WJSAM | World Journal of Sustainable Advances in Multidisciplinarity
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INTERDISCIPLINARITY | SUSTAINABILITY
Volume 1, Issue 2 | ISSN: 3155-783X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/wjsam.V1.I2.49

Philippine English in Selected Elementary Learning Materials in English: A Cross-Linguistic Critic

Jonal S. Advincula
Master Teacher II, Calbayog Pilot Central Elementary School, Calbayog City, Samar, Philippines

Email: jonal.advincula@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examined the representation of Philippine English in Department of Education Grade 4 English learning materials used in selected public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Calbayog City during School Year 2025–2026 and explored their implications for elementary English instruction. Employing qualitative content analysis, the study purposively selected instructional documents and analyzed linguistic features using a Philippine English features checklist, comparative examination, and thematic interpretation. The analysis identified 40 lexical items, 30 grammatical patterns, 30 pragmatic features, 17 local-language insertions or representations, and 33 pedagogical features. Findings revealed that localized vocabulary, culturally embedded expressions, and respectful communication practices reflected Filipino identity and social values, while structured instructional activities emphasized curriculum organization and assessment. Grammatical patterns included both nonstandard constructions and contextually acceptable English forms, highlighting the importance of distinguishing linguistic variation from grammatical inaccuracies. Overlapping linguistic categories further demonstrated the interconnected cultural, communicative, and instructional functions of language. The study concluded that Philippine English constituted a meaningful linguistic and cultural resource within the examined instructional material. It recommended guided comparisons of English varieties, culturally responsive teaching strategies, and greater attention to linguistic diversity and communicative appropriateness. The document-based scope limited conclusions concerning classroom implementation and learner outcomes. The findings contribute to Philippine English scholarship by providing a contextualized framework for improving linguistic inclusivity, instructional material development, and culturally responsive elementary English education.

Keywords: *Content Analysis, Culturally Responsive Teaching, English Learning Materials, Linguistic Variation, Philippine English, Translanguaging, World Englishes*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Context of the Study

English functions as both a medium of learning and a resource for social participation in multilingual societies. In the Philippines, that role reflects historical education policies and sustained contact with Filipino and regional languages (Davis, 2024). Such contact contributed to Philippine English (PhE), a recognizable variety with locally meaningful linguistic conventions. Rather than treating every difference from American or British English as an error, the World Englishes perspective recognizes that English develops distinctive forms across sociocultural settings (Kachru, 1992). Borlongan (2022) documents the historical development, structural features, and educational relevance of this variety, while Bolton et al. (2024) demonstrate the breadth of scholarship concerning its grammar, linguistic identity, and multilingual contexts. The language presented in elementary learning materials has particular significance because written examples and activities expose pupils to vocabulary, sentence patterns, and expectations about appropriate English usage. Curriculum discussions therefore involve two legitimate considerations: acknowledging linguistic practices familiar to Filipino learners and preparing them to communicate intelligibly across contexts. Bernardo (2024a) argues for grammar teaching that recognizes Philippine English alongside the plurality of English varieties, rather than assuming that an external standard is the only acceptable pedagogical norm. This concern is relevant to the Department of Education's curriculum reforms, including the policy guidelines for implementing the MATATAG Curriculum (Department of Education, 2024). Against this background, the present study examined officially prescribed Grade 4 English learning materials used in selected public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Calbayog City during School Year 2025–2026. It focused on their written lexical, syntactic, and semantic features, especially forms associated with Philippine English and their relationship to other established English usages. The central concern was how these materials represented local linguistic realities while maintaining clarity and contextual appropriateness for elementary English instruction.

