accepted
6. Students have different views <u>with regards</u> success.	2.78	±1.15	Somehow Accepted
7. There are a number of organizations <u>wherein</u> students can join.	3.14	±0.92	Somehow Accepted
8. It's a <u>more correct</u> answer.	2.70	±1.00	Somehow Accepted
9. Students should <u>get involved</u> to extra-curricular activities.	3.20	±0.87	Somehow Accepted
10. The secretary attended the meeting <u>in behalf</u> of her boss.	2.98	±1.07	Somehow Accepted
11. <u>Majority</u> of students nowadays use online references to do their papers.	3.32	±0.84	Accepted
12. It must be enacted to a law whatever the political <u>cost</u> .	2.96	±0.89	Somehow Accepted
13. They <u>left</u> the Philippines before their children entered college.	3.18	±0.89	Somehow Accepted
14. Students are required to attend the symposium which <u>would</u> be held in May	2.68	±1.03	Somehow Accepted
15. The use of social media <u>have been</u> the most significant change in the last decade.	2.52	±1.22	Somehow Accepted
16. <u>The number</u> of students enrolled last term have increased.	2.54	±1.25	Somehow Accepted
17. A number of different teaching techniques <u>has</u> emerged.	2.28	±1.18	Somehow Unaccepted
18. Either the students or the teacher <u>know</u> how to open the presentation.	2.00	±1.11	Somehow Unaccepted
19. One-third of the test items <u>was</u> asked during the review.	2.78	±1.19	Somehow Accepted
20. This method, along with other methods, <u>are</u> applicable now.	2.36	±1.20	Somehow Unaccepted
21. I, together with my other classmate, <u>are</u> attending the symposium.	2.10	±1.20	Somehow Unaccepted
22. That is <u>one of the reason</u> why I chose to pursue my education.	2.22	±1.30	Somehow Unaccepted
23. The president <u>assured</u> free tuition to all State Universities and Colleges.	3.18	±0.89	Somehow Accepted
24. In schools, students are <u>taken cared of</u> by their teachers.	2.94	±1.05	Somehow Accepted
25. Due to the requirements, <u>me</u> and my group mates are staying in the hostel over the weekend.	2.44	±1.02	Somehow Unaccepted
26. In pair work, choose the person <u>who</u> you think you could work well with.	2.60	±1.06	Somehow Accepted
27. Since its very <u>traffic</u> in Metro Manila, I don't want to study there.	2.98	±0.88	Somehow Accepted
28. Thank you for the <u>invite</u> you sent last week.	3.18	±0.93	Somehow Accepted
29. My teacher has that fascination in <u>vintagy</u> items.	2.68	±1.01	Somehow Accepted
30. Since I was not responding to his message, he <u>unfriended</u> me in Facebook.	3.04	±0.85	Somehow Accepted
31. He would <u>unsmile</u> whenever that person passes by.	2.46	±1.00	Somehow Unaccepted
32. I have <u>PMed</u> to you the proposal.	2.78	±0.86	Somehow Accepted

Statement	Mean	SD	Description
33. When he heard the news, he <i>OMGed</i> .	2.60	±0.87	Somehow Accepted
34. The materials were already <i>xeroxed</i> yesterday.	2.44	±1.04	Somehow Unaccepted
35. I <i>will</i> return next week.	3.08	±0.74	Somehow Accepted
36. The <i>celebrant</i> did not expect the kind of party given to him during his 45th birthday.	3.22	±0.83	Somehow Accepted
37. This is <i>necessarily needed</i> to pass the course.	2.52	±1.12	Somehow Accepted
38. The five members divided the task <i>between</i> themselves.	1.94	±1.03	Somehow Unaccepted
39. She tried <i>to quickly finish</i> the book before she had to leave.	2.86	±0.89	Somehow Accepted
40. I should drink <i>fewer</i> coffee.	2.18	±1.01	Somehow Unaccepted
41. My doctor advised me to have <i>less</i> doughnut for my immediate recovery.	2.72	±1.00	Somehow Accepted
42. He will <i>bring</i> his father to Tagaytay this summer.	3.12	±0.99	Somehow Accepted
43. Faculty members are engaged in their respective <i>researches</i> .	3.26	±0.84	Accepted
44. Last February 14, I did a not so <i>valentiney</i> undertaking.	2.36	±1.00	Somehow Unaccepted
Grand Mean	2.73	±1.01	Somehow Accepted

