International Journal of Linguistics Studies
ISSN: 2754-2599
DOI: 10.32996/ijls
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijlss

IJLS
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Corpus-Based Morphosyntactic Analysis of Grammarly-Corrected Philippine English Tweets

Anna Ryana D. Tampogao [1]✉, Sittie Aina S. Cosain [2], Shangrela G. Sieras[3]
[123]*Mindanao State University-Main Campus, Marawi City, Philippines*
Corresponding Author: Sittie Aina S. Cosain, **E-mail**: cosain.ss48@s.msumain.edu.ph

| ABSTRACT

The growing use of artificial intelligence–driven writing tools has reshaped English language production, particularly in informal digital spaces. While tools such as Grammarly are widely used to improve grammatical accuracy, their compatibility with nativized varieties of English, such as Philippine English (PhilE), remains underexplored. This study investigates how Grammarly processes the morphosyntactic features of PhilE tweets and examines the patterns that emerge across the corpus. Using a descriptive, corpus-based mixed-methods design, 160 publicly available tweets from eight Mindanao cities were drawn from the Twitter Corpus of Philippine Englishes (TCOPE) and analyzed through frequency counts and qualitative textual analysis grounded in Error Analysis and World Englishes frameworks. Findings reveal that users' tweets often feature syntactic reduction, verb-phrase deviations, prepositional and idiomatic variations, and noun-phrase modifications, reflecting systematic, rule-governed patterns in digital discourse. Grammarly most frequently applies preposition and infinitive particle insertion, article insertion and possessive correction, preposition deletion and verb transitivity adjustment, article insertion for countable nouns, and standardization of spelling, orthography, and word segmentation. Many of these flags, however, were false positives, reflecting hyper-standardization rather than genuine errors. Overall, Grammarly frequently overcorrects nativized features of Philippine English, emphasizing Inner-Circle norms. The study underscores the need for users to critically engage with automated feedback and for developers to design tools sensitive to the systematic, rule-governed features of localized English varieties. Filipino users should consider Grammarly's advice as guidance, not set-in-stone rules, when writing for local or digital audiences. Revision decisions should be guided by context, communicative purpose, and linguistic identity.

| KEYWORDS

Philippine English, AI Writing Tools, English morphosyntax, computer-mediated communication, automated writing evaluation

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 01 January 2025 **PUBLISHED:** 24 January 2026 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijls.2026.6.1.3

1. Introduction

The global landscape of English-language production has been fundamentally reshaped by two converging forces: the ubiquity of Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) and the rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into education. In recent years, Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools such as Grammarly have become essential fixtures in academic and professional settings. Recent studies consistently demonstrate their utility in helping L2 learners identify surface-level errors, build writing confidence, and foster autonomous learning (Llausas et al., 2024). At the same time, English continues to diversify into distinct "World Englishes," such as Philippine English (PhilE). Far from being a mere deviation from American norms, PhilE has evolved into a legitimate, nativized variety with stable morphosyntactic features, including distinct verb complementation and unique prepositional usage (Gonzales, 2023). As Filipinos increasingly use platforms like X (formerly Twitter) for expression, they produce vast amounts of authentic text that reflect these unique, culturally embedded linguistic norms (Dayon, 2017).

Despite these developments, a critical challenge exists for both researchers and users of AI-based writing tools. Specifically, there is a digital divide between the localized norms of Philippine English and the standardized algorithms used by automated writing evaluation tools. While recent studies confirm that Grammarly is effective for improving grammatical accuracy in standard academic essays (Llausas et al., 2024; Miranty & Widiati, 2021), it remains unclear how well these algorithms accommodate the nativized features of Philippine English found in informal digital spaces. Bailey & Lee (2020) have primarily examined Grammarly's impact on formal student compositions or general social network posts, often overlooking the specific morphosyntactic innovations, such as creative affixation or code-switching, present in Filipino digital discourse. As a result, there remains a clear gap in the literature concerning how AWE tools respond to authentic, regionally grounded Philippine English as it is used in everyday digital communication. Furthermore, relying on such tools without critical awareness may lead to "over-correction," in which valid PhilE features are flagged as errors, potentially delegitimizing Filipino linguistic identity (McCarthy et al., 2022).

This study addresses this gap by conducting a corpus-based morphosyntactic analysis of Philippine English tweets processed through Grammarly. Specifically, this research utilizes 160 randomly selected tweets from the TCOPE (Tweets Corpus of Philippine English), representing users from eight cities in Mindanao. This study uses the TCOPE corpus because it contains authentic social media texts produced by Filipino users, which exhibit systematic morphosyntactic, lexical, and pragmatic patterns characteristic of PhilE (Gonzales, 2023). It is important to note that this study analyzes the raw tweets themselves, not Gonzales' previous analysis, although his work provides empirical support for considering TCOPE tweets as representative of PhilE due to their consistent, rule-governed morphosyntactic features.

The focus on Mindanao is particularly significant because the region remains underrepresented in corpus-based studies of Philippine English, despite its rich linguistic diversity and complex contact situations involving Visayan, Tagalog, Tausug, and other local languages. Selecting eight cities across Mindanao allows the study to capture a broader range of regional and sociolinguistic variation, rather than privileging data from more frequently studied urban centers such as Metro Manila. By aligning authentic social media texts side by side with Grammarly's automated corrections, this study seeks to examine how the tool interacts with regionally grounded PhilE features and, in doing so, to answer the following questions:

1. What types of morphosyntactic errors are found in users' X tweets?
2. What types of corrections does Grammarly apply to the morphosyntactic errors found in users' tweets?
3. What patterns emerge in Grammarly's morphosyntactic corrections across the compiled corpus?