1.2. Research Problem

The issue is not whether Philippine English is a legitimate variety, but how its features are represented and explained in instructional texts intended for developing readers. Policarpio (2023) identifies substantive grounds for considering Philippine English in the national English curriculum, while Bernardo (2024b) demonstrates that educational spaces can make local English varieties visible and pedagogically meaningful. These contributions raise questions about the linguistic examples, explanations, and implicit standards to which pupils are exposed through prescribed learning materials. Philippine classrooms draw on multiple linguistic resources, while English education involves differing approaches to multilingualism and language policy (Martinez & Martin, 2024). De Los Reyes (2024), for example, documented translanguaging practices in Grade 3 English instruction, illustrating the importance of recognizing multilingual classroom contexts. However, classroom practices alone do not establish the wording of Grade 4 learning texts. Written materials may incorporate localized vocabulary or grammatical constructions, favor external English norms, or present different forms without explaining their contextual use. These possibilities require examination. For the selected English 4 materials in Calbayog City, the specific concern was therefore the presence, nature, and differences of Philippine English features and the teaching implications that follow from textual evidence. Broader scholarship does not fully address this material-level problem.

1.3. Research Gap

Existing scholarship has examined Philippine English variation, grammar, and local norms across linguistic and educational settings (Cruz & Martin, 2024). Dita (2025) synthesizes research on Philippine English grammar, including corpus-based descriptions, while Bolton et al. (2024)

document substantial work across sociolinguistic and educational domains. These accounts do not map the expressions and structures appearing in selected DepEd Grade 4 English materials used in Calbayog City during School Year 2025–2026. They also leave unresolved how differences between localized forms and established usages should be interpreted. The present study addressed this context-specific and material-level gap through close analysis of written lexical, syntactic, and semantic features. World Englishes provides the basis for recognizing legitimate variation, while systemic functional linguistics supports interpretation of language choices in context (Halliday, 1985). A cross-linguistic perspective, informed by the relationship between learners' languages discussed by Cummins (2000), further guided pedagogical interpretation. The intended contribution was a documented account of textual representation, not a direct measurement of learner achievement.

1.4. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to explore and map the presence of Philippine English in officially prescribed DepEd Grade 4 English learning materials for School Year 2025–2026 in selected public elementary schools within the Schools Division of Calbayog City. Specifically, it sought to identify Philippine English features in the written materials; examine differences among these features and their relationship to other established English usages; and derive pedagogical implications for English instruction in elementary education. The analysis concentrated on lexical, syntactic, and semantic content through a cross-linguistic and World Englishes perspective. It did not include classroom observations, teacher accounts, pupils' actual language use, or direct assessments of instructional effectiveness.

1.5. Significance and Practical Contribution of the Study

By documenting the linguistic forms embedded in Grade 4 learning materials, the study provided a basis for examining whether instructional examples are locally meaningful, contextually appropriate, and sufficiently clear for classroom use. Its findings may help elementary English teachers explain variation without automatically equating localized usage with error. Curriculum developers and learning-resource reviewers may use the analysis to consider where examples, contextual explanations, or editorial guidance could be refined. The study also extended material-focused inquiry within Philippine English scholarship by applying established linguistic perspectives to a specific set of DepEd texts. Its proposed pedagogical implications are interpretive recommendations drawn from written content, rather than claims that particular materials cause measurable changes in pupils' proficiency.

1.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Alignment

The study is aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education, which emphasizes inclusive and equitable learning. In particular, SDG Target 4.1 emphasizes quality primary education, while Target 4.7 includes appreciation of cultural diversity and its contribution to sustainable development (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2025). Examining Philippine English in Grade 4 materials supports these priorities by considering whether instructional language reflects learners' linguistic contexts while remaining clear and educationally appropriate. Its attention to local language identity offers a basis for more culturally responsive explanations and learning-resource review. The study contributes to these objectives through textual analysis and pedagogical recommendations; it does not measure SDG progress, student attainment, or the direct effectiveness of curriculum interventions.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

This study employed qualitative content analysis to examine the representation of Philippine English in Grade 4 English learning materials. Document-based inquiry supported systematic

identification and interpretation of lexical, syntactic, grammatical, idiomatic, and pragmatic features in instructional texts (Morgan, 2022). The analysis was informed by Kachru's (1992) World Englishes framework to interpret Philippine English as a localized variety. Cross-linguistic comparisons with Standard American English helped identify linguistic adaptations and their communicative and educational functions rather than merely classifying departures from external norms.

