JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

CODE MESHING IN ACADEMIC WRITING: IDENTIFYING ERRORS THROUGH SOCIAL CONTEXT

Vince Condrad P. Dimasu-ay, LPT
Quality Assurance Coordinator
St. Mary's Academy of Midsayap, Inc.
Midsayap, Cotabato, Philippines
Email: vdimasuay@icloud.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1495-5371

Jerson S. Catoto, PhD
International Affairs and Linkages Director
Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology
Arakan, Cotabato, Philippines
Email: jscatoto@cfcst.edu.ph
ORCID: https://orchid.id/0000-001-8053-3904

Corresponding Author

Vince Condrad P. Dimasu-ay, LPT
Quality Assurance Coordinator
St. Mary's Academy of Midsayap, Inc.
Midsayap, Cotabato, Philippines
Email: vdimasuay@icloud.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1495-5371

ABSTRACT

The growing number of multilingual learners affects students' academic writing through their linguistic backgrounds, causing differences in meaning. This study determined the conditions under which code-meshed terms in the academic writing of English majors can be regarded as errors, based on Error Analysis Theory and the concept of code meshing. A qualitative, context- and error-based analysis was conducted on the literacy journey essays of 15 second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education English majors from a college in Cotabato, Philippines, during the first semester of A.Y. 2024–2025. The results show 47 code-meshed terms, which were categorized into four types, namely, word choice errors (28), overuse of *very* (8), redundancy (8), and clipping (3). Word choice errors accounted for 59.6% of the total errors committed, and the most common source of these errors was translation from Filipino. While code meshing allows learners to express their ideas, some unintended meanings are conveyed. It is therefore concluded that code meshing is acceptable, but that academic conventions in English should still be observed. Teachers are encouraged to raise learners' awareness of context and to help them revise their expressions.

Keywords: *academic writing; code meshing; error analysis; Philippine English; social context; World Englishes*

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The growing number of multilingual students in the classroom has led writing education to function as 'linguistic sieves,' whereby only dominant forms of English are accepted (Choi, 2021). Translanguaging pedagogies have therefore been proposed to counter this filtering effect and to help students write using their whole linguistic repertoire (Gonzales & Machado, 2022).

In the field of writing education, the translingual approach has gained ground. This approach does not enforce strict rules; instead, it views language as a tool for creating meaning (Choi, 2021). It recognizes the power of all language users to manipulate language for particular purposes and treats variation in language as a resource (Athon, 2019). Linguistic diversity is thus regarded as a positive.

Code meshing is the main textual strategy in this approach. It involves blending local varieties with Standard Written English (Canagarajah, 2006) and includes the limited use of vernacular Englishes for rhetorical and identity purposes (Canagarajah, 2011). Teaching code-meshing can be a useful tool for giving students positive views of themselves as multilingual individuals (Lee, 2013). However, mixing languages in academic writing can cause problems when unfamiliar words or phrases are included.

Considerable research has been conducted on Philippine English and its use of code-switching, code-mixing, and hybridization (Bolton et al., 2024). However, this research has been largely positive in tone, with little consideration given to the negative aspects or to a local model for teaching English (Bernardo & Madrunio, 2015). This study responds to the demand to make Philippine English research more inclusive by acknowledging the non-standard variations spoken by the majority (Tupas, 2004). It examines the social meaning of code-meshed words and determines when they become errors in the writing of Filipino English majors.

The Philippines is an excellent setting for this research. It is a constitutionally recognized multilingual Outer Circle country in which English is used as a second language within institutions (Tajeddin & Pakzadian, 2020), a situation that has produced a distinct variant known as Philippine English (Quinto et al., 2026). Because this variant is sociolinguistically complex and has 'circles within circles' (Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles) (Martín, 2014), the essays naturally showcase the complexities of contact among Filipino, the regional languages of Cotabato, and academic English.

Taken together, these strands of scholarship point to a tension at the center of this study. Translanguaging and translingual pedagogies legitimize the use of a writer's whole linguistic repertoire, and code meshing offers a concrete textual means of doing so. Academic writing in English, however, continues to operate within conventions of Standard Written English, and a term that is meaningful within the writer's own linguistic world may not carry the intended meaning for a reader who does not share that background. The question is therefore not simply whether multilingual writers code-mesh, but under what conditions a code-meshed term continues to function as a rhetorical resource and under what conditions it begins to function as an error.

This question is especially relevant for English majors enrolled in a teacher education program, such as the Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSE) English majors who participated in this study. Their writing is the product of an ongoing process of learning English, and it also shapes how they may later understand, model, and evaluate the writing of their own learners. How they use and judge code-meshed terms in academic text is thus a matter of both personal writing development and pedagogical consequence.

The research gap addressed by this study follows from this concern. As noted above, existing research on Philippine English has documented code-switching, code-mixing, and hybridization, but it has given limited attention to the negative aspects of these practices and to a local model for teaching English (Bernardo & Madrunio, 2015; Bolton et al., 2024). What remains to be examined is the point at which code-meshed terms in learners' academic writing cease to communicate what the writer intended, and what the social context of the term

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

contributes to that judgment. By analyzing code-meshed terms in context rather than by frequency alone, this study seeks to contribute to filling that gap.

The study draws its data from the literacy journey essays of the participants. A literacy story is a highly personal genre that invites the use of culturally embedded language, and it therefore makes visible how the participants' Filipino, the regional languages of Cotabato, and English interact in a single text. For this reason, the essays provide a suitable site for examining how code meshing operates in the writing of learners whose linguistic repertoires extend beyond English.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on Error Analysis Theory (Corder, 1967), which has both a theoretical purpose, to understand how learners acquire a second language, and a practical purpose, to use the learner's first language or dialect to improve teaching. Corder suggests that learners' errors are not random but form part of the development of their linguistic system. He identifies three types of errors: pre-systematic (learners are unaware that a rule exists), systematic (learners consistently apply a rule incorrectly), and post-systematic (learners know that a rule exists but apply it inconsistently).

In addition to Error Analysis, this study draws on code meshing, which recognizes that multilingual writers can use their vernacular within a single piece of writing through strategies such as recontextualization, voicing, interactional, and textualization. When code-meshed terms are analyzed, they should be considered in context to identify whether they carry a negative connotation or are used rhetorically. The two frameworks are used together to strengthen students' metacognition and to make them more aware of rhetoric in their writing, so that they can decide whether a vernacular term would benefit their writing.

The two frameworks play complementary roles in the analysis. Error Analysis Theory supplies the question of whether a learner's expression deviates from standard English, and it treats such deviations as evidence of the learner's developing linguistic system rather than as random lapses. In this study, that question was addressed by comparing each code-meshed term with standard English on the basis of its denotative meaning. Code meshing, on the other hand, supplies the question of what the term does within the text: whether it is used rhetorically, whether it carries a negative connotation, and what value it adds to the text as a whole. This question was addressed through contextual analysis. Applying both lenses to the same unit of analysis allows the study to distinguish a term that merely deviates from the standard from a term that is used for a rhetorical or identity-related purpose.

