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ABSTRACT

Like many of its South East Asian neighbours, the Philippines is characterised by individual and collective multilingualism, being home to over 180 individual languages (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2013, p. 25). Unlike its neighbours, however, the Philippines is the first nation in the region to legislate and implement Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE) nationally. As such, the Philippines represents a valuable example for other countries as they attempt to develop language-in-education policy and put it into practice.

Employing grounded theory case study methodology, this dissertation examines Filipino MTB MLE policies and their implementation in Mindanao, one of the most remote and linguistically diverse regions of the country. Through policy analysis and semi-structured interviews with key informants, this study presents findings for three key research questions which evolved through the study. This study has not tested the validity of MTB MLE as an educational alternative, which is well proven in the literature. Instead, the concern of this research was to determine the level of support the current MTB MLE policies have created for MTB MLE in the Philippines, the challenges which have been encountered in the implementation of these policies, as well as the aids which have facilitated implementation.

The findings suggest that the policy environment present in the Philippines is indeed supportive, and existing policies are approved by key stakeholders involved in MTB MLE implementation. A number of challenges were identified, which risk the successful implementation of MTB MLE in Mindanao. The most common challenges cited by informants and supported by the literature were the lack of teacher training provided and the difficulties in producing appropriate learning materials. Conversely, a number of aids to implementation were found; the most important of these being support from groups outside of the government such as NGOs, HEIs, community members, teachers and principals. Four key recommendations were drawn from these findings, and include developing a supportive political environment for MTB MLE, focusing on training at the local level, extending partnerships and ensuring sufficient start-up funding is available.

The recommendations presented in this study of the Philippines may inform the design and implementation of new national MTB MLE policies in other countries, as well as in the scale up of the Filipino program.
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# Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APIS</td>
<td>Annual Poverty Indicators Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECS</td>
<td>Department of Education, Culture and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DepEd</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Department of Education Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Dominant Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Implementing Rules and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1, L2, etc</td>
<td>First Language, Second Language, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI</td>
<td>Language of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB MLE</td>
<td>Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDL</td>
<td>Non-dominant Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEDA</td>
<td>National Economic Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP</td>
<td>Philippines Peso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Republic Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

The Philippines is home to over 180 individual languages (Lewis, et al., 2013, p. 25), with most citizens speaking three or more languages. The Philippines is not alone in its linguistic plurality; almost all of its South East Asian neighbours may be characterised by individual and collective multilingualism. Unfortunately, education systems in these countries do not always reflect their rich linguistic diversity. Education in the Philippines, as in many other multilingual countries, is traditionally delivered exclusively in an official or colonial language for political, ideological and practical reasons. However, the delivery of basic education programs in a student's second language, rather than their mother tongue, has been linked to educational under-achievement, poor literacy development and high dropout rates (eg. Benson, 2005b; Lewis & Lockheed, 2006; Pinnock, 2009; Rosenthal, Baker, & Ginsburg, 1983).

In response, many Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and other community based organisations in South East Asia, including Timor-Leste, Cambodia, Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam (Kosonen & Young, 2009; Taylor-Leech, 2011; UNESCO, 2007b) are experimenting with Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE) as an alternative to traditional school systems. The Philippines, however, is the only South East Asian nation to adopt national policy requiring MTB MLE in all public and private schools across the country. As such, the Philippines represents a valuable example for other countries as they look to turn language-in-education policy into practice.

The Filipino government, through the Department of Education (DepEd), has enacted a number of policies in recent years which are pertinent to MTB MLE; most notably the DepEd Order 74 Institutionalizing Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (2009). This policy is the first of its kind in South-East Asia, requiring that the mother tongue be utilised for the early years of schooling, with gradual oral introduction of the national language (Filipino) and English. National implementation of the policy into public schools began in the 2012-13 school year, after an initial bridging period of three years while materials were developed and teachers trained. Now coming into its third year of implementation, it is appropriate that research be undertaken into the manner of this implementation in order to determine both the drivers and barriers to successful MTB MLE education.

The present study will attempt to do just that: utilising both primary and secondary data, this study will analyse the policy itself and the manner in which it has been implemented to date. The chosen methodology for this study is that of a ‘grounded theory case study’, such as that
employed in Bonner and Adams (2012), Olsen (2013), Sela and Harel (2012) and Turgut (2012), and utilises policy documents and data collected during semi-structured interviews (SSIs). Posited upon Ricento and Hornberger’s (1996) model of language policy dissemination and implementation, participants in the SSIs were selected in order to provide a multi-level sample of stakeholders involved in MTB MLE implementation in the country. Though national in scope, this study has adopted a particular focus on the regions of Mindanao in the south of the Philippines given the rich ethno-linguistic diversity in the area and its remoteness from the capital, Manila.

This study begins with a review of the current literature related to MTB MLE itself, as well as the linguistic, historical and modern contexts in which the current Filipino initiative sits. This review of the literature suggested policy and implementation as the basic areas of concern of the research, rather than the validity of MTB MLE itself. As the study progressed, three research questions evolved based on the results of the early part of the research. These questions are:

**Question 1: How supportive is policy environment of MTB MLE in the Philippines?**
**Question 2: What challenges are there for implementing MTB MLE in Mindanao?**
**Question 3: What has aided in the implementation of MTB MLE in Mindanao?**

In answering these questions, this study aims to provide recommendations that are applicable both to DepEd in the scale-up of the current MTB MLE program, and to policy makers and researchers in other countries looking to implement new national MTB MLE policy.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. BACKGROUND

Most countries can be characterized by individual and societal multilingualism (Edwards, 1994). Indeed, three quarters of the world’s population speak two or more languages (Crystal, 2006). Though no country is truly monolingual, low-income countries are characterised as being particularly multilingual, usually due to historical, political and economic phenomenon, such as colonialism and immigration (Cenoz & Genesse, 1998).

Unfortunately, educational systems in low-income countries rarely reflect their rich linguistic diversity. Fewer than 10 percent of the world’s languages are used in education (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Walter (2009) contends that nearly 40 percent of the world’s population speak languages which are not used in education systems, including approximately 221 million primary-aged children worldwide who do not have access to education in their mother tongues. Education is usually delivered in dominant languages\(^a\) (DL) such as the official language, regional Lingua Francas or a colonial language, rather than the local, non-dominant language (NDL).

When children are made to study in a language that is not their own, the result is “submersion” education; a term coined by Skutnabb-Kangas (see eg. 1990) as an analogy to “forcibly holding a child under water” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1990p. 105). Submersion in education affects both the quality and inclusivity of education programs.

Students whose home language is not used as the language of instruction (LOI) generally have lower levels of achievement and attainment relative to their peers (Bamgbose, 2004; Lewis & Lockheed, 2006; Rong & Grant, 1992; Rosenthal, et al., 1983). These students may learn to decode or repeat but rarely engage in meaningful learning. For example, Hornberger and Chick (2001) illustrate that student-teacher interaction in South African and Peruvian submersion education settings is limited to “safe talk” or parroting of expected yes/no answers. An eight year longitudinal study by Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey, and Pasta (1991) found that Latino students submerged into English education were unlikely to achieve greater than 40 percent on their final examinations. To quote Williams and Cooke (2002, p. 317), “it is abundantly clear that education

---

\(^a\)This study has adopted the terminology of Benson and Kosenen (2013) of dominant and non-dominant to refer to more powerful and less powerful languages in multilingual societies. Herein, ‘dominant’ language refers to a language which has received greater power compared to other ‘non-dominant’ languages, due to social structure, historical traditions or granted prestige (Kosonen, 2010; Vilfan, 1993), and does not necessarily refer to quantitative differences (Ricento, 2006). In the context of the Philippines, the dominant languages are Filipino and English.
in a language that few learners, and not all teachers, have mastered detracts from quality and compounds the other problems of economically impoverished contexts”.

The effects of submersion education are felt more acutely by girls and women. In traditional societies, girls and women are often confined to the home and domestic interactions which are solely conducted in their local language. Therefore girls are less likely to understand the LOI and are placed at an immediate disadvantage to their male counterparts, who tend to have greater exposure to DLs (O’Gara & Kendall, 1996; UNESCO, 2003).

It has been extensively documented that students taught in a language that is not their home language experience higher dropout rates and higher repetition rates (Benson, 2005b; Hovens, 2003; Klaus, 2003; Lewis & Lockheed, 2006; Patrinos & Psacharopoulos, 1997; Pinnock, 2009; Steinberg, Blinde, & Chan, 1984). Children without access to education in their native language are far more likely to be out of school. The World Bank (2005) estimates that 50 percent of the world’s out-of-school children live in communities where the language of schooling is rarely, if ever, used at home, and Pinnock (2009) makes the startling point that 72 percent of world’s out-of-school children live in countries classed as “highly linguistically fractionalised”\(^b\). There are many complex political and economic issues at play in education in minority contexts, but to quote Wolff, “language is not everything in education, but without language, everything is nothing in education”.

