



PHILIPPINE NORMAL UNIVERSITY
The National Center for Teacher Education

POLICY BRIEF SERIES

VOLUME 8 | ISSUE 9 | 2024

PRINT ISSN: 2984-9063

ONLINE ISSN: 2984-9071

Evaluation of the Mother Tongue Based Multilingual Education Policy

Niña Christina L. Zamora, Ma. Jhona B. Acuña, Heidi B. Macahilig, Mark Ponce C. San Juan, Red Honeylee G. Valencia



Photos taken during the FGDs with Key Stage 1 Teachers of DepEd Bicol and DepEd Bukidnon

The implementation and integration of the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education was a significant shift from the bilingual system in the Philippines. The MTB MLE Language Policy aimed to use mother tongue as the mode of instruction for Key Stage 1 (K – 3) learners. However, its rollout faced challenges due to several factors which were identified by this research. Through qualitative descriptive design for an in-depth, detailed, and comprehensive analysis and assessment of the MTB MLE Policy, the Thematic analysis of the data identified three themes namely: Challenges and Issues in MTBMLE (Mother Tongue Based Multilingual Education), Teacher Training and Pedagogical Knowledge, and Cultural and Social Consideration which reflected the experiences of Key Stage 1 teacher-participants that will serve as input for policy formulation and implementation.

Recommended Citation:

Zamora, et.al. (2024). Evaluation of the Mother Tongue Based Multilingual Education Policy. *Policy Brief Series* 8 (9), pp. 1-7. Philippine Normal University Educational Policy Research and Development Office.



PNU Educational Policy Research and Development Office
(+632) 317-1768 loc 750 | eprdo@pnu.edu.ph | www.pnuresearchportal.org

Introduction

The Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE) initiative in the Philippines, is a significant shift from the Bilingual System towards the use of the mother tongue. The policy, implemented in 2009 (DepEd Order 74) and 2012 (DepEd Order No.16), mandates the use of the mother tongue as the primary medium of instruction from kindergarten to the third grade to facilitate the smooth transition to Filipino and English while preserving linguistic heritage and addressing the language diversity in language inclusive learning settings. The approach is based on research showing that children learn best when taught in a familiar language (Cummins, 2001; Lartec et. al, 2014; Estremera, 2017) by incorporating culturally responsive pedagogies and materials, incorporating indigenous knowledge systems, local traditions, and community resources. The integration of the MTBMLE in the K-12 Curriculum covers language development, cognitive development, academic development, and sociocultural awareness. Gempeso and Mendez (2021) explain that L1 is mandated to be continuously used as MOI in a transition or bridging process through grade three; L2 shall be introduced in the first semester of grade one and have the four macro skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) continuously developed from grades two to six; and, L3 shall be introduced during the second semester of grade one and the four macro skills shall be integrated and developed starting from grade two until grade six.

However, the successful rollout of the MTBMLE policy in the Philippines faces challenges that concern the lack of standardized orthographies, inadequate teacher training, limited culturally appropriate materials, and assessment among others have hindered its successful implementation (Espino, Gonzales, & Martin; 2021)..

The MTB MLE Language Policy

Several studies, such as the Lingua Franca Project (1999-2001) and the Lubuagan Project (1999-present), led the government to initiate policies that will connect the learners from their native tongue to other languages – Filipino and English (Dekker & Walter, 2011). Executive Order # 74 Series of 2009, institutionalized MTB MLE in the Philippines. This was strengthened by the approval of Republic Act 10533 in 2013 which states that the learner’s first language is the language of instruction from kindergarten through grade 6. Filipino and English were to be taught as second languages from grade 1 which gradually increased from grades 4-6. Senate Bill 3286 was also passed in 2013 instructing the Department of Education to implement the MTB MLE policy.

One of the MTB MLE language policy's main goals is to have an impact on the learners in the four domains of child development, thus, incorporating it into the K–12 Basic Education Program.