Corder's three types of errors also provide a vocabulary for interpreting the findings. Errors may be pre-systematic, in which the learner is unaware that a rule exists; systematic, in which the learner applies a rule incorrectly and consistently; or post-systematic, in which the learner knows the rule but applies it inconsistently. These distinctions are returned to in the discussion of the findings, particularly in relation to translation, overgeneralized verb forms, and the contrast between local and global errors.

In terms of the overall flow of the study, the literacy journey essays served as the input. Each essay was examined for instances of code-meshing, the meaning of each term within its text was established, and the term was compared with standard English in order to determine whether it constituted a language error. The terms were then categorized and described in terms of their frequency and distribution. The outcome was an account of the conditions under which code-meshed terms can be regarded as errors, together with implications for the teaching of academic writing.

Objectives of the Study

This study sought to determine and explain the instances in which code-meshing can be regarded as an error in the writing of English major learners. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How is code-meshing used in the written output of the learners?

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

2. What does code-meshing imply in academic text as a form of language error?

Significance of the Study

The results of this study are important for three groups of people.

Language Teachers. A clear distinction between deviant and non-deviant terms is of great benefit to language teachers, as it gives them practical knowledge that they can use in class.

Materials Writers. The detailed list of lexical items (Table 1) and the examples of equivalent terms (Table 5) will help materials writers create register-specific materials.

World Englishes and Philippine English Researchers. The small corpus provides a complete list of lexical items in which the socially meaningful code-meshed terms can be clearly identified. It can therefore provide evidence for claims about how these terms are used in the local context.

Taken together, the three groups reflect the dual orientation of the study. For teachers and materials writers, the findings translate into classroom practice and instructional resources. For researchers, the corpus and the classification of terms offer a documented basis for further study of how code-meshed terms are used and evaluated in the local context.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study covered the literacy journey essays written by all 15 second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSE) English majors of the College of Education, Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Arakan, Cotabato, during the first semester of School Year 2024–2025. It focused on code-meshed terms at the level of the individual word within sentences, which were examined through error analysis and contextual analysis.

The study is subject to several limitations. First, the small number of essays (n = 15) means that the prevalence rates cannot be generalized to all Filipino English majors. Second, the text type used in this study made the occurrence of code mixing more likely because the essays were about the writers' literacy 'journey' (Canagarajah, 2023). Third, the qualitative coding method relies on interpretive judgment, and it may be argued that some categories overlap (e.g., translation vs. lack of vocabulary). Lastly, the learners' backgrounds (English proficiency and other regional first languages) were not known, and interviews with the writers were not available; hence, the intent behind their use of language had to be assumed.

These delimitations and limitations bear directly on how the findings should be read. Because the corpus is small and was produced in response to a single writing task, the counts and percentages reported in this paper describe this group of 15 writers and this type of text; they are not estimates of prevalence in the wider population of Filipino English majors. Because the categories rest on interpretive judgment, the boundaries between them, particularly between translation and lack of vocabulary, should be treated as analytic distinctions that are useful for teaching rather than as rigid divisions. Finally, because the writers' intentions were inferred from the text and not confirmed with the writers, the contextual meanings reported in this paper represent the most plausible reading of each term in context.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of clarity and consistency, the following terms are used in this study as described below. The descriptions are drawn from the way the terms are used in the sections that follow.

Code meshing. The blending of local varieties or vernacular with Standard Written English within a single text (Canagarajah, 2006), including the limited use of vernacular Englishes for rhetorical and identity purposes (Canagarajah, 2011).

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

Code-meshed term. A word or phrase in the participants' essays in which the influence of Filipino, a local variety, or informal usage was evident in the English text, and which was identified and analyzed in context in this study.

Error. In this study, a code-meshed term is regarded as an error when, on the basis of its denotative meaning, it deviates from standard English and, in context, conveys an unintended meaning or fails to convey the meaning that the writer intended.

Inappropriate choice of words. The main category of errors in which a word or phrase with a related but not exact meaning was chosen. It has two subcategories: lack of vocabulary, in which the meaning of a known word was extended, and translation, in which the expression reflects the meaning or structure of Filipino.

Frequent use of 'very.' The use of the intensifier *very* to emphasize feelings and ideas where a more accurate word, or no intensifier, would have been more suitable.

Redundancy. The use of words or structures that duplicate meaning or that make a clause wordy or incomplete, including pleonasm, comparative redundancy, and structural redundancy.

Clipping of words. The shortening of a word or phrase, including true clipping (e.g., *kinder*) and initialism (e.g., *senior hs*).

Local and global errors. Local errors are slight inaccuracies or unintended meanings that cause little confusion, whereas global errors interfere with the main message of the text and require interpretation.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

METHODS

This section presents the methods and procedures employed in the study. It covers the research design, the locale and participants, the research instrument, the data collection procedure, the data analysis, and the ethical considerations.

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative methodology. Contextual analysis and error analysis were used to investigate the connotation of specific instances within a mini corpus. A qualitative design was chosen because it draws on multiple methods and takes an interpretive and naturalistic approach to investigation. The social meaning that a term carries in the context of an essay cannot be established by examining frequencies alone.

Error analysis examined whether the code-meshed terms were language errors when compared with standard English on the basis of their denotative meaning. Contextual analysis examined how the words were used within the text and the value they provided to the text as a whole. Both methods were applied to the same unit of analysis (the individual word within sentences) so that both the denotative deviation and the contextual value could be recorded.

The use of two methods applied to the same unit of analysis is the central feature of the design. A frequency count alone would show how many code-meshed terms were present, but it would not show what those terms meant in the essays or whether they affected the writer's message. Conversely, a purely contextual reading would show what the writer intended but would not establish whether the expression deviated from standard English. By recording both the denotative deviation and the contextual value of each term, the design allowed the study to describe the terms in a way that is useful for teaching: whether a term is an error, how it came about, and what kind of response it calls for.

Locale and Participants

This study was conducted at the College of Education of the Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Doroluman, Arakan, Cotabato, Philippines, during the first semester of School Year 2024–2025. Purposive sampling through total enumeration was employed, in which participants are deliberately chosen to provide greater illumination of a specific theme or phenomenon. All learners in the second-year BSE English major class (N = 15) were the participants of this study.

Total enumeration was appropriate for this study because the class was small and all of its members could be included. Including every learner in the class meant that the corpus reflects the whole group rather than a selection of its writers, and it made it possible to describe the distribution of code-meshed terms across all 15 participants, including the participant whose essay contained no code-meshed term. The participants were second-year BSE English majors, that is, learners who were enrolled in a teacher education program with a specialization in English.

Research Instrument

The data used in this study were the written essays of the BSE English major participants. These essays were used to elicit the participants' writing styles and to observe code mixing in the data. The participants were given a writing task in which they told their literacy story. Literacy stories give participants the opportunity to use language that is highly personal and rich in cultural elements, which makes visible how their Filipino and English interacted with each other in their texts.

