VMC ANALYTIKS

Students' Perception, Recognition and Adaptation of Philippine English in Higher Education

OPEN ACCESS

Pedro O. Quiñal Jr.[1], ORCID No. 0000-0003-3652-639X
Mary Joy Hernando[1], ORCID No. 0000-0002-6861-9825

[1]Instructor, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Cebu – Main Campus, Sanciangko Street, Cebu City, Philippines

Abstract

The study aims to determine the perception, recognition and adaptation of Philippine English in higher education at the University of Cebu-Main Campus. It analyzed students' attitudes and experiences to help inform debates on the role of Philippine English in academic and professional contexts and to provide input to language teaching policy. The study used a descriptive-correlational design to collect data from 314 students through a researcher-made survey questionnaire. The study revealed that students viewed Philippine English as an acceptable and functional variety of English for educational settings in terms of acceptability and effectiveness in academic communication. Respondents also displayed a high level of recognition regarding Philippine English, notably the influences of Filipino languages on the language and code-switching and often adapted Philippine English in different social contexts but less in academic settings. The study further revealed a significant difference of its acceptability and usefulness in the academic setting when respondents are grouped according to age, year level and college. This study underscored the importance of understanding the perceptions of students as well as the regional adaptation of Philippine English to help inform language education policy and also calls for further examinations in the following areas: teacher impact, longitudinal studies, social media influence, and comparative regional or institution-based research.

Keywords: Philippine English, World Englishes, students' perception, language recognition, language adaptation, descriptive-correlational method

INTRODUCTION

World Englishes are varieties of English that developed in different parts of the world as a result of English's globalization. World Englishes are localized varieties of English influenced by linguistic and cultural factors. In the Philippines, English has become a separate variety called Philippine English and is widely used in many domains, including education. As one of the frameworks of a different type of English used in the country, Philippine English is 'not just a deviation from the native English but a legitimate linguistic system with its own lexical, phonological, and syntactic characteristics' (Bautista, 2000). As higher education institutions are the first sites for exposure to a language and facilitation of language development (Bailey, 2025), it is essential to appropriately analyze students' perceptions, recognition, and adaptation of Philippine English and examine its role in the school and professional settings.

From a global perspective, the concept of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) explores the validity of English varieties among non-native users, prioritizing communicative interaction over the traditional native-speaker norms (Jenkins, 2009). English ceased to be a language of Inner Circle countries (Al-Mutairi, 2020), has now regionalized in various parts of the globe, adapting itself into typical linguistic and sociocultural environments. The changing stance also raises questions in higher education, with students and educators facing demands to bridge the gap between global and localized English. Research has investigated

students' attitudes toward various non-native varieties of English, highlighting the conflict between linguistic identity, intelligibility, and perceived prestige (Kirkpatrick, 2007).

In the Asian context, English has a diverse status, which includes being an official language in India and Singapore and a foreign or second language in countries such as Japan and South Korea. Localized adaptations of English are well observed in the emergence of Asian Englishes (Kachru, 1990), e.g., Indian English (Kachru, 2005) and Singaporean English (Gupta, 1994)). Within Asian higher education contexts, research has shown that students often acknowledge and draw on their local variety of English but may still choose to promote native English norms for academic and professional purposes (Deterding, 2010). This duality mirrors the ongoing negotiation between globalizing standards of English and national ideological points of national identity.

In the Philippines, English is institutionally entrenched in education, government, and media. Philippine English has been well documented in studies demonstrating it to be a stable variety with its own phonological and lexical characteristics (Bautista & Bolton, 2008). Although Philippine English is accepted in informal and social contexts, there have been debates on whether it is suitable for academic writing (Tupas & Salonga, 2016). It was also found that some students and educators still favor American English, for they view this variety as prestigious, although there is an emerging awareness that Philippine English is a legitimate linguistic variety of its own (Martin, 2014).

Locally, Cebu City remains significant in learning English as universities like the University of Cebu–Main Campus further mold students' language skills. The university's unique mix of students from various language groups makes it an interesting location to explore the topic of Philippine English. As Cebu City has a solid footing in the business process outsourcing (BPO) trade, and proficiency in English is an important criterion for employment, the student's adjustment to Philippine English may determine their employability in the future. No comprehensive study has ever examined how students in higher educational institutions in Cebu City perceive and adapt to Philippine English in academic and professional environments.

Although a fair amount of research has been done on Philippine English, none has been done to particularly map out how students in higher education, including those in Cebu City, negotiate usage in academic, social, and professional contexts. To date, little research has investigated how students recognize and adapt to these challenges, although faculty perceptions (Dayag, 2008) and media representation (Gonzales, 2017) have been documented. Filling in the gap between the domains of the disciplines in higher education institutions offers insights that can be crucial for language policy and pedagogy mechanisms.

This study aims to investigate students' perceptions, recognition, and adaptation to Philippine English in higher education. The study hopes to aid in the continuing dialogue regarding the functions of Philippine English within these domains by examining the perceptions and experiences of these language users. Therefore, understanding these factors will shape language education policies and practices, as well as awareness of linguistic inclusivity alongside achieving competence in global English.

LITERATURES

Several theories were used in this study as a framework for understanding the perception, recognition, and adaptation of Philippine English in higher education. One of the foundational theories is the World Englishes theory (Kachru, 1985), which theorizes that English exists in three concentric circles: the Inner Circle (native varieties such as American and British English), the Outer Circle (former colonies wherein English is spoken institutionally, for instance, the Philippines), and the Expanding Circle (countries wherein English is learned as a foreign language). This framework legitimizes regional/equivalent

varieties of English and hence is relevant to the concern about Philippine English being a separate grammatical system.

Another key theoretical framework is English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) Theory (Jenkins, 2009), which challenges the dominance of native English norms and emphasizes English's role as a global means of communication. This theory is relevant to the study as it examines how students transition between Philippine English and other types of English in academic and professional settings. Comprehending how students view their variation within the extensive ELF framework might illuminate linguistic attitudes and adaptation techniques.