The four domains include linguistic development, cognitive growth, academic development, and social awareness. Goldstein and Naglieri (2011) define language development as "a higher-level cognitive skill involving auditory and oral abilities in humans to communicate verbally about individuals' wants and needs". It provides a solid foundation for academic success which is influenced by environmental, biological, and neurological factors. Cognitive development refers to the mental processes and abilities involved in acquiring knowledge, understanding concepts, solving problems, and processing information. One key aspect of cognitive development includes higher order thinking skills (HOTS), which are classified according to various learning taxonomies such as Bloom's taxonomy. Under HOTS, critical thinking is the process of actively and skillfully assessing and interpreting information, arguments, and evidence to form reasoned judgments and make well-informed decisions (Watson, 2017). Academic growth is the progress and development that students achieve in their academic tasks over time. It involves literacy, numeracy, critical thinking, problem-solving, and subject-specific competencies to be mastered in all learning areas. Sociocultural awareness refers to the recognition, understanding, and appreciation of the cultural, social, and historical factors that mold individuals, groups, and societies. In the multilingual classroom, the teacher develops the awareness of the students to their cultural backgrounds, beliefs, values, customs, and traditions which influence the students’ behaviors.

In the implementation of the policy, DepEd provided guidelines in the implementation of Mother Tongue (L1). Gempeso and Mendez (2021) explain that “ L1 is mandated to be constantly used as the MOI during a transition or Bridging method through grade three; L2 shall be introduced in the first semester of grade one, and have the four macro skills (hearing, speaking, reading, and writing) been constantly strengthened since grades two to six; and, L3 shall be introduced during the second semester of grade one and the fourth” (D.O. No. 28, Section 2013, DepEd, 2013).

Methodology

The research used the qualitative descriptive design to provide an in-depth, detailed, and comprehensive description to attain the study's objectives. It systematically described, analyzed, and assessed the MTB MLE policy as an input to policy formulation



and its implementation. In particular, it described the experiences and perceptions of the Key Stage 1 teachers on MTB MLE. Data on the teacher’s attitudes and beliefs, pedagogies, and professional development were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews, and focused group discussions. Preset questions were prepared to serve as interview guides to determine focus. With prompts, participants were asked to reconstruct significant experiences in conducting their lessons and thoughts on the implementation of MTB MLE.

Data were analyzed utilizing thematic analysis to identify the trends, patterns, and relationships of the various codes (Braun & Clark, 2006). To make sense of the data, interview results were transcribed, coded, and categorized to determine the emergence of themes. Coding the interview transcripts gained the following categories: a) challenges and issues in MTBMLE implementation; b) teacher training and pedagogy; c) cultural views in teaching MTB MLE. To be more efficient, the MAX Qualitative Data Analysis (MAXQDA) tool was used in managing and analyzing qualitative data effectively.

Results and Discussion

The thematic analysis enabled the identification of the themes in this study that reflect the experiences of the Key Stage 1 teacher-participants. The table below shows the teacher-participants’ understandings, perspectives, and challenges in implementing MTBMLE.

Table 1. Summary of Themes

1.	Challenges and Issues in MTBMLE
2.	Teacher Training and Pedagogical Knowledge
3.	Cultural and Social Consideration

Aiming to improve the foundations of basic education in the Philippines, MTBMLE has been initiated to improve the learning outcomes of students particularly, in the Key Stage 1. In its implementation, MTBMLE faces a multitude of challenges and issues in its effectiveness and inconsistencies. In the table below, the teacher-participants identified the challenges and issues they have experienced.

Sub-theme 1. Teacher training and reduction of competencies

The issue of teachers’ inadequacy of MTB MLE training and the reduction poses significant challenges to its effective implementation in Key Stage 1. The challenge comes from

limited resources, inadequate teacher preparation, and given priorities to teachers in performing their jobs. Moreover, teachers are expected to be proficient both in the mother tongue of their learners and the language of instruction. This proficiency will effectively convey concepts, facilitate instructions easily, and give support to the students.