The decision to use literacy stories as the data source was deliberate. Because the task asked participants to narrate their own literacy experiences, it encouraged a personal register and the use of culturally embedded language. This made the essays a natural site for observing how Filipino and English interacted in the participants' writing. At the same time, as acknowledged in the limitations of the study, the personal nature of the task may have made code mixing more likely than it would be in other genres of academic writing.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

Data Collection

A cover letter outlining the aims of the study was sent to the Dean of the College of Education. Once approval was granted, a single day was chosen for the session, and a venue was decided upon. The participants completed a three- to four-hour essay-writing task on their literacy history. All the essays were then collected and analyzed. The extended time allowed the participants to plan what they would write without pressure, so that the essays would be representative of the words they would normally use when writing.

The data collection followed a simple sequence: seeking approval, scheduling a single session, administering the writing task, and collecting the essays for analysis. Allowing three to four hours for the task was intended to give the participants time to plan, so that the essays would reflect the words the participants would normally use rather than words produced under time pressure. The essays were presented in the analysis with participant codes (P1–P15) and line numbers (L), which made it possible to trace every term back to its source.

Data Analysis

The written texts were manually analyzed in order to:

1. identify any instances of code meshing;
2. understand the meaning of each term within its text; and
3. explain the implications of each term as an example of language error by referring to its meaning, interpretation, and language value.

The identified terms were then divided into categories.

The analysis proceeded from the identification of terms to their interpretation and then to their classification. In the first step, instances of code meshing were identified in the essays. In the second step, the meaning of each term within its text was established, and this contextual meaning is reported in Table 1. In the third step, the implications of each term as a language error were explained by referring to its meaning, interpretation, and language value. The terms were then divided into categories, which are reported in Table 2, and the categories were described in terms of frequency, number of participants, and percentages (Tables 3 and 4). Finally, the error analysis was used to describe the terms as local or global errors, which is discussed in the Discussion section.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to the ethical guidelines for research involving learners. Consent was obtained from all participants, and it was clearly explained that they could participate if they wished. As they had the right to choose whether to participate, they were not considered vulnerable. All learners were assured that their identities would remain anonymous throughout the investigation. In accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012, their work was disposed of appropriately (shredded and burned) to ensure that their data could not be traced back to them as sources of information. Because the study used purposive full-enumeration sampling, all members of the class were included.

The participants were also given pseudonyms (P1–P15). All extracts are presented exactly as they were written. References to specific named individuals in the learners' school life have been kept as they appeared in the original texts because they were mentioned by the learners; they are not used to judge those individuals.

Taken together, these provisions reflect the aim of protecting the participants while preserving the integrity of the data. Presenting extracts exactly as written ensures that the analysis is based on what the participants actually wrote, and retaining references to named individuals as they appeared in the essays, without using them to judge those individuals, keeps the data intact while respecting the people mentioned in them.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered on the code-meshed terms in the literacy journey essays of the BSE English major participants. The results are presented first, followed by a discussion of their implications in relation to the research questions and the relevant literature.

The results are organized in four parts. The first presents the contextual meanings of the code-meshed terms (Table 1). The second presents their classification (Table 2). The third presents their frequency and distribution across categories and participants (Tables 3 and 4). The fourth presents a per-term analysis of each category. The Discussion that follows interprets these results in relation to Error Analysis Theory, code meshing, and the literature on Philippine English and World Englishes.

Contextual Meanings of the Code-Meshed Terms

Table 1 presents the 44 code-mixed words used by the BSE English major participants in their essays, together with their meanings in context. Underlined sections show where code mixing occurred. The table provides an overview of the contextual meaning of the code-mixed words; the third column shows what the writer clearly intended to say, which can later be matched against the actual denotative meaning of the phrase in standard English. A consistent pattern emerged from the corpus: the learners were rarely at a loss for what to say, but they tended to search for the right word and often settled on a similar one.

Table 1. Contextual Meaning of Code-Meshed Terms in the Text

No.	Code-meshed terms	Contextual meaning in the text
1.	When I turned into 1st grade, I already knew how to read.	Becoming a 1st grader
2.	…growing up with a broke family and it made me difficult to study…	Incomplete family; struggle
3.	…my grandmother taught me one by one just to help me in my assignments when it comes to math…	Teaching step-by-step
4.	I was happy to participate and join activities…	Engage
5.	…especially as communication became very convenient for us.	Useful
6.	Literacy in the present had become a very powerful influence to our society.	Has greater impact
7.	When I was still young, I reminisce some of my experience and my journey…	During childhood years
8.	…there's no time for me not to ask questions from them when I was still a kid.	Asking questions all the time
9.	But with hard work and believe in myself, eventually I overcome it.	Having faith
10.	…I haven't heard them saying bad words which is now I realize…	Offensive statements
11.	…I was surrounded with people that also has the same mindset as mine.	Having the same perception toward a certain goal
12.	…I started to learn the first word I've been spoken.	My first language
13.	Honestly, I can say that for being talkative of mine it has a big contribution on how I learn different things…	Congenial
14.	I can really say that our kinder teacher is really a good mentor.	A teacher who teaches kindergarten
15.	I graduated as class valedictorian in kinder.	Kindergarten

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

No.	Code-meshed terms	Contextual meaning in the text
16.	As my year level got higher my learnings towards literacy is on higher level as well.	The process of promotion to the next education level; literacy also improved
17.	When I was in my 12th grade, it is very unexpected for me to be chosen as an Editor-in-chief of our school publication.	Did not see it coming
18.	I graduated as higher honor student and got several academic awards.	A high rank in academics
19.	Literacy is very efficient in our lives it creates opportunities for people…	Beneficial
20.	…when I learned that the very basic of reading and writing…	Fundamentals
21.	I carry on my senior high school at CMC Kidapawan.	Enrolled
22.	…I experienced financial difficulties which helps me realize the value of money…	Monetary problems
23.	…some people loves to read, while some not…	Some do not
24.	In our daycare and kindergarten days…	A pre-school
25.	…due to a poor status, and much suffers on how to find foods just to survive…	Lower class status in the society; causes distress
26.	…being an effective teacher in sharing my knowledge and learning to my students to be part of the literacy literate individual.	A person who acquired the skills of being a good mentor
27.	I can hardly ready during my grade school…	Having difficulties in learning
28.	I barely speak and talk to even my sibling…	Not interested in initiating conversations
29.	…independent as I am a little far from my parents I started to be a little talkative and a little loud in school.	Lives in a different location from home
30.	I am a little fan of words, essays, English and I really hated math…	Inclination towards learning English
31.	…there are a lot of things that happened during my senior hs time.	Senior high school
32.	…sometimes also I am degraded and I felt unworthy for this course…	Embarrassed or humiliated
33.	…before, we satiate our literacy, all of us experienced hilarious moments…	Fulfill the requirements of
34.	As if she can yell at me while the prayer is going on that's why I quickly escaped my tragedy.	She would not dare yell; run away to avoid the consequences
35.	When I was in elementary, I was so small, thin, and very shy child.	Petite; introvert
36.	…my passion in sports specifically playing gymnasts…	The act of performing the sport of gymnastics
37.	…I have higher grades but it's not enough to bring me at list.	Be on the honor list
38.	I choosed education and English as my major…	Deciding to take Education as a degree
39.	…when I entered high school in my secondary life I enjoy my teenage life…	Teenage life

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

No.	Code-meshed terms	Contextual meaning in the text
40.	…I can make sir Jerson Catoto our adviser and language terrorist proud.	A strict teacher in terms of teaching the technicalities of language
41.	This motto of mine is very helpful because it is my drive to strive more…	Substantial
42.	…I can't understand it very well and I find it hard to answer.	Too difficult to comprehend
43.	My grades in Math and English are very low.	Lower than the desired grade
44.	When I stepped in college, I tooked an education major in English course	Decided to take education as the degree

A closer reading of Table 1 shows how often the intended meaning differs from, and is larger than, the English form that was written. In several cases, the intended meaning is more precise than the expression that stands for it. For example, *very convenient* was intended to mean *useful*, *very efficient* to mean *beneficial*, and *very basic* to mean *fundamentals*, so that a single adjective or noun would have conveyed the meaning more directly. In other cases, the written form compresses more than one idea. *Broke family* is glossed as *incomplete family; struggle*, which indicates that the expression carries both a description of the family and an experience of hardship; and *so small, thin, and very shy* is glossed as *petite; introvert*.