2.2. Research Context and Document Corpus

The study focused on English instructional materials used in Philippine elementary education, Grade 4 resources issued within the preceding decade under the revised K to 12 curriculum. The corpus included textbooks and related materials produced or endorsed by the Department of Education, such as workbooks, teacher's guides, and supplementary resources. The selected texts comprised dialogues, narratives, instructions, exercises, and comprehension passages. These documents, rather than individuals, constituted the research corpus. This focus reflected scholarship on Philippine English and its educational contexts (Bernardo, 2024a; Bolton et al., 2024).

2.3. Sampling Technique and Sample Determination

The study applied purposive selection of instructional documents based on their relevance to Grade 4 English instruction, DepEd production or endorsement, accessibility within public education, and widespread school use. Selection covered different text genres to capture linguistic features across instructional purposes. A source-and-excerpt checklist identified the material type, grade level, subject area, and relevant sections for examination. This approach was appropriate for qualitative document research (Morgan, 2022). The selected documentary corpus was described according to its instructional source types and text genres; however, the total number of documents and extracted passages was not reported.

2.4. Research Instrument and Validation

The instrument was a Philippine English features checklist and a content analysis framework adapted from Kachru (1992). The checklist captured source details and excerpts illustrating vocabulary, syntax, grammar, idioms, and context-specific expressions. Coding classified occurrences according to frequency, contextual function, pedagogical purpose, and degree of variation from standard forms. Expert review assessed the instrument's relevance, comprehensiveness, and clarity. Reliability checks involved repeated application to materials and independent assessments by evaluators from the University of Eastern Philippines who were graduates of the Doctor of Arts in Language and Literature program. Reliability assessment involved repeated application of the coding framework and independent evaluation, although a numerical reliability coefficient was not reported.

2.5. Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher collected qualitative data through document examination of Grade 4 textbooks, workbooks, and related English instructional resources. Materials were screened using the stated selection criteria, after which relevant passages from dialogues, narratives, instructions, and exercises were identified. Instances of localized vocabulary, grammatical constructions, syntactic variation, and code-switching were extracted and annotated. These excerpts were prepared for comparison with standard English usage while considering the influence of Philippine languages. This procedure followed the documentary focus of qualitative analysis (Morgan, 2022).

2.6. Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Analysis combined corpus-based examination with thematic interpretation. Repeated reading and annotation supported initial coding of localized vocabulary, spelling, idioms, verb forms, prepositions, articles, honorifics, politeness expressions, code-switching, and translanguaging. Identified features were compared with Standard American English and grouped according to frequency and communicative or pedagogical function. The codes were reorganized into themes of nativization, first-language influence, cultural embeddedness, instructional translanguaging, and pedagogical localization. Themes were refined through continuous comparison and interpreted using Kachru's Outer Circle perspective. The movement from codes to themes was consistent with contemporary qualitative analytic guidance (Bingham, 2023; Braun & Clarke, 2022).

2.7. Ethical Considerations

The inquiry analyzed educational documents rather than collecting information directly from human respondents. As the research focused on educational documents rather than human respondents, participant recruitment, individual informed consent, and withdrawal procedures were not applicable to the research design. Institutional ethics review, permission to reproduce instructional materials, and specific data-security arrangements were not documented in the study. Ethical interpretation of the findings depended on maintaining the distinction between documented linguistic examples and the researcher's contextual analysis, without attributing characteristics to individual pupils or teachers.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Lexical Features Reflecting Philippine Identity and Classroom Discourse