The findings of this study offer theoretical implications for the compatibility of Error Analysis in the era of Artificial Intelligence and provide practical insights for Filipino users who rely on these tools for academic and professional communication. In the context of English Language Teaching, this highlights the importance of guiding learners to engage critically with automated feedback by distinguishing genuine morphosyntactic errors from nativized features of PhilE, thereby supporting more inclusive, context-aware, and effective writing instruction.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Morphosyntactic Features of Philippine English

The research is founded on the premise that Philippine English is nativized rather than a set of errors. Dayon (2017) gave an initial description of the English spoken in Davao City, highlighting common morphological features such as innovative affixation (e.g., gina-close 'closes' [without corollaries in Standard Philippine English], paglunch 'having lunch', naopen 'had been opened') and contact-induced transfer. Syntactically, Dayon (2017) identified features such as run-on sentences (comma splices) and verb-tense inconsistency. She treats these "localized" features as "external influence" from the Visayan languages rather than competence deficits. Gonzales (2023) furthered this perspective through the TCOPE (Twitter Corpus of Philippine Englishes), which showed that PhilE on social media is marked by significant movement and structured variation across the country's regions. Supporting this, other studies have shown similar patterns in PhilE. Dimaculangan and Sarmiento (2025) found that grammatical constructions, like verb-preposition combinations and subject-verb agreements, follow consistent patterns, while L. H. Aquino and C.J. Aquino (2024) highlighted distinctive ways adjectives are used. Magpale (2025) also observed that some syntactic choices, such as leaving subjects out in nonfinite clauses, are tied to social and cultural norms in the Philippines. Collectively, these studies show that many PhilE features are rule-governed and socially conditioned, providing a framework to examine how tools like Grammarly interact with these forms.

2.2 Efficacy of Grammarly in L2 Writing

An emerging body of scholarly literature presents a nuanced view of Grammarly and its role in writing instruction. In a systematic review, Llausas et al. (2024) reported that Grammarly significantly reduces grammatical errors and supports learner autonomy in addressing surface-level issues, although it provides less effective feedback on higher-order skills, such as organizing content.

Beyond learner perceptions, several studies have examined the effectiveness of Grammarly and similar automated writing evaluation tools in correcting morphosyntactic errors. Miranty and Widiati (2021) found that Grammarly is particularly effective in identifying sentence-level grammatical issues such as verb tense, subject–verb agreement, and article use, which are largely rule-governed and comparable to those addressed by human instructors. Bailey and Lee (2020) similarly observed that Grammarly performs well in correcting local grammatical errors in both test-based and social media texts, especially those involving surface-level morphosyntax. A broader synthesis by Dizon (2024) confirms that Grammarly consistently supports grammatical accuracy across L2 writing contexts, while McCarthy et al. (2022) caution that automated feedback may encourage uncritical acceptance of corrections, particularly when form-focused accuracy is prioritized over meaning. This limitation becomes more salient in nativized English varieties such as PhilE, where systematic morphosyntactic patterns may be flagged as errors despite their communicative and sociolinguistic validity.

2.3 Automated Feedback in Digital Genres

The writing context in question is also particularly media-specific and has an important bearing on the way AWE tools are implemented. Bailey and Lee (2020) conducted an exploratory study examining Grammarly's performance on test-based essays and SNS posts. They concluded that Grammarly would be most successful at correcting the "local surface-level errors" (such as articles and prepositions) found in SNS writing. Notably, they observed that corrections often had a clearer impact on SNS posts, as the sentences were shorter. However, McCarthy et al. (2022) cautioned that spelling and grammar feedback alone produced no effects on the quality of a student's first draft, indicating that while Grammarly-like tools may help polish a text, they do not directly impact underlying writing ability. This also highlights the importance of exploring whether Grammarly allows users in the Philippines to "polish" tweets, or if it just erases their online personality's unique morphosyntactic padding.

2.4 Algorithmic Bias and the "Standard Language" Ideology

For this study, the theoretical perspective of algorithmic bias in AI is a key lens. Although tools such as Grammarly present themselves as neutral and objective, this image has recently come under scrutiny, suggesting that they encode particular linguistic ideologies, specifically those of "Inner Circle" varieties such as Standard American or British English. UWA (2025) points out that AI models are biased toward training on mainstream American datasets and thus consistently ignore, misrepresent, and "correct" valid forms of post-colonial Englishes. This leads to a kind of "technological gatekeeping," in which perfectly valid features of Philippine English are flagged not as "wrong" but as "unsupported" because they have been underrepresented in AI training data. Studies on Philippine English in social media, such as the systematic patterns observed in relativiser use on Twitter/X, further illustrate that these digital language forms are rule-governed rather than random deviations (Gonzales, 2025). Greene-Santos (2024) also highlights the broader societal implications of such biases, noting that AI systems can reproduce existing inequities and disproportionately affect underrepresented or marginalized groups. This theme is essential to the present analysis because it helps explain why Grammarly may overcorrect the tweets in the corpus, treating nativized features of Philippine English as deviations from standard norms.