In other cases, a known word or phrase was extended to a meaning that it does not ordinarily carry. *Carry on* was intended to mean *enrolled*, *daycare* to mean *a pre-school*, *degraded* to mean *embarrassed or humiliated*, and *language terrorist* to mean *a strict teacher in terms of teaching the technicalities of language*. In these cases, the reader must rely on the surrounding context to recover the intended meaning, since the expression, read on its own, points to a different one.

A third group of terms reflects the structure or meaning of Filipino rather than a lexical choice alone. *I've been spoken* is glossed as *my first language*, *no time for me not to ask questions* as *asking questions all the time*, and *as if she can yell at me* as *she would not dare yell; run away to avoid the consequences*. For these expressions, the glosses are longer than the original phrases, which suggests that the writers were expressing meanings that they could not fully convey through a single English expression. Finally, *tooked*, *choosed*, and *kinder* reflect the application of a rule or a shortening in a way that departs from standard English. Taken together, these observations support the pattern noted at the outset: the learners were rarely at a loss for what to say, but they often settled for an expression that was close to, but not the same as, the meaning they intended.

Classification of the Code-Meshed Terms

Table 2 shows how the code-meshed terms were categorized. There were four main categories: inappropriate choice of words, frequent use of 'very,' redundancy, and clipping of words. Inappropriate choice of words had two subcategories, lack of vocabulary and translation. All the terms are listed with the participant (P) and line number (L) so that they can be easily traced back to the essays.

Table 2. Classification of Code-Meshed Terms

Classification	Code-meshed terms (participant, line)
Inappropriate Choice of Words	
Lack of vocabulary	turned into 1st grade (P1, L9); one by one (P2, L11); carry on (P9, L32); financial difficulties (P9, L38); daycare (P11, L11); effective teacher (P11, L48); little far from my parents (P12, L41); little fan of words, essays, English (P12, L42); degraded (P12, L57); I was so small, thin (P14, L1); playing gymnasts (P14, L17); bring me at list (P14, L38); language terrorist (P14, L43)

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

Classification	Code-meshed terms (participant, line)
Translation	broke family (P2, L3); believe in myself (P5, L34); bad words (P6, L14); same mindset (P6, L30–31); I've been spoken (P7, L2); no time for me not to ask questions (P7, L6–7); literacy is on higher level (P7, L37–38); poor status (P11, L37); I can hardly ready (P12, L2); satiate (P13, L3); As if (P13, L18); secondary life (P14, L24); choosed (P14, L39); understand it very well (P15, L20); tooked (P15, L26–27)
Frequent Use of "Very"	very convenient (P3, L17); a very powerful (P3, L19); very unexpected (P7, L54); very efficient (P8, L20); very basic (P9, L17); very shy (P14, L1); very helpful (P15, L3); very low (P15, L22)
Redundancy	it made me difficult (P2, L3); participate and join (P2, L15); When I was still young (P5, L1); talkative of mine (P7, L6); As my year level got higher (P7, L37–38); higher honor (P7, L58); while some not (P10, L11 & L12); speak and talk (P12, L14)
Clipping of Words	kinder teacher (P7, L21); kinder (P7, L24); senior hs (P12, L48)

Note. P = participant; L = line in the participant's essay.

Within the main category of inappropriate choice of words, the two subcategories differed noticeably. The 13 terms under lack of vocabulary were terms in which the meaning of a known word or short phrase had been extended, such as *carry on* for enrollment, *degraded* for humiliation, and *daycare* for a pre-school. The translation subcategory comprised 15 terms, mostly phrases, that retained the syntax or meaning of Filipino, for example, *broke family*, *poor status*, *I can hardly ready*, and *no time for me not to ask questions*. This appears to reflect both limited vocabulary and structural transfer.

The remaining categories were smaller but distinct. Frequent use consisted of eight terms, such as very convenient (P3, L17), *very powerful* (P3, L19), and *very unexpected* (P7, L54). Redundancy likewise consisted of eight terms, such as *participate and join* (P2, L15), *speak and talk* (P12, L14), and *while some not* (P10, L11 and L12). Clipping consisted of three terms: *kinder teacher* (P7, L21), *kinder* (P7, L24), and *senior hs* (P12, L48). The classification therefore shows a corpus in which most terms involve the choice of an individual word or phrase, with smaller groups of terms involving emphasis, wordiness, and shortening.

Frequency and Distribution of the Categories

Table 3 summarizes the frequency of the code-meshed terms across categories. A total of 47 code-meshed terms were identified. Of these, 28 were attributed to inappropriate choice of words, consisting of 13 cases of lack of vocabulary, found in the essays of six participants (P1, P2, P9, P11, P12, and P14), and 15 cases of translation, found in the essays of nine participants (P2, P5, P6, P7, P11, P12, P13, P14, and P15). Frequent use of *very* was observed in 8 cases across six participants (P3, P7, P8, P9, P14, and P15), equivalent to 40% of the class. Redundancy occurred in 8 cases across five participants (P2, P5, P7, P10, and P12), and clipping occurred in 3 cases across two participants (P7 and P12).

Table 3. Frequency of Code-Meshed Terms and Number of Participants per Category

Classification	Terms (n)	Participants (n)	Participants (%)
Inappropriate choice of words: lack of vocabulary	13	6	40.0
Inappropriate choice of words: translation	15	9	60.0
Frequent use of "very"	8	6	40.0
Redundancy	8	5	33.3
Clipping of words	3	2	13.3

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

Classification	Terms (n)	Participants (n)	Participants (%)
Total	**47**	—	—

Note. N = 15 participants. Percentages are based on the number of participants whose essays contained at least one term in the category.

In relation to the 47 lexical items, lack of vocabulary accounted for 27.7% of the errors and translation for 31.9%, so that, overall, inappropriate lexical choices accounted for 59.6% of the occurrences. Frequent use of *very* and redundancy each accounted for 17.0% of the errors, and clipping accounted for 6.4%. Although the figures alone may not appear large, Table 3 shows how the errors in each category were distributed. Translation was the most frequent category (15 terms) and was used by nine participants (60.0%), which indicates that translation is a common feature of the interlanguage of this cohort. Clipping, in contrast, was the least frequent category (3 terms) and was used by only two participants (13.3%). Two of the three instances occurred in the same essay (P7), which also contained terms from several other categories. This suggests that clipping is an individual stylistic choice.