2.2. **Mother-Tongue Based Multilingual Education Programs**

Many multilingual countries are now attempting to address these issues through mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB MLE) programs. MTB MLE uses the learner’s first language (termed the L1) to teach basic literacy (reading and writing) and beginning academic content. The second language (L2) is taught systematically and gradually, so that students are able to transfer their knowledge from L1 to L2 (Benson, 2006; Heugh, 2006). MTB MLE programs generally follow one of two models.

2.2.1. **Models of MTB MLE**

The first model of MTB MLE is considered weak or “subtractive”, and is based on a transitional view of multi- or bilingualism. Transitional multi- or bilingualism holds that the ultimate goal of bilingual programs is for the learner to be fluent in the L2 (Crystal, 2006; Lambert, 1975). This implies that the mother tongue may only be used until the learner is able to continue

---

\(^b\) Pinnock’s assessment of “linguistic fractionalisation” is based on the work of Alesina, Devleeschauwer, Easterly, Kurlat, & Wacziarg (2003).
permanently in the DL. In practice, subtractive MTB MLE usually utilises the mother tongue as LOI during the first 1-3 years of schooling, but abruptly transition to the L2 as LOI from the third or fourth year (Malone, 2007). Weak MTB MLE models do not utilise best practice, and thus tend to yield limited results compared to strong models. Analysis based on weak models have caused critics to claim that MTB “isn’t working” (Benson, 2002b). This model is often utilised on economic grounds, with the idea that by quickly returning to the existing system, costs will be reduced. Section 2.2.2.2 will explain why this reasoning is inaccurate.

Strong or “additive” MTB MLE models are based on a maintenance view of multilingualism, which holds that the goal of a multilingual program is fluency in both the L1 and L2 (Crystal, 2006; Lambert, 1975; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). In the additive model, the L2 is acquired in addition to the mother tongue, which continues to be used throughout the program. Strong MTB MLE programs begin entirely in the L1, and gradually add the L2 orally from the second or third year, and subsequent languages from the fourth or fifth year (Malone, 2007).

Though even minimal use of the mother tongue is likely to produce improvements over an entirely L2-based system, a strong multi- or bilingual model is much more likely to have long-term benefits. Baker (2001) and Thomas and Collier (2002) have conducted longitudinal studies that document these benefits.

2.2.2. Benefits of MTB MLE

The benefits of MTB MLE programs over traditional education systems have been demonstrated repeatedly throughout the literature. These benefits can be loosely grouped into three categories: educational, economic and behavioural /affective benefits. This section will outline these benefits, and clarify common myths about MTB MLE.

2.2.2.1. Educational benefits

There is a considerable body of literature from as early as 1943 (Malherbe, 1943) demonstrating the educational benefits of MTB MLE over submersion methodologies (see Baker, 2001; Benson, 2002b; Cummins, 2000; Dutcher, 1995 for reviews).

Use of students’ L1 means that literacy and content can be taught meaningfully from day one, and that this knowledge can then be transferred across into the L2, according to Cummins’ (1979) interdependence theory. Thomas and Collier’ (1997; 2002) longitudinal studies support this assertion reporting that “only those language minority students who had 5-6 years of strong
cognitive and academic development in their L1— as well as through L2— did well in Grade 11 assessments”

Further, it is commonly believed that the learning in the L1 is to the detriment of the dominant language, in a kind of “either or” dichotomy (Heugh, 2012). It is feared that greater exposure to the L1 will increase fluency in this language at the expense of the L2 (Benson, 2005a, 2006). Thomas and Collier (1997; 2002) demonstrated that, in fact, language development, fluency and literacy in both the L1 and L2 is improved, despite less time being devoted to explicit use of the L2. This is consistent with accepted linguistic theory on first and second language acquisition, which holds that “language acquisition, first or second, occurs when comprehension of real messages occurs, and when the acquirer is not 'on the defensive’” (Krashen, 1981).

Krashen’s theory and Cummins interdependency theory (Cummins, 1979, 1991) are particularly important to note in the Filipino context, given the high economic value placed on English proficiency (see section 2.2.2.2).

2.2.2.2. ECONOMIC BENEFITS

Economic arguments against MTB MLE are frequently mounted. These arguments hold that converting to MTB MLE is too expensive, or that students must speak the DL in order to gain employment (Benson, 2005a, 2006). In both cases, evidence suggests that the opposite is in fact true. Cost/benefit analyses of MTB MLE programs show a net economic benefit both for the implementing body and for individual participants.

Studies by Halaoui (2003) and Vawda and Patrinos (1998) demonstrated that the additional costs for MTB MLE resources are minimal compared to traditional programs, and indeed, are only required during initial set-up of the program. Once the program is in place, the cost of resourcing is equal to that of any other program. Furthermore, cost/benefit analyses by Chiswick, Patrinos and Tamayo (1996) and by Dutcher and Tucker (1995) demonstrated that MTB MLE produce savings through reduced repetition and dropout rates.

Literacy is vital for employment and thus economic development (de Soto, 2000) but literacy, and the language of that literacy, should be relevant to the learner’s context (Carrington, 1997). As Bruthiaux (2002) notes, more than half the population in low-income countries are engaged in the informal sector, which most often only requires fluency and literacy in local languages. Thus, education programs aiming to develop literacy in the dominant language do not necessarily have any relevance to students’ local employment prospects. Further, the World Bank (2005) notes
that “children whose first language is not used at school are (...) much less likely to be able to contribute to a country’s economic and intellectual development”.

There are strong economic motivations for Filipinos to learn English. The nation’s knowledge of English is intrinsically linked to its economy, with approximately 10 percent of the population working overseas and up to 13.5 percent of Gross Domestic Profit (GDP) coming from their remittances (ADB, 2009). Similarly, outsourced call centres in the Philippines employed between 150,000 and 170,000 Filipinos in 2008 (Fringal, 2009) and contribute USD 1.5 billion a year to the economy (Tuchman, 2007). However, studies by Acuña and Miranda (1994) and Fringal (2007) found that the traditional education system in the Philippines had not adequately prepared workers to professionally communicate in English. Given the strong link between L1 and L2 or L3 proficiency (Cummins, 1979; Krashen, 1981; Thomas & Collier, 1997), MTB MLE education would improve Filipino students’ competency in English and hence increase economic opportunities.

2.2.2.3. BEHAVIOURAL AND AFFECTIVE BENEFITS

Important behavioural and affective benefits flow from MTB MLE programs. These include increased participation and teacher-student interaction (eg. Baker, 2001; Benson, 2006), increased self-esteem and confidence in students (eg. Dutcher, 1995; UNESCO, 2006), and greater involvement and support on the part of parents and communities (eg. Dutcher, 2004; Hovens, 2003).

There is evidence that increased confidence and participation levels translate into increased enrolments and decreased rates of repetition and drop out (Benson, 2002a; Dutcher, 2004; Hovens, 2002; UNESCO, 2006), particularly for girls (Benson, 2001, 2005b, 2006; UNESCO, 2005a). Similarly, MTB MLE has been shown to increase attendance. Smits, Huisman, and Kruijff (2008) using data from approximately 160 language groups in 26 countries found that when there is mother-tongue instruction available in the language spoken by the group, educational attendance is higher. These findings on increased enrolment are important, given that countries characterised by high linguistic diversity contain over 70 percent of out-of-school children (Pinnock, 2009).

The behavioural and affective benefits of MTB MLE would be welcomed in the Filipino context. In the Philippines, Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) in primary education is generally over 100 percent, GER is calculated as number of enrolled children of all ages divided by total number of children in the official school age group. GER may exceed 100 percent as it does not differentiate between over-aged and under-aged pupils and repeaters (Huebler, 2005).
however the Net Enrolment Rate (NER)\textsuperscript{d} is somewhat lower, fluctuating at around 60 percent between 2006 to 2011, indicating that many students are over-aged for their grade (Albert et al., 2012). Drop out and repetition rates are high, with only one in four students finishing primary schooling on time (Albert, et al., 2012). DepEd figures show that the highest dropout rate for the last 30 years has been at Grade 2 (cited in M. C. R. B. Bautista, Bernardo, & Ocampo, 2009). By better engaging students (particularly young students) in their education, MTB MLE could decrease repetition and dropout rates in the Philippines.

2.2.3. LEARNING MATERIALS FOR MTB MLE

A further differentiating factor of MTB MLE as compared to traditional education systems is the use of localised and culturally meaningful learning materials. MTB MLE curriculum is based on the learner’s previous experiences, incorporating cultural traditions and community practices into the classroom. As Dekker and Young (2005) describe, “the most important consideration in the design (of MTB MLE curriculum) is that a child’s cognitive and affective development is closely related to the intimate relationship between the learner, his first language and his culture milieu”. By building on experiences and vocabulary that the learner is already familiar with, they can more easily make connections with the new ideas and skills that are taught (Freire, 1973; Kincheloe, 2008; Kolb, 1984).