Out of the 44 items in the questionnaire, only three were chosen as "acceptable," making up 6.81 percent of the total number of PhE grammatical and lexical items included in the study. None of the items were marked by the respondents as "unaccepted" or "unacceptable". It is interesting to point out that only three statements were accepted. These include "*Many great movies are based from popular novels*," "*The majority of students nowadays use online references do their papers*," and "*Faculty members are busy in their various researches*".

As explained by Bernardo and Madrunio (2015), the feature *majority* in PhE is more acceptable than its American English counterpart. Another plausible explanation is that *majority* is considered a plural noun, making the use of the article *a* before *majority* may appear awkward (Trenkic, 2009, as cited in Bernardo & Madrunio, 2015). Bautista's (2008) findings that the use of articles is problematic for ESL learners across PhE studies may also explain why this item was judged acceptable to the participants.

The acceptance of the prepositional phrase *based from* across the three discourse types is consistent with the findings of Bernardo and Madrunio (2015, as cited in Torres, 2019), who noted that this form has already attained formal recognition. As such, it can be used not only in conversation but also in lectures, presentations, speeches, meetings, and other forms of formal spoken discourse, as well as in inflection. The acceptability of the plural form *researches* across the four discourse types suggests that the countable use of certain English nouns is viewed as a key indicator of outer and expanding circle usage (Torres, 2019).

Out of the 44 items, 28 were rated as "somewhat accepted." Since some of these features are considered acceptable only in spoken language and not in written form, several PhE structures were rated as "somewhat accepted" by the participants in the interviews. Torres (2019) provides further support for this finding, showing that recognition of PhE in formal settings is still developing, especially given that the participants were taught by English professors who adhered to the American English paradigm. The limited acknowledgment of PhE in the written domain, particularly in academic writing such as term papers, essays, articles, and theses, suggests that it has not yet gained momentum in formal written contexts.

This implies that the respondents viewed the PhE lexical and grammatical items used in the study as generally accurate and adequate, and recognized PhE as a language variant. These results are consistent with Tupas' (2006) view that PhE is appropriate for the educated class, which includes the respondents in this study. At the same time, the findings also indicate that acceptance of this variant remains limited. It is possible that the respondents perceived PhE as acceptable only in certain contexts, such as informal discourse. This

interpretation aligns with Tupas' (2006) findings and Martin's (2014) observation that PhE is still far from being regarded as an ideal model for classroom instruction.

There were 13 out of 44 items rated as "somewhat unaccepted." These items were not outright "unaccepted," but they bordered on being "unaccepted" because the respondents were reluctant to deviate from the norms of Standard English when teaching in the classroom. This assertion is consistent with the findings of Martin (2014), who reported that respondents in earlier studies believed that PhE was not an ideal form of English to use in classroom instruction.

Items related to the overgeneralisation of affix use, such as *unsmile* ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.00$) and *valentiney* ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 1.00$), which were also identified in Bautista (2001b), were rated as "somewhat unaccepted" by the participants. Similarly, in Bautista's (2001b) study, lexicalised brand names such as *xeroxed* ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.04$) showed the same result. This suggests that teachers tend not to accept local varieties that expand vocabulary through changes to prefixes, suffixes, or root words, particularly when such forms have not been previously encountered. They also tend to reject items that result from lexical creativity, such as lexicalised acronyms and brand names.

In addition, the participants rated the phrase *fill in the blanks* as somewhat unaccepted. This finding runs counter to Torres's (2019) results, which suggest that the acceptance of preposition deletion in expressions such as *fill in the blanks* can be attributed to the spontaneous nature of spoken discourse and the understanding that the phrase remains clear with or without the preposition. Moreover, one possible reason for omitting the preposition is that the meaning of the verb *fill* already conveys the intended action.

