
Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

Liriolyn B. Pacursa¹, Marlon C. Etngay²

¹Quirino State University-Maddela Campus

²Mountain Province General High School

ABSTRACT: Majority of language teachers have long been concerned about multilingualism. More emphasis and research into the extent to which this problem exists among language teachers, as well as the positive and negative influence of this on the academic achievements of students, is required. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which multilingualism was used in the classrooms of both language teachers in junior and senior high schools and tertiary instructors, as well as to compare the differences in teachers' and instructors' practices and challenges faced when implementing multilingualism. It would also like to know if there is a significant difference in the extent of multilingual instruction used by respondents based on their age, teaching experience, and educational level.

The study revealed that most teachers, instructors, and professors' resort to practice multilingual teaching in the classroom with a qualitative description of "most of the time." And on the extent of the advantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents, the overall mean rating of 3.64 (sd = 0.86) has a qualitative description of "Very". In the meantime, respondents' perceptions of the extent of multilingual teaching disadvantages had a mean value of 3.43, with a qualitative description of "moderate." Furthermore, when the respondents are grouped by age, teaching experience, and educational attainment, the F-values for age, teaching experience, and educational attainment are 1.32, and 1.30, respectively, with significant values of 0.57, 0.27, and 0.87, which are all higher than 0.05, which suggests insignificance. Finally, on the significant difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching among respondents when grouped by subject taught and current employment, the t-values for subject taught and current employment are 0.33 and 0.17, respectively, with significance values of 0.74 and 0.86, which are higher than 0.05, indicating insignificance.

KEYWORDS: Advantages, Disadvantages, Extent, Filipino, Target Language, Multilingualism

I. INTRODUCTION

We live in a multilingual world in which new languages are formed, constantly adapted, and lost. A language may dominate for decades or even centuries, only to be consigned to history when the political paradigm changes. Some are stored and studied by interested scholars and other enthusiasts, but many are lost and forgotten. Few survive the onslaught of a language with a larger and/or more powerful group of speakers. Across nations and over the centuries, different languages have become dominant, due to their speakers' use in politics, commerce and/or various educational fields which transcend borders. They have taken on the role of a lingua franca to facilitate the sharing of information and discoveries in specialized fields such as mathematics, science, religion and history, making it necessary to learn them to become a member of the powerful community in areas such as politics and education. In these circumstances, people have sometimes yielded, or been forced to surrender to the pressure of the dominant language, while some have had to fight for the status and survival of their local and national languages.

Teaching of target language has often been a challenge to language teachers most especially in a country who uses English as foreign language and a second language which has been an important norm in schools in most countries, Wernicke (2018). More recently, researchers have begun to place a growing emphasis on the benefits of implementing teaching practices in the language classroom that draw on multilingualism as a resource, that is, multilingual teaching practices (MTPs) (García & Sylvan, 2011; Hall & Cook, 2012; Kirsch & Duarte, 2020). Attention has also turned towards exploring teachers as multilingual individuals in their own right (Canagarajah, 2017; Makalela, 2015), especially those teaching multiple languages (Aslan, 2015; Calafato, 2020b). Such teachers might draw on their and their students' multilingualism in significantly different ways than do those teaching only one foreign language, with this having significant implications for their students' learning. These developments come as rising levels of super-diversity (Spotti & Kroon, 2017) have led some countries to implement changes to their foreign language curricula for schools to promote multilingualism among younger generations and prepare them to navigate a globalized world, one where multilingualism is considered an asset (Liwinski, 2019; Wright et al., 2015).