Localised learning materials require a transformation of the curriculum to include culturally relevant learning and reading materials. For ethno-linguistic minorities in the Philippines, such reading and instructional materials in their languages are not readily available (Sibayan, 1985). Ideally, materials should be developed by those who know the language and the culture most intimately, including community elders and traditional leaders, as well as teachers and other community members who have had further education. For example, in a MTB MLE program in Lubuagan in the Philippines’ Cordillera region, teachers and other community members worked together to develop a series of bilingual traditional stories (Dekker & Young, 2005). After the materials are developed, they should be edited by multiple language speakers, then field tested by a wider audience of community members (Casquite, 2010).

2.3. EDUCATION, LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION POLICY

Education, language and language-in-education policy, as a manifestation of political will and official support, are vital at all phases of MTB MLE program development (Dekker & Young, 2005). Education policy may be text or discourse related to formal and non-formal education systems

\textsuperscript{d} NER is calculated as enrolled children in the official school age group divided by total number of children in the official school age group. NER cannot exceed 100 percent (Huebler, 2005).
and operations (Dutcher, 2003, 2004). In its general sense, language policy is any deliberate effort to affect the structure, function, and acquisition of languages or language varieties (Ball, 2006). Good language policy should aim to “ensure equity for all language groups” (Haddad, 1995). Language-in-education policy relates to legislation, protocol or guidelines pertaining to LOI and language of literacy used in basic education (Tollefson, 2008).

2.3.1. Frameworks for language-in-education policy analysis

There are various approaches and frameworks related to language policy and planning. Hornberger (Hoosain & Salili, 2005, p. 68) provides a summary of existing language policy frameworks. Malone (2007) draws on her experience with MTB MLE to outline seven specific directives required in good language-in-education policy:

1. Statement regarding purposes, goals and intended outcomes relating to the program, based on an understanding of the language situation in the country.
2. Directives regarding the languages to be used.
3. Directives regarding use of students’ L1 and the period for which it is to be used as LOI.
4. Directives regarding the agencies and organisations that will be involved.
5. Directives regarding implementation, including assignment of responsibilities.
6. Directives regarding how financial support will be provided.
7. Directives regarding how the policy will be incorporated into existing education systems.

However, supportive language-in-education policy must be accompanied by advocacy and training (Corson, 1993), and should be integrated into the larger education policy and planning sphere (Bennett, 2009; Heugh, 2012).

2.4. Stakeholders

Ricento and Hornberger (1996) use the metaphor of an onion to explain the process of language policy dissemination and implementation (see Figure 1). At the outer layer of the onion sit the broad language policy objectives as articulated by policy makers. The classroom teacher is placed at the centre of the onion and is responsible for the day to day pedagogical decisions that most directly affect students (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996, p. 417). Between the outer and the inner layers are several layers of intermediary actors, such as state boards of education, district officers, NGOs, etc; this is particularly true of countries with highly centralised state structures (such as the Philippines).
As policies move down through the layers of the onion, they are generally modified, either explicitly or through interpretation (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996, p. 417). This may result in a policy not being implemented at the local level in the way in which it was intended (Ball, 2006; Gipps & Brown, 1992; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). As Ball (2006, p. 46) asserts, “we cannot predict or assume, much to the chagrin of politicians, how (policy) will be acted on in every case in every setting (...) solutions to the problems posed by policy texts will be localised and should be expected to display ad hocery and messiness”. Policy implementation is dependent on local contexts, thus localised analysis of policy is required to fully understand the situation as a whole.

2.4.1. Policy Makers and Intermediary Actors
Policy makers play an important role in successful MTB MLE programs, creating the political will and supportive political environment essential for a sustainable MTB MLE program. They have initial power over the design of the program and are responsible for assigning and distributing essential funding for implementing and sustaining MTB MLE programs (UNESCO, 2007a).

Policy makers may also be responsible for coordinating MTB MLE implementation with intermediary actors and school-based stakeholders. Where there are large numbers of stakeholder organisations involved in the program, or in highly centralised bureaucracies with

---

* Context here covering local stakeholders, resources, culture, history, etc.
multiple intermediary actors, the coordination role becomes more important (Alidou et al., 2006; UNESCO, 2007a). For a program that is national in scope, such as that of the Philippines, this role is vital.

Intermediary agencies, such as NGOs, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and community organisations, may be involved in language mapping, orthography development, advocacy, community mobilisation, curriculum and learning material development, teacher training, and various other activities (UNESCO, 2007a). In the Philippines, and elsewhere, these groups often have more experience in these activities, having implemented MTB MLE programs well before government policies and programs were in place.

2.4.2. Teachers

Being at the ‘chalk-face’ of the education system, teachers are a key variable in the success of MTB MLE programs. Therefore it is clear that teacher training and professional development is a key component required for successful MTB MLE programs (Paulson, 2012; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007). Effective teacher professional development programs include quality content that enhances teachers’ content and pedagogical knowledge, the incorporation of adult learning principles, and sufficient duration, including follow-up training (Paulson, 2012). Ocampo (2006, p. 69) further recommends teachers participate in discussion sessions and mentoring programs “to empower them to create workable and effective solutions in addressing learners’ concerns”.

Teacher training for MTB MLE must also produce a change in teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and motivations (Guskey, 2003; Paulson, 2012). This no small task, given that teachers, themselves having been educated through a traditional school system and often believe that NDLs are unsuitable for the classroom (Benson, 2005a). This is certainly true of teachers in the Philippines, who generally believe in the superiority of English for academic purposes (Burton, 2013).

Teachers should also be prepared to teach in the specific language of their school. Paulson (2012) notes that teachers in the Philippines do not always know how to read and write in their own mother tongue, given that local languages are rarely used for academic or literary purposes. Filipino teachers may also be transferred from one region to another (Department of Education, 2013) and may not speak the same mother tongue as their students.
2.4.3. Other Stakeholders

Haugen asserts that “acceptance is the hallmark of good language planning and policy implementation” (cited in Mesthrie, 2002, p. 398). Learners, parents, teachers, school boards, policy makers and other stakeholders must understand and support the program for MTB MLE education if it is to be sustainable in the long term (Chiathoh, 2011).

Empirical studies have looked at the perceptions of learners, parents and community towards MTB MLE policies and programs, with highly varying results. Ruiz (1988, pp. 6-18) identified three approaches to language policy, which are useful in analysing stakeholder perceptions to language policy and MTB MLE. His ‘language orientations’ are:

- The ‘language as a problem’ orientation, which views societal-multilingualism as a problem for both national unity and modernisation. For example, Braam (2004) documents learners’ and parents’ rejection of MTB MLE in South Africa in favour of instruction in English, the DL.
- The ‘language as a right’ orientation, which sees language as a fundamental human right (eg. Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; 2002).
- The ‘language as a resource’ orientation, which understands that proficiency in any language is a social and individual resource and thus bilingualism and multilingualism are something to be cultivated and taken advantage of. Examples include Chakma (2012) in Bangladesh, and Fakeye (2011) and Iyamu and Ogiegbaen (2008) in Nigeria.

In the Philippines, many teachers and parents have a ‘language as a problem’ orientation and are unsupportive of MTB MLE because they want their children to learn English in order to access the attendant economic benefits (Sibayan, 1999). They find it counterintuitive that less exposure to English in the early years can better achieve this goal (Burton, 2013; Gallego & Zubiri, 2011).

2.5. National Context

As language policy must be understood within its national context (Cooper, 1987, p. 183), an overview of the Filipino context will be given with particular details on the Mindanao region.

The Philippines has a population of just over 92 million (National Statistics Office, 2014). Nationally, there are approximately 11.8 million indigenous peoples, with many located Regions X and XI of Mindanao (UNESCO, 2005b; see Appendix A). The islands of Mindanao are the most

---

¹ As per the latest census in 2010 (National Statistics Office, 2014).
geographically, ethnically and linguistically diverse areas in the country (Symaco, 2013a). There are 18 Lumad\(^e\) (Ulindang, 2011) and 13 Islamic ethno-linguistic groups (Symaco & Baunto, 2010).

Mindanao, with a population of almost 22 million (NSCB, 2010), contains 14 of the 20 poorest provinces in the Philippines (NCSB, 2012; Schiavo-Campo & Judd, 2005, p. 5). Poverty indices in Mindanao are consistently higher than the national average and those for the Manila region (see Figure 2).
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**FIGURE 2 POVERTY INCIDENCE AMONG FAMILIES**

### 2.5.1. LINGUISTIC CONTEXT

A nation’s linguistic context plays an important role in the formulation and implementation of language and education policies in that country. As Bautista, Bernardo and Ocampo (2009, p. 18) aptly put it, “Filipinos are, at the very least, bilingual”. The Philippines is home to approximately 185 languages (Lewis, et al., 2013). It is one of the few heterogeneous countries in the world without an absolute majority of native speakers of any one language (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1998), though almost 90 percent of the population speak one of 8 major regional languages (Sibayan, 1974). The Southern Philippines is among the most linguistically diverse areas of the country, with approximately 121 languages and dialects (Lewis, et al., 2013; see Appendix B). The two official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and English.