2.5 Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) and Filipino "Digitalk"

The types of data, by genre (e.g., tweets and calls for knowledge) in Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC), are based on language use in the Philippines. Outside of formal academic writing, social media language is marked by "Digitalk" or "Netspeak," which emphasizes expressiveness, creativity, and efficiency over conformity to established grammar standards. Dino & Gustilo (2018) describe Filipino Digitalk as a variety identified by unique morphological processes such as clipping (shortening of words), creative affixation (e.g., mag-tweet, i-add), and code-switching (Taglish). Gonzales (2023), drawing on a parallel corpus to the TCOPE, claims that these are not haphazard "errors," but rather patterned sociolinguistic markers of identity. Additional corpus-based analyses indicate that Philippine English in social media exhibits systematic and predictable patterns, demonstrating that these non-standard forms are functional rather than random (Gonzales, 2025). The study will have to distinguish between true grammatical errors that impede communication and these merely stylistic features of "Digitalk," the same kind that Grammarly is likely to misidentify as “spelling” or “grammar” errors, for failing to understand the cultural context.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study uses a descriptive corpus-based research design. As described by Brezina (2018), this framework goes beyond mere data collection, functioning as a systematic methodology that emphasizes the analysis of "real language in use" rather than introspection or experimental control. Unlike experimental designs, in which variables are manipulated in an artificial environment, a corpus-based design allows the examination of linguistic phenomena, such as morphosyntactic innovations, as they naturally occur within specific registers, for instance, social media discourse (Egbert et al., 2022). This methodological choice is especially

suited to this study, as it aims to convey the observables of Philippine English without subscribing to prescriptive norms, thereby allowing the variety to be described on empirical evidence rather than theoretical assumptions.

In this study, the mixed-methods approach was used to examine Philippine English tweets by first quantitatively identifying and counting morphosyntactic and lexico-grammatical forms flagged by Grammarly, and then qualitatively analyzing how these forms function in context. The research sought to identify morphosyntactic and lexico-grammatical patterns in Philippine English tweets that elicited corrective feedback from Grammarly, as well as patterns of overcorrection or false positives. The study was grounded in Corder's (1967) Error Analysis for systematic learner errors and developmental tendencies, and Kachru's (1983) World Englishes for the nativized features of language varieties and localized norms in Outer Circle varieties.

3.2 Corpora and Sampling

The study compiled a corpus of 160 Philippine English tweets using data from the Twitter Corpus of Philippine Englishes (TCOPE), focusing on eight Mindanao cities—Butuan, Cagayan de Oro, Davao, General Santos, Iligan, Jolo, Surigao, and Zamboanga—which represent the available Mindanao-based data in the corpus (Gonzales, 2023). These tweets contained complete sentences or utterances with three or more words, for which Grammarly could suggest reasonable corrections. Tweets consisting solely of emojis, punctuation marks, single characters, monosyllabic sounds, or fewer than three words were excluded due to insufficient syntactic context for automated analysis. Tweets written entirely in local vernaculars (e.g., pure Tagalog or Bisaya) were also removed, as Grammarly is designed to process English text only and cannot provide reliable morphosyntactic feedback on non-English constructions. From the resulting pool of analyzable English tweets, quota samples were randomly drawn for each city. The sampling was intended to provide broad coverage of regional and sociolectal variation in Philippine English while yielding sufficient qualitative and quantitative data for analysis.

To address the uneven distribution of tweets across locations, a stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure balanced representation: 20 tweets were selected from each city, for a total of 160. Prior to sampling, the raw dataset underwent systematic filtering to ensure analytic validity and compatibility with Grammarly.

3.3 Data Analysis

To ensure analytic rigor, the study employed a corpus-based mixed-methods approach grounded in Error Analysis (Corder, 1967) and the World Englishes framework (Kachru, 1983). This dual framework enabled the systematic distinction between genuine morphosyntactic errors (developmental deviations) and nativized, rule-governed features of Philippine English (PhilE).

Each selected tweet was then processed through Grammarly, and the original and corrected versions were aligned side by side to enable direct comparison. The identified morphosyntactic features were subsequently coded using the classification frameworks of Dayon (2017) and Gonzales (2023) to distinguish developmental errors from nativized Philippine English forms. Finally, the coded data were aggregated and prepared for quantitative frequency analysis and qualitative interpretation, focusing on error types, correction patterns, overcorrection, false positives, and missed corrections.

Quantitatively, all Grammarly-flagged items were tabulated, and frequency counts and percentages were computed to describe the distribution of morphosyntactic features and correction types across the corpus. A key quantitative measure was the false positive rate, defined as instances in which Grammarly incorrectly flagged an attested and contextually appropriate PhilE feature as an error, allowing assessment of the tool's treatment of dialectal variation as linguistic deficiency. Complementing this, a qualitative textual analysis was conducted in which each Grammarly flag was manually reviewed and coded as either a morphosyntactic error or a nativized PhilE feature using the taxonomies of Dayon (2017) and Gonzales (2023). This analysis examined the linguistic environments that triggered Grammarly's corrections, including verb transitivity, article use, syntactic reduction, and orthographic variation. By integrating quantitative patterns with qualitative interpretation, the study identified points where Grammarly's prescriptive, Standard American English–oriented algorithms diverged from the descriptive reality of Philippine English in digital discourse, thereby delineating the limitations of automated writing evaluation tools when applied to institutionalized Outer-Circle English varieties.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents and discusses the findings of the corpus-based analysis of 160 Philippine English (PhilE) tweets collected from eight cities in Mindanao. Following the prescribed structure, the presentation of findings strictly adheres to the order of the research questions: (1) the types of morphosyntactic errors identified in users' tweets, (2) the types of Grammarly corrections applied to these morphosyntactic features, and (3) the emerging patterns in Grammarly's morphosyntactic corrections across the compiled corpus. Quantitative frequency data are presented alongside qualitative analysis to provide a comprehensive account of how Grammarly's automated feedback interacts with nativized features of Philippine English in informal digital discourse.

4.1 Types of Morphosyntactic Errors Identified in Users' Tweets

Table 1 shows recurrent morphosyntactic patterns in Philippine English tweets that Grammarly flagged as errors. The most prevalent pattern is syntactic reduction, accounting for 29 of 52 flagged instances (55.77%), which includes 12 instances of subject deletion, 8 instances of article omission, and 9 instances of morphological reduction. Examples such as 'Going to the mall later' and 'Feeling tired today' were categorized by Grammarly as sentence fragments. However, qualitative analysis shows that these constructions function as pragmatically appropriate and contextually complete utterances in informal computer-mediated communication (CMC), where brevity and immediacy are valued.