Table 4 shows the distribution of the code-meshed terms per participant. Because total enumeration was used, the corpus allows several observations to be made.

Table 4. Distribution of Code-Meshed Terms per Participant

Participant	Lack of vocabulary	Translation	Very	Redundancy	Clipping	Total
P1	1	0	0	0	0	1
P2	1	1	0	2	0	4
P3	0	0	2	0	0	2
P4	0	0	0	0	0	0
P5	0	1	0	1	0	2
P6	0	2	0	0	0	2
P7	0	3	1	3	2	9
P8	0	0	1	0	0	1
P9	2	0	1	0	0	3
P10	0	0	0	1	0	1
P11	2	1	0	0	0	3
P12	3	1	0	1	1	6
P13	0	2	0	0	0	2
P14	4	2	1	0	0	7
P15	0	2	2	0	0	4
Total	**13**	**15**	**8**	**8**	**3**	**47**

Note. N = 15 participants. Counts are derived from the term-level classification in Table 2.

Several patterns emerged from the data. First, code meshing was fairly widespread: 14 of the 15 participants had at least one code-meshed term in their essays. However, the number of coded items varied widely, ranging from 1 to 9, with an average of 3.1 per participant (3.4 per essay containing code meshing). Second, a large proportion of the code meshing came from a small number of participants: P7 (9 items), P14 (7 items), P12 (6 items), P2 (4 items), and P15 (4 items). Together, these five participants accounted for 30 of the 47 lexical items. P7 had the highest proportion of items (19.1%) and was the only participant with code meshing in all four categories; P12 and P14 also had code meshing in three categories.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

Third, some categories were more concentrated than others. P14 and P12 contributed 7 of the 13 items in the lack-of-vocabulary category. The translation category showed a range of one to three items per writer across nine essays. The *very* category was spread thinly across six writers who did not otherwise perform notably in the other categories. The most prolific essays contained multiple categories with high numbers of code-meshed terms, which suggests that code-meshing in this corpus is related to the writers' general approach to writing.

Some categories also overlapped. P2's opening sentence contains both a translation (*broke family*) and a redundancy (*it made me difficult*) within the same clause, and a sentence by P7 likewise contains both a redundancy and a translation. When categories overlap, correcting a single term will not make the sentence acceptable. Accordingly, when teaching resources are created from these findings, replacing individual items alone will not produce an academic piece of writing; changing *broke family* to *broken home*, for example, would not be sufficient.

Participant-Level Profiles

Table 4 also allows the participants to be described individually. Taken from the counts in the table, the 15 participants can be grouped according to the number of code-meshed terms in their essays. One participant (P4) produced no code-meshed term. Three participants (P1, P8, and P10) produced one term each: P1 in the lack-of-vocabulary category, P8 in the *very* category, and P10 in the redundancy category. Four participants produced two terms each: P3 (both in the *very* category), P5 (one translation and one redundancy), and P6 and P13 (both in the translation category). P9 and P11 each produced three terms, with two in the lack-of-vocabulary category and one in another category (*very* for P9 and translation for P11).

The five participants who produced the most terms account for the largest share of the corpus. P2 and P15 each produced four terms. P2's terms were distributed across lack of vocabulary (1), translation (1), and redundancy (2), whereas P15's terms were limited to translation (2) and *very* (2). P12 produced six terms, distributed across lack of vocabulary (3), translation (1), redundancy (1), and clipping (1). P14 produced seven terms, concentrated in lack of vocabulary (4) and translation (2), with one term in the *very* category. P7 produced nine terms, the largest number in the corpus, distributed across translation (3), redundancy (3), clipping (2), and *very* (1). Together, P7, P14, P12, P2, and P15 account for 30 of the 47 terms.

These profiles show that the categories do not distribute evenly across writers. Some writers' terms were concentrated in a single category, as with P3 and P13, whereas others' terms were spread across several categories, as with P7 and P12. This supports the observation that code meshing in this corpus is related to the writers' general approach to writing rather than to a single linguistic feature.

Per-Term Analysis of the Categories

Inappropriate Choice of Words

Inappropriate choice of words was the most prevalent category. Learners in this corpus regularly chose a word or phrase whose meaning was related to, but not exactly the same as, what the sentence required. This generally did not impede understanding, but it altered the meaning received by the reader.

Lack of vocabulary. The students tended to overgeneralize the meanings of words. Six participants (P1, P2, P9, P11, P12, and P14) used words that were similar in meaning to what was needed. For example, they used *carry on* to mean continuing one's studies, *daycare* to mean pre-school, *degraded* to mean humiliated, and *language terrorist* to mean a strict teacher of languages (a label that conveys a frightening and unfriendly impression). Two points are worth noting. First, these substitutions were generally deliberate rather than careless: the writers tried to use *carry on* to mean *continue*, but the expression does not work because the phrase carries a set meaning in another context. Second, all 13 of these items were understandable because each had a clear intended meaning; none of the sentences needed to be interpreted from an external context.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

The contextual meanings in Table 1 clarify how this overgeneralization operated. P9's *carry on* was intended to mean *enrolled*, and P11's *daycare* to mean *a pre-school*. P12's *degraded* was intended to mean *embarrassed or humiliated*, and P14's *language terrorist* to mean a strict teacher of the technicalities of language. In each case, the writer selected a word that is related to the intended concept but that, in standard usage, designates something else. The writer's intended meaning can be recovered from context, as noted above, but the reader must make an inferential step that the writer did not intend to require. P14's *bring me at list* and P12's *little fan of words, essays, English* similarly show the writer approximating the intended meanings (*be on the honor list* and *inclination towards learning English*, respectively) with the closest expressions available.

The distribution of this subcategory is also informative. Of the 13 terms, 7 were produced by two participants (P14 with 4 and P12 with 3), and the remaining 6 were produced by P9 (2), P11 (2), P1 (1), and P2 (1). The subcategory was therefore present in the essays of six of the 15 participants, but it was concentrated in the writing of a few.

Translation. Translation errors were made by non-native speakers who translated from their first language (L1). This was evident among all nine participants concerned. They rendered Filipino into English inaccurately, resulting in incorrect or unclear expression. Three types of errors were observed. First, lexical translation errors occurred, in which the range of meaning of a Filipino word was transferred, for example, "broke family" and "poor status." Second, structural translation errors occurred. These are harder to detect when editing because the individual English words are correct but are arranged in a Filipino sentence structure, for example, "I can hardly ready." Third, systematic overgeneralization errors occurred: the participants applied the English rule of adding *-ed* to regular verbs to irregular verbs, for example, "choosed" and "tooked."

The contextual meanings in Table 1 show what the translated expressions were intended to convey. *Believe in myself* was intended as *having faith*, *bad words* as *offensive statements*, *same mindset* as *having the same perception toward a certain goal*, and *poor status* as *lower class status in the society; causes distress*. *Secondary life* was intended as *teenage life*, *satiate* as *fulfill the requirements of*, and *I can hardly ready* as *having difficulties in learning*. In each case, the English words are individually recognizable, but their combination, or the sense that they carry, follows the writer's first language rather than standard English usage.