---

\(^e\) Lumad refers to non-Muslim ethnic groups.

\(^h\) Data from NCSB (2012).
2.5.1.1. Tagalog and Filipino
Filipino was born out of the 1935 Philippines Constitution, which called for “the development and adoption of a common national language based on one of the existing native languages” (Republic of the Philippines, 1935, Article XIII). The national language created was heavily based on Tagalog, the native language from the region of Manila. It was selected despite being there being fewer native speakers of Tagalog than Cebuano (another major regional language) at the time (Census data cited in Gonzalez, 1991). Its selection as the source of input for the national language reflects its political, economic and geographic status (Gonzalez, 1974, 1991).

The Tagalog-based national language was firstly named ‘Pilipino’ in 1959, and later renamed ‘Filipino’ by the 1987 constitution (Ocampo, 2006). By 1969 Pilipino was the prescribed LOI for all primary grades (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003). An evolving language, Filipino has also been influenced by Spanish, English, Chinese and indigenous languages (Ocampo, 2006).

2.5.1.2. Spanish
During the Spanish colonial period (1565-1898), formal education in Spanish was established through the 1863 Educational Decree, but was limited to elite classes. Catholic missionaries more commonly learned local dialects to convert indigenous groups, and hence Spanish language proficiency was never widespread. It is estimated that when the United States took over colonial control in 1889, only two to four percent of the population was fluent in Spanish (Gonzalez, 2003).

2.5.1.3. English
The American colonial period (1897-1946) was characterised by the rapid spread of English language. Though US President McKinley initially accepted local languages in schools, he subsequently ordered English to be used and by 1900 all schools used English as LOI and forbade the use of Filipino languages (Gonzalez, 2003; Sibayan, 1985). The ‘English-only’ policy was reinforced in 1901 by the arrival of American teachers (Gonzalez, 1998b, p495) who brought with them American textbooks, with images and concepts completely foreign to Filipino students (Sibayan, 1999, p. 243). The American schooling system made English more available to the general Filipino population (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003).

English-based schooling was briefly interrupted in 1942 when Japanese forces invaded the Philippines and prohibited the use of English. However, in practice, English and Tagalog continued
to be taught in school, with Japanese added as a compulsory foreign language until the end of WWII in 1945 (Gonzalez, 2003).

Despite being an official language, a 2006 survey of Filipinos found that only 32 percent reported proficiency in English (cited in M. L. S. Bautista & Bolton, 2008, p. 5). For those who are proficient in English, Gonzalez (1998) contends that the variety of English spoken in the Philippines is developing its own standards in pronunciation, lexicon and syntax.

2.5.1.4. CEBUANO

One of the major regional languages in the Philippines is Cebuano, spoken by approximately one-fifth of the population of the Philippines (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2014). It is widely spoken throughout the lowland areas of eastern Mindanao and is used as a trade language in most other areas in Mindanao (Wolff, 1972). Despite being the second largest linguistic group in the Philippines, it has never reached the same level of ‘prestige’ as Tagalog and, until recently, it had not been used in the education system.

Cebuano, or Binisaya as it is commonly referred to by its speakers, posses several dialects. According to Wolff (1972, p. 6), dialects of Cebuano are “remarkably uniform”. Though this is true of grammar, Endriga (2011) notes there are significant phonetic and lexical variations between dialects of Cebuano. Endriga describes the Cebuano of Davao as being influenced by various indigenous and regional languages due to high levels of migration.

2.5.2. MTB MLE CONTEXT

When the Philippines gained independence from the United States in 1946, English remained the only LOI, while Tagalog was taught as a subject nationally. The decade immediately following independence saw a number of experiments with local language use in primary education. One important experiment which ran from 1948 to 1954 is known as the ‘Iloilo Experiment in Education through the Vernacular’. Iloilo was the first research project in the Philippines to test the theory of first language education under experimental conditions (Sibayan, 1999). The regional language Hiligaynon was used as the primary LOI for one group of students, and after the first year of implementation, tests found that children in the Hiligaynon group outperformed those taught in English (Nolasco, 2008). The Rizal Experiment from 1960 to 1966 and the Second Iloilo Language experiment from 1961 to 1964 both found similar positive effects of L1 education (Dumatog & Dekker, 2003; Sibayan, 1999).
The 1957 Revised Education Program incorporated the results of the Iloilo experiments, giving school administration the option of selecting and developing their own curriculum incorporating local languages and contexts (Gonzalez, 1998). However, the program’s ambiguity and lack of resource backing meant it was not widely implemented (Dekker & Young, 2005).

In 1974 the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) Order No. 25 introduced a new Bilingual Education Policy, mandating Filipino as LOI for certain humanity subjects and English for other subjects (Gonzalez, 2003; Ocampo, 2006). Local languages where permitted as ‘transitional languages’ for initial instructions up to Grade 3 (Dekker & Young, 2005). The Bilingual Education Policy was reviewed in 1987 through DECS Order No. 52 but maintained Filipino and English as LOIs whilst elevating local languages to ‘auxiliary languages’ status (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Ocampo, 2006; Quisumbing, 1987). The use of Filipino and English was seen as logistically more manageable compared to the 1957 program (Dekker & Young, 2005).

Though there were a number of DECS Memos relating to the use of regional Lingua Franca in schools (eg. DECS Memo No. 144 s.1999, DECS Memo No. 2433 s.2000 and DECS Memo No. 153 s.2001), the 1987 bilingual policy essentially remained in force until 2009.

A third important MTB MLE experiment, building upon those in Iloilo and Rizal, was carried out in the Cordillera region from 1998. The Lubuagan First Language Component was initiated in 1998 and has been described as the “most compelling L1-based education program so far” (Nolasco, 2008). Longitudinal studies by Walter and Dekker (2008) and Dumatog and Dekker (2003) found that children in the Lubuagan MTB MLE schools consistently scored higher than control students in maths, reading, Filipino and English, providing further empirical evidence that using the L1 as LOI improves Filipino students’ educational outcomes.

2.5.3. Modern Context

Through the ‘Governance of Basic Education’ Republic Act 9155 of 2001, education in the Philippines is regulated by the Department of Education (DepEd). DepEd’s purpose is to “formulate, implement, and coordinate policies, plans, programs and projects in the areas of formal and non-formal basic education” (Department of Education, 2014a). It is responsible for approximately 48,446 public schools, which in 2012 served one quarter of the Filipino population (Musa & Ziatdinov, 2012; Pazzibugan, 2013).

Underfunding is a significant issue for education in the Philippines. Though funding for DepEd doubled between 2000 and 2010, the total educational budget remains below the World Bank’s
suggested allowance of 20 percent (Albert, et al., 2012; Musa & Ziatdinov, 2012). A public school teacher’s salary is approximately AUD248, which is less than the AUD416 that the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) suggests is required for the average family to live on (Agarao-Fernandez & Guzman, 2005). This inevitably impacts upon the quality and quantity of teachers available. Further, DepEd budgeting works on the school year, whereas the national budget cycle is based on the calendar year (Luz, 2008), which creates obvious discrepancies for financial planning and funds allocation, particularly for reform-orientated programs (M. C. R. B. Bautista, et al., 2009).

The highly centralised, hierarchical and transitive nature of DepEd’s structure presents a second significant challenge for educational reform in the Philippines. The Department’s agenda is almost exclusively defined by the current departmental Secretary, and educational reforms initiated by one Secretary may or may not be continued by successive Secretaries (M. C. R. B. Bautista, et al., 2009). Frequent changes in DepEd secretaries (there have been 8 different secretaries since 2001) break the continuity of reform advocacy.

DepEd’s central office in Pasig City, Manila, is responsible for defining standards to be upheld at the school level, including curriculum, textbooks and quality assurance (M. C. R. B. Bautista, et al., 2009). The centralised hierarchy of DepEd has cultivated unequal power relations between regional stakeholders interacting with central office officials. As far back as 1925, a survey conducted by US researcher George Counts commented on how the centralised Filipino education system limited autonomy and initiative of regional stakeholders (Smith, 1945). Luz (2008) describes the practice of the central office to issue ‘memos’ to regional offices, who will not act on local issues without explicit instructions from a central office memo to do so.

The centralised nature of the Filipino education system means that remote areas tend to display far lower educational indicators than Manila. Indigenous peoples, generally located in the most isolated parts of the country, are the least educated and least likely to benefit from government education opportunities (UNESCO, 2005b). Remoteness and linguistic diversity have been cited as a contributing factor to low educational indicators in Mindanao (Symaco, 2013a; Watson, 2012). The ARMM region of Mindanao presents particularly low educational achievement rates compared to Metro Manila, where the majority of students are taught in their first language (see Figure 3).