Closer examination of these flagged instances shows that subject deletion, article omission, and morphological reduction are systematic strategies in informal digital communication. For example, pro-drop constructions such as 'Need to wake up early' (Zamboanga) allow users to omit the subject without losing clarity, while article omission in phrases like 'praying at mosque' (Jolo) streamlines the message for faster reading. Morphological reduction, as in 'hu hv attaind' (Iligan), reflects phonetic abbreviation and textual shorthand common in social media. These patterns illustrate that what Grammarly flags as errors often function as efficient, contextually interpretable linguistic choices rather than true grammatical mistakes.

These reductive forms align with established descriptions of CMC, where users prioritize speed, efficiency, and shared contextual understanding over syntactic completeness (Dino & Gustilo, 2018). This theoretical perspective reinforces the observation that subject deletion, article omission, and morphological reduction are adaptive and systematic strategies in informal digital environments, where interlocutors rely on contextual cues and pragmatic inference to interpret messages.

Table 1
Types of Morphosyntactic Errors in Users' Tweets

Types of Morphosyntactic Errors	Specific Linguistic Feature	Examples	Frequency	Percentage
Syntactic reduction	Subject Deletion (Pro-Drop)	"Need to wake up early" (ZAM); "Wish i could dream" (CDO); "First thing Im gonna bake" (BUT)	12	23.08%
	Article Omission	"praying at mosque" (JOL); "Top photo taken" (ZAM); "requested my dad to find malamute" (ILI)	8	15.38%
	Morphological Reduction (Textspeak)	"hu hv attaind" (ILI); "d international observation" (ILI); "n hurry" (ZAM)	9	17.31%
Verb Phrase Deviations	Missing Auxiliaries (Passive/State)	"I just ousted as the mayor" (GEN/CDO); "Oxygen not getting the hype" (BUT)	4	7.69%
	Aspectual Confusion & Tense	"I'm not see you" (ILI); "thought it's going to be" (SUR)	3	5.77%
	Subject-Verb Agreement	"Desperate times needs" (ILI); "it's tastes like" (ZAM); "persons who never really sees" (BUT)	5	9.62%
Prepositional & Idiomatic	L1-Calquing & Transitivity	"knocking your heart" (SUR); "prepare for my things" (CDO)	3	5.77%

	Dangling Prepositions	"our outreach in -" (ZAM); "relax on a sunday" (CDO)	2	3.85%
Noun Phrase Modifications	Pluralization of Mass Nouns	"buying writing stuffs" (JOL); "foods" (JOL)	2	3.85%
	Non-Standard Determiners/Usage	"them hoes" (GEN); "the proper of Tandag" (SUR); "pidoras" (ZAM)	4	7.69%
Total			52	100.00%

Note. The abbreviations inside the parentheses indicate the city of origin for each tweet example: BUT = Butuan; CDO = Cagayan de Oro; GEN = General Santos; ILI = Iligan; JOL = Jolo; SUR = Surigao; ZAM = Zamboanga.

Verb phrase deviations were the second most frequent morphosyntactic error in the corpus, accounting for 12 of 52 flagged instances (23.08%). These deviations included missing auxiliaries in passive or stative constructions, aspectual confusion and tense errors, and violations of subject-verb agreement (see Table 1). Closer examination of these flagged instances reveals distinct patterns. Missing auxiliaries in passive or stative constructions appear in examples such as 'I just ousted as the mayor' (General Santos/Cagayan de Oro) and 'Oxygen not getting the hype' (Butuan), where the auxiliary verb is omitted but the intended meaning is still recoverable from context. Aspectual confusion and tense errors are evident in tweets like 'I'm not see you' (Iligan) and 'thought it's going to be' (Surigao), illustrating deviations in verb-form selection relative to temporal context. Subject-verb agreement errors, such as 'Desperate times needs' (Iligan), 'it's tastes like' (Zamboanga), and 'persons who never really sees' (General Santos), demonstrate a mismatch between the subject and the verb, yet the overall meaning remains intelligible within the informal digital discourse.

These verb phrase deviations illustrate how PhilE users in informal digital communication often produce non-standard verb forms that remain understandable to readers. While Grammarly flags these constructions as errors, they reflect natural variation shaped by context, verb tense usage, and efficient writing choices, illustrating the gap between prescriptive grammar rules and flexible language use in CMC.

Another type of morphosyntactic deviation involved prepositional and idiomatic errors, identified in 5 of 52 flagged instances (9.62%) in the corpus. These included L1-calquing and transitivity mismatches, as well as dangling prepositions, indicating non-standard prepositional usage in Philippine English tweets (see Table 1). Analysis of the examples shows that L1-calquing and transitivity errors occur when Philippine English speakers map Filipino or Visayan structures directly onto English, as in 'knocking your heart' (Surigao) and 'prepare for my things' (Cagayan de Oro), where prepositions are used according to native-language patterns rather than standard English norms. Dangling prepositions appear in examples such as 'our outreach in -' (Zamboanga) and 'relax on a Sunday' (Cagayan de Oro), where prepositional phrases are left incomplete or misaligned syntactically. Despite being flagged by Grammarly, these constructions are generally understandable to readers familiar with Philippine English in digital communication, reflecting predictable patterns of nativized usage.