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

Hence, the linguistic and cultural diversity in the Philippines brings much complexity to the issue of language policy in education. With more than 7000 islands and 181 distinct languages (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2013), the Philippines offers a challenging environment for implementing a language policy that can serve the whole country. Consequently, language policies for Philippines schools have fluctuated greatly over the last century with a different policy for nearly every generation. Until recently, the 1974 and 1987 Bilingual Education Policies determined the language of instruction in schools to be Filipino and English. This is despite the fact that about 80% of the population does not speak either of these as a first language. Meanwhile, on the study of Fennig (2013) he justifies the idea that in order to have a productive learning pedagogy or outcome it is important to value the students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds and encourage the use of their languages in the classroom which is really valuable in teaching and in the pedagogical practices. It can also boost students' confidence, help achieve learning goals, enhance academic performance and contribute to a greater awareness of other languages and cultures in the wider community by celebrating diversity and inclusion.

These ideas were also supported by the conclusions of following scholars like Kroll and Dussias (2017) wherein they stated that supporting multilingualism in the classroom can be a valuable pedagogical practice with positive effects on students' academic performance, as well as social and emotional well-being. Whether in a passive way by allowing students to use their home language, or a more active way by implementing teaching and learning practices that draw on more than one language "translanguaging" is one such pedagogy CUNY (2013), it is important to view all students' languages as resources rather than unwanted baggage on the way to "language of instruction only". Small pedagogical practices such as showing interest in, and valuing, students' linguistic and cultural resources can have many positive effects. Encouraging students to use their home languages to support group work, for example, means that students will be able to use already existing knowledge that would have remained invisible otherwise. Such practices can provide inclusive opportunities for deep learning and effective scaffolding towards building knowledge and developing language proficiencies.

The researchers were motivated by the aforementioned circumstances to learn more about the extent to which multilingualism is used in the classrooms by both language teachers in junior and senior high schools as well as tertiary instructors. It also provides a comparative look at the differences between teachers and instructors, as well as the difficulties they face when implementing multilingualism. It would also like to know if there is a significant difference in the extent to which multilingual instruction is implemented when they are classified by age, teaching experience, and educational attainment of the respondents. Furthermore, to see if there is a significant difference in the extent to which respondents have implemented multilingual instruction when grouped by subject taught and current employment.

II. RELATED STUDIES

Multilingualism, defined as the ability to utilize at least two languages to some level, or, as Linck et al. (2015) put it, "having some degree of proficiency in more than two languages," has not always been seen positively. Bilinguals, and especially multilinguals, were once thought to be at a disadvantage when compared to monolinguals. On the one hand, their brains were thought to have less room for other skills, such as math or creativity; on the other hand, their languages were thought to be only partially developed in comparison to monolinguals' single well-formed language (Baker 1988 as cited by Illman and Pietil, 2018). Monolingual bias, or the continual comparison of L2 competence to monolingual norms, has played a significant role in L2 research (Ortega, 2014).

Rather than considering multilingualism as a handicap, a more contemporary interpretation of the phenomenon sees it as a source of promise (Illman and Pietil, 2018). Linguistic diversity is viewed as a valuable resource, and increasing learners' knowledge of languages, their differences and similarities, is thought to aid language learning. As a result, new methods to multilingualism have arisen, with a particular emphasis on viewing an individual's languages as mutually interacting and so facilitating language learning. Two of the most prominent proponents of this holistic approach to language learning, Cenoz and Gorter (2011), emphasize that multilinguals and learners in the process of becoming multilinguals should not be viewed as imitation monolinguals in a second or additional language, but rather as possessing unique forms of competence, or competencies, in their own right.

Thus, the fundamental concept is to take into account all of the languages that a student is familiar with. In addition, rather than focusing on how a learner differs from a native speaker, the holistic approach focuses on what multilingual learners can do with their languages (Cenoz and Gorter, 2011).

Implementation of Multilingualism in the Classroom

More than half of the world's population speaks two or more languages on a daily basis, and a substantial body of research has shown that multilingualism has numerous advantages (Collins, 2018). It is still a contentious issue in many classrooms today that students speak languages other than the one being taught in the school. Students may come from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds in the classroom, speak one language at home and another at school, or be learning the language of

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

instruction (Taylor-Leech & Ollerhead, 2022). Multilingual education, according to UNICEF, UNESCO, and the European Commission, can play a significant role in engaging a diverse range of learners.