---

1 Based on XE exchange rate of 1.00 PHP = 0.0248248 AUD
2.5.4. Policy Context

In recent years there have been a number of significant policy reforms aimed to improve basic education, particularly for NDL groups. The first, and most pertinent to this study, is the DepEd Order (DO) No. 74 s.2009. Passed on July 14, 2009, it sees MTB MLE “institutionalized as a fundamental educational policy and program in this Department in the whole stretch of formal education including pre-school and in the Alternative Learning Systems (ALS)” (Department of Education, 2009). The first three years following the Order were prescribed as a “bridging plan” for piloting in 921 schools, with the assistance of local and international NGOs and an Australian bilateral project. Following the bridging period, the original Order was succeeded by DO No. 16 on February 17, 2012 (Department of Education, 2012) which sets out the specific guidelines for implementing MTB MLE for the 2012-13 school year initially in eight major Lingua Francas and four specified additional languages.

Prior to 2013, one concern of stakeholders was that government support of MTB MLE rested solely in DepEd, and thus in the hands of the relevant secretary at the time. However, in January 2013 the Philippines Congress passed the Republic Act No. 10533, known as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Congress of the Philippines, 2013). In addition to mandating a 13 year, K-12 education system, the Act requires that the regional or native language of the students to be

\[\text{Data from Albert, et al. (2012) and Symaco (2013b).}\]
used as the primary LOI from kindergarten to Grade 3, with a gradual transition to English and Filipino over the following three years (Congress of the Philippines, 2013).

2.6. RESEARCH JUSTIFICATION

This chapter has provided a review of the literature pertaining to language-in-education policy, MTB MLE and the Filipino context. This review has informed the design and implementation of the research undertaken for this study.

Section 2.2 has shown that MTB MLE has proven pedagogical, economic and behavioural benefits, both internationally and in the Philippines (Baker, 2001; Cummins, 2000; Dutcher, 1995). Therefore this study does not seek to draw conclusions on the quality or benefits of MTB education in the Philippines; rather, this study will accept the premise that MTB MLE is an effective and desirable educational strategy.

Section 2.3 found that language-in-education policies, as a manifestation of political will and official support, are a vital precondition for successful MTB MLE programs (Dutcher, 2003, 2004). However, it was also found that the existence of supportive policy alone does not guarantee that successful educational reform is sure to follow (Ball, 2006; Gipps & Brown, 1992). Good language-in-education policy must still be disseminated and implemented through various actors, in accordance with Ricento and Hornberger’s (1996) model. Understanding the impediments to and drivers of implementation is critical for future MTB MLE initiatives, both in the Philippines and internationally.

Section 2.5 has shown that Mindanao, a highly ethnically and linguistically diverse area of the Philippines (Lewis, et al., 2013), is disadvantaged educationally and displays disappointing educational achievement rates (Albert, et al., 2012; Symaco, 2013b). Mindanao represents an ‘extreme’ example of the issues in the Filipino education system and is thus an interesting case to be investigated in this study (Pettigrew, 1998).

Therefore the review of the literature has suggested that the main concern of this research be the policy and implementation of MTB MLE in Mindanao. The coming school year 2014-15 will be only the third year of national MTB MLE implementation in the Philippines, and, with the exception of Burton’s (2013), Skoropinski’s (2012) and Young’s (2011) theses, there have been few in-depth studies of its implementation. As the first South East Asian nation to institute MTB MLE at a
national level, the Filipino example is expected to hold learning opportunities for neighbouring countries looking to initiate their own national system, as well as for scale up in the Philippines.
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study has been based on both grounded theory and case study theory. Case study has been used to inform the object of the research (the ‘case’), while grounded theory has informed research design and data analysis. Similar methodologies combining grounded theory and case studies (termed ‘grounded theory case study’) have been employed in other educational research studies, such as in those of Bonner and Adams (2012), Olsen (2013), Sela and Harel (2012) and Turgut (2012).

3.1.1. GROUNDED THEORY

Grounded theory methodology entails “systematic, yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analysing qualitative data to construct theories ‘grounded’ in the data themselves” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 2). Unlike other social science research methodologies, grounded theory begins with data collection and not with the formulation of a hypothesis; instead, grounded theory sees “generating theory and doing social research (as) two parts of the same process” (Glaser, 1978, p. 2).

Consistent with grounded theory, in this study no hypothesis was established prior to starting research. The review of the literature informed only the direction of the study (ie. focus on MTB MLE policy and implementation, rather than on validity of MTB MLE). The three research questions, which will be used to orientate the presentation of results in Chapter 4, were only developed during the data analysis stage. Both the research questions and the conceptual framework were continually evolved and refined as the study progressed. The three questions are:

**Question 1:** How supportive is policy environment of MTB MLE in the Philippines?

**Question 2:** What challenges are there for implementing MTB MLE in Mindanao?

**Question 3:** What has aided in the implementation of MTB MLE in Mindanao?

Researchers employing grounded theory are interested in producing an explanation rather than a description of the phenomena studied (Schroth, 2013). Further, according to Strauss and Corbin (1994, p. 281), grounded theory may be relevant and potentially influential to policy makers. Thus this is an appropriate choice of methodology for the present study which aims to provide recommendations that are of use to policy makers in the Philippines and internationally.
Other defining characteristics of research based on grounded theory are present in this study and will be further detailed in this section. These include making comparisons, developing generative and concept-relating questions, using theoretical sampling, systematic coding procedures, and focusing on individual perspectives (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 274-275).

3.1.2. CASE STUDY THEORY
A case study is “a research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamics present within single settings” (Eisenhardt, 1989). Yin’s (2009) criteria for use of a case study approach holds true for this research project. Yin asserts that a case study must firstly be investigating a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context, and secondly be investigating where the relationship between the context and phenomenon is unclear.

The MTB MLE policy is certainly a contemporary phenomenon, being only in its early years of implementation. Similarly, with the exception of the postgraduate studies of Burton (2013), Skoropinski (2012) and Young (2011), few in-depth studies of the Philippines national MTB MLE policy implementation have yet been conducted. Thus use of the case study approach is highly appropriate for this context.

The selection of a case to be studied is an important aspect of case study research (Eisenhardt, 1989). Given that the number of cases that can be studied at one time is limited, Pettigrew (1998) recommends that cases be chosen which demonstrate extreme situations in which the process of interest is transparent and observable. The case chosen for this study is the region of Mindanao, in southern Philippines. As outlined in Chapter 2, Mindanao is certainly an “extreme” example of educational disadvantage (Albert, et al., 2012; Symaco, 2013b) and linguistic diversity (Lewis, et al., 2013) and thus is an appropriate choice of case in the present study of MTB MLE policy and implementation.

3.2. RESEARCH DESIGN
Both grounded theory and case study methodologies allow for a variety of tools and strategies to be incorporated (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Triangulation has been achieved in this grounded theory case study by incorporating multiple forms of investigation and by collecting data from multiple sources. Further, multiple data sources allow an understanding of situations from various viewpoints (Merriam, 1998). This study will primarily utilise original qualitative research, in the form of SSIs, but will also incorporate policy analysis.
In answering the first research question, the original policy documents and their Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) will be examined, comparing them against frameworks for good language-in-education policy set out in the literature. Then, given Haughen’s assertion that “acceptance is the hallmark of good language planning and policy implementation” (cited in Mesthrie, 2002, p. 398), the opinions of key informants collected during SSIs on the quality of the policy will also be used in the analysis of the policy itself.

SSIs with key informants will be the primary basis for answering the second and third research questions. Section 3.3 will outline the process for analysing this primary data. Secondary data, drawn from the literature, will be incorporated in order to further triangulate the results found in the interview data.

3.2.1. Description of Research Participants

The selection of research participants was posited upon Ricento and Hornberger’s (1996) language policy model, which describes the various actors involved in the implementation and dissemination of policy as ‘layers’ of an onion (see Figure 1). Research participants were selected from each layer of Ricento and Hornberger’s onion: DepEd staff representing the outer layer, staff of non-government organisations (NGOs) representing intermediary agencies, and principals and teachers from Mindanao primary schools at the centre of language policy implementation. As Cracknell (2000, p. 319) notes “various categories of stakeholders will have their own value systems, and each of these is significant and cannot be ignored”. Thus each group will provide a different perspective on the issue.