The lexical mapping of the DepEd Grade 4 English learning material identified 40 items and expressions associated with national identity, local cultural knowledge, and classroom discourse. The highest item-level frequencies occurred in notebook (41), write in your notebook (32), Grade 4 (27), our country (22), and Filipinos (21). Other frequently recorded expressions included Luzon (19), learning competencies (19), Filipino (18), Visayas (16), English 4 (14), Visayan (12), values integration (11), hospitality (11), and Filipino heritage (10). These occurrences indicated that the material incorporated familiar national and educational references while repeatedly directing learners toward prescribed instructional activities. As the categories included overlapping words, expressions, and conceptual references, the reported item frequencies should not be interpreted as percentages of mutually exclusive lexical types. Expressions related to Filipino identity appeared alongside more specific references to family life, customs, places, and artifacts. The recorded forms included Lolo/Lola (9), po/opo (7), vinta (6), fiesta (5), halo-halo (4), bayanihan as a conceptual reference (4), sinigang (3), adobo (3), Pahiyas Festival (3), otap (2), Maria Clara dress (2), and baro't saya (1). The source also classified bayan/homeland (6) as implied through context rather than as a consistently quoted term. This distinction matters because the mapping encompassed both explicit lexical forms and contextual representations. Regional and food-related expressions situated English tasks within recognizably Philippine settings, whereas national markers and inclusive phrases connected language use with cultural belonging. The observed localization is compatible with Biermeier's (2024) corpus-based account of Philippine English lexical innovation and with the broad description of the variety assembled by Borlongan (2022). Flores (2024) similarly documented Philippine English lexical forms in student publications and found that English teachers differed in their acceptance of particular expressions. Unlike those studies, the present analysis concerned one Grade 4 learning material rather than public language use or teachers' attitudes. The findings therefore demonstrate cultural and institutional lexical representation within the

selected text, not the extent of acceptance or use among all learners. They suggest that vocabulary instruction can explore local meanings, audience, and context while distinguishing cultural terms from ordinary curriculum labels.

3.2. Grammatical Patterns and the Interpretation of Localized English

The grammatical mapping classified 30 patterns across agreement, tense and aspect, articles, prepositions, sentence organization, modifiers, and classroom directives. Illustrations included subject–verb agreement variation ("They has talked"), copula variation ("She are dancing"), simplified past-time marking ("Yesterday he go"), double past marking ("did went"), modal combinations ("can reached"), and non-standard comparison ("more madder"). The analysis also recorded topic-fronting and repeated pronouns ("Maria, she felt..."), preposition choices ("in nighttime" and "in the weekend"), and possessive constructions ("house of Maria"). These examples illustrated the range of grammatical structures identified through the analysis. Interpretation remained descriptive because individual pattern frequencies and comparisons across textbooks were not reported. The classification requires attention to the function and grammatical acceptability of individual examples. Constructions such as "in school," "people are," "the boy I saw," "There are many," "have talked," and "You may write" can be conventional in English, depending on their contexts. Their inclusion in a feature inventory cannot by itself establish grammatical deviation or uniqueness to Philippine English. Likewise, the presence of a non-standard example in a learning material does not establish that Grade 4 pupils produced the form, that it originated in first-language transfer, or that it had become an accepted local norm. The strongest source-supported finding is that the document analysis grouped varied grammatical and discourse forms under Philippine English-related categories. Bernardo (2024a) argued for grammar instruction informed by Philippine English and Global Englishes perspectives, emphasizing awareness of multiple norms rather than uncritical reliance on a single variety. Cainta (2025) found that English teachers accepted a range of Philippine English grammatical and lexical items while still evaluating particular forms differently. These studies support distinguishing documented variation from grammatical inaccuracy and considering the purposes for which forms are used. In the Grade 4 material, a useful instructional implication is to compare unequivocally non-standard examples with conventional written alternatives while discussing contextually acceptable forms without stigmatizing local language identity. Thus, the grammatical findings call for careful language analysis, not a generalized diagnosis of learners' proficiency.