In the Philippines, MTB-MLE was established by the Department of Education (DepEd) in 2009 with the goal of encouraging students to utilize their mother tongue as a medium of instruction (MOI) in order to improve their learning (Dumanig, David & Symaco, 2012). The outcomes of the Lingua Franca Education Project (LFEP) of 1999 and the Lubuagan First Language Component led to the adoption of this strategy. The LFEP was a pilot program for Grade 1 (age 7) kids that aimed to "design and implement a nationwide bridging program from the vernacular to Filipino and later English to build beginning literacy for use in public schools" at the time (DECS Memo 144, p.1). Furthermore, the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) did a longitudinal study on the usage of mother tongue in an elementary school in Lubuagan, Kalinga Province, which revealed that students who attended classes in their mother tongue scored higher on tests (Dumatog & Dekker, 2003).

As a result of the introduction of MTB-MLE, a range of mother tongue languages have been employed as the medium of instruction in the first three years of primary school (Grades 1 to 3). In primary schools, 19 mother tongues are utilized as MOI out of 187 languages in the Philippines (Ethnologue, 2017). Aklanon, Bikol, Botolan Sambal, Chavacano, Hiligaynon, Ibanag, Ilokano, Ivatan, Kapampangan, Kinaray-a, Maguindanaon, Maranao, Pangasinan, Sinugbuanong Bisaya, Surigaonon, Tagalog, Tausug, Waray, and Yakan are among these (Dep ed., 2016). The teachers' knowledge of their students' need to express themselves in the language of their choosing, as well as their willingness to enable it, are all part of helping their students' identity-building process. In a study conducted by Soffronow (2015) in the Philippines, it was revealed that teachers encourage their students to express themselves orally in their mother tongue in their classrooms if they are unable to do so in English or Filipino. Furthermore, two of the teachers mentioned that they encourage students to write in their native language. The study further revealed that during class, the teachers translate the majority of the instructions from English to Cebuano, both orally and in writing. The teacher respondents described how they translated the Filipino language into English and Cebuano during Filipino lessons to ensure that all students understood the topic.

Soffronow (2015) further claims that in the Philippines, English is the target language and the students' mother tongue is viewed as a support language. When the students can comprehend the topic in English, the mother tongue is no longer regarded as necessary, and the teacher will stop using it. The four teachers who took part in the study all described comparable techniques of employing the students' native speech. In addition, due to a shortage of resources, the majority of written literature in the Public School is produced by the teachers themselves. This allows them to adapt the language to the topic they're presenting (Soffronow, 2015).

The current study, however, is unique in that it sought to: (a) determine the profile of the respondents in terms of age, years of service, educational attainment, and subject taught; (b) determine the extent of use of multilingualism in the classroom of both junior and senior high school teachers and tertiary instructors; and (c) determine the extent of the advantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents. ((d) determined the extent to which respondents perceived the disadvantages of multilingual teaching; (e) determined whether there was a significant difference in the extent to which respondents implemented multilingual teaching when grouped according to age, teaching experience, and educational attainment; and, finally, determined whether there was a significant difference in the extent to which respondents implemented multilingual teaching when grouped according to age, teaching experience, and educational attainment.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study utilized the descriptive-comparative design to gather information on the extent of used of Multilingualism in the classroom of both language teachers in JUNIOR and SENIOR HIGH and TERTIARY INSTRUCTORS. It provides also a comparative look at the differences between teachers 'and instructors practices and challenges experience while implementing multilingualism. Moreover, the respondents of the study were the instructors and teachers of the institutions of Quirino State University-Maddela Campus, Bintawan National High School and Mountain Province General Comprehensive High School. Furthermore, Purposive Sampling was used in choosing the participants. As such, these respondents were able to qualify to partake in the inquiry process.