Lastly, Giles and Coupland (1991) in their Sociolinguistic Accommodation Theory, show how speakers adapt their language to decrease or increase social distance depending on contact with others. This theory asserts that people adapt their language features depending on their audience, location, and communicative goals. This notion offers insight into the way in which students adapt to different varieties of English with respect to their academic, social, or professional environments. Especially in formal contexts, the notion explains why there can be differences between how words are used in Philippine and standard English.

Other notable characteristics of Philippine English as a stable variety include phonology, lexis, and syntax (Bautista & Bolton, 2008). An early study by Bautista (2000) considered Philippine English a valid system, not just a wayward version of native English. Recent studies have also examined its use in educational and professional contexts and found that it is gaining ground among Filipino-speaking individuals.

Based on Gonzales's (2017) study, attitudes towards Philippine English by educators were investigated, and it turns out that regardless of acceptance of its spoken form, there was tension towards its written use in formal academic writing. Dayag (2008), with a different focus, investigated perceptual differences

toward Philippine English and noted continuing tensions between linguistic nationalism and conformity to varieties of English found in the outer circle or global standards. Though Philippine English is the liberal default for almost everything else, specific sectors still cling to Standard English for academic and professional reasons.

However, the more general study of World Englishes has indicated that various localized English in the international arena are being acknowledged and accepted (Kirkpatrick, 2007). In Asia, for instance, research on Singaporean English has shown that students' awareness of their local variety coexists with their preference for Standard English in formal settings (Deterding, 2010). In India, Indian English interacts with British English in letters and business communication (Kachru, 2005), suggesting a parallel negotiation between local and global within the educational context.

Studies on attitudes toward language in higher education showed that students' views on non-native English varieties influenced their language use. For example, Tupas and Salonga (2016) revealed that Filipino students perceive and support the use of Philippine English particularly in the spoken context. Yet, they also prefer American English standards in written discourse and professional settings. Martin (2014) also elaborated on the positioning of Philippine English in the context of higher education curricula, providing further insight into how the variety is framed within teaching materials used in higher education. According to these studies, Philippine English is generally used; however, it takes on different levels of acceptability depending on the communicative context.

Studies on English proficiency among Cebuano students suggest they are exposed to Philippine and American English, mainly due to economic ties to the business process outsourcing (BPO) industry (Bernardo, 2011). The proliferation of call centers and international companies in Cebu further enforces the demand for English fluency, which often ends up favoring the service of

standardization of how English is pronounced and written. However, acceptance of Philippine English as a communicative tool continues to grow, especially in the workplace.

From an educational perspective, the University of Cebu-Main Campus is one of the higher educational institutions in the country where students from different language backgrounds are taught using English. Nonetheless, no research exists investigating the perception and adjustment of Cebuano students, specifically toward Philippine English in formal contexts. This particular study seeks to fill that gap by investigating the attitudinal acceptance of Philippine English as a legitimate variety among students and their adaptation strategies in different communicative contexts.

This study will thus contribute to the dialogue on language policy, curriculum development, and linguistic inclusivity in colleges and universities in Cebu by filling this gap in the literature about language use in higher education institutions. The results of this study should also inform the status of the English language in the country and possible ways to integrate Philippine English in academic settings effectively.

METHODS

This study utilized a descriptive correlational research design to explore students' perception, recognition, and adaptation of Philippine English. Descriptive research was utilized to describe students' attitudes, recognition, and usage, while the correlational method explored patterns of relationships between the respondents' profiles and their language perception, recognition, and adaptation of Philippine English. The study employed numerical data analysis to profile patterns and measure the extent of perception, recognition, and adaptation.

The study was conducted at the University of Cebu-Main Campus with a total of 314 randomly selected students representing different colleges and year levels. This sampling technique sought to gather a representative sample and thorough analysis within different groups of students.

The researchers utilized a researcher-made survey questionnaire to assess the students' perception, recognition, and adaptation of Philippine English in academic, written, and spoken contexts. To facilitate efficient data collection, the survey questionnaire was distributed through an online Google form. Students were asked to rate their perceptions of Philippine English, its usage across various situations, and its linguistic features. This rating system allowed the respondents to quantify their self-reported adaptation to Philippine English. Further, pilot testing was conducted to ensure the survey instrument's validity and reliability, which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.945, indicating excellent internal consistency before the final data gathering, which involved 314 student respondents.

To ensure confidentiality, informed consent was obtained and signed before participation. The trustworthiness of the study was upheld through a systematic methodology, which involved careful data collection and rigorous analysis. Transparency and consistency were maintained throughout the research process to enhance the reliability and credibility of the findings.

The following statistical tools were employed to analyze the gathered data:

Frequency and Percentage. These were used to present the demographic profile of the respondents (e.g., age, gender, college, year level), as well as to describe the distribution of responses related to the perception, recognition, and adaptation of Philippine English. Frequency counts and percentage distributions provided a clear overview of general trends and response patterns.

Weighted Mean. The weighted mean was utilized to determine the average ratings of students' perception, recognition, and adaptation across various contexts. This allowed the researchers to quantify the extent to which students acknowledged and adapted to

Philippine English in academic, spoken, and written forms.

Chi-Square Test of Independence. This non-parametric test was applied to examine the association between categorical variables, such as demographic characteristics (e.g., college, year level) and students' perception or recognition of Philippine English. It assessed whether significant relationships existed between the respondents' profiles and their attitudes toward Philippine English.

Kruskal-Wallis H Test. As a non-parametric alternative to ANOVA, the Kruskal-Wallis test was employed to compare the perception, recognition, and adaptation scores across more than two independent groups (e.g., different colleges or year levels). This test was particularly appropriate given the ordinal nature of the survey data and the potential non-normal distribution of responses.

Through these tools, the study was able to profile patterns and measure the extent of student engagement with Philippine English, while also identifying significant differences or associations across demographic variables. The combination of descriptive and inferential statistics provided a comprehensive understanding of how students perceive, recognize, and adapt to Philippine English in an academic setting.