Hence, these prepositional and idiomatic deviations highlight the interaction between native-language influence and English usage in informal digital communication. While Grammarly marks them as errors, they reflect systematic tendencies in Philippine English that are intelligible to readers. From the perspective of Error Analysis (Corder, 1967), these forms may be interpreted as systematic transfer-based deviations; however, within the World Englishes framework (Kachru, 1983), repeated and socially intelligible calques can also be seen as early or stabilized stages of nativization rather than random learner errors. This demonstrates that such deviations function pragmatically within CMC, emphasizing the role of context and shared cultural understanding in interpreting meaning.

Lastly, the corpus further revealed morphosyntactic errors related to noun phrase modifications, occurring in 6 instances (11.54%). These included pluralization of mass nouns and non-standard determiner usage, reflecting non-standard noun phrase constructions in Philippine English tweets (see Table 1). Analysis of the examples shows that pluralization of mass nouns occurs in constructions such as 'buying writing stuffs' and 'foods' (Jolo), where countable forms are applied to nouns that are typically uncountable in Standard English. Non-standard determiner usage appears in phrases like 'them hoes' (General Santos), 'the proper of Tandag' (Surigao), and 'pidoras' (Zamboanga), illustrating deviations in determiner selection and noun phrase formation. Despite being flagged by Grammarly, these constructions are generally interpretable by readers familiar with PhilE, demonstrating systematic patterns rather than random errors.

These noun phrase modifications highlight how Philippine English users in informal digital communication adapt noun phrases to their communicative needs. While Grammarly treats these constructions as errors, they reflect predictable, socially intelligible patterns that facilitate meaning in context, emphasizing the importance of considering nativized forms when evaluating grammaticality in CMC.

Overall, the analysis of PhilE tweets shows that users frequently employ nonstandard morphosyntactic forms, including syntactic reduction, verb-phrase deviations, prepositional and idiomatic variations, and noun-phrase modifications. Although these constructions are often flagged by Grammarly as errors, they are systematically used and contextually interpretable in informal digital communication, reflecting the interplay of native-language influence, pragmatic considerations, and stylistic adaptation. These findings lay the groundwork for examining how automated tools respond to such patterns in the subsequent section.

4.2 Types of Grammarly Corrections Applied to the Morphosyntactic Features

Common types of Grammarly corrections applied to users' tweets include preposition insertion and infinitive particle insertion; article insertion and possessive noun correction; preposition deletion and verb transitivity adjustment; article insertion for countable nouns; and standardization of spelling, orthography, and word segmentation. These corrections show that Grammarly consistently applies Standard American English (SAE) rules to morphosyntactic features, providing a basis for understanding how each correction operates in practice.

Table 2
Types of Grammarly Corrections Applied

Morphosyntactic Error from the Tweets	Grammarly-corrected form	Grammar Focus	Types of Grammarly Corrections Applied
"I hav respect n ppl hu hv attaind& done smthng n der fields.its dsappointng wen dey twist issues just serve der selfsh intersts."	"I have respect **for** ppl who have achieved something in their fields. It's disappointing when they twist issues **to** serve their selfish interests."	Dependent prepositions and infinitives; adding the preposition 'for' and the particle 'to'.	Preposition insertion and infinitive particle insertion
"so our neighbors outside r loudly rrading quran outsideinnalillahi wa inna ilayhi rajiun for jehans grandmother"	"So our neighbors outside are loudly reading **the** Quran. Innalillahi wa inna ilayhi rajiun for **Jehan's** grandmother."	Definite articles and possessive nouns; adding the article 'the' and a possessive apostrophe.	Article insertion and possessive noun correction
"I need to prepare for my things"	"I need to prepare my things."	Syntactic structure of transitive verbs; removing the unnecessary preposition 'for'.	Preposition deletion/verb transitivity adjustment
"hehe i like huskies too how about Yoochun's dog malamute? I requested my dad to find malamute"	"Hehe, I like huskies too. How about Yoochun's dog malamute? I requested my dad to find **a** malamute."	Articles with countable nouns; adding the indefinite article 'a' to the object.	Article insertion for countable nouns
"Meetin'my bestfriend yrs after thought she might b a total stranger!"	**Meeting my best friend years** after thought she might **be** a total stranger!	Orthography and word segmentation; expanding abbreviations and correcting spacing for compound nouns.	Orthography and word segmentation standardization

Note. Bold text in the "Grammarly-corrected form" column indicates the specific grammatical additions or corrections made to the original tweet.

One of the primary types of corrections involves inserting prepositions and infinitive particles. For instance, the tweet "I hav respect n ppl hu hv attaind & done smthng n der fields.its dsappointng wen dey twist issues just serve der selfsh intersts" was corrected by Grammarly to "I have respect for ppl who have achieved something in their fields. It's disappointing when they twist issues to serve their selfish interests," where the preposition "for" and the infinitive particle "to" were added. This correction aligns dependent prepositions and infinitive structures with SAE syntax. While the correction is technically accurate, the original construction reflects common Philippine English usage, influenced by L1 transfer and high-context communication, in which relational meanings are inferred rather than explicitly marked. These examples illustrate how Grammarly enforces prescriptive norms on verb–preposition

combinations and infinitive constructions, often at the expense of the pragmatic or cultural nuances inherent in Philippine English digital communication.

These preposition and infinitive corrections demonstrate Grammarly's tendency to standardize localized structures according to Inner-Circle English norms. This highlights that while Grammarly improves grammatical conformity according to prescriptive norms, it often disregards the functional and sociolinguistic properties of PhilE, particularly in informal digital discourse where high-context communication, cultural markers, and pragmatic inference guide interpretation.