Further, the researchers ensured that accurate data were gathered. As such, they utilized several instruments in collecting data, as follow:

A. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE ON RESPONDENTS PROFILE (PART 1)

The Teachers Demographic profile was gathered using an adopted and modified survey questionnaire specifically used for gathering the needed data in Demographic Data of Spannungsfeld zwischen Sprachwissen. (2014).) on their research study titled, "School language and the role of multilingualism in class". (see Appendix A for the PART 1 survey questionnaire);

B. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN ANSWERING THE RESEARCH

This was 30-item statement indicators divided into 10 per parts which are: (1) Using Multilingualism in the Classroom; (2) Advantages of Multilingual Teaching in the Classroom; and (3) Disadvantages of using Multilingualism Teaching in the

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

classroom. The aforementioned survey questionnaire was adopted and modified based on Erling's research. Et.al. (2017) in their study Multilingual classrooms: Opportunities and Challenges for English Medium Instruction in Low- and Middle-Income Contexts.

Its aims are to: (1) determine the extent of the advantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents; (2) determine the extent of the disadvantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents; (3) determine if there is a significant difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to age, teaching experience, and educational attainment; and (4) determine if there is a significant difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the In addition, a 5-point likert scale was utilized to respond to the following indicators: strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree nor agree, agree, and strongly agree. (see Appendix B for the (PART 2-survey questionnaire);

Additionally, the following were the procedures undertaken in the process of data gathering, to wit:

The researchers ask their respective heads and supervisors for permission to conduct their study at their school. Finally, in order to analyze and interpret the data, the following statistical tools were used: In determining the demographic profile of the respondents, a computation of mean percentages was done; In determining the extent of respondents' use of multilingual teaching in the classroom, computation of mean percentages was done; In determining the extent of the advantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents, computation of mean percentages was done; In giving the appropriate qualitative descriptions for individual items in the extent of advantages and disadvantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents, the following mean percent scale and qualitative descriptions were used: 1.50-2.49 (Slight); 2.5-3.49 (Moderate); 3.5-4.49 (Very); 4.5-5.0 (Extreme); In determining the extent of the disadvantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents, computation of mean percentages was done; ANOVA was used to determine the significant difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching among the respondents when grouped according to age, teaching experience, and educational attainment. And lastly, in determining the significant difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to subject taught and current employment, the T-Test was used.

IV. TABLE

I. PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

The profile of the respondents as presented herein includes age, years of service, educational attainment, subject taught, and current employment.

Age	Frequency	Percent
26-30 years old	20	37.7
31-35 years old	8	15.1
36-40 years old	9	17.0
41-45 years old	2	3.8
46-50 years old	11	20.8
51-55 years old	2	3.8
56-60 years old	1	1.9
Total	53	100.0
Years of Service	Frequency	Percent
1-5 years	13	24.5
6-10 years	22	41.5
11-15 years	7	13.2
16-20 years	3	5.7
21-25 years	7	13.2
more than 30 years	1	1.9
Total	53	100.0
Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
baccalaureate	16	30.2
master's degree earner	23	43.4
master's degree (finished)	9	17.0
doctor's degree (finished)	3	5.7
doctor's degree (unit earner)	2	3.8
Total	53	100.0
Subject Taught	Frequency	Percent

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

English	41	77.4
Filipino	12	22.6
Total	53	100.0
Type of Agency	Frequency	Percent
DEPED	49	92.5
CHED	4	7.5
Total	53	100.0

The table presents data on various demographic and professional characteristics of the respondents. In terms of age, the majority (37.7%, n=20) were in the 26-30 years age group, followed by those in the 46-50 years age range (20.8%, n=11). Regarding years of service, most respondents (41.5%, n=22) had been in the teaching profession for 6-10 years, with 24.5% (n=13) having served for 1-5 years. This indicates that a significant portion of the population has less than 10 years of experience in teaching. Regarding educational attainment, the largest group of respondents (43.4%, n=23) held a Master's degree, followed by those with a bachelor's degree (30.2%, n=16). Additionally, 17.0% (n=9) had completed their Master's degree, while 5.7% (n=3) had earned doctoral units, and 3.8% (n=2) had obtained a doctoral degree. These findings suggest that most respondents are focused on advancing their professional growth through higher education to become more productive, efficient, and knowledgeable teachers. In terms of the subject taught, the majority of respondents (77.4%, n=41) were English majors, while 22.6% (n=12) taught Filipino. This indicates a larger representation of English majors in the sample. Finally, concerning current employment, 92.5% (n=49) of the respondents were teachers in the Department of Education (DepEd), while 7.5% (n=4) were from the Commission on Higher Education (CHED).