3.3. Pragmatic Features of Respect, Cooperation, and Classroom Authority

The pragmatic mapping identified 30 communicative features associated with interpersonal relationships, values, and instructional interaction. Respect and politeness were represented through po/opo, address forms such as Auntie and Lolo/Lola, softened classroom directions ("You may write" and "Please write"), gratitude ("Thank you everyone"), and indirect advice ("You should try"). Other examples expressed encouragement ("You can do it"), praise ("You are amazing!"), and moderated criticism ("She could do better"). Because the inventory presented illustrative forms and functions rather than numerical frequencies, these features can be discussed as recurring categories of analysis but cannot be ranked by prevalence. Collective and moral orientations were represented in expressions such as "Our country," "We must help," and "They worked together," along with narratives involving Maria and Dodoy, historical figures, apology, guilt, and pride. These excerpts connected language tasks to social responsibility, respectful relations, and moral reflection. At the same time, teacher-centered instructions such

as “Follow carefully” and “Write in your notebook” assigned clear roles within classroom activity. These two strands were not mutually exclusive: the material could encourage supportive relationships while maintaining strong task direction. However, textual examples alone cannot show how teachers enacted these instructions or whether learners responded with greater respect, cooperation, or deference. Borlongan (2022) situated Philippine English within social and educational contexts, while Martinez and Martin (2024) described the tensions teachers negotiate between monolingual norms and pluralist approaches to English instruction. Valdez and Vitorio (2024), although examining a different kind of text, further showed that local English expression can carry identity and ideological meanings. Read alongside the present findings, this literature supports interpreting classroom pragmatics as socially situated rather than merely formulaic. For elementary teaching, the documented examples provide material for comparing polite requests, constructive disagreement, and audience-sensitive responses. The central finding is that the learning material integrated interpersonal and civic meanings into English-language instruction while also reflecting structured classroom authority.

3.4. Translanguaging and Representation of Local Language Identity

The code-switching and translanguaging inventory listed 17 inserted or represented forms within the English-language material. The highest documented item frequencies were Mamang (9), Lola (8), and vinta (8), followed by Lolo (5). Other entries included barangay (2), Pahiyas Festival (2), otap (2), adobo (2), po (1), opo (1), baro’t saya (1), sinigang (1), lechon (1), halo-halo (1), and Maria Clara dress (1). These forms embedded familiar relationships, social titles, governance terms, food, and cultural artifacts within English narration. Some were left untranslated, whereas others were accompanied by brief explanations. Their presence illustrated a localized linguistic repertoire; not every culturally specific noun or proper name necessarily constituted a complete switch between languages. Two entries also demonstrated that multilingual representation was not limited to positive cultural identification. “Visaya, Visaya…” was recorded twice in a narrative involving linguistic bullying, and pepul, a respelling of people, appeared once as a representation of pronunciation. The first example situated a regional label within a discriminatory interaction, while the second invited attention to how accents are represented and judged in written discourse. These passages make it possible to discuss language-based stigma, although the material analysis did not establish readers’ attitudes or classroom reactions. The overlap between kinship terms and food names in the lexical and translanguaging inventories likewise indicates that the categories describe intersecting functions rather than independent totals. De Los Reyes (2024) documented the purposes of translanguaging in multilingual Philippine elementary classrooms, providing classroom-based context for the linguistic resources represented in the selected material. Martinez and Martin (2024) also treated translanguaging as part of broader debates about language policy and teachers’ professional judgment, while Bernardo (2024b) examined pedagogical possibilities for making Philippine English visible in educational spaces. The present finding complements these accounts at the level of textbook content, not actual classroom practice. It indicates that English lessons can use existing local-language references to explain cultural meaning and examine the consequences of ridiculing regional labels or accents. Their educational value would depend on how these textual examples are discussed and taught.