Similarly, a common type of correction involves inserting articles and correcting possessive nouns. For example, the tweet "so our neighbors outside r loudly reading quran outside innalillahi wa inna ilayhi rajiun for jehans grandmother" was corrected by Grammarly to "So our neighbors outside are loudly reading the Quran. Innalillahi wa inna ilayhi rajiun for Jehan's grandmother," where the definite article "the" was inserted before "Quran" and a possessive apostrophe was added to "Jehan's grandmother." These corrections align noun phrases with Standard American English norms for articles and possessive markers, ensuring grammatical completeness. While these changes are accurate according to prescriptive rules, the original forms reflect Philippine English conventions and culturally embedded expressions that are intelligible to readers familiar with local digital discourse.

In these cases, these articles and possessive corrections illustrate Grammarly's systematic approach to enforcing formal English grammar in noun phrases, often standardizing culturally and religiously sensitive lexical items. From a theoretical perspective, such interventions can be viewed through Error Analysis (Corder, 1967), in which deviations reflect systematic transfer-based patterns, or within the World Englishes framework (Kachru, 1983), in which repeated and contextually interpretable forms may represent early or stabilized stages of nativization rather than random errors. This underscores that while Grammarly improves grammatical conformity, it may inadvertently obscure pragmatic and sociolinguistic nuances in Philippine English tweets, especially in high-context digital communication.

The third type of Grammarly correction involves deleting prepositions and adjusting verb transitivity. For instance, the tweet "I need to prepare for my things" was corrected to "I need to prepare my things," where the unnecessary preposition "for" was removed to align the verb with Standard American English transitive patterns. This correction enforces prescriptive verb–object structures, standardizing constructions that are locally acceptable in PhilE, where prepositions may reflect L1 influence or high-context communication.

These corrections demonstrate Grammarly's tendency to normalize verb-preposition constructions, prioritizing grammatical conformity over pragmatic appropriateness. This highlights that although Grammarly improves syntactic accuracy according to prescriptive norms, it may overlook contextually intelligible patterns in PhilE digital discourse.

Another type of Grammarly correction involves article insertion for countable nouns. For example, the tweet "hehe i like huskies too how about Yoochun's dog malamute? I requested my dad to find malamute" was corrected to "Hehe, I like huskies too. How about Yoochun's dog malamute? I requested my dad to find a malamute," where the indefinite article "a" was inserted before the countable noun "malamute." This correction reflects Grammarly's enforcement of Standard American English rules on noun phrase completeness, standardizing constructions that are commonly acceptable in PhilE digital usage.

This pattern shows that Grammarly consistently prioritizes formal grammatical completeness over contextual intelligibility. While the original construction is clear and communicatively sufficient for local readers, Grammarly treats the absence of an article as an error, reinforcing prescriptive norms. From a World Englishes perspective (Kachru, 1983), such patterns may be viewed as localized and systematic rather than deficient, highlighting the tension between standardized grammar rules and adaptive language use in informal PhilE online communication.

Moreover, a recurring type of Grammarly correction involves spelling, orthography, and word segmentation standardization. For example, the tweet "Meetin'my bestfriend yrs after thought she might b a total stranger!" was corrected to "Meeting my best friend years after thought she might be a total stranger!", where abbreviated forms were expanded, apostrophes were removed, and spacing was corrected in the compound noun "best friend." This correction reflects Grammarly's emphasis on converting informal, abbreviated, and concatenated forms into fully standardized written English, even when the original message is clear to readers familiar with PhilE digital writing.

Overall, this pattern demonstrates Grammarly's strong preference for formal written norms over pragmatic efficiency in CMC. While such standardization improves surface-level correctness, it often disregards the functional role of abbreviation, phonetic spelling, and textual compression in Filipino digital discourse. Viewed through the World Englishes framework (Kachru, 1983), these forms

may be understood as localized and systematic rather than deficient, highlighting the limitation of applying Inner-Circle norms to Outer-Circle Englishes.

Collectively, the findings in this section show that Grammarly consistently enforces prescriptive standards, with limited sensitivity to cultural context, pragmatic intent, and nativized usage in Philippine English.

4.3 Emerging Patterns in Grammarly's Morphosyntactic Corrections Across the Corpus

Analysis of the corpus revealed recurring patterns in Grammarly's morphosyntactic corrections. Spelling and orthographic corrections were the most frequent, followed by preposition and article corrections, indicating a strong emphasis on surface-level mechanical and grammatical accuracy. Table 3 summarizes the overall frequency of the most common correction types, providing a clear overview of the dominant patterns for further discussion, while Table 4 shows the distribution of these corrections across cities.

Table 3
Emerging Patterns of Morphosyntactic Corrections Across Corpus

Source of Origin	Frequency	Percentage	Morphosyntactic Error from the Tweets	Grammarly-corrected form
Spelling Correction	16	21.05%	smthng	something
Orthographic Correction	14	18.42%	quran	Quran
Preposition Correction	12	15.79%	respect n ppl	respect **for** ppl
Subject–Verb Agreement (SVA) Correction	8	10.53%	Desperate times needs	Desperate times **need**
Article Correction	10	13.16%	I requested my dad to find malamute	I requested my dad to find **a** malamute
Subject Correction	7	9.21%	Need to wake up early	**I** need to wake up early
Determiner Correction	5	6.58%	the proper of Tandag	**the proper** of Tandag
Word Segmentation Correction	4	5.26%	bestfriend	best friend
Total	76	100%	–	–

Note. Bold text in the "Grammarly-corrected form" column indicates the specific grammatical additions or corrections made to the original tweet.