II. The Extent of Implementation of Multilingual Teaching of the Respondents

Table 2 presents the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents

I. Indicator	Mean	Std. Deviation	qualitative description
1. Besides the target language in class, I use other languages.	4.23	1.23	most of the time
2. I use multilingual classes whenever I think my students have difficulty understanding the lesson.	3.54	1.57	most of the time
3. Even if the headteacher or principal conducts evaluations and observations, I do the discussion in the target language and other languages such as Iloco, Bontok, and so on.	4.17	0.92	most of the time
4. I use various languages as a medium of instruction to make it easier for students to learn and understand the lesson.	3.73	1.29	most of the time
5. I allow students the opportunity to express their reactions and questions about the lesson in a variety of languages, including Filipino and other vernacular languages.	3.96	1.45	most of the time
6. In answering the questions, I allow my students to use other languages they are familiar with, such as Filipino and other vernacular languages.	4.00	1.40	most of the time
7. I translate statements into a language that my students can understand when I need to explain complex topics.	3.50	1.54	most of the time
8. I allow my students to respond in multiple languages whenever a closed-ended or open-ended question is asked.	3.88	1.40	most of the time
9. To ensure that my students grasp the lesson, I also translate it into Filipino or another language to ensure that my students understand them.	3.67	1.53	most of the time
10. When I'm giving instructions, I use other languages besides the target language	4.00	1.20	most of the time
OVERALL	3.83	0.96	most of the time

The indicator "besides the target language in class, I use other languages." gained the highest mean score of 4.23 (sd=1.23) with "most of the time" as its qualitative description, followed by the indicator "Even if the headteacher or principal conducts evaluations and observations, I do the discussion in the target language and other languages such as Iloco, Bontok, and

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

so on..” with a mean score of 4.17 (sd=0.92) with “most of the time” as its qualitative description. In general, the overall mean score of 3.83 (sd=0.96) with “most of the time” as its qualitative description.

With these, it could be further inferred that even though that the subject has its own medium of instruction which is English or Filipino, most of the teachers/instructors/professors would resort to practice multilingual teaching because they do believe it would help ease the language barrier between the teacher and the student. Some students find it difficult to understand the concept of the lesson when the teacher will teach in pure english or filipino.

III. The Extent of Advantages of Multilingual Teaching as Perceived by the Respondents

Table 3 presents the extent of Advantage of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents.

Indicator	Mean	SD
1. Having a multilingual classroom can assist my students in understanding the lesson much better.	4.17	0.94
2. Translating the lessons into a vernacular language can improve the learning pedagogy.	3.81	0.86
3. In my classroom, I encourage my students to ask questions in a language other than English because it keeps them more interested.	3.38	0.97
4. Using multiple languages in class is acceptable since it encourages students to be more engaged and involved in class discussions.	3.62	0.93
5. It is mandatory to use terms that the students understand to retain the information and effectiveness of the lesson.	2.71	1.80
6. Language mixing in the classroom can contribute to a positive learning environment.	3.62	0.66
7. When I teach, I use the target language and other languages to help students enhance their comprehension skills	3.71	0.67
8. Language mixing should be permitted in schools because it enhances students' learning.	3.63	0.91
9. Other languages must also be allowed to be used as a medium of instruction. This will enable students to be more confident in asking questions when encountering vague concepts.	3.58	1.07
10. Language mixing can even encourage active supplementary language study, allowing students to maintain a connection to their mother tongue and culture.	3.71	1.02
Overall	3.64	0.86