3.5. Pedagogical Features of Curriculum Organization and Learning Tasks

The pedagogical mapping identified 33 instructional and institutional features, showing how the material organized lesson content, exercises, assessment, and reflection. The most frequently

listed indicator was the EXERCISE label (64), followed by the "in your notebook" directive (54). Visual or multimodal literacy content and LESSON labeling were each recorded 45 times, while learning-competency codes appeared 23 times. Nation-building vocabulary used as instructional content appeared 18 times, and historical heroes were used as exemplars 17 times. The material also included Philippine-context prompts (13). These frequencies described different types of indicators, including section headings, phrases, and content themes; they should not be combined or interpreted as directly comparable proportions. Assessment and sequencing were also prominent. Learning Competencies labels, lesson pretests, lesson posttests, teacher-scripted assessment instructions, and "I can" reflection checklists were each recorded 12 times. Unit headings and cross-curricular framing each appeared seven times. GEAR UP, ANCHOR DOWN, SAIL ON, and GO BEYOND were each recorded six times, alongside other six-count categories such as reflection, enrichment, Values Integration, and motivation. The coding inventory also recorded the spelling "Valves/valves" under the Values Integration category. Overall, the mapped organization showed a structured sequence of tasks, guided assessment, and cultural or civic content, but the existence of these elements does not establish how they were implemented in classrooms. Policarpio (2023) discussed grounds for incorporating Philippine English into the national English curriculum, whereas Bernardo (2024b) proposed educational spaces as resources for teaching a local English variety. Martinez and Martin (2024) emphasized teacher agency in navigating language policies and classroom practice. These contributions provide useful context for a source text that combined local content with routine instructional controls. The findings imply that teachers can preserve clear lesson organization while broadening response formats through dialogue, locally grounded examples, and student-generated interpretation. However, the analysis does not establish that each identified feature is exclusive to Philippine textbooks or that frequent exercise labels automatically constrain participation.

3.6. Distinctions and Overlaps Across the Five Feature Categories

Comparison of the five inventories showed that they described different dimensions of the same Grade 4 material. Lexical features referred principally to vocabulary and cultural meanings; grammatical features concerned structural patterns; pragmatic features identified interpersonal functions; translanguaging features highlighted local-language insertions and representations; and pedagogical features described the organization of instruction and assessment. These were analytical differences rather than statistically tested differences across respondents, schools, or learning materials. The category frequencies were interpreted descriptively because the analysis did not report a common denominator for comparing their respective rates. Overlap was nevertheless a substantive finding. The terms po/opo and Lolo/Lola served simultaneously as locally meaningful vocabulary and elements embedded in English texts. "Write in your notebook" could be coded as a formulaic lexical phrase, an imperative construction, a directive with a pragmatic purpose, and an instructional routine. Consequently, adding the inventories together would count some of the same text more than once. The distinction also prevents the interpretation of every cultural term as a grammatical variant or every grammatical example as a uniquely Philippine English feature. The categories revealed a recognizable contrast between cultural representation and institutional organization without making them mutually exclusive. Food, clothing, kinship, regional labels, and collective pronouns foregrounded local identity, while learning-competency codes, assessment labels, and teacher directions foregrounded educational structures. Biermeier (2024) and Cruz and Martin (2024) described Philippine English as a complex and actively researched variety, while De Los Reyes (2024) illustrated how

multiple linguistic resources operate in Philippine schooling. The current analysis adds a text-specific illustration of how linguistic, social, and instructional functions may coexist in elementary learning materials. Its contribution lies in differentiating those layers rather than assigning a single meaning to all mapped occurrences.