There were a total of 10 participants, almost evenly distributed amongst the participant groups. The participants have been chosen in order to be representative of all groups, whilst keeping in mind the word limit and timeframe of this Masters dissertation. Nine of the ten participants were Filipino citizens; the remaining participant was a British national who has lived and worked in the Philippines for a number of years. Four participants were male and six were female, and each participant group included at least one participant from each gender (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Participant Demographics: Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DepEd participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Half of the participants are based in Region XI in Mindanao (see Table 2). Four of the remaining participants are based in Manila, but with extensive experience in Mindanao. The final participant is currently based outside of the Philippines, but the interview with this participant was conducted in Manila.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS: CURRENT LOCATION</th>
<th>Region XI</th>
<th>Manila</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DepEd participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DepEd participants included two representatives from the central office in Manila and from one representative from a field office in Region XI. One participant was directly responsible for the MTB MLE program. One participant had previously been responsible for the MTB MLE program in their region. One representative was from the office for indigenous people education. In this way a variety of perspectives from within DepEd itself were collected.

Participants from NGOs included two males and two females. This group was the only group to include one non-Filipino participant. Three interviews were conducted in Manila and one in Region VI. All participants in this group had significant experience in the Mindanao region.

The final participant group included two female teachers and one male principal from two elementary schools in Region XI. The schools are located in the barangays of Inawayan and Darong, both in the municipality of Santa Cruz, in Region XI. The schools have 1,105 and 684 students enrolled, respectively (Department of Education, 2014b). Students in these schools were predominantly Cebuano speaking, and participants stated that there were Muslim and indigenous students in both schools. The Principal who participated in the study was identified and referred to the researcher because of his previous experience working in indigenous people schools on the Balut and Sarangani islands, many of which had already piloted MTB MLE with the assistance of NGO groups. The Principal in turn recommended two teachers who had been teaching MTB MLE in a nearby school for two years.

`Barangay` is Filipino for village and is the smallest administrative unit in the Philippines.
Participants were recruited through direct snowballing; all participants were given the option of recommending other potential participants either from the same participant group or other groups. In general, participants tended to recommend only other participants from the same group (e.g. DepEd staff recommended other staff from DepEd). The exception was the school Principal, who was recommended by a DepEd participant. The researcher contacted recommended persons herself in order to avoid the possibility of unequal relationships between those parties.

3.2.2. RESEARCH ETHICS

Given that “all human interaction, including the interaction involved in human research, has ethical dimensions” (National Health and Medical Research Council, 2014), it is important researchers consider the ethical issues and potential risks to research participants in their study. This study has abided by Deakin University’s (2010) Human Research Ethics Guidelines and the National Health and Medical Research Council’s (2014) National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. It has received ethics approval from Deakin University’s Human Ethics Advisory Group (approval reference number HAE-14-017, valid to 10 March 2018). The researcher has thoroughly assessed all areas of possible risk to the research project and implemented means to mitigate them.

3.3. RESEARCH PROCEDURE

3.3.1. LITERATURE REVIEW PROCEDURE

The first step undertaken in this study was a thorough review of the literature related to MTB MLE, language, education and language-in-education policy, and the Filipino context. This literature review has informed and influenced the design of the study. Over 200 sources were consulted in the process of the literature review. Sources were retrieved from online databases, Deakin’s library and a specialist library in Manila. In addition to technical sources, texts from newspapers in the Philippines have also been incorporated.

3.3.2. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The first data source for this study was policy documents. These were obtained from the websites of DepEd and the Congress of the Philippines. Both the DepEd Order (DO) and Republic Act (RA) were analysed, since the modern context of MTB MLE stems from both policies. The specific documents analysed were:

---

1 This library is managed by SIL Philippines and contains published and unpublished texts on linguistics and education, particularly related to ethno-linguistic minority groups in Asia.
The principal tool used in this study has been SSIs. The design of the tool, in terms of questions and focus, continued to evolve as the study progressed, consistent with the grounded theory methodology (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 17). The questions incorporated into the research tool were generative and concept based (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 274-275) and allowed the participant to respond openly and to direct the conversation. The research tool is included in Appendix D.

Interview data was collected over a two week period between March and April 2014, both in Manila and in Mindanao. Interviews were held at a time and location suggested by the participant. Eight of the ten interviews were conducted in quiet, private locations (eg. office, library) so that the participant could feel at ease in their responses. The remaining two were held in public locations (coffee shops) as these locations were suggested by participants as a more convenient location for them. Before beginning the interview, rapport was established with the participants through informal conversation on topics relevant to the participant’s context.

The interview process began with an explanation on the nature of the study, the purpose of the research and the procedure for the interview. Interview participants were given a Plain Language Statement and Consent Form (Appendix C – personal details have been removed). The main points of the statement were explicitly explained verbally, and participants were given the opportunity to ask questions or seek clarification on any points they may have felt uncertain about before signing the consent form. Wherever possible, the document was distributed several days before the interview, to allow participants time to read and comprehend the contents.

The interview roughly followed the script set out in Appendix D. Interviews lasted between 10 and 55 minutes, depending on the participant’s responsiveness. Certain participants had more knowledge on the issues and were more open to the discussion, whereas others, particularly teachers, were shorter in their response and perhaps felt confined by their abilities in English. The nature of SSIs meant that not all questions were asked to all participants. Participants based
outside of Mindanao where asked to focus on the experience they had in Mindanao in their responses, though of course they were free to draw from their experiences nationally.

The interviews were recorded and subsequently sent to a typist for transcription. Recording the interviews meant that the researcher was free to focus on the conversation rather than on note taking. The transcriber was a professional typist with personal experience in South East Asia and thus attuned to the Filipino accent. The researcher participated in transcribing in order to fill in gaps in the transcription, most commonly where names of a specific language, ethnic group or geographic region were mentioned.

3.3.3. DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Data was collected from two sources: policy documents and ten SSIs. Initial data analysis began during the data collection period, with the researcher reviewing interviews in the evening, in order to further inform the interview script for the following day. This “continuous interplay between analysis and data collection” is consistent with grounded theory methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 273). At the end of two week period of in-country data collection, the more formal analysis of transcribed interviews began. The process for analysing transcribed data was again consistent with the stages of grounded theory analysis. According to Flick (2006), these stages are:

- **Category stage**: using broad groups of similar concepts to generate theory
- **Concept stage**: grouping of codes with similar content into concept groups
- **Code stage**: identifying codes that permit key points in the data to be gathered
- **Theory stage**: explanations are developed to elucidate the subject of the research

Specifically, the following activities were conducted in each of the stages of analysis:

- **Category stage**: In the first instance, transcripts were pre-coded to distinguish responses by categories related to each of the research questions (i.e. policy, challenges to implementation, and aids to implementation).
- **Concept stage**: The second round of open-coding was conducted to discriminate the key concepts under each category (e.g. challenges: resources, knowledge).
- **Code stage**: Under each of these concepts or themes, the third round of open-coding aimed to categorise each of the remarks into final codes related to challenges or aids. Categories that were explicitly stated will herein be referred to as ‘mentioned’.
After having categorised the explicit statements made by participants, in the final round of coding transcripts were coded to examine underlying concepts and categories which were not explicitly stated (e.g., teacher’s lack of knowledge on theory of MTB MLE as indication of lack of teacher training). Categories that were implicitly implied will be referred to as ‘inferred’.

Once open-coding rounds were completed, data was entered into a frequency table to assess which themes, categories and codes were most salient in participants’ responses. The frequency tables for each research question can be found in Appendices 5, 6 and 7.

- **Theory stage**: the final stage of analysis was to develop theories based on the codes and concepts identified in the previous stages.

The analysis of policy documents followed a similar process to the analysis of interview data. However, in this case the codes were preselected according to the directives set out by Malone (2007), rather than being determined by the data as in the analysis of interview data. Therefore the process for policy analysis was somewhat more succinct and included only one round of coding against the seven directives.

### 3.3.4. Assumptions in Data Analysis

The codes found in the data have been presented in the frequency tables of Appendices 6, 7 and 8. Analyses of these tables have been based on the assumption that codes which were mentioned or inferred by a larger number of participants are viewed by participants as being of greater importance. In relation to questions 2 and 3, codes mentioned by a larger number of participants can be considered a consistent challenge or aid experienced across stakeholders groups. Codes which were mentioned by only one participant will not be considered important nor discussed in the findings, as it is not possible to conclude from the basis of this study alone if that code has been experienced by others or if it is unique to that participant. Chapter 5 will examine the findings based on these assumptions.

### 3.4. Researcher Considerations

In qualitative research, it is important to make reference to the researcher’s background in order to situate them within the research (Angrosino, 2005; Ely, Anzul, Friedman, Garner, & Steinmetz, 1991). In this way the reader may have a clearer understanding of the possible implications this background may have had on the study.
The researcher is employed by an organisation which manages aid programs on behalf of the Australian government, including an Indigenous and Muslim education project in the Philippines. It is highly likely that many, if not all, of the research participants are familiar with this project. In an attempt to minimise the risk of this influencing the responses of participants during interviews, the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form made particular reference to the fact that this research is independent of the researcher’s employer or any other organisation. However, it should be noted that three participants made reference to Australian aid projects during interviews. It is impossible to know if these projects would still have been mentioned should the interview have been with a different researcher; therefore this code has been removed from the findings of this study (though it has been kept in Appendix G for reference).