RESULTS

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered from the respondents' demographic profile, their level of perception of Philippine English concerning acceptability and usefulness in academics, their level of recognition of Philippine English in terms of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, and their level of adaptation of Philippine English in terms of its usage in speaking and writing.

Demographic profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, year level, and college enrolled. As shown in Table 1, most of the respondents are female, with 60.8%, while 39.2% are male. In terms of age distribution, the most significant

percentage of respondents is between the ages of 18-20 (71.7%), followed by between 21-23 years old (22.0%) and above 24 years old (6.4%).

This age breakdown underscores that most of the respondents fall within the age bracket of young adults, likely within their early years of studying in tertiary education.

Table 1
Profile of the Respondents (N=314)

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	123	39.2%
Female	191	60.8%
Total	**314**	**100.0**
Age		
18-20 Years Old	225	71.7%
21-23 Years Old	69	22.0%
24 Years Old and Above	20	6.4%
Total	**314**	**100.0**
Year Level		
First Year	172	54.8%
Second Year	68	21.7%
Third Year	44	14.0%
Fourth Year	30	9.6%
Total	**314**	**100.0**
College Enrolled		
College of Engineering	55	17.5%
College of Computer Studies	30	9.6%
College of Criminal Justice	22	7.0%
College of Business and Accountancy	88	28.0%
College of Social Work	19	6.1%
College of Hospitality Management	10	3.2%
College of Arts and Sciences	41	13.1%
College of Customs Administration	30	9.6%
College of Teacher Education	17	5.4%
College of Nursing	2	0.6%
Total	**314**	**100.0**

In terms of year level, first-year students make up the highest percentage at 54.8%, followed by second-year students at 21.7%, third-year students at 14.0%, and fourth-year students at 9.6%. Furthermore, the College of Business and Accountancy has the highest number of respondents (28.0%), followed by the College of Engineering (17.5%) and the College of Arts and Sciences (13.1%). The College of Teacher Education represents 5.4% of the respondents, while the College of Criminal Justice accounts for 7.0%. The College of Computer Studies follows with 9.6%, and the College of Hospitality and Tourism Management constitutes 3.2% of the respondents. Meanwhile, the College of Nursing has the least representation at 0.6%.

These variations in respondents' distribution highlight the stronger participation of students from business, engineering, and arts and sciences, while technical and healthcare fields have lower representation.

Level of perception in terms of acceptability and usefulness in academic settings. Table 2 presents the respondents' perceptions regarding the acceptability and usefulness of Philippine English in academic settings. The findings indicate that Philippine English is generally viewed as both acceptable and functional in educational contexts.

Table 2
Mean Distribution on the Level of Perception of Philippine English in Terms of Acceptability and Usefulness in Academics (N=314)

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Verbal Description
• Philippine English is an acceptable variety of English in academics.	3.5032	.69341	1	Strongly Agree
• Philippine English is as valid as other varieties of English.	3.4904	.67939	2	Strongly Agree
• Philippine English is useful for communication in academic settings.	3.4713	.71551	3	Strongly Agree
• Using Philippine English does not negatively affect students' academic performance.	3.2229	.71585	15	Agree
• Philippine English should be formally recognized in higher education.	3.3025	.75466	10	Strongly Agree
• Professors should allow the use of Philippine English in writing and speaking.	3.3376	.75033	9	Strongly Agree
• Philippine English helps students' express ideas more effectively.	3.4299	.73035	7	Strongly Agree
• Exposure to Philippine English does not hinder learning Standard English.	3.2866	.71543	12	Strongly Agree
• Philippine English is a reflection of our cultural identity.	3.4554	.71915	5	Strongly Agree
• It is acceptable to use Philippine English in formal academic discussions.	3.2548	.72741	14	Strongly Agree
• Philippine English contributes to linguistic diversity in education.	3.4299	.65664	6	Strongly Agree
• The use of Philippine English should be encouraged in local publications.	3.3025	.71555	11	Strongly Agree
• Students feel more confident communicating in Philippine English.	3.3408	.74246	8	Strongly Agree
• The use of Philippine English is not a sign of poor English proficiency.	3.4650	.72850	4	Strongly Agree
• Philippine English can be integrated into English language curricula.	3.2834	.72335	13	Strongly Agree
GRAND MEAN	**3.3776**	**.574665**		**Strongly Agree**

[1.00 to 1.75– Strongly Disagree; 1.76 to 2.50 – Disagrees; 2.51 to 3.25 –Agree; 3.26 to 4.00 – Strongly Agree]

The most highly rated indicator was "Philippine English is an acceptable variety of English to use in academic environments," which received a mean score of 3.5032 (SD = 0.69341), indicating strong agreement. This was followed closely by "Philippine English is as valid as other varieties of English," with a mean of 3.4904 (SD = 0.67939), also reflecting strong agreement. The third-highest rated statement was "Philippine English is useful for communication in academic settings," with a mean score of 3.4713 (SD = 0.71551), further supporting its perceived significance in academic discourse. On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicator was "Using Philippine English does not negatively affect students' academic performance," which ranked 15th, with a mean of 3.2229 (SD = 0.71585), suggesting comparatively lower—but still favorable—agreement. Similarly, the statement "Philippine English is accepted by most educators in academic institutions" ranked 14th, with a mean of 3.2548 (SD = 0.72741), reflecting slightly more reserved perceptions of institutional acceptance.

Despite the variability in individual indicators, the grand mean of 3.3776 (SD = 0.574665) suggests an overall strong agreement that Philippine English is acceptable and useful in academic settings. Several mid-ranked indicators also reinforce this positive perception. For instance, the seventh-ranked statement, "Philippine English helps students express ideas more effectively," earned a mean of 3.4299 (SD = 0.73035), while the fifth-ranked item, "Philippine English is a reflection of our cultural identity," garnered a mean of 3.4554 (SD = 0.71915). Even indicators with relatively lower means still showed general agreement. For example, the ninth-ranked statement, "Professors should allow the use of Philippine English in writing and speaking," had a mean of 3.3376 (SD = 0.75033). Overall, the data indicate a positive and affirming view of Philippine English among respondents, highlighting its acceptability, cultural relevance, and practical usability in academic settings.