When the grand mean falls between 2.5 and 3.4, it is interpreted as "somewhat accepted." Under this interpretation, there is a degree of reluctance to accept the lexical and grammatical features of PhE. Bautista (2001b) found that although the overall diversity and ideal linguistic behaviour of PhE were relatively high, ratings for individual PhE expressions and lexical items were comparatively low. This may be because English teachers were more willing to accept PhE as an abstract variety alongside other national varieties of English than to accept its specific lexical or grammatical features, possibly due to concerns about violating established grammatical norms.

Furthermore, Torres and Alieto (2019) reported that PhE is "accepted," but only to a limited extent. Their findings suggest that the participants' tendency to rate PhE lexical and grammatical items as "somewhat accepted" has a clear explanation, i.e. American English remains the preferred model. In addition, Torres (2019) argues that the syntax and lexicon of PhE are widely accepted in both formal and informal spoken discourse and are beginning to gain acceptance in informal written contexts. On the other hand, the fact that most items were excluded from the final quadrant underscores the need for PhE to establish a clearer position within formal written discourse. It is therefore not surprising that PhE is still gradually entering formal written domains, given that the participants were educated by teachers who followed the American English model. Like other World Englishes varieties, PhE has yet to gain wide acceptance in formal written contexts, particularly in academic writing such as term papers, essays, articles, and theses.

The prepositional phrase *cope up with* is generally accepted, which supports Bernardo and Madrunio's (2015) finding that it has already received formal recognition and can be used in formal spoken contexts, such as speeches, presentations, communications, conferences, and other forms of formal spoken discourse, as well as in informal written discourse such as blogs, emails, texts, and tweets. According to Bautista (2008), the simplifying process explains why *guaranteed* is acceptable. The participants' acceptance of it may also be

explained by Bernardo and Madrunio's (2015) assertion that *ensure* is used as an ambitransitive verb when the object (i.e., *us*) is often unnecessary, particularly when it is clear that *us* is being referred to.

Bautista (2001b) also found that lexicalised acronyms, such as *OMGed* ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.87$) and *PMed* ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 0.86$), were rated as "somewhat accepted." Studies on the acceptability of plural forms across the four discourse types further show that the countable use of certain English nouns is viewed as a key indicator of usage in the outer and expanding circles (Torres, 2019). The acceptance of *will* as a future marker in the first person can be explained by Nelson's findings (2005, as reported in Borlongan, 2013) that *will* and its variants are the most common grammatical means of expressing future time in PhE.

The term *celebrant* is also widely used in American English, the parent variety of PhE. This suggests that the term is acceptable and supports Torres's (2019) definition of a *celebrant* as someone who marks a special occasion with a party or another distinctive activity. Meanwhile, the fact that two expressions may have similar meanings but are used in different contexts may explain why *bring* is considered appropriate instead of *take*. In line with Bernardo and Madrunio's findings (2015, as cited in Torres, 2019), prepositional phrases such as *result to*, *based from*, *cope with*, and *on behalf*, as well as *with regards*, *wherein*, and the *get-passive*, are accepted across the three discourse types and can be used in lectures, presentations, speeches, meetings, and other formal spoken contexts, as well as in inflection.

Barbers (1964, as cited in Torres, 2019) noted that the decline of the inflected form *whom* is reflected in the acceptance of *who* in contexts where *whom* would traditionally be expected. Finally, speakers may assume that the second element in *taken care of*, namely *care*, should also appear in a past form because in Filipino both *taken* and *care* are treated as verbs, and *taken* appears in the past participle form. This helps explain why *taken care of* is considered appropriate in the two discourse types discussed by Torres (2019).

Significant Difference between Extent of Acceptability and Respondents' Profile

This section assesses if there are any notable variations in the degree to which English language teachers find the PhE's grammatical and lexical items acceptable, based on the profiles of the respondents.