Legend: 1.0-1.49(Not at all); 1.50-2.49(Slight); 2.5-3.49 (Moderate); 3.5-4.49 (Very); 4.5 - 5.0 (Extreme)

Based on the table, the respondents agreed to the following indicators “Having a multilingual classroom can assist my students in understanding the lesson much better.”; “Translating the lessons into a vernacular language can improve the learning pedagogy.”; “Using multiple languages in class is acceptable since it encourages students to be more engaged and involved in class discussions.”; “Language mixing in the classroom can contribute to a positive learning environment.” ; “When I teach, I use the target language and other languages to help students enhance their comprehension skills”; “Language mixing should be permitted in schools because it enhances students' learning.”; “Other languages must also be allowed to be used as a medium of instruction. This will enable students to be more confident in asking questions when encountering vague concepts.”; and “Language mixing can even encourage active supplementary language study, allowing students to maintain a connection to their mother tongue and culture.”. Out of the 10 advantages of multilingual teaching listed there were 7 indicators that were marked “Very” and 3 indicators were marked “moderate”. The overall mean rating of 3.64 (sd=0.86) has a qualitative description “Very”

With these, it could be furthered inferred that majority of the language teachers believe that multilingual teaching is more effective in delivering the lesson. Using language other than the target language in teaching will encourage students to participate in the class discussion.

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

IV. The Extent of Disadvantages of Multilingual Teaching as Perceived by the Respondents

Table 4. The extent of disadvantages of multilingual teaching as perceived by the respondents

Indicator	Mean	SD
1.Using another language in the same lesson is confusing.	2.90	0.98
2.Because of the multilingual class, students will be unable to use the target language (English or Filipino) effectively.	3.44	1.09
3. Due to the use of many languages in the classroom, students tend to be more reliant on their native tongue than the target language.	3.65	1.15
4. Students grew lazier in using the target language since they were completely dependent on the teacher's translation.	3.46	1.04
5.Students tend to use the vernacular language more frequently and informally during class hours.	3.69	1.08
6.As a result, students have a lesser chance of effectively mastering the target language.	3.56	1.16
7. Due to a lack of English or Filipino functional literacy, the majority of students have difficulty with academic writing	3.87	1.09
8.Students cannot improve their academic writing skills since they learn using words from their native language.	3.37	1.10
9.Language teachers' competence to communicate in the target language would be affected by multilingualism.	3.56	1.06
10.As a result of having a multilingual class, student comprehension of the target language will worsen.	3.08	1.04
OVERALL	3.43	1.07

Legend: 1.0-1.49(Not at all); 1.50-2.49(Slight); 2.5-3.49 (Moderate); 3.5-4.49 (Very); 4.5 - 5.0 (Extreme)

The following indicators were marked “agree” by the respondents: “Due to the use of many languages in the classroom, students tend to be more reliant on their native tongue than the target language.”; “Students tend to use the vernacular language more frequently and informally during class hours.”; “As a result, students have a lesser chance of effectively mastering the target language.”; “Due to a lack of English or Filipino functional literacy, the majority of students have difficulty with academic writing”; and “Language teachers' competence to communicate in the target language would be affected by multilingualism.” Out of the 10 disadvantages listed as indicators, half or 5 indicators were marked “very” by the respondents and the rest of the indicators were marked “moderate”. Therefore, it can be implied that the respondents believe that there are more benefits in practicing multilingual education compared to its disadvantages.

V. Significant Difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to age, teaching experience, and educational attainment

Table 5. Significant Difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to age, teaching experience, and educational attainment

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
age	Between Groups	5.82	5.00	1.16	0.79	0.57
	Within Groups	68.18	47.00	1.48		
	Total	74.00	51.00			

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

teaching experience	Between Groups	5.83	5.00	1.17	1.32	0.27
	Within Groups	41.64	47.00	0.89		
	Total	47.47	52.00			
educational attainment	Between Groups	1.17	4.00	0.29	0.30	0.87
	Within Groups	46.30	48.00	0.96		
	Total	47.47	52.00			

Table 5 presents the Significant Difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to age, teaching experience, and educational attainment as assessed through the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The F-value which corresponds to age, teaching experience and educational attainment are .79, 1.32, and .30 with significance values .57, 0.27 and 0.87 which is all higher than the 0.05 which suggest insignificance. The findings imply that regardless of age, teaching experience and educational attainment the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching doesn't differ in any of the given profile variables.