These observations are consistent with existing research on how Philippine English is perceived in the academic context. The study of Bautista (2000) underscored the fact that Philippine English is now widely regarded as a valid variety of English both in school and in the workplace. Likewise, Martin (2014) pointed to the role of Philippine English in constructing academic discourse and its increasing establishment among teaching professionals and students alike. More recently, Bernardo (2024) discovered that Philippine English is used as a functional linguistic tool at the tertiary

level, affirming its functionality and acceptability. The findings of this research support these assertions, as they show the respondents' strong agreement with the occurrence and significance of Philippine English within educational institutions. These findings align with ongoing discussions on World Englishes and the growing acceptance of localized English varieties in formal education.

Level of recognition of Philippine English in terms of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary. Table 3 presents the respondents' level of recognition of Philippine English features in terms of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

Table 3
Mean Distribution on the Level of Recognition Philippine English in Terms of Pronunciation, Grammar, and Vocabulary (N=314)

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Verbal Description
• Distinct pronunciation patterns in Philippine English.	3.0796	.63701	14	High
• Influence of Filipino languages in Philippine English pronunciation.	3.2548	.62334	2	Very High
• Common grammatical structures are unique to Philippine English.	3.1497	.67820	8	High
• Differences between Philippine English and Standard English grammar.	3.1465	.69975	10	High
• Unique vocabulary words used in Philippine English.	3.1561	.67202	7	High
• Differences in spelling conventions of Philippine English.	3.1083	.69760	11	High
• The use of Filipino words in Philippine English (e.g., 'barangay').	3.3280	.63249	1	Very High
• Awareness of Philippine English sentence structure variations.	3.1688	.63461	5	High
• Awareness of common loanwords in Philippine English.	3.0573	.69450	15	High
• Recognition of common idioms and expressions in Philippine English.	3.1051	.68188	12	High
• Identification of phonetic variations in Philippine English.	3.0987	.66385	13	High
• Understanding of the historical development of Philippine English.	3.1688	.72397	6	High
• Awareness of code-switching between English and Filipino.	3.2389	.68551	3	High
• Distinction between formal and informal Philippine English usage.	3.1911	.69350	4	High
• Familiarity with academic and non-academic Philippine English usage.	3.1497	.69219	9	High
GRAND MEAN	**3.1601**	**.51724**		**High**

[1.00 to 1.75– Very Low; 1.76 to 2.50 – Low; 2.51 to 3.25 –High; 3.26 to 4.00 – Very High]

The most highly recognized indicator was "The use of Filipino words in Philippine English (e.g., 'barangay')," which received a mean score of 3.3280 (SD = 0.63249), indicating a "Very High" level of recognition. Following this, "The influence of Filipino languages on Philippine English pronunciation" ranked second with a mean of 3.2548 (SD = 0.62334), also reflecting a "Very High" recognition level. The third most

recognized feature was "Awareness of code-switching between English and Filipino," with a mean score of 3.2389 (SD = 0.68551), indicating strong recognition of bilingual language use. Another notable indicator was the "Distinction between formal and informal Philippine English usage," which received a mean of 3.1911 (SD = 0.69350), highlighting respondents' awareness of stylistic variation. The fifth highest-rated item, "Awareness of sentence structure variations in Philippine English," earned a mean score of 3.1688 (SD = 0.63461), suggesting a solid understanding of syntactic differences.

These results suggest that respondents demonstrate a high recognition of Philippine English, especially in its incorporation of Filipino linguistic features. The grand mean of 3.1601 (SD = 0.51724), classified as "High", supports this interpretation. In addition, other indicators also reflect consistent recognition. For instance, "Unique vocabulary words used in Philippine English" had a mean of 3.1561 (SD = 0.67202), while "Common grammatical structures unique to Philippine English" followed closely with a mean of 3.1497 (SD = 0.67820), both indicating awareness of lexical and grammatical distinctions. The lowest-ranked indicator, "Awareness of common loanwords in Philippine English," still garnered a "High" recognition with a mean of 3.0573 (SD = 0.69450). Similarly, "Identification of phonetic variations in Philippine English" (M = 3.0987, SD = 0.66385) and "Recognition of common idioms and expressions in Philippine English" (M = 3.1051, SD = 0.68188) reveal consistent acknowledgment of Philippine English as a distinct linguistic variety. In summary, the findings suggest that while vocabulary and grammar features of Philippine English are more strongly recognized, pronunciation features—though still well acknowledged—appear to be slightly less recognized. This highlights the respondents' broad, though varied, understanding of Philippine English.

These findings corroborate the existing research pointing to the recognition and authenticity of Philippine English as a variety of languages. Bautista and Boltron (2008) stressed that Philippine English is

characterized by some specific phonological, lexical, and grammatical features that separate it from the other varieties of English. Martin (2014) corroborated this by pointing out that Filipino words and phrases incorporated into Philippine English help its distinctiveness. More recently, Bernardo (2022) discovered that increased acceptance of Philippine English in higher education and work environments is symptomatic of widespread recognition. These results are part of the continued debate on World Englishes and the recognition of localized forms of English in different communicative contexts.

Level of adaptation of Philippine English in terms of speaking and writing. Table 4 presents the respondents' frequency of adaptation of Philippine English in both speaking and writing contexts.