Table 6. Chi-square test of significant difference of the extent of acceptability and profile

Variables	Pearson Chi-square Value	p-value	Interpretation
Age * Extent of Acceptability	113.876 ^a	.407	Not Significant
Gender * Extent of Acceptability	35.431 ^a	.543	Not Significant
HEA * Extent of Acceptability	146.012 ^a	.531	Not Significant
YOS * Extent of Acceptability	172.896 ^a	.079	Significant
SOE * Extent of Acceptability	76.607 ^a	.395	Not Significant
VEE * Extent of Acceptability	164.436 ^a	.168	Not Significant
VEHS * Extent of Acceptability	169.097 ^a	.113	Not Significant
VEC * Extent of Acceptability	181.723 ^a	.554	Not Significant

Note:

0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5

HEA-Highest Educational Attainment

YOS-Years of Service

SOE-Status of Employment

VEE-Variety of English used when still a student in Elementary

VEHS-Variety of English used when still a student in High School

VEC- Variety of English used when still a student in College

According to the respondents' profiles, the level of acceptability of PhE lexical and grammatical features varies across several demographic and professional factors, not only in terms of years of service. The results indicate that female teachers, those with higher educational attainment (master's and doctoral degree holders), and those exposed to multiple English varieties during their education tend to show greater acceptance of PhE features. Meanwhile, teachers with longer years of service also demonstrated higher levels of acceptability, suggesting that extensive classroom experience contributes to a more informed and tolerant attitude toward localised English forms. This finding underscores the combined influence of experience, education, and linguistic exposure in shaping teachers' language attitudes. These are factors that have often been overlooked in previous language attitude studies. For instance, although Bautista (2001b) examined English teachers' perceptions of PhE, her study did not consider these profile-related variables, particularly years of service and educational background.

Moreover, the results reveal that other profile variables, such as age, gender, highest educational attainment, work position, and the variety of English used across educational levels (elementary, high school, and college), show little to no statistically significant effect on acceptance levels. This finding aligns with the study of Torres and Alieto (2019), who likewise reported no significant difference between male and female respondents in their acceptance of PhE grammatical and lexical features.

In summary, the key factor influencing the acceptance of PhE grammatical and lexical characteristics among English instructors is the number of years they have spent teaching. Other demographic variables do not appear to play a significant role in shaping their attitudes. This suggests that classroom experience and sustained exposure contribute more strongly to language acceptance than demographic factors.

CONCLUSION

This study examined English language instructors' acceptance of the grammatical and lexical features of Philippine English (PhE) and explored how teachers' demographic profiles influence this acceptance. The findings show that while PhE is generally recognised as a legitimate variety of English, teachers' acceptance of its specific grammatical and lexical features remains cautious. This hesitation appears to emerge from the expectation that Standard English should serve as the primary classroom model, which limits the full integration of PhE into teaching practices.

A key finding of the study is the positive relationship between teaching experience and acceptance of PhE. Teachers with longer years of service demonstrated higher levels of acceptance of PhE grammatical and lexical features. This suggests that sustained classroom exposure contributes to a more informed and tolerant perspective toward localised English varieties. In contrast, other demographic variables showed limited influence on acceptance levels.

These findings contribute to the broader discussion on language attitudes by highlighting the role of professional experience in shaping teachers' perceptions of non-standard English varieties. They also have practical implications for language education and policy. Teacher education programmes and professional development initiatives may benefit from including modules that raise awareness of and familiarity with PhE, particularly for less experienced instructors. Recognising the influence of teaching experience can help stakeholders design strategies that encourage more inclusive language practices and support the integration of PhE in educational settings.

Finally, this study has several limitations. It focused on English instructors within a specific region, which may limit the generalisability of the findings. Future research could involve larger and more diverse samples across

different institutional and geographic contexts. In addition, qualitative methods such as interviews or focus group discussions could provide deeper insight into the reasons behind teachers' acceptance or resistance toward PhE features.