Furthermore, although the research has several years professional and personal experience with Filipino culture, it should be noted that there may have also been cross-cultural factors influencing on the study. These factors may include the language of the research tool (English), physical distinctiveness between the researcher and participants, and lack of shared tradition and values (Young, 2001).
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. RESEARCH QUESTION 1: POLICY

In order to answer the first research question, ‘how supportive is policy environment of MTB MLE in the Philippines?’ two policies were utilised as data sources (see Section 3.3). The criteria for ‘supportive’ for the purposes of this study was (1) adherence to the directives defined by Malone (2007, see section 2.3), and (2) the acceptance of the policy by key informants related to MTB MLE.

Before any sort of national MTB MLE plan can be implemented, it should have governmental policy underpinning it and the support of stakeholders at the highest level. While this alone will not ensure success, it is an important precondition suggested in the literature (Dutcher, 2003, 2004) and confirmed by informants interviewed in this research. Though localised MTB MLE can be successful without federal support (as the Lubuagan project was: Dumatog & Dekker, 2003; Walter & Dekker, 2011), any sort of scale up requires a supportive political environment, particularly in education systems which are as centralised and hierarchical as that of the Philippines (M. C. R. B. Bautista, et al., 2009).

This study demonstrates that a supportive policy and political environment exists in the Philippines. An analysis of the original policy documents shows that the two most relevant DepEd and Federal Government policies related to MTB MLE in the Philippines (DO 74, the original establishing policy, and RA 10533, which situated MTB MLE within greater K-12 reform) adequately provide for most of the criteria established by Malone (2007) for good language-in-education policy. Key informants in this study confirmed this, with the majority of participants concurring that DepEd DO 74 was good in their opinion, with only two suggesting areas for improvement, such as turning the DO into law and shortening the bridging period into English.

4.1.1. ADHERENCE TO MALONE’S DIRECTIVES

The first data source was the original policy documents themselves. The policy documents were coded to distinguish passages related to Malone’s directives. The most significant quotes related to each directive are displayed in the table in Appendix E. This table shows that, between the two major policies related to MTB MLE in the Philippines and their implementation guidelines, each of Malone’s directives have been considered in the policies.

The first directive, which requires a statement regarding purposes, goals and intended outcomes of the program, received substantial attention in the policy documents. Of the many quotations
that could have been selected to demonstrate adherence to this directive, two have been provided in the table. This shows that there is an understanding of MTB MLE theory and intended outcomes at the policy-making level.

Directive 2, on the specific languages to be used, was sufficiently clear in the text. Similarly, Directive 3, on the use and time frame of L1 in the program, was also well detailed in the policy documents. One quotation has been provided in Table 4, and in fact DO 74 included an in-depth annex detailing the bridging plan from L1 to L2 and L3.

Directive 7, requiring an explanation of how MTB MLE would be incorporated into the existing education system, was evidenced through the quote: “in all public schools, specifically in Kindergarten, Grade 1, 2 and 3 as part of the K to 12 Basic Education Program”.

The other directives, on the other hand, have received less attention in the policy documents. Directive 4 requiring information on how other agencies and organisations would be involved in the program received scant consideration in the document although two quotations have been provided. In relation to MTB MLE (as a separate initiative to the introduction of two additional school years), DepEd was the only organisation noted. There is no mention of NGO or Higher Education Institution (HEI) involvement. References to Directive 5 were similarly vague.

Directive 6 on financial support was only evidenced on one occasion; “the budgetary requirement of the programs under this Rule shall be ensured by the national government”. This quote as ambiguous in that it does not answer the question of which of the departments, committees or institutions under the national government shall be responsible for financing the reform. It is interesting to note that these two points were also raised by interview participants in relation to research question two.

4.1.2. Acceptance of Policy

The second criteria used to measure the ‘supportiveness’ of the policy context in the Philippines was the level of acceptance of the policy by key informants. Data on key informants’ opinion on DO 74 was gathered during SSIs. Participants were first asked if they were familiar with the policy, and if the response to this was affirmative, participants were asked about their opinion on the policy. A third question was prompted on some occasions (depending on the participant’s response to the first two questions) as to the changes the participant would make to the policy given the chance. The findings of the analysis of this data are summarised in Table 1 below. A more detailed table, breaking down participants by group, can be found in Appendix F.
The responses of participants from DepEd and from NGO groups were positive, with 5 participants stating they held a positive opinion of the policy. The participants used various degrees of positive vocabulary to describe the policy, including ‘good’, ‘very good’ and ‘perfect’. Most participants attributed their positivity about the policy to the recognition it gives to MTB MLE and to NDL speakers; “I rejoice with the implementation of this DepEd Order simply because it gives value not just to the languages but to the speakers themselves” (Participant 7, NGO).

Two participants presented mixed opinions on the policy, suggesting areas where it could be improved. Participant 2 (DepEd) suggested that “the bridging, it is too long” and Participant 5 stated that “it has to become a law”. Overall, however these two participants were positive about the policy itself despite these concerns. Further, several participants alluded to the fact that further policy will be required in the future. For example, Participant 1 stated that “for me it is a perfect policy for a starting point...” and Participant 6 (NGO) said she believed that DO 74 “was always conceived that it would be a step in the journey rather than the final statement”.

As Gipps and Brown (1992) have demonstrated, teachers may not to have read policy documents, therefore the question regarding opinion on policy was framed differently for school level participants. These participants were asked why their schools had begun teaching in Cebuano language. If they had referred to the policy in their answer, the researcher intended to ask further questions to gauge their familiarity with and opinion on the policy. However, none of the three school-level participants were familiar with DO 74. One teacher, Participant 9, knew that DepEd had something to do with the change in the school’s LOI, but did not know of the policy. The fact that the school-level participant group was unfamiliar with MTB MLE policy infers lack of teacher training; this issue will be further discussed in Section 4.2.

### TABLE 3 PARTICIPANTS’ OPINION ON DO 74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed but overall positive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar with policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. **Research Question 2: Challenges to Implementation**

The second research question (‘what challenges are there for adopting and implementing national MTB MLE through DO 74?’) seeks to understand the challenges to implementing MTB MLE in
Mindanao. The analysis of data was posited upon the assumption that challenges mentioned by multiple participants are more consistently experienced across stakeholder groups and thus may be considered an important finding in this study (see Section 3.3.4). Considering this assumption, the most important challenges found were the lack of teacher training provided and the difficulties in producing appropriate learning materials.

Table 4 summarises the most challenges reported by key informants. For a full analysis, refer to Appendix G, and to see the distribution of codes among participant groups, refer to Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4 IMPORTANT CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTATION FOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCEPTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CODES: CHALLENGES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MENTION OR INFERENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># OF TIMES MENTIONED OR INFERRED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of learning materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of learning materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of learning materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE/HABITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teacher knowledge/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of DepEd knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived superiority of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing teaching habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF DEPED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on centralised structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consultation/partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers assigned from outside community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent changes in administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to reach small languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale of implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1. Resources

Resources were identified as an important theme in the data, being explicitly cited a total of 42 times. School-level participants were more likely to cite resources as a challenge to implementation compared to other themes. Between the three school-level participants, resources were mentioned a total of 15 times, whereas these participants mentioned knowledge just three times and did not directly mention any other concept at all.
Within the concept of resources, the most frequent code encountered was ‘production of learning materials’, cited by seven participants across all participant groups. As documented in the literature review, MTB MLE programs require localised, culturally sensitive learning materials (Casquite, 2010; Dekker & Young, 2005; Young & Wisbey, 2013), and lack of such materials has been a barrier to quality education for students from ethno-linguistic minorities for many years (Sibayan, 1985). Implementation in 19 languages across the country has meant that the national MTB MLE program has been required to produce a huge number of new learning materials. Participants noted a number of challenges related to their production, particularly related to getting elders and other key stakeholders to participate in materials development, as well as the time and financial resources required by teachers to develop new materials.

On a related challenge, four participants commented on the difficulty of ‘transferring learning materials’. In an attempt to maximise on newly produced learning resources, DepEd has transferred learning materials from Cebu to Mindanao, on the assumption that the two varieties of Cebuano are similar enough to be understood by Cebuano speaking students in Mindanao. Though this may seem like a practical time and cost saving system, there are considerable phonetic and lexical variations between the dialects in Cebu and in Mindanao, as described by Endriga (2011). This produces confusion on the part of the student as well as the teacher; as Participant 8 (school) notes: “the MTB MLE (learning materials) we use come from Cebu. There are words that the locals and even the teachers could hardly understand. The meaning of the words that they use is not so familiar with these children”.