VI. Significant Difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to subject taught and current employment

Table 6. Significant Difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to subject taught and current employment

Subject Taught	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
English	3.85	0.76	0.12	.33	0.74
Filipino	3.75	1.48	0.43		
Current Employment	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
DEPED	3.84	0.99	0.14	0.17	0.86
CHED	3.75	0.50	0.25		

Table 6 presents the Significant Difference in the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching of the respondents when grouped according to subject taught and current employment as assessed through T-test. The t-value which corresponds to subject taught and current employment are: 0.33 and 0.17 with significance values of 0.74 and 0.86 which higher than the 0.05 which suggests insignificance. These findings would imply that the extent of implementation of multilingual teaching is not significantly different regardless of the subject taught and the current employment.

V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the study, the following are drawn:

The majority (37.7%) of the respondents were between the ages of 26 and 30 years old, with those aged 46 to 50 years old coming second at 20.8%. In terms of years of service, most respondents (41.5%) had been teaching for 6 to 10 years, followed by those with 1 to 5 years of experience (24.5%). Regarding educational attainment, the majority of respondents held a Master's degree (43.4%), with Bachelor's degree holders at 30.2%. Additionally, 17.0% had completed their Master's degree, 5.7% had earned doctoral units, and 3.8% had completed their Doctorate. When it came to the subjects taught, 77.4% were English majors, while 22.6% taught Filipino. Concerning the implementation of multilingual teaching in the classroom, the respondents had a mean score of 3.83 (SD = 0.96), indicating that most of the time, teachers incorporated multilingual teaching strategies to help bridge language barriers, especially when students struggle to understand lessons taught solely in English or Filipino. The overall mean rating for the perceived benefits of multilingual teaching was 3.64 (SD = 0.86), with a qualitative description of "Very," reflecting that most language teachers believe multilingual teaching improves lesson delivery and encourages student participation in discussions. However, the respondents rated the disadvantages of multilingual teaching at a mean of 3.43, suggesting a moderate perception of its drawbacks. Further analysis on the significant differences in the implementation of multilingual teaching, based on age, teaching experience, educational attainment, subject taught, and current employment, showed no

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

significant differences, as the F-values and t-values were all above the 0.05 threshold for significance. This implies that the extent of multilingual teaching implementation does not vary significantly with these profile variables.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE WORKS:

Meanwhile, the following recommendations were developed: First, language teachers should be aware of the negative impact of excessive use of multilingualism in the classroom most of the time: Second, students' academic performance should be continuously monitored and evaluated to ensure academic commitment to their studies: Third, regardless of what language is used, a variety of teaching pedagogues should be used to engage students in class discussions, and productive pedagogues should be used, and effective and relevant instructional materials should be developed to encourage students to participate in class discussions and listen attentively, even if teachers will be using the target language (English) as the medium of instruction, especially for higher year levels such as senior high. Finally, even though they will be reducing the use of multilingualism in the classroom, teachers should regularly assess their students' academic performance and give them relevant courses or orientation on how to comfortably cope with their teaching.

Furthermore, developing and educating language teachers are highly essential aspects in achieving multilingualism practices in education. This can be accomplished by giving additional training and seminars for both English and Filipino language teachers in respective institutions. There should also be the development of translation bodies supported by linguistic experts to assist in the translation of both Lingua Franca and other vernacular languages as well as the target language. This can also be used to foster the formation of bodies of language teachers to do additional research or studies, as well as to improve multilingualism practices in education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers would like to express their gratitude to the administrations of Quirino State University, Bintawan National High School, and Mountain Province General Comprehensive High School for allowing them to conduct their research, as well as the participants for their cooperation and support.