Translation was the largest category, and it was also the most widely distributed. It was found in the essays of nine participants (P2, P5, P6, P7, P11, P12, P13, P14, and P15), with each of them contributing between one and three terms. The breadth of its distribution is what distinguishes it from lack of vocabulary, which was concentrated in a few essays. Translation, in other words, was a feature of the writing of most of the participants whose codes meshed, rather than of a small number of writers.

Frequent Use of "Very"

Six participants (40%) frequently used the intensifier *very* to emphasize feelings and ideas across eight different terms, which made the writing more colloquial. Two main patterns were observed. In five of the terms, *very* intensified a word that could have been replaced by a more accurate one, for example, *very convenient*, *very efficient*, and *very basic*. The remaining terms either used *very* redundantly with an absolute or comparative adjective, as in *very unexpected* and *very low*, or used *very* to generalize a feature that would have been better described by one specific word, as in *very shy* rather than *introvert*.

Table 1 shows what the writers meant in each case. *Very convenient* was intended as *useful*, *a very powerful influence* as *has greater impact*, *very efficient* as *beneficial*, *very basic* as *fundamentals*, and *very helpful* as *substantial*. In each of these, a single more specific word would have carried the intended meaning. *Very unexpected* was intended as *did not see it coming*, and *very low* as *lower than the desired grade*, which are cases in which the modified word already expresses the meaning. In the case of *very shy*, the intended meaning (*petite; introvert*) is more specific than the phrase that was written. The category was distributed across six participants (P3, P7, P8, P9, P14, and P15), each of whom contributed between one and two terms, so that no single writer accounted for a large share of it.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

Redundancy

Several instances of redundancy and wordiness were seen across the eight phrases. Three types of redundancy were identified. The first was pleonasm, in which two words with the same meaning are combined, for example, *participate and join*, *speak and talk*, and *When I was still young*. The second was comparative redundancy, in which redundant comparative words are used, for example, *As my year level got higher* and *higher honor*. The third was structural. These items were placed in this category because they affect the meaning of what is being said; however, they arise from grammatical problems in the sentence rather than from redundancy as such. They include missing verbs, as in *while some not*, and misplaced adjectives, as in *it made me difficult*.

The distribution of this category shows that redundancy, like translation, was spread across several writers: five participants (P2, P5, P7, P10, and P12) contributed the eight terms, with P2 and P7 contributing two and three terms, respectively. Table 1 shows what the redundant expressions were intended to mean. *Participate and join* was intended as *engage*, *when I was still young* as *during childhood years*, *higher honor* as *a high rank in academics*, and *talkative of mine* as *congenial*. The structural cases are different in kind: *while some not* is glossed as *some do not*, and *it made me difficult* is glossed within *incomplete family; struggle*. In these cases, the problem is not an excess of words but an incomplete or misarranged clause, which is why they call for a different kind of instruction.

Clipping of Words

Shortening was evident in the essays in two forms. The first was true clipping, in which Participant 7 abbreviated *kindergarten* to *kinder*. This created a problem of meaning because *kinder* is already a word in English, an adjective meaning warm-hearted or generous. The second was initialism, in which Participant 12 abbreviated *senior high school* to *senior hs*. Although this is a common feature of online communication in the Philippines, it was inappropriate in the essay because it created an overly informal and marked register.

Table 1 confirms the intended meanings of the clipped forms: *kinder teacher* as *a teacher who teaches kindergarten*, *kinder* as *kindergarten*, and *senior hs* as *senior high school*. The case of *kinder* is notable because the clipped form is itself an English word with a different meaning, so that the reader may initially interpret the form as the adjective rather than as the abbreviated noun. This is a clear example of how a form that is acceptable in one context can generate ambiguity in another.

Discussion

Code Meshing as a Social Practice in Philippine English

The participants drew on their literacy backgrounds to create an original and creative approach to writing in English through the use of neologisms, contractions, and code mixing. These features can be regarded as examples of Philippine English, a nativized variety that has been influenced historically by American education in the Philippines. The Philippines is part of the Outer Circle in the World Englishes model, in which English is used as a second language in institutional settings alongside local languages.

The essays demonstrate that code mixing is a systematic process that can be measured within sentences. This is consistent with previous research showing that Filipino learners have positive attitudes toward English and often use code-switching when bilingual. Such code-switching is a deliberate rhetorical device. Because the participants were writing personal accounts of their literacy development, it was natural for them to draw on their bilingual background to create an authentic piece.

These observations also help to explain why the study treats code meshing as a social practice rather than as a purely linguistic phenomenon. The terms identified in the essays cannot be understood apart from the participants' linguistic backgrounds, the setting in which English is used as a second language, and the genre in which they were writing. A term such as *language terrorist* is glossed in Table 1 as a strict teacher in terms of teaching the technicalities of language, but a reader who encountered it without that context could take it to mean something

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

quite different. It is this dependence on social context that makes contextual analysis necessary alongside error analysis.

Lack of Vocabulary as Conceptual Generalization

The 13 lexical errors show that the learners were using an intentional strategy: they used words they knew to form generalizations for concepts for which they lacked a word, as in *carry on* and *daycare*. Although these may seem reasonable uses of the lexis, they carry an unintended meaning. This can confuse the reader and requires recourse to context. The finding is consistent with research on second-language and Philippine writing showing that students continue to have difficulty with lexical choice despite years of learning English.

This means that learners need to understand the exact meanings of the words they already know rather than simply expand their abstract vocabulary. For example, while *carry on* and *continue* may both be part of a learner's recognition vocabulary, learners often lack knowledge of how to use these words. *Carry on* is an intransitive verb in this sense and needs an activity. To reduce such errors, students need to focus on the depth of their vocabulary knowledge so that they know exactly which words go together and what words mean in context.

This interpretation is consistent with the observation that the lack-of-vocabulary terms were generally understandable and deliberate. The learners were not producing unintelligible text; they were making reasoned approximations from the vocabulary available to them. Instruction that treats these items merely as mistakes to be crossed out would overlook this reasoning. A more productive response is to build on what the learners already know by showing where the known word and the intended concept overlap and where they diverge.

Translation as Interlingual Transfer

Translation was the largest category, with 15 instances distributed across nine essays. It occurred at the lexical level, whereby learners used the semantic range of a Filipino word with an incorrect English equivalent (e.g., *poor status* instead of *kahirapan*), and at the syntactic level, whereby the structure of Filipino influenced word choice in English (e.g., *I can hardly ready*). Overgeneralization from textbook rules also occurred with irregular verb forms such as *choosed* and *tooked*. As seen in second-language error analysis and translation studies, translating thoughts from Filipino into English can help learners generate ideas spontaneously. However, literal word-for-word translation may result in incoherent sentences.

This study treats translation as a compositional strategy: learners generated content first and then translated it into English, which resulted in coherent pieces of writing despite the problematic phrases. The aim of instruction should therefore be to give learners control over this strategy. Learners need to be aware of rhetoric and be taught through translanguaging pedagogy so that they know which translations work well in particular contexts.