REFERENCES

- Alberca, W. (1978). *The distinctive features of Philippine English in the mass media* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Santo Tomas.
- Alieto, E. O., & Rillo, R. M. (2018). Language attitudes of English language teachers (ELTs) towards Philippine English. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 13(1), 84–110.
- Alo, M. A., & Igwebuike, E. E. (2012). The grammaticality and acceptability of Nigerianisms: Implications for the codification of Nigerian English. *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association*, 15(1), 14-32.
- Aranas, P. G. (1988). *Characterization of the English spoken by English and Mathematics teachers on the tertiary level of education in selected universities in Metro Manila* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of the Philippines.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2000). *Defining standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features*. De La Salle University Press.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2001a). Attitudes of English language faculty in three leading Philippine universities toward Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, 4(1), 4–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2001.10801062>
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2001b). Attitudes of selected Luzon university students and faculty toward Philippine English. In M. L. G. Tayao, T. P. Ignacio, & G. S. Zafra (Eds.), *Rosario E. Maminta in focus: Selected writings in applied linguistics* (pp. 236–273). The Philippine Association for Language Teaching, Inc.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2008). Investigating the grammatical features of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 201-218). Hong Kong University Press.
- Bautista, S., & Bolton, K. (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Bernardo, A. S. (2013). *Toward an endonormative pedagogic model in the teaching of English grammar in Philippine higher education institutions* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Santo Tomas.
- Bernardo, A. S. (2017). Philippine English in the ESL classroom: A much closer look. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19(2), 117–144.
- Bernardo, A. S., & Madrunio, M. (2015). A framework for designing a Philippine-English-based pedagogic model for teaching English grammar. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(1), 42-71. <https://doi.org/10.59960/3.a3>
- Bolton, K. (2008). English in Asia, Asian Englishes, and the issue of proficiency. *English Today*, 24(2), 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607840800014X>
- Borlongan, A. M. (2009). A survey on language use, attitudes, and identity in relation to Philippine English among young generation Filipinos: An initial sample from a private university. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 3, 74-107.
- Borlongan, A. M. (2013). Corpus-based works on the Philippine English verb system. *Asian English Studies*, 15, 69-98.
- Brown, K. (1995). World Englishes: To teach or not to teach? *World Englishes*, 14(2), 233-245.
- Casambre, N. (1986). What is Filipino English? *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching*, 14(1-4), 34-49.
- Chang, L. D. (2008). *Understand me or not? Accent, acceptability and intelligibility in international English: The case of Singapore* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. National University of Singapore.
- Dayag, D. T. (2007). Exploring the intelligibility of Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, 10(1), 4-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2007.10801197>
- Dayag, D. T. (2012). Exploring the use of questions as a rhetorical strategy in classroom discourse in multilingual contexts. *Proceedings of the 1st World Congress of Scholars of English Linguistics (WCSEL-1)*, 26-30.
- De Leon, K. (2016). *The intelligibility of Philippine English to selected ASEAN countries* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. De La Salle University.
- Dimaculangan, N., & Gustilo, L. (2017). Lexical patterns in the early 21st century Philippine English writing. *Advanced Science Letters*, 23(2), 1094-1098. <https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2017.7505>
- Dita, S. N., & De Leon, K. D. (2017). The intelligibility and comprehensibility of Philippine English to EFL speakers. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19(2), 100-118.
- Elliot, A. (1981). *Child language*. Cambridge University Press.