Most schools in remote areas lack resources that constrain the teachers to attend professional development opportunities for training in pedagogy and curriculum development. This results in inadequate teacher preparations to effectively implement MTB MLE approaches and methodologies in the classroom.

Sub-theme 2. Limited implementation and misconceptions

This sub-theme captures the misconceptions about the effectiveness and purpose surrounding MTB MLE policy. The limited resources and funding for instructional materials and teacher training constraints hinder the implementation of MTBMLE.

Moreover, inconsistencies in policy implementation are evident at the local and regional levels. Misconceptions about the MTBMLE’s effectiveness, relevance, and impact on academic outcomes contribute to the resistance of various stakeholders as reflected in the response,

Furthermore, the limited awareness and advocacy efforts on the benefits of MTBMLE contribute to its limited implementation.

Sub-theme 3. Transition and bridging issues

This sub-theme focuses on the lack of a bridging system from L1 to L2 and transition to English. The transition process is critical considering the development of cognitive and linguistic abilities of the learners in the foundation years of learning. This transition involves the gradual shift in instructing the learners in their mother tongue to proficiency in the second language and English guaranteeing learning.

Sub-theme 4. Curriculum development and assessment

The lack of training and support for teachers to observe principles and practices in MTBMLE instruction in the curriculum is essential. Designing the MTBMLE curriculum is a challenge for teachers to accommodate learners with linguistic diversity ensuring that they comprehend lessons in each classroom. How the curriculum was designed, the limited resources and the use of the mother tongue in assessment have also been problems for the teachers.

Sub-theme 5: Cultural development and building nationalism



Relevant to cultural development and building nationalism, MTBMLE initiatives promote the linguistic heritage of the learners. It shapes the learner's identities towards their cultural identities and builds nationalism through their language.

Conclusions

The implementation of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education in the Philippines faces various challenges and issues that need to be resolved. These are interrelated issues and barriers such as pedagogical knowledge and teacher preparation, curriculum development and assessment, cultural development and social considerations, misconceptions about MTB MLE, transitioning from L1 to L2, to L3, and competency reduction of teachers. However, efforts are needed to address the implementation challenges to ensure its role in achieving the goals in the Key Stage 1 goals and objectives.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

To achieve the goal of MTBMLE, it is highly recommended that certain actions be taken:

Comprehensive teacher training. Teachers must be provided with professional development opportunities to understand the principles of MTBMLE, enhance their pedagogical knowledge and skills, and develop their language proficiency about the L1 of the learners.

Ongoing curricular review and adaptation. Align the curriculum to the local contexts, assessments, and language development objectives. Value the feedback from stakeholders to make the curriculum relevant and engaging to the learners. Incorporate the local traditions into the curriculum.

Production of quality instructional materials. The government should make available high-quality teaching materials, books, and supplementary materials in the various mother-tongue languages for more culturally and linguistically appropriate materials.

Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. A systematic collection of data on student performance outcomes, teacher performance, resource utilization, and support systems must be in place as input for improvement.

Policy support and advocacy. Provide clear guidelines for policy implementation.

Acknowledgement

National Research Council of the Philippines as the funding agency of the project.



References:

- CHED Memorandum Order No. 74, s. 2017 Retrieved from <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CMO-No.-74-s.-2017.pdf>
- Chow P., & Cummins J. (2003). "Valuing multilingual and multicultural approaches to learning," in *Multilingual Education in Practice: Using Diversity as a Resource* eds Schecter S. R., Cummins J. (Portsmouth, NH:Heinemann;) 32–61
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Bilingual Children's Mother Tongue: Why Is It Important for Education?* Retrieved March 25, 2015 from: http://www15.gencat.net/pres_casa_llengues/uploads/articles/Bilinguall%20Childrens%20Mother%20Tongue.pdf
- Durgunoğlu, A. Y., & Verhoeven, L. (Eds.). (1998). *Literacy development in a multilingual context: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Enhanced Basic Education Act. In <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>
- Estremera, Michael & Marinas,. (2017). *The Implementation of Mother Tongue -Based Multilingual Education: Viewing it from the Grade III Teachers' Perspective*.
- Lartec, Jane & Belisario, Anastacia & Bendanillo, Jamaica & Binas-o, Hanni & Bucang, Novfirst & Cammagay, Jan. (2014). *Strategies and Problems Encountered by Teachers in Implementing Mother Tongue-Based Instruction in a Multilingual Classroom*. IAFOR Journal of Language Learning. 1. 10.22492/ijll.1.1.04.
- The World Bank. (2021). *Loud and Clear: Effective Language of Instruction Policies For Learning*. Retrieved from <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/517851626203470278/pdf/Effective-Language-of-Instruction-Policies-for-Learning.pdf>
- Trudell, B. (2007). *Local community perspectives and language of education in sub-Saharan African communities*. *International journal of Education Development*
- Tupas, R. (2014). *Inequalities of multilingualism: challenges to mother tongue-based multilingual education*. *Language and Education*, 29, 2, 112-124.
- UNESCO. (2009). *Mother tongue-based Literacy Programmes: Case Studies of Good Practice in Asia*. Retrieved March 9, 2015 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001517/151793e.pdf>
- Winfield, Lukas, (2016). "The Thai-Lao Mother Tongue: Teacher Needs, Competencies, and Conditions for Effective Instruction". *Master's Capstone Projects*. 181. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie_capstones/181
- Zauche, L., Thul, T., Mahoney, A., & Stapel-Wax, J. (2016). *Influence of language nutrition on children's language and cognitive development: An integrated review*. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, Vol. 36
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Nelson, K. (1996, 2012) *Language in Cognitive Development Emergence of the Mediated Mind*. Cambridge University Press
- Roberts, C. (1994). *Transferring literacy skills from L1 to L2: From theory to practice*. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, Vol. 13
- Ochi, Y. (2009). *The Role of L1 in Facilitating L2 Production*. *Interpreting and Translation Studies (Japan Association for Interpreting and Translation Studies)*, No.9. pages 123-140.
- Zhang, D., & Koda, K. (2008). *Contributions of L1 reading sub-skills to L2 reading development in English as a foreign language among school-aged learners*. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, Vol 4 No 1
- Dutcher, N. (2001) *Expanding Educational Opportunity in Linguistically Diverse Societies*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED466099>
- UNESCO GEM Report 2016 <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000243713>
- Issue Briefs. UNESCO Learning Portal. Retrieved from: <https://learningportal.iiep.unesco.org/en/issue-briefs/improve-learning/language-of-instruction> November 3, 2022
- UNICEF. (2016). *The impact of language policy and practice on children's learning: Evidence from Eastern and Southern Africa*. <https://www.unicef.org/esa/sites/unicef.org/esa/files/2018-09/UNICEF-2016-Language-and-Learning-FullReport.pdf>
- Ball, J. (2011). *Enhancing Learning of Children from Diverse Language Backgrounds: Mother Tongue-based Bilingual or Multilingual Education in Early Childhood and Primary School years*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Benson, C. (2016). *Addressing Language of Instruction Issues in Education: Recommendations for Documenting*. Background paper prepared for the 2016 Global Education Monitoring



Report, Education for people and planet: Creating sustainable futures for all.

Bühmann, D., & Trudell, B. (2007). *Mother Tongue Matters: Local Language as a key to Effective Learning*. Paris: UNESCO.

Pinnock, H. (2009). *Language and Education: The Missing Link. How the Language Used in Schools Threatens the Achievement of Education for All*. Berkshire: CfBT Education Trust. London: Save the Children.

USAID. (2015). *Planning for Language Use in Education: Best Practices and Practical Steps for Improving Learning*. EdData II Briefer. Washington DC: United States Agency for International Development.