3.7. Implications for English Teaching in the Elementary Grades

The combined findings suggest that Philippine English can be addressed in Grade 4 lessons as a context-sensitive language resource while students continue to learn forms suited to different audiences and communicative purposes. Lexical examples such as bayanihan, vinta, po/opo, and local food names offer opportunities to explain meanings that are not always conveyed by direct English substitution. Geography-related terms and civic expressions can be examined as textual representations of community and national belonging. Biermeier (2024), Borlongan (2022), and Flores (2024) provide recent bases for discussing lexical localization and the varied social acceptance of Philippine English features. These pedagogical implications were derived from the documented instructional content rather than from the evaluation of classroom interventions. The grammatical findings support guided comparison rather than indiscriminate correction. Teachers could contrast the source examples “They has talked,” “did went,” and “can reached” with conventional written forms, while explaining why expressions such as “in school” and “the boy I saw” may already be acceptable. Bernardo (2024a) and Cainta (2025) support a nuanced approach in which recognition of Philippine English does not require treating all constructions as equivalent across contexts. Such lessons could develop awareness of meaning, grammatical convention, and audience without attributing the textbook’s examples to actual learner performance. The pragmatic and translanguaging examples also offer a basis for discussing respectful address, courteous disagreement, belonging, and the stigma associated with language labels and accents. The narrative containing “Visaya, Visaya…” could be used to examine why ridicule of linguistic identity is harmful, while the honorific and kinship examples could prompt comparison of culturally meaningful forms of address. De Los Reyes (2024) and Martinez and Martin (2024) provide recent contextual support for using learners’ varied linguistic resources thoughtfully. These proposals require deliberate teaching decisions; the document analysis itself cannot determine their classroom outcomes. Finally, the frequent exercise, notebook, competency, and assessment labels indicate that teachers can retain predictable instructional structures while inviting more varied participation. Learners might respond through discussion, written reflection, visual analysis, collaborative explanation, and examples drawn from local contexts, provided these remain aligned with lesson objectives. Bernardo (2024b) and Policarpio (2023) emphasize the pedagogical relevance of Philippine English in educational settings. In synthesis, the five sets of findings support a balanced implication for elementary teaching: recognize local linguistic identity, explicitly teach context-appropriate English, challenge linguistic prejudice, and use the existing lesson structure to create opportunities for meaningful participation. These remain evidence-informed implications of textbook content rather than measured effects on learners.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that Grade 4 English learning materials incorporated distinctive Philippine English features through localized vocabulary, culturally grounded expressions, recurring grammatical patterns, respectful forms of address, translanguaging practices, and structured instructional strategies. These linguistic and pedagogical features reflected Filipino cultural identity, social values, and familiar communicative practices while supporting the instructional purposes of the materials. The findings further revealed differences in the representation and

emphasis of Philippine English across the identified lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, translanguaging, and pedagogical categories. These patterns illustrated the interconnected linguistic, cultural, communicative, and instructional dimensions of Philippine English within the analyzed content. Collectively, the findings established that Philippine English served as a meaningful linguistic and cultural resource within elementary English education. The study emphasized the importance of recognizing linguistic diversity, maintaining communicative appropriateness, and integrating culturally responsive approaches into English learning materials without diminishing the relevance of established language conventions.

Based on the findings, curriculum developers and elementary English teachers are encouraged to strengthen the integration of Philippine English through culturally responsive and linguistically inclusive instructional practices. Learning materials should incorporate guided comparisons between Philippine English and Standard English to develop learners' awareness of language variation while maintaining communicative appropriateness. Curriculum developers should also improve values-oriented activities by including opportunities for critical reflection on cultural identity, social expectations, and language use. Furthermore, instructional materials should present diverse communicative situations involving respectful disagreement, negotiation, inquiry, and assertiveness to expand learners' pragmatic competence. Teachers are encouraged to utilize translanguaging activities to promote positive language attitudes and awareness of linguistic discrimination. To complement the structured instructional activities identified in the materials, educators should integrate collaborative problem-solving, open-ended projects, and exploratory learning tasks. These recommendations aim to strengthen pedagogical flexibility, learner participation, and the meaningful representation of Philippine English within elementary language instruction.