- Escalona, S. (2018). Attitude towards Philippine English: A case of BSU English teachers. *Language and Letters Research Journal*, 5(1).
- Foluke, F. (2012). Perceptual convergence as an index of the intelligibility and acceptability of three Nigerian English accents. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(5), 100-115.
- Fujiwara, Y. (2007). A web-based survey on British pragmatics acceptability of Japanese refusals in English: From cross-cultural to intercultural. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 16(1), 137-152.
- Gonzalez, A. (1983). When does an error become a feature of Philippine English? In R. Noss (Ed.), *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia*. (pp. 150-172). SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Gonzalez, A. (1985). *Studies on Philippine English*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Gonzalez, A. (1991). The Philippine variety of English and the problem of standardization. In M. L. Tickoo (Ed.), *Languages and standards: Issues, attitudes, and case studies* (pp. 86-96). SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Gonzalez, A. (1997). The history of English in the Philippines. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context* (pp. 25-40). Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Gonzalez, A. (2004). The social dimensions of Philippine English. *World Englishes*, 23(1), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2004.00331.x>
- Gonzalez, A. (2008). A favorable soil and climate: A transplanted language and literature. In M. L. S. Bautista & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 13-27). Hong Kong University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9789888052639-006>
- Gustilo, L., & Dimaculangan, N. (2018). Attitudes of Filipino English teachers toward 21st century Philippine English writing. *Advanced Science Letters*, 24(11), 8349-8352(4). <https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2018.12560>
- Gustilo, L., Tocalo, A. W., & Calingasan, K. A. (2019). The intelligibility and acceptability of Internet Philippine English (IPE): Their implications for English language teaching in the new English varieties. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2), 83-104. https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/faculty_research/1305/
- Halliwell, S. (1993). Teacher creativity and teacher education. In D. Bridges & T. Kerry (Eds.), *Developing teachers professionally: Reflections for initial and inservice trainers* (pp. 66-82). Routledge.
- Hernandez, H. (2020). Filipino graduate students' attitudes toward teaching educated Philippine English: A sample from a premier teacher education institution. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 20(1), 31-42. <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/apssr/vol20/iss1/4/>
- Jambalos, T. (1989). *Grammatical competence of Filipinos in English across generations* [Unpublished master's thesis]. De La Salle University.
- Kachru, B. B. (1983). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 31-54). Pergamon Press.
- Khejari, M. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards the use of mother tongue as a language of instruction in lower primary schools in Hamisi District, Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(1), 75-85.
- Kogan, N. (1979). Beliefs, attitudes, and stereotypes about old people: A new look at some old issues. *Research on Aging*, 1(1), 11-36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016402757911002>
- Llamzon, T. A. (1997). The phonology of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context* (pp. 41-48). Macquarie Library.
- Martin, I. P. (2014). English language teaching in the Philippines. *World Englishes*, 33(4), 472-485. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12108>
- McKaughan, H. P. (1993). Towards a standard Philippine English. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 24(2), 41-55.
- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. (2008). *World Englishes: The study of new language varieties*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nilsenová, M. (2009). Acceptability/grammaticality. In S. Chapman & C. Routledge (Eds.), *Key ideas in linguistics and the philosophy of language* (pp. 1-2). Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748631421-004>
- Nkansah, N. (2016). *Acceptability of lexico-grammatical features of Ghanaian English* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Cape Coast.
- Regala-Flores, E. (2014). Phonological features of basilectal Philippine English: An explanatory study. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 5(6), 128-140.
- Romero, M. S. (1993). Filipino writing competence in English across generations. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 24(2), 57-71.
- Rosales, E. F., & Bernardo, A. S. (2017). When pedagogical acceptability judgments of ESL teachers and ESL learners differ. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 5(7), 193-202. <http://www.ijern.com/journal/2017/July-2017/14.pdf>

- Sewell, A. (2012). The Hong Kong English accent: Variation and acceptability. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 1-21.
- Ting, S. P. (2011). *On the acceptability and status of grammatical features of Hong Kong English: Perceptions from local undergraduates in Hong Kong* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Torres, J. (2019). Positioning Philippine English grammar and lexicon in four discourse quadrants. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 22(1), 253-276.
- Torres, J. M., & Alieto, E. O. (2019). Acceptability of Philippine English grammatical and lexical items among pre-service teachers. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2/3), 158-181. https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/faculty_research/1306/
- Trenkic, D. (2009). Accounting for patterns of article omissions and substitutions in second language production. In M. G. Mayo & R. Hawkins (Eds.), *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications* (pp. 115-143). John Benjamins.
- Tupas, R. (2006). Standard Englishes: Pedagogical paradigms and their conditions of (im) possibility. In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the World: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 169–185). Continuum.
- Wang, Y. (2009). Chinglish: An emerging new variety of English Language? *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 4(1), 28-41. <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.1574>