Table 4
Mean Distribution on the Level of Adaptation Philippine English in Terms of Speaking and Writing (N=314)

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Verbal Description
• I use Philippine English pronunciation in daily conversations.	3.1497	2	2	Often
• I use Philippine English pronunciation in academic presentations.	2.9427	.73473	13	Often
• I apply Philippine English grammar in my academic writing.	3.0159	.70806	7	Often
• I use Philippine English vocabulary in formal discussions.	3.0287	.72549	6	Often
• I switch between Philippine English and Standard English based on context.	2.9490	.74813	11	Often
• I consciously adapt my English depending on the audience.	3.0860	.75977	4	Often
• I use Philippine English expressions in social interactions.	3.1975	.72332	1	Often
• I use Philippine English spelling conventions in my writing.	3.0414	.77596	5	Often
• I incorporate Filipino words when speaking in English.	2.9459	.75428	12	Often
• I am comfortable using Philippine English in professional settings.	3.1083	.70670	3	Often
• I use Philippine English in creative writing.	3.0064	.77085	9	Often
• I write formal documents using Philippine English structures.	2.9650	.75963	10	Often
• I participate in academic discussions using Philippine English.	2.8854	.82274	14	Often
• I feel confident speaking in Philippine English.	2.8185	.79666	15	Often
• I use Philippine English in written exams and assignments.	3.0127	.79122	8	Often
GRAND MEAN	**3.0102**	**.52567**		**Often**

The findings indicate that respondents "often" adapt Philippine English across various communicative situations. The most frequently reported behavior was "I use Philippine English expressions in social interactions," which received the highest mean score of 3.1975, reflecting the respondents' regular use of localized expressions in social settings. Ranking second was "I use Philippine English

pronunciation in everyday conversations," with a mean of 3.1497, suggesting that such pronunciation patterns are commonly employed in daily verbal exchanges. Respondents also reported feeling comfortable using Philippine English at work, with a mean score of 3.1083 (ranked 3rd), indicating its frequent usage in professional contexts. Additionally, the statement "I adapt my use of English depending on the audience" obtained a mean score of 3.0860 (ranked 4th), further showing that respondents consciously adjust their English usage–often incorporating Philippine English–based on the communicative context.

Several other indicators also showed an "often" level of adaptation. For example, "I use Philippine English spelling conventions in my writing" had a mean score of 3.0414 (ranked 5th), while "I use Philippine English vocabulary in formal discussions" followed with a mean of 3.0287 (ranked 6th). Similarly, the use of Philippine English grammar in academic writing was reported with a mean score of 3.0159 (ranked 7th), further supporting the frequent incorporation of local English features in formal contexts. The results suggest a general tendency to "often" adapt Philippine English in various speaking and writing situations. This is supported by the grand mean of 3.0102 and a standard deviation of 0.52567, indicating a moderately consistent adaptation pattern across respondents.

The findings are consistent with researches that recognize the "nativization" of English in the Philippines. Bautista (2000) quoted the emergence of unique Philippine English varieties based on local languages and contexts. Likewise, Gonzalez (2004) wrote about adopting and utilizing Philippine English in different contexts, testifying to its changing status. These previous findings are consistent with the present data, which indicate that Philippine English is used frequently in social, educational, and workplace contexts. In addition, comparable studies mention the context-dependent utilization of English varieties, where speakers alternate between standard and localized varieties. Lastly, this accommodation is part of a new paradigm of

English language indigenization in post-colonial settings.

Relationship between respondents' profile and level of perception of Philippine English in terms of acceptability and usefulness in academic settings. Table 5 presents the significant relationships between the respondents' demographic profiles and their level of perception of Philippine English in terms of its acceptability and usefulness in academic contexts.

Table 5
Chi-square Test Between Respondents' Profile and Level of Perception of Philippine English in Terms of Acceptability and Usefulness in Academics

Variables	df	Computed Value	P-value	Decision	Interpretation	Strength
Sex & Perception	3	7.122	.068	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant	n/a
Age & Perception	6	13.746	.033	Reject H₀	Significant	C=0.148 (Weak Association)
College Enrolled & Perception	27	56.699	<.001	Reject H₀	Significant	C=0.245 (Moderate Association)
Year Level & Perception	9	26.761	.002	Reject H₀	Significant	C=0.169 (Weak Association)

[Reject H₀: P-value < ∝], [V∈ [0.00-0.2]: weak association, V∈ [0.21-0.4]: Moderate association, and V > 0.41: Strong Association]

The results indicate varying degrees of association across demographic variables. The relationship between sex and perception yielded a computed Chi-square value of 7.122 with 3 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.068. Since the p-value is higher than the standard significance level (typically set at 0.05), the null hypothesis could not be rejected, indicating no significant relationship between respondents' sex and their perception of Philippine English.

In contrast, the relationship between age and perception produced a Chi-square value of 13.746 with 6 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.033. This result falls below the threshold of significance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis and suggesting a statistically significant but weak association (Cramer's V = 0.148) between age and perception. Moreover, a more notable result is observed in the relationship between college enrolled and perception, which generated a Chi-square value of 56.699 with 27 degrees of freedom and a p-value less than 0.001. This indicates a significant and moderately strong association (Cramer's V

= 0.245) between students' college affiliation and their perception of Philippine English.

These findings align with broader discussions in the field of sociolinguistics and World Englishes. As Kachru (1985) emphasized, the perception and use of English varieties are shaped by sociocultural contexts. The significant influence of age on perception supports prior sociolinguistic findings that language attitudes often vary across age groups. Similarly, the educational environment, represented by the "college enrolled" variable, reflects the role of communities of practice in shaping language norms and attitudes (Wenger, 1998). In sum, the data contribute to the growing body of literature on localized Englishes, affirming that perception of English varieties—such as Philippine English—are not monotonous but are shaped by social and demographic factors. This highlights the importance of considering these variables in discussions surrounding language legitimacy and variation in academic and professional domains.