The general ‘lack of learning materials’ was identified as an important challenge, and was mentioned or inferred by six participants across all groups. It was most commonly cited by school-level participants (see Appendix I). Among school-level participants, this was the most commonly mentioned challenge. Participant 10, a first Grade teacher, emphasised that “until now no books (have been) given to the children... for two years no books”. Lack of learning materials is a manifestation of the widespread underfunding in the Filipino education system (Albert, et al., 2012) but is exacerbated by the need to produce new, localised materials for a MTB MLE curriculum.

‘Lack of financial resources’ was mentioned or inferred by six participants across all groups. Underfunding remains a consistent issue for the Philippines education system, and despite recent increases, DepEd’s budget remains below the World Bank’s recommended allowance (Albert, et al., 2012; Musa & Ziatdinov, 2012). Although maintenance costs for MTB MLE programs is no more than traditional educational systems, during initial setup of the program additional funds
are required. This is particularly the case where there are limited existing resources available in local languages (Halaoui, 2003; Vawda & Patrinos, 1998). Participants lamented that additional funds for new resources had not been sufficient; “it was not included in our plan to purchase the materials needed for the teachers to implement Mother Tongue Based Multilingual Education. So we find it difficult to find funds for that matter” (Participant 8, school). A contributing factor to this challenge may be that budgetary requirements for the program were not adequately delineated in the policy itself, as was found in the analysis of policy documents for research Question 1.

4.2.2. Knowledge

Within the concept of ‘knowledge’, there are several important challenges. As Chiatoh (2011) asserts, all stakeholders must understand the MTB MLE program for it to be sustainable long term. Therefore the challenges found under this theme together represent a significant barrier to successful MTB MLE implementation in Mindanao.

The challenge mentioned or inferred by the largest number of participants was ‘lack of teacher knowledge’. This code was mentioned by nine of the ten participants. This is notable, as no other challenge was mentioned or inferred so consistently. To date, teachers implementing MTB MLE in public schools have received only five days of teacher training, and school administrators have not received any formal training: “district teachers are only trained for 5 days and then (are) implementing immediately...” (Participant 1, DepEd). Various authors have commented on the importance of teacher training as an important factor in quality education programs and quality MTB MLE programs in particular (Benson, 2005a; Paulson, 2012; Yoon, et al., 2007). Five days is not sufficient time to change teacher paradigms and habits.

This leads to a second important challenge: ‘changing teaching habits’. This code was mentioned by six participants. Participant 2 speaks about teachers “spoon feeding” students to “put the answers in the mouth of the students just so they will be able to react”. Participant 1 (DepEd) links the challenge of changing teacher habits to the scarcity of teacher training to date; “they squashed the training so that the teachers, they went back to the old strategy”. Participant 7 rightly notes that changing from traditional education to MTB MLE represents a “paradigm shift”, which is difficult for teachers who were educated in a more traditional style; “the whole concept of the teachers being educated in an entirely different system from what they will be teaching now. So if they were taught in a non-cultural way, they were taught by implication that their culture is not important. They were forced not to speak their language and now they are going to be teaching it”. This is consistent with Guskey (2003), who stresses that teacher training should be
more than knowledge transfer, but should promote changes in teachers’ attitudes and beliefs in the classroom.

The other important challenge in this concept group was ‘lack of public knowledge’, mentioned or inferred by six participants. Participants specifically referred to the parents and other community members’ lack of understanding and even awareness of MTB MLE. Participants 5 and 7 (NGO) observed that many parents, particularly in rural areas, have not even heard of MTB MLE let alone have an understanding of its principles; “even now there are still people in the outskirts of the Philippines that don’t really know what MTB MLE is and why the government is doing it”.

The challenge ‘perceived superiority of English’ is intrinsically linked, as this perception stems from lack of public knowledge. This challenge was also mentioned six participants. Participant 7 (NGO) summarises: “parents too they want their children to learn English more than any other language”. This perception has been found cited various times in literature on the Philippines (Burton, 2013; Gallego & Zubiri, 2011; Sibayan, 1999) and has also been found in international contexts (Braam, 2004).

Finally, three participants mentioned that DepEd staff also lacked sufficient knowledge on MTB MLE. Participant 6 (NGO) explained that this was due to the common practice of DepEd to assign persons from different departments or areas: “many of them have identified a multilingual education supervisor as a lot of them have been given the job and don’t really know what they are doing yet” (Participant 6, NGO). Participant 1, herself from the DepEd group, illustrates this point: when she was assigned as the MTB MLE and indigenous education focal point, she describes “my education, my knowledge and concept about what to do about the Indigenous Peoples as well as the Mother Tongue is none yet – zero”.

4.2.3. Nature of DepEd
The third concept related to challenges was the nature of DepEd. It is interesting to note that almost half of the total number of times this concept was mentioned or inferred was attributed to participants from DepEd (13 out of 27), signifying that even those within the structure find it to be a challenge for MTB MLE implementation (see Appendix I for detailed analysis of the participant distribution of the concept).

The first important challenge found in this concept group is ‘centralised structure’. This code was mentioned or inferred by seven participants and refers to both the centralised structure itself, as well as to stakeholders’ dependence on the on this structure, and the difficulties this implies for
implanting a decentralised MTB MLE program. Participant 3 (DepEd) explains that “people are used to that kind of system where you have central office prepare the materials (then) you cascade, roll-out, download (to the districts)”. While participants from the school-level group did not explicitly mention this code as a challenge, the researcher was able to infer a reliance on centralised structure from responses by two participants in this group. For example, Participant 10 stated that “we cannot teach the children without the guides. We have to follow the curriculum”. This suggests that teachers feel that they are not capable of or not allowed to develop their own curriculum or materials, but would rather wait until DepEd issues something. This exemplifies what Luz (2008) and Bautista et al. (2009) have described in-depth the unequal power relations that are maintained between DepEd’s central office and regional stakeholders, which limits the capacity and autonomy particularly of teachers and school administrators.

A second challenge found in the group was ‘lack of consultation and partnership’. This challenge was mentioned or inferred by five participants. Participant 3, a DepEd employee himself, summarises: “consulting people is difficult... these communities working with the Department of Education for the longest time have been marginalised in the education process. (DepEd staff think that they) don’t have to consult this elder or this parent who probably hasn’t finished a degree in school”. According to Ricento and Hornberger’s (1996) theory, stakeholders at all levels must be involved in language policy dissemination and implementation. This is also consistent with UNESCO’s thinking on the subject (UNESCO, 2007a). It is interesting to note that, in the analysis of policy documents related to research Question 1, it was found that the Directive 4 (requiring information on how other agencies and organisations would be involved in the program) was not adequately explained. The challenge of lack of consultation and partnership between DepEd and other stakeholders also relates to the vast scale of MTB MLE implementation across an island archipelago. This will be further discussed under the next concept group.

The final two challenges in this concept group relate to the transient nature of DepEd. Three participants mentioned the challenge of ‘teachers assigned from outside the community’. Participant 4 (NGO) notes that “a lot of teachers (are) assigned in the community that is foreign for them”. DepEd may transfer teachers between communities and even between regions (Department of Education, 2013) and so teachers may not speak the same mother tongue as their students. This presents an obvious challenge to MTB MLE, which requires teachers to also be a proficient speaker of their students’ L1.

Similarly, three participants noted that there are ‘frequent changes in administration’. This mainly refers to changes at the division level. For example, one participant in the DepEd group inferred
this code through a recounting of her experience as the MTB MLE focal person, describing how duties originally assigned to her had often later been reassigned to others. This code also referred to actual or potential changes at higher levels of DepEd which could affect their MTB MLE program. Participant 4 (NGO) summarises: “we fear... that if Pinoy” don’t want already Luistro”, this Department Order will change. So we can’t be sure if after Luistro, this order will still be there”. Bautista et al. (2009) describes the significant influence that a Secretary holds over DepEd programs, and how this affects the continuity and sustainability of educational reform.

4.2.4. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Several participants also commented on the strategy and design of MTB MLE implementation. Four participants expressed concern that the languages selected for initial MTB MLE are nineteen of the larger, regional languages, and not the languages of the most disadvantaged communities. Sibayan (1974) notes that almost 90 percent of the population speak one of eight major regional languages. Each of these eight languages has been included in the initial implementation of MTB MLE, specified in clause 3 of DO 16 (Department of Education, 2012). This means that there is a high degree of population coverage under the program. However, as Participant 6 (NGO) notes, “the place where MTB MLE is most needed is up in the mountains and on the little islands where people don’t hear Filipino being used. Yet if you look at the 19 languages that now have been chosen, they do focus on the largest languages, many of which are very urban... there is tension there”. Further challenges in this area are likely if and when DepEd decides to scale up implementation to include smaller language groups.

Though DepEd has decided to focus on only nineteen languages, three participants still expressed concern that the scale of this is too great. Participant 2 (DepEd) stated that “to be starting right away with twelve languages it is too difficult... after a year we added seven