Bruner, J. S. (1978). The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R., J. Jarvella, and W. J.M. Levelt (eds.) *The Child's Concept of Language*. New York: Springer-Verlag

Goodluck, H. (1991). *Language acquisition: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell

McLeod, S. A. (2015). Jean Piaget. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/piaget.html (January 14, 2016)

Saxton, M. (2010). *Child Language: Acquisition and Development*. SAGE

Tomasello, M. (2005). *Constructing a language*. Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Britannica. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/policy-analysis> November 3, 2022

Philippine Constitution, Republic Acts retrieved from: <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph> November 3, 2022

Department of Education, DepEd and DECS Orders retrieved from <https://www.deped.gov.ph> November 3, 2022

Commission on Higher Education CMOs retrieved from: <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph> November 3, 2022

Ma. Jhona B. Acuña is a professor and the current Associate Dean of the Faculty of Languages and Literature at the Philippine Normal University

Niña Christina L. Zamora is a professor in Filipino in the College of Advanced Studies at the Philippine Normal University

Heidi B. Macahilig is a professor and the current Director of the Educational Policy Research and Development Office at the Philippine Normal University

Mark Ponce C. San Juan is a graduate student pursuing Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction and a Research Assistant of the Educational Policy Research and Development Office at the Philippine Normal University

Red Honeylee G. Valencia is an instructor at Cavite State University – Imus Campus and a graduate student pursuing Master of Arts in Educational Assessment and Evaluation at the Philippine Normal University

About the Authors

The PNU Educational Policy Research, and Development Office



PNU Educational Policy Research and Development Office
(+632) 317-1768 loc 750 | eprdc@pnu.edu.ph | www.pnuresearchportal.org

The EPRDO is a specialized research center in the University focused on policy research and studies on teacher education. It is established to provide research-based policy recommendations to policy makers. It also serves as the clearing house for all data relevant to teacher education in the Philippines and beyond.

Vision

The Philippine Normal University through the EPRDO aims to be an innovation hub of teacher education research and educational policy studies.

Mission

To strengthen the culture of excellence in teacher education research and educational policy studies.

Objectives

The EPRDO shall manage the University's research production, enhance human resource capabilities, and share expertise to other Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in the area of teacher education research

Strategies

1. Establish and maintain a web-based university research portal that facilitates automated research management systems, and which also serves as the database of teacher education policies and teacher education research in the country and Southeast Asia.
2. Share research expertise and competence in teacher education research with other TEIs throughout the country;
3. Develop and disseminate the University research agenda
4. Design and implement the research capability program for faculty and staff;
5. Manage University's research production particularly the conduct of educational policy studies in education and teacher education; and
6. Serve as the implementing arm for research incentives and research ethics review.

Values

SYNERGY (Working collaboratively as a team)

EFFICIENCY (Delivering research services efficiently)

EXCELLENCE (Achieving high quality research outputs)

PRODUCTIVITY (increasing research production of the University)

The **Policy Brief Series** aims to provide observations, analyses, and insights by PNU faculty and researchers on various educational policy issues. The views contained in the policy

briefs are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the University.

The **Policy Brief Series** is published monthly by the **Philippine Normal University Educational Policy Research and Development Office** (PNU-EPRDO). The PNU-EPRDO oversees the editing, compiling, and printing of the policy brief.

Editors

Special Term, SY 2023-2024

Heidi B Macahilig, PhD

Director

Allen A Espinosa, PhD

Nikolee Marie A Serafico-Reyes, PhD

Arlyne C Marasigan, PhD

Fellows

Bhejay L. Molera

Seth R. de Guia

Support Staff

Address

Room 205, Pedro Orata Hall

Philippine Normal University, Manila, Philippines 1000

<https://www.facebook.com/pnueprdo>



PNU Educational Policy Research and Development Office

(+632) 317-1768 loc 750 | eprdc@pnu.edu.ph | www.pnuresearchportal.org