A total of 76 morphosyntactic corrections were identified across the corpus, exceeding the 52 tweets analyzed because some tweets contained two or more corrections. For example, the tweet "I hav respect n ppl hu hv attaind & done smthng n der fields. its dsappointng wen dey twist issues just serve der selfsh intersts" received both preposition insertion ("for") and infinitive particle insertion ("to"), while "so our neighbors outside r loudly rrading quran outside innalillahi wa inna ilayhi rajiun for jehans grandmother" included both article insertion ("the") and possessive noun correction ("Jehan's"). Table 3 shows the frequency of these emerging correction patterns across the corpus, indicating that spelling and orthographic corrections were the most common, followed by corrections to prepositions and articles. This pattern reflects Grammarly's prioritization of surface-level written accuracy, while the distribution of other corrections illustrates systematic morphosyntactic intervention across tweets.

Orthographic corrections in the corpus refer to adjustments that standardize written forms, including capitalization, proper spelling, and word segmentation. For instance, "quran" was corrected to "Quran," and "bestfriend" was corrected to "best friend." Spelling corrections were particularly frequent, addressing abbreviated or phonetic forms such as "smthng" → "something." Preposition corrections, including insertion ("for") and deletion ("for"), and article corrections ("the," "a") were also common, reflecting Grammarly's enforcement of SAE morphosyntactic norms. Other notable patterns included subject–verb agreement corrections, subject insertions in pro-drop constructions, and determiner adjustments, all of which illustrate the systematic ways in which Grammarly standardizes local PhilE structures without always accounting for contextual or pragmatic nuances.

Table 4

Emerging Patterns of Morphosyntactic Corrections Across Cities

Origin	Type of Corrections	Frequency	Percentage
Cagayan de Oro	Preposition Deletion, Subject Insertion, Auxiliary Insertion	6	11.54%
Davao	SVA Correction, Article Insertion, Spelling Correction	6	11.54%
General Santos	Determiner Replacement, Capitalization, Auxiliary Insertion, Spelling Correction	6	11.54%
Iligan	Spelling/Textspeak Fix, SVA Correction, Article Insertion	7	13.46%
Jolo	Mass Noun Replacement, Article Insertion, Spelling Correction, Proper Noun Flag	7	13.46%
Surigao	Preposition Insertion, Lexical Replacement, Tense Correction, Punctuation	5	9.61%
Zamboanga	Subject Insertion, Syntactic/ Fragment Fix, Article Insertion, Spelling Correction	9	17.31%
Butuan	Auxiliary Insertion, SVA Correction, Spelling/Slang Fix, Punctuation	6	11.54%
Total		52	100.00%

Note. SVA= Subject-Verb Agreement. Textspeak: Informal language or slang typically used in digital messaging (e.g., "r" for "are", "u" for "you"). N= Total number of corrections analyzed (*N*=52).

Across all eight cities, the most salient pattern was a high rate of false positives, in which Grammarly flagged nativized PhilE features and intentional stylistic choices as errors. Table 3 shows that Grammarly's corrections across the corpus are primarily concentrated on subject insertion and fragment repair, article insertion, and spelling or textspeak normalization. Subject insertion and syntactic completion are most evident in Zamboanga (17.31%) and Iligan (13.46%), reflecting Grammarly's tendency to "complete" pragmatically reduced clauses common in digital discourse. Article insertion and determiner replacement recur across Davao, General Santos, and Jolo, indicating a strong bias toward enforcing Standard American English nominal structures. In contrast, prepositional insertion and deletion occur less frequently and are more localized, as seen in Surigao and Cagayan de Oro, suggesting that Grammarly's most systematic interventions target clause structure and orthography rather than relational meaning.

In the context of CMC, where subject deletion, syntactic reduction, and creative spelling function as discourse strategies rather than errors, these correction patterns indicate a mismatch between Grammarly's prescriptive norms and the pragmatic conventions of online Philippine English. By prioritizing subject insertion, article restoration, and textspeak normalization, Grammarly recontextualizes informal digital utterances into standardized written forms, potentially reducing the immediacy, expressiveness, and identity-marking functions of social media language.

Preliminary coding of Table 4 shows that a substantial portion of Grammarly's corrections involved nativized features of Philippine English. This pattern reveals a tendency toward hyper-standardization, where Grammarly enforces Inner-Circle English norms while failing to accommodate systematic variation in Outer-Circle Englishes.

From the perspective of Error Analysis, many of these flagged forms do not represent genuine learner errors but rather predictable and rule-governed structures. Within the World Englishes paradigm, these features constitute legitimate localized norms that are functional and communicatively effective in their sociolinguistic context. Grammarly's inability to recognize these patterns positions the tool as a linguistic gatekeeper rather than a neutral writing aid.

This emerging pattern has broader implications for AWE in multilingual and postcolonial settings. The findings suggest that overcorrection is not merely a technical limitation but a sociolinguistic issue, as hyper-standardization may marginalize localized

English varieties and contribute to the erasure of linguistic identity in digital spaces. Consequently, the study underscores the need for more culturally responsive and context-aware AI-driven writing tools.

5. Conclusions

This study examined how Grammarly's automated corrective feedback interacts with the morphosyntactic features of Philippine English (PhilE) in informal digital discourse. Based on the analysis of 160 tweets from eight cities in Mindanao, the findings reveal a consistent mismatch between Grammarly's Standard American English–oriented algorithms and the nativized, context-sensitive structures of Philippine English. The study identified three major conclusions grounded in the empirical findings.

First, the study concludes that Grammarly frequently misidentifies syntactic reduction, subject deletion, and orthographic reduction associated with Digitalk as grammatical errors, despite their pragmatic and stylistically appropriate use in informal computer-mediated communication (CMC). These features, which were among the most frequently flagged constructions in the corpus, function as register-appropriate and pragmatically motivated strategies in CMC. Rather than signaling morphosyntactic deficiency, such forms reflect economy of expression and discourse conventions typical of Philippine English in social media contexts, resulting in a substantial number of false positives.