The classification of translation errors into lexical, structural, and overgeneralized forms is useful for teaching because each requires a different response. Lexical translation errors call for attention to the range of meaning of English words in contrast with their Filipino counterparts. Structural translation errors, which are harder to detect because the individual words are correct, call for attention to the arrangement of words within the clause. The overgeneralized verb forms *choosed* and *tooked* can be read, in terms of Corder's types of errors, as an instance of a rule being applied consistently but incorrectly, which suggests that learners can benefit from explicit attention to irregular forms. This reading is offered as an interpretation of the examples and not as a finding of the study.

Intensification and the Rhetoric of Emphasis

Non-native speakers often use intensifiers such as *very* in their writing, and they tend to generalize. Learner corpus studies have shown that learners greatly overuse *very* because it is perceived as a general intensifier. Learners do not use many *-ly* adverbs, often combine *very* with non-gradable adjectives, and do not notice collocations in the same way as native speakers.

Although there are only eight examples in this study, they point to an important underlying reason for the use of *very*. In five of these examples, *very* functions as a lexical item: because the writer does not know a more exact

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

adjective, *very* is used instead. Telling students to remove *very* will therefore not help. Instead, teachers should teach specific adjectives, for example, *influential* instead of *very powerful* or *fundamental* instead of *very basic*, as well as the relevant collocations.

The pattern observed with *very* illustrates a more general point about the relationship between vocabulary and emphasis. Where the writer lacks a more exact adjective, an intensifier fills the gap. Training learners to remove the intensifier without providing an alternative would simply leave the gap unfilled. The pedagogical response is therefore to expand the learners' stock of specific adjectives and to teach the collocations in which those adjectives occur.

Redundancy and the Economy of Academic Prose

Redundancy can occur when learners try to make their phrases more elaborate and become verbose. This is supported by the literature on ESL and academic writing in the Philippines. Lexical additions in the form of duplication or unnecessary repetition make sentences unnecessarily long, and they are an important focus for teachers seeking to improve learners' writing.

Within the corpus, two instances of redundancy are not typical examples: *it made me difficult* and *while some not*. These arise from the absence or incorrect selection of grammatical features. Classifying them simply as redundancy could cause confusion because the problem lies at the clause level, and asking the learner merely to remove some words will not solve it. Accordingly, these eight items need to be taught through two different lessons: one on conciseness for the genuine pleonastic pairs and one on ensuring that clauses are complete.

The distinction between the two lessons is practical. A lesson on conciseness would work with pleonastic pairs such as *participate and join* and *speak and talk*, asking learners to decide which word to keep. A lesson on completeness of clauses would work with items such as *while some not*, and *it made me difficult*, asking learners to identify the missing or misplaced element and to reconstruct the clause. Treating all eight items as one category would obscure this difference.

Clipping, Acronym, and the Register of Digital Literacy

Although clipping was the smallest category (three entries), it clearly demonstrates how learners transfer knowledge from digital literacies outside school by using the clipped forms common in messaging and social media. While back clipping and other types of clipping are very common in modern English and online media, corpus linguistics indicates that clipped words tend to be used in informal and interactive contexts, whereas academic writing tends to use full forms.

Teachers would need two different approaches to help learners understand why these examples were inappropriate. The first example (*senior hs*) is a register error: it is acceptable in casual text messages, and the teacher need only teach the learner to unclip the word. The second example (*kinder*) is a meaning error: clipping *kindergarten* creates ambiguity with an existing English adjective, and teachers would need to help learners recognize this.

The contrast between *senior hs* and *kinder* shows that clipped forms can be problematic for different reasons. The first is a matter of register: the form is acceptable in informal communication but out of place in academic writing. The second is a matter of meaning: the clipped form collides with an existing English word. Both are best addressed by raising learners' awareness of the context in which a form is used and of the reader who will receive it.

Reckoning Error: Local versus Global, and the Limits of a Prescriptive Frame

Error analysis was used to classify the 47 items found in the corpus as either local or global errors. The majority of the code-meshed terms were local errors, which cause little confusion and involve slight inaccuracies or unintended meanings within the text. However, a few instances, such as *I can hardly ready* and *while some not*, were classified as global errors, which interfere with the main message of the text and require interpretation. This

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

distinction is important because each type requires a different teaching strategy: local errors call for instruction on the effects of connotation and collocation, whereas global errors call for instruction on basic clause structure.

Overall, this shows the importance of a balanced approach to prescriptive rules. Much research has been conducted on World Englishes and code-meshing; it is therefore acceptable to include some vernacular in a text, for example, figurative expressions such as *language terrorist*. However, when deviations are unintended and appear in formal texts, multilingual writers may be penalized. Teachers and writers should therefore consider each term in context. If a term is used creatively and serves a clear purpose within the text, it should be left as it is. If a term causes confusion and does not convey what the writer intended, it should be altered.

The local and global distinction also helps to explain why the same rhetorical choice can be received differently. A figurative expression such as *language terrorist* is a local matter: it may startle or amuse a reader, but the message of the text remains intact. A clause such as *while some not* is a global matter because the reader must reconstruct the meaning before the sentence can be understood. Evaluating code-meshed terms in context therefore means asking not only whether a term is standard but also how much work the reader must do to understand it.

Implications for Educational Practice

Educators need to understand code-meshing as a natural part of academic writing in Philippine English and teach students to avoid confusion. They should focus on teaching the depth of lexical features such as collocations, connotations, and register. They should also teach explicit editing strategies at the clause level and encourage metacognitive awareness so that learners view their first language as a resource. Furthermore, teachers should aim to develop students' addressee-related competence, grounded in World Englishes and Philippine English pedagogy. Ultimately, this would help students feel empowered to use translingual practices while adhering to formal rules by using code meshing deliberately in appropriate situations.

Responding to the Research Questions

The first research question asked how code meshing is used in the written output of the learners. The results show that code meshing was widespread, being present in the essays of 14 of the 15 participants, and that it took the form of 47 terms in four main categories. Inappropriate choice of words was the largest category (28 terms), followed by frequent use of *very* (8), redundancy (8), and clipping (3). Translation from Filipino was the most common individual source, and a small group of writers accounted for a large share of the terms.

The second research question asked what code-meshing implies in academic text as a form of language error. The results suggest that the implications depend on context and on the kind of term. Most terms were local errors, in which the intended meaning could be recovered from context, although the reader was required to make an inference. A few terms were global errors, in which the clause itself needed to be reconstructed. Some terms, such as figurative expressions, can be regarded as acceptable rhetorical choices when they serve a clear purpose in the text. Code meshing is therefore not in itself an error; it becomes an error when it is unintended and conveys a meaning other than the one the writer wanted to convey.

Implications for Specific Groups

For language teachers, the findings suggest that instruction should distinguish between kinds of terms. Lack-of-vocabulary items call for work on the depth of vocabulary knowledge, translation items for work on the range of meaning and on clause structure, *very* items for work on specific adjectives and collocations, redundancy items for work on conciseness and on completeness of clauses, and clipped forms for work on register and on ambiguity.