The researchers express their heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to their families for their unconditional love, generosity, moral and financial support.

REFERENCES

- 1) Alberto, R., Gabinete, S., & Raaola, V. (2016). Issues and Challenges in Teaching Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education in Grades II and III: The Philippine Experience. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2768558>
- 2) Alex. (2016). Language In Society – Multilingualism As Both A Problem And Resource - English Resource. Retrieved January 9, 2022, from Tutorhunt.com website: <https://www.tutorhunt.com/resource/19445/>
- 3) Cenoz, J. and D. Gorter. (2015). 'Towards a holistic approach' in J. Cenoz and D. Gorter (eds.). *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 4) Collins, C. (2018, September 3). Multilingualism in the classroom: why and how it should be encouraged - Living Languages. Retrieved January 9, 2022, from Living Languages website: <https://tinyurl.com/4hfawksf>
- 5) Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- 6) Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- 7) Department of Education (2016). Mother Tongue-based learning makes lessons more interactive and easier for students. Retrieved from <http://deped.gov.ph/press-releases/mother-tongue-based-learning-makes-lessons-more-interactive-and-easier-students>
- 8) Dumanig, F. (2019). *Bilingualism and Multilingualism in Primary Education (Philippines)*. DOI 10.5040/9781474209472.0016
- 9) Dumanig, F., David, M.K., and Symaco, L. (2012). Competing Roles of the National Language and English in Malaysia and the Philippines: Planning, Policy, and Use. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 1(2):104-115.
- 10) Dumatog, R and Dekker, D (2003), *First language education in Lubuagan, Northern Philippines*, Manila: SIL International http://www.sil.org/asia/ldc/parallel_papers/dumatog_and_dekker.pdf
- 11) *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. (2017). The Philippines. Retrieved from ethnologue.com.
- 12) Erling, Et.al. (2017). Multilingual classrooms: opportunities and challenges for English medium instruction in low- and middle-income contexts. *Open Access Journal*.
- 13) García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Basil/Blackwell.

Multilingualism: Teachers Implementation in the Four Corners of the Room

- 14) Illman, V., & Pietilä, P. (2018). Multilingualism as a resource in the foreign language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(3), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx073>
- 15) Linck, J., E. Michael, E. Golonka, A. Twist and J. W. Schwieter. (2015). 'Moving beyond two languages: the effects of multilingualism on language processing and language learning' in J. W. Schwieter (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingual Processing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 16) Ortega, L. (2014). 'Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA' in S. May (ed.). *The Multilingual Turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. London: Routledge.
- 17) Okal, B. (2014, January 1). Benefits of Multilingualism in Education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 2(3): 223-229, DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2014.02030
- 18) Soffronow, M. (2015). *Multilingual Classrooms: A study of four Filipino teachers' experiences*.
- 19) Spannungsfeld zwischen Sprachwissen. (2014). *School language and the role of multilingualism in class*. Publisher: htw saar Saarbrücken Editors: T. Tinnefeld.
- 20) Taylor-Leech, K., & Ollerhead, S. (2022). Promoting multilingual approaches in teaching and learning | Unesco IIEP Learning Portal. Retrieved January 9, 2022, from Unesco.org website: <https://tinyurl.com/24pvsa5d>
- 21) Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 9, George Washington University. Accessible on: <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/effectiveness>
- 22) Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (2002). *Reforming educational policies for English language learners means better schools for all*. *The States Educational Standard* (3: 1) (The quarterly journal of the National Association of State Boards of Education, Alexandria, Virginia).
- 23) Trent, E. (2013, October 29). The benefits of multilingual education | The Tech. Retrieved January 9, 2022, from The Tech website: <https://thetech.com/2013/10/29/trent-v133-n49>
- 24) Tupas, R. (2008). Bourdieu, historical forgetting, and the problem of English in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies*, 56 (1), 46-67.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.