The study focused on Philippine English features represented in Grade 4 English learning materials; therefore, its findings should be interpreted within this specific educational and textual context. The identified linguistic, pragmatic, and pedagogical patterns may not fully represent materials used in other grade levels or instructional settings. Furthermore, the presence of these features in learning materials does not necessarily establish their actual application or effects on classroom learning. The document-based scope also limits the transferability of the findings to other instructional materials, grade levels, and educational contexts. Future investigations may examine additional learning materials and explore classroom implementation and learner responses to provide a broader understanding of Philippine English in elementary education.

5. REFERENCES

Bernardo, A. S. (2024a). Philippine English and Global Englishes-inspired grammar teaching. Asian Englishes, 26(1), 174–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2023.2174532

Bernardo, A. S. (2024b). Teaching Philippine English through schoolscapes. World Englishes, 43(4), 661–677. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12673

Biermeier, T. (2024). Endonormative stabilization in Philippine English lexis. World Englishes, 43(4), 555–570. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12671

Bingham, A. J. (2023). From data management to actionable findings: A five-phase process of qualitative data analysis. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 22, 16094069231183620. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620

Bolton, K., Cruz, P. A. T., & Martin, I. P. (2024). Research bibliography for Philippine English (2008–2023). World Englishes, 43(4), 714–724. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12674

Borlongan, A. M. (Ed.). (2022). Philippine English: Development, structure, and sociology of English in the Philippines. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Philippine-English-

Development-Structure-and-Sociology-of-English-in-the-Philippines/Borlongan/p/book/9781138370760

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE Publications. https://us2.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/thematic-analysis/book248481

Cainta, E. J. I. (2025). Acceptability of Philippine English among English language teachers. K@ta, 27(2), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.27.2.155-170

Cruz, P. A. T., & Martin, I. P. (2024). Researching Philippine Englishes. World Englishes, 43(4), 534–540. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12668

Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. Multilingual Matters. https://books.google.com/books/about/Language_Power_and_Pedagogy.html?id=glXCwQEACAAJ

Davis, D. R. (2024). The Monroe Report, US colonialism and English language education in the Philippines. World Englishes, 43(4), 541–554. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12664

De Los Reyes, R. A. (2024). Translanguaging in multilingual elementary classrooms in the Philippines. World Englishes, 43(4), 678–692. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12672

Department of Education. (2024). Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum (DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/07/23/july-23-2024-do-010-s-2024-policy-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-the-matatag-curriculum/

Dita, S. N. (2025). The grammar of Philippine English: An update. In S. Rüdiger, T. Neumaier, S. Leuckert, & S. Buschfeld (Eds.), World Englishes in the 21st century: New perspectives and challenges to the Dynamic Model. Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781399527842.003.0006

Flores, R. A. (2024). Exploring Philippine English in student publications: Perspectives of English teachers on language usage and acceptance. LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 27(2), 632–647. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v27i2.7293

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). An introduction to functional grammar. Edward Arnold. https://books.google.com/books/about/An_Introduction_to_Functional_Grammar.html?id=k_4vAQAAMAAJ

Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1992). The other tongue: English across cultures (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press. https://www.press.uillinois.edu/books/?id=p062001

Martinez, J. C., & Martin, I. P. (2024). English language education and educational policy in the Philippines. In A. J. Moody (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of Southeast Asian Englishes (pp. 527–540). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192855282.013.28

Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a qualitative document analysis. The Qualitative Report, 27(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044

Policarpio, P. H. (2023). Several bases for integration of Philippine English into the English curriculum of the Philippines. Asian Englishes, 25(3), 499–506. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1873031

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2025). The sustainable development goals report 2025. United Nations. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2025/

Valdez, P. N., & Vitorio, R. (2024). Philippine English and commodity formation. World Englishes, 43(4), 647–660. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12684