Relationship between respondents' profile and the level of recognition of Philippine English in terms of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. Table 6 shows the significant relationships between the respondents' profile and their level of recognition of Philippine English in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

Table 6
Chi-square Test Between Respondents' Profile and Level of Recognition of Philippine English in Terms of Pronunciation, Grammar, and Vocabulary

Variables	df	Computed Value	P-value	Decision	Interpretation	Strength
Sex & Recognition	3	3.343	.342	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant	n/a
Age & Recognition	6	4.698	.583	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant	n/a
College Enrolled & Recognition	27	71.768	<.001	Reject H₀	Significant	C=0.267 (Moderate Association)
Year Level & Recognition	9	7.408	.595	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant	n/a

[Reject H₀: P-value < ∝], [V∈ [0.00-0.2]: weak association, V∈ [0.21-0.4]: Moderate association, and V > 0.41: Strong Association]

The table shows that sex and recognition have a computed value of 3.343 with 3 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.342. Because the p-value is higher than the significance level, the null hypothesis could not be rejected and indicated that there was no significant relationship between recognition and sex.

Likewise, the relationship between recognition and age has a calculated value of 4.698 and 6 degrees of freedom with a p-value of 0.583, resulting not to reject the null hypothesis and indicating no significant relationship.

Additionally, the relationship between year level and recognition has a calculated value of 7.408 with 9 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.595, again leading to the inability to reject the null hypothesis and demonstrating no significant relationship.

However, the relationship between college enrolled and recognition signifies a different result. The calculated value of this relationship is 71.768 with 27 degrees of freedom, and the p-value is less than 0.001. This p-value is smaller than the significance level, which results in the rejection of the null hypothesis and shows that there is a significant relationship. The strength of this relationship is a moderate association, and its C-value is 0.267. This implies that the program where students are enrolled impacts their awareness of Philippine English when it comes to pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. These findings indicate the influence of pedagogical context on the awareness of English language variations.

The result significantly recognized that Philippine English is consistent with the general sociolinguistic view that variation in language and attitudes is socially conditioned. Bautista (2000) has discussed in great detail the characteristics of Philippine English and how it has become institutionalized in some areas within the Philippines. Institutionalization can differ across different learning institutions, accounting for the high significance of results. Studies on language socialization within educational settings also support this, suggesting that students adapt to their specific academic communities' linguistic norms and expectations.

Relationship between respondents' profile and the level of adaption of Philippine English in terms of speaking and writing. Table 7 depicts the correlation between respondents' profiles and adaptation of Philippine English in speaking and writing.

The results showed that there is no significant correlation between sex and adaptation to Philippine English, with a computed value of 0.791 and a p-value of 0.852. Likewise, there is no significant correlation between age and adaptation, with a computed value of 4.274, and a p-value of 0.640. These findings suggest that sex and age do not significantly affect how individuals adapt to Philippine English.

Table 7
Chi-square Test Between Respondents' Profile and the Level of Adaptation of Philippine English in Terms of Speaking and Writing

Variables	df	Computed Value	P-value	Decision	Interpretation	Strength
Sex & Adaptation	3	.791	.852	Failed to Reject H_o	Not Significant	n/a
Age & Adaptation	6	4.274	.640	Failed to Reject H_o	Not Significant	n/a
College Enrolled & Adaptation	27	70.617	<.001	Reject H_o	Significant	C=0.274 (Moderate Association)
Year Level & Adaptation	9	13.958	.124	Failed to Reject H_o	Not Significant	n/a

[Reject H_o: P-value < ∝], [V∈ [0.00-0.2]: weak association, V∈ [0.21-0.4]: Moderate association, and V > 0.41: Strong Association]

Nevertheless, a strong correlation exists between college enrolled and adaptation to Philippine English, with a computed value of 70.617 and a p-value of < 0.001. This implies that the program enrolled by the respondents contributes to their adoption of Philippine English. The magnitude of this relationship is deemed to be a moderate association, with a C-value of 0.274. On the other hand, year level has no effect on adaptation with a computed value of 13.958, and p-value of 0.124.

The importance of the environment is consistent with research on communities of practice where common experience dictates linguistic norms (Wenger, 1998). Sociolinguistic study also highlights how institutions such as colleges influence variation in language (Foucault, 1972). In addition, research on World Englishes shows that educational contexts determine the legitimization of local English varieties (Kachru, 1985). These facts all highlight the impact of social context on language adaptation.

Difference on the perception of Philippine English in terms of acceptability and usefulness in academic settings when respondents are grouped according to their profile. Table 8 presents the difference on respondents' perceptions of Philippine English – specifically its acceptability and usefulness in academic contexts – when grouped according to their demographic profiles. The results reveal significant differences in perception across several variables.

Table 8
Kruskal-Wallis H Test on Demographic Variables Influencing Acceptability and Usefulness of Philippine English in Academic Context

Variables		N	Mean Rank	df	H	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Age	18–20 years old	225	161.29					
	21–22 years old	69	157.98					
	23 and above years old	20	113.25	2	7.337	.026	Reject H₀	Significant
	Total	314						
Sex	Female	123	152.74					
	Male	191	160.57	1	.793	.373	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	Total	314						
Year Level	First Year	172	170.02					
	Second Year	68	127.76					
	Third Year	44	154.07	3	15.163	.002	Reject H₀	Significant
	Fourth Year	30	158.18					
	Total	314						
College Enrolled	College of Engineering	55	152.34					
	College of Computer Studies	30	176.15					
	College of Criminal Justice	22	121.98					
	College of Business and Accountancy	88	165.38					
	College of Social Work	19	181.53					
	College of Hospitality Management	10	123.30	9	19.61	.020	Reject H₀	Significant
	College of Arts and Sciences	41	169.24					
	College of Customs Administration	30	139.80					
	College of Teacher Education	17	157.21					
	College of Nursing	2	34.00					
	Total	314						

Asymptotic significance displayed. The significance is 0.05. [Reject Ho: P-value < ∝]

A statistically significant difference by age was observed (p = 0.026), with varying mean ranks: 161.29 for ages 18–20 (n = 225), 157.98 for ages 21–22 (n = 69), and 113.25 for respondents aged 23 and above (n = 20). This suggests that younger respondents tend to have higher perceptions of Philippine English's acceptability and usefulness in academics. In contrast, there was no significant difference by sex (p = 0.373), with mean ranks of 152.74 for females (n = 123) and 160.57 for males (n = 191), indicating that

gender does not significantly influence perception in this context.