For materials writers, the findings suggest that materials should be register-specific and that they should address the overlap between categories. Because a single sentence may contain more than one kind of term, exercises built from the corpus should invite learners to revise the whole clause rather than to substitute a single item.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

For researchers in World Englishes and Philippine English, the findings suggest that the question of when a code-meshed term becomes an error can be examined empirically through contextual analysis of learner corpora. The documented list of terms, together with their contextual meanings and classification, offers a basis for such work and for comparison with other groups of writers and other genres.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study on the code-meshed terms in the academic writing of English major learners and the recommendations based on the results obtained.

Summary of Findings

The principal findings of the study are summarized as follows:

1. A total of 47 code-meshed terms were identified in the literacy journey essays of the 15 participants. These were categorized as inappropriate choice of words (28 terms: 13 lack of vocabulary and 15 translation), frequent use of *very* (8), redundancy (8), and clipping of words (3).
2. Inappropriate choice of words accounted for 59.6% of the 47 terms. Lack of vocabulary accounted for 27.7% of the terms and was found in the essays of six participants (40.0%), while translation accounted for 31.9% and was found in the essays of nine participants (60.0%). Translation from Filipino was therefore the most common individual source of errors.
3. Frequent use of *very* and redundancy each accounted for 17.0% of the terms, found in the essays of six participants (40.0%) and five participants (33.3%), respectively. Clipping was the smallest category, accounting for 6.4% of the terms and found in the essays of two participants (13.3%).
4. Code-meshed terms were found in the essays of 14 of the 15 participants, with each writer contributing between 1 and 9 terms (an average of 3.1 per participant, or 3.4 per essay containing code meshing). A small group of heavy users (P7, P14, P12, P2, and P15) contributed 30 of the 47 terms, often across multiple categories. P7 contributed the largest share (19.1%).
5. Some categories overlapped within the same clause or sentence, as in P2's *broke family* and *it made me difficult*. In such cases, correcting a single term does not make the sentence acceptable in academic writing.
6. Most of the code-meshed terms were local errors with slight inaccuracies or unintended meanings, whereas a few, such as *I can hardly ready* and *while some not*, were global errors that interfere with the main message of the text.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. **Word Creation and Word Choice in Learners' Writing.** The learners used word-creation strategies and, at times, used words, terms, and phrases incorrectly, and this is directly related to their literacy and culture. Of the 47 terms, incorrect use of words was the most common strategy, accounting for 28 terms (59.6%). Translation from Filipino was the most common individual source, with nine of the fifteen participants using it. The terms were not evenly distributed among the learners (14 of 15 participants), with each learner producing between 1 and 9 terms, and there were a number of heavy users who produced terms in multiple categories.
2. **Code Meshing and Academic Conventions.** From a World Englishes perspective, word-creation and meaning-modification strategies are acceptable ways of making texts more appealing to readers, and code meshing is an acceptable approach. However, it is still necessary to follow the conventions of prescriptive English within academic texts.
3. **Local and Global Effects of Code-Meshed Terms.** Most code-meshed terms were local errors: their intended meanings could be recovered from context, although the reader was required to make an inference, and they involved slight inaccuracies or unintended meanings. A few terms were global errors that interfere with the main message of the text and require interpretation. The two kinds of error call for different teaching responses, with local errors calling for attention to connotation and collocation and global errors calling for attention to basic clause structure.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

4. **Context as the Basis for Judging Code-Meshed Terms.** Whether a code-meshed term is acceptable depends on the context in which it is used and on the purpose it serves. A term that is used creatively and has a clear purpose within the text can be left as it is, whereas a term that causes confusion and does not convey what the writer intended should be altered. Code meshing is therefore not in itself an error; it becomes one when it is unintended and conveys a meaning other than the one the writer wished to convey.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Awareness of Context.** Teachers are encouraged to support learners in identifying code-meshed terms, in understanding the meaning of these terms in context, and in deciding whether changes need to be made.
2. **Lexical Depth and Editing Skills.** Teachers may teach the connotations of known words and their collocations, and may teach explicit editing strategies at the clause level. This will also help learners understand that editing is a skill in itself.
3. **Instruction Targeted to the Type of Term.** Instruction may be matched to the kind of term identified: attention to the depth of vocabulary knowledge for lack of vocabulary; translanguaging pedagogy and attention to the range of meaning and clause structure for translation; specific adjectives and their collocations in place of *very*; lessons on conciseness for pleonastic pairs and on completeness for incomplete clauses; and attention to register and ambiguity for clipped forms.
4. **Register-Specific and Clause-Level Materials.** Materials writers are encouraged to develop register-specific materials from the documented list of lexical items. Because categories may overlap within a sentence, exercises should invite learners to revise the whole clause and not merely to substitute individual items.
5. **Code Meshing as a Rhetorical Choice.** Learners should be shown that code meshing is a rhetorical decision, so that they understand that it is not a matter of mistake or correctness but a choice.
6. **Further Studies.** Future research may extend this study by applying code-meshing strategies to analyze other varieties of English and by examining alternative writing strategies, such as interaction and voice (Canagarajah, 2011). Studies may also be conducted on a larger scale, examining the code-meshing strategies of basic education learners or those used in administrative writing. To address the limitations of this study, future research should combine text analysis with stimulated recall to confirm the intentions of the writers, which would also help identify local and global errors more clearly. Finally, a comparative approach across different genres (e.g., personal narrative and expository writing) would help clarify how genre affects code meshing.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 4 Pages 4765-4786
ISSN: 3155-7546 (Online)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24339363

REFERENCES

Athon, A. (2019). Designing rubrics to foster students' diverse language backgrounds. *Journal of Basic Writing, 38*(1), 78–104. https://doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.2019.38.1.05

Bernardo, A. S., & Madrunio, M. R. (2015). A framework for designing a Philippine-English-based pedagogic model for teaching English grammar. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.59960/3.a3

Bolton, K., Cruz, P. 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

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(4), 586–619. https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc20065061

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Choi, J. (2021). Navigating tensions and leveraging identities: A young trilingual child's emerging language ideologies. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1964366

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.1967.5.1-4.161

Gonzales, G. C., & Machado, E. (2022). Taking the leap: Supporting multilingual writers through translanguaging. *The Reading Teacher, 75*(6), 685–692. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2097

Kalan, A. (2022). Negotiating writing identities across languages: Translanguaging as enrichment of semiotic trajectories. *TESL Canada Journal, 38*(2), 63–87.

Lee, A. Y., & Handsfield, L. J. (2018). Code-meshing and writing instruction in multilingual classrooms. *The Reading Teacher, 72*(2), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1688

Lee, M. E. (2013). Shifting to the World Englishes paradigm by way of the translingual approach: Code-meshing as a necessary means of transforming composition pedagogy. *TESOL Journal, 5*(2), 312–329. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.121

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

Quinto, J. B., Perillo, V. A. B., & Saldo, J. N. (2026). Deviant grammatical features of Philippine English: Acceptance among educated Philippine English users. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review, 6*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v6i1.5088

Tajeddin, Z., & Pakzadian, M. (2020). Representation of inner, outer and expanding circle varieties and cultures in global ELT textbooks. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 5*, Article 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00089-9

Tupas, T. R. F. (2004). The politics of Philippine English: Neocolonialism, global politics, and the problem of postcolonialism. *World Englishes, 23*(1), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2004.00334.x

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.