Second, the study concludes that Grammarly inadequately accounts for nativized morphosyntactic features of Philippine English. The most common types of Grammarly corrections applied to users' tweets include preposition insertion and infinitive particle insertion; article insertion and possessive noun correction; preposition deletion and verb transitivity adjustment; article insertion for countable nouns; and standardization of spelling, orthography, and word segmentation. While Grammarly treats these patterns as violations of SAE norms, qualitative analysis demonstrates that many of these constructions are rule-governed and systematic, aligning with both developmental processes described in Error Analysis and localized norms recognized in the World Englishes framework. This indicates that Grammarly's feedback often conflates legitimate features of Philippine English with genuine learner errors.

Third, the study concludes that Grammarly operates as a hyper-standardizing mechanism that reinforces Inner-Circle English norms. This is evidenced by its high rate of false positives involving culturally embedded lexical items, nativized features, and localized expressions. These patterns reflect algorithmic bias in automated writing evaluation tools, positioning Grammarly as a linguistic gatekeeper rather than a neutral assistant. Such hyper-standardization risks marginalizing Outer-Circle English varieties and undermining linguistic identity in Philippine English digital discourse.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study offers the following recommendations:

English language teachers should encourage critical interaction with automated feedback by framing Grammarly in a World Englishes–informed context. Students need to be trained to differentiate real morphosyntactic errors from nativized or register-bound forms in informal computer-mediated written communication.

Filipino users should consider Grammarly's advice as guidance, not set-in-stone rules, when writing texts for local or digital audiences. Revision decisions should be guided by context, communicative purpose, and linguistic identity. Teachers should help learners differentiate between SAE-driven corrections and nativized or register-appropriate constructions. Producers of automated writing evaluation tools should include data from Outer-Circle Englishes, such as Philippine English, to reduce false positives and improve sociolinguistic inclusivity, ensuring that AI-supported writing tools are sensitive to systematic patterns in local English varieties.

Future research may analyze additional corpora (L1 or L2), compare different automated writing evaluation platforms, or explore users' attitudes toward AI feedback and its effects on linguistic ownership. Longitudinal studies could investigate the impacts of continued exposure to automated correction on writing practices in World Englishes contexts, providing insight into the broader sociolinguistic implications of hyper-standardization.

Funding: This research received no external funding.
Orcid ID: [1] https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3171-9840
[2] https://orcid.org/0009-0001-1076-4878
[3] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2151-1905
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1]. Aquino, L. H., & Aquino, C. J. (2024). Morphological and syntactic characteristics of adjectives in Philippine English. In *Proceedings of the 38th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 38)* (pp. 1150–1159). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://aclanthology.org/2024.paclic-1.144.pdf

[2]. Bailey, D., & Lee, A. R. (2020). *An exploratory study of Grammarly in the language learning context: An analysis of test-based, textbook-based, and Facebook corpora.* TESOL International Journal, 15(2), 4–27

[3]. Brezina, V. (2018). *Statistics in corpus linguistics: A practical guide*. Cambridge University Press.

[4]. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5*(1–4), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.16

[5]. Dayon, C. (2017). Morphosyntactic features of English variety in Davao City, Philippines. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Applied Linguistics and Language Education (ICALLE 2017)* (pp. 100–108).

[6]. Dimaculangan, N., & Sarmiento, M. (2025). *A corpus-based review of Philippine English grammatical constructions in ESL Master's theses from 2019–2025.* International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 7(SI2), 239. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.239

[7]. Dino, C. M., & Gustilo, L. E. (2018). *FB digitalking: Standard, non-standard, or hybrid? Advanced Science Letters, 24*(11), 8328–8332. https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2018.12554

[8]. Dizon, G. (2024). A systematic review of Grammarly in L2 English writing. *Cogent Education, 11*(1), 2397882. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2397882

[9]. Egbert, J., Larsson, T., & Biber, D. (2022). *Doing linguistics with a corpus: Methodological considerations*. Cambridge University Press.

[10]. Gonzales, W. D. W. (2023). Broadening horizons in the diachronic and sociolinguistic study of Philippine English with the Twitter Corpus of Philippine Englishes (TCOPE). *English World-Wide, 44*(4), 403–434. https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.00085.gon

[11]. Gonzales, W. D. W. (2025). Restricted restrictives on Twitter/X: Analysing and predicting English relativiser choice in the Philippine Twitter-/X-scape. *Corpora*. https://doi.org/10.3366/cor.2025.0334

[12]. Greene-Santos, A. (2024, February 22). *Does AI have a bias problem?* NEA Today. https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/does-ai-have-a-bias-problem

[13]. Kachru, B. B. (1983). *The Indianization of English: The English language in India*. Oxford University Press.

[14]. Llausas, S. M., Ruiz, E., Ayucan, S. M., & Evardo Jr., O. J. (2024). *A systematic literature review on the use of Grammarly in improving the writing skills of ESL/EFL students.* International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 5(9), 3507–3516. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.09.10

[15]. Magpale, T. A. J. G., (2025). *Beyond the standard: A sociolectal and probabilistic turn in Philippine English phonology* (Vol. 4, Issue 2, Article 11). *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.59588/2961-3094.1216

[16]. McCarthy, K. S., Roscoe, R. D., Allen, L. K., Likens, A. D., & McNamara, D. S. (2022). Automated writing evaluation: Does spelling and grammar feedback support high-quality writing and revision? In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Educational Data Mining (EDM 2022)* (pp. 160–170). International Educational Data Mining Society.

[17]. Miranty, D., & Widiati, U. (2021). Automated writing evaluation (AWE) in higher education. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 11*(4), 126–137. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.11.04.12