Notably, year level showed a highly significant effect on perception (p = 0.002). The mean ranks varied across year levels: 170.02 for the First Year (n = 172), 127.76 for the Second Year (n = 68), 154.07 for the Third Year (n = 44), and 158.18 for the Fourth Year (n = 30), suggesting that perceptions fluctuate as student progress through their academic journey. Furthermore, the college enrolled was also found to significantly impact perception (p = 0.020), with mean ranks ranging from 34.00 for the College of Nursing (n = 2) to 181.53 for the College of Social Work (n = 19). This indicates that disciplinary and institutional affiliations influence students' attitudes toward Philippine English.

These findings support established sociolinguistic theories on the influence of social variables on language perception. Kachru's (1985) work on World Englishes underscores how social factors such as age and institutional context affect the recognition and acceptance of localized English varieties. Similarly, Wenger's (1998) theory of communities of practice explains how shared experiences – such as those within college programs – shape linguistic norms and attitudes. Moreover, sociolinguistic research highlights how age-related variation contributes to differing language ideologies, with younger individuals often showing more adaptive or inclusive attitudes toward non-standard varieties. The significant influence of academic context also reflects institutional language ideologies, aligning with Foucault's (1972) assertion that institutions often regulate which language forms are legitimized or marginalized. The findings reinforce the view that perceptions of Philippine English are not homogeneous but profoundly shaped by age, academic standing, and institutional affiliation, underscoring the complex and nuance intersection of language, identity, and social structure.

Difference on the recognition of Philippine English in terms of pronunciation, grammar and

vocabulary when respondents are grouped according to their profile. Table 9 highlights the difference in the level of recognition of Philippine English regarding the respondents' pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary when categorized by profile.

Table 9
Kruskal-Wallis H Test on Demographic Variables Influencing Recognition of Philippine English in terms of Pronunciation, Grammar, and Vocabulary

	Variables	N	Mean Rank	df	H	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Age	18-20 years old	225	158.23	2	.697	.706	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	21-22 years old	69	159.33					
	23 years old and above	20	142.95					
	Total	314						
Sex	Female	123	152.63	1	1.00	.752	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	Male	191	160.64					
	Total	314						
Year Level	First Year	172	158.58	3	5.398	.145	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	Second Year	68	140.46					
	Third Year	44	175.70					
	Fourth Year	30	163.27					
	Total	314						
College Enrolled	College of Engineering	55	163.15	9	15.14	.087	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	College of Computer Studies	30	160.20					
	College of Criminal Justice	22	135.55					
	College of Business and Accountancy	88	152.34					
	College of Social Work	19	175.21					
	College of Hospitality Management	10	117.40					
	College of Arts and Sciences	41	186.80					
	College of Customs Administration	30	155.40					
	College of Teacher Education	17	138.53					
	College of Nursing	2	54.50					
	Total	314						

*Asymptotic significance displayed. The significance is 0.05. [Reject Ho: P-value < ∝]

Based on the Kruskal-Wallis test results, there was no significant difference in the recognition of Philippine English based on sex (p=0.752), with females (n=123) having a mean rank of 152.63 and males (n=191) having a mean rank of 160.64. A separate analysis also showed no significant difference among specific sex and age groups (p=0.706), where the mean ranks were 158.23 for females aged 18–20 (n=225), 159.33 for males aged 21–22 (n=69), and 142.95 for the combined group of females and males aged 23 and above (n=20).

Additionally, the study found no significant difference in recognition based on year level (p=0.145), with mean ranks ranging from 158.58 for First-Year students (n=172) to 163.27 for Fourth-Year students (n=30). Likewise, college enrolled did not result in a significant difference in recognition (p=0.087), even though mean ranks ranged widely from 54.50 for the College of Nursing (n=2) to 186.80 for the College of Arts and Sciences (n=41).

The statistical analysis shows no significant difference in the perception of Philippine English based on demographic factors like sex, year level, or college enrollment. This finding is consistent with the study by Hernandez (2020), who found that Filipino graduate students possess a moderate to very high awareness of Philippine English (PhE) as a distinct local variety. The study highlights that demographic variables alone do not fully explain this high awareness. This suggests that the recognition of Philippine English is likely tied to other, more influential factors such as shared exposure to media, educational policies, and overall attitudes toward language. The uniform awareness across different groups implies that the perception of Philippine English is widely distributed. Therefore, the demographic factors in this study do not reliably predict a person's ability to identify Philippine English features. Future research should explore specific sociolinguistic variables beyond age, sex, and year level to identify what truly drives the recognition of Philippine English.

Difference in the recognition of Philippine English in terms of speaking and writing when respondents are grouped according to their profile.

Table 10
Kruskal-Wallis H Test on Demographic Variables Influencing Recognition of Philippine English in terms of Speaking and Writing

Variables		N	Mean Rank	df	H	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Age	18-20 years old	225	159.74	2	2.202	.332	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	21-22 years old	69	157.87					
	23 and above years old	20	131.05					
	Total	314						
Sex	Female	123	159.34	1	.730	.393	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	Male	191	156.31					
	Total	314						
Year Level	First Year	172	167.24	3	11.29	.010	Reject H₀	Significant
	Second Year	68	128.44					
	Third Year	44	156.66					
	Fourth Year	30	168.78					
	Total	314						
College Enrolled	College of Engineering	55	164.69	9	7.488	.586	Failed to Reject H₀	Not Significant
	College of Computer Studies	30	169.30					
	College of Criminal Justice	22	167.27					
	College of Business and Accountancy	88	153.20					
	College of Social Work	19	152.84					
	College of Hospitality Management	10	124.45					
	College of Arts and Sciences	41	170.11					
	College of Customs Administration	30	144.42					
	College of Teacher Education	17	151.21					
	College of Nursing	2	65.25					
	Total	314						

*Asymptotic significance displayed. The significance is 0.05. [Reject Ho: P-value < ∝]

Table 10 presents the Kruskal-Wallis test results, highlighting the differences in

respondents' level of adaptation to Philippine English in speaking and writing when grouped by profile. The results indicate no significant difference in adaptation based on age (p=0.332), with mean ranks of 159.74 for 18–20 year olds (n=225), 157.87 for 21–22 year olds (n=69), and 131.05 for those 23 and above (n=20). Likewise, there was no significant difference in adaptation between sexes (p=0.393), with mean ranks of 159.34 for females (n=123) and 156.31 for males (n=191). However, the analysis found a significant difference in adaptation based on year level (p=0.010). The mean ranks varied notably: 167.24 for First Year (n=172), 128.44 for Second Year (n=68), 156.66 for Third Year (n=44), and 168.78 for Fourth Year (n=30). Conversely, there was no significant difference based on the college enrolled (p=0.586), despite the mean ranks ranging from 65.25 for the College of Nursing (n=2) to 170.11 for the College of Arts and Sciences (n=41).

The significant difference in adaptation across year levels suggests that prolonged exposure and integration into an academic environment influence language use. This finding is consistent with Wenger's (1998) theory of communities of practice, which posits that individuals' linguistic practices are shaped by their everyday experiences and evolving roles within a learning community.

Furthermore, the absence of a significant difference in adaptation among students from different colleges may seem to contradict some sociolinguistic theories that emphasize the role of institutional contexts in shaping language use. However, this finding is supported by Llamzon (1969), one of the pioneers in the study of Philippine English. He suggests that Philippine English is a stabilized and institutionalized variety widely taught and used throughout the entire Philippine educational system, regardless of specific college or discipline. This broad, uniform exposure could account for the lack of significant differences in adaptation between students from different colleges, implying that the influence of broader academic community outweighs any potential differences between individual colleges.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that students consider Philippine English a functional and appropriate variety for academic contexts. This is supported by high mean scores for statements like "Philippine English is an acceptable variety of English for academic purposes" (M = 3.5032) and "Philippine English is useful for communication in academic settings" (M = 3.4713). Respondents also demonstrated high awareness of Philippine English, particularly regarding the influence of Filipino and the practice of code-switching. This consciousness is evident in the "Very High" score for the indicator "The use of Filipino words in Philippine English" (M = 3.3280).

The results suggest that students have a positive perception and understanding of Philippine English. While they are aware of and accept the language, their actual use of it varies by context. For instance, they use Philippine English expressions more frequently in social interactions than in more formal academic presentations, where usage is more restrained.

Statistical analysis revealed no significant difference in the adaptation of Philippine English based on sex and age. However, a significant difference was observed based on college enrolled and year level, indicating that the learning environment and academic progression play a crucial role in students' adaptation trajectories. Ultimately, the study suggests that students have a complex role in the perception, recognition, and adaptation of Philippine English.

Philippine English is generally perceived positively by students who acknowledge its unique linguistic features. However, the extent to which they adapt their usage depends on their academic stage and context. This evidence contributes to the growing body of research on World Englishes and the increasing acceptance of localized English in higher education.

Future studies should explore how teachers' pedagogical practices and attitudes influence

learners' acquisition and use of Philippine English. Longitudinal studies could also help track how students' perceptions and adaptation change over time. Additionally, the role of social media and technology in shaping students' exposure to and knowledge of Philippine English needs to be explored further. Finally, comparative studies across different regions or institutions could provide a broader perspective on the dynamics of Philippine English in tertiary education.

REFERENCES

Al-Mutairi, M. A. (2020). Kachru's three concentric circles model of English language: An overview of criticism & the place of Kuwait in it. *English Language Teaching,13*(1),85–88. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n1p85

Bailey, S. (2025). *Academic writing: A handbook for international students* (6th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003509264

Bautista, M. L. S. (2000). *Defining Standard Philippine English: Its Status and Grammatical Features.* De La Salle University Press. Manila. Philippines

Bautista, M. L. S., & Bolton, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives.* Hong Kong University Press. https://doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/97896 22099470.003.0001

Bernardo, A. S. (2011). De-hegemonizing the "hegemonized": An exploratory study on the dominion of American English in the oldest university in Asia*. i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching, 1*(3), 7–22. https://doi.org/10.26634/jelt.1.3.1591

Bernardo, A. S. (2022*). Language teaching. In Philippine English* (pp. 288–305). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429427824-29

Bernardo, A. S. (2024). Teaching Philippine English through schoolscapes. *World Englishes.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12673

Dayag, D. T. (2008). English-language media in the Philippines: Description and research. In M. L. S. Bautista & K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary perspectives* (pp. 55–74). Hong Kong University Press. https://doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/97896 22099470.003.0004

Deterding, D. (2010). Norms for pronunciation in Southeast Asia. *World Englishes, 29*(3), 364–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2010.01660.x

Foucault, M. (1972). The discourse on language (R. Swyer, Trans.). In A. M. Sheridan Smith (Trans.), *The archaeology of knowledge* (pp. 215–237). Pantheon Books.

Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and consequences.* Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Gonzales, W. D. W. (2017). Philippine Englishes. *Asian Englishes, 19*(1), 79–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.12 74574

Gupta, A. F. (1994). *The step-tongue: Children's English in Singapore.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hernandez, H. P. (2020). Awareness of Filipino graduate students towards Philippine English. *The Normal Lights*, *14*(2).

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 200–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English

language in the outer circle. In H. G. Quirk & R. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1990). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes.* University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon.* Hong Kong University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Llamzon, Teodoro A. (1969). *Standard Filipino English*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Martin, I. P. (2014). Philippine English revisited. *World Englishes, 33*(1), 50–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12054

Tupas, R., & Salonga, A. (2016). Unequal Englishes in the Philippines. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 20*(4), 451–471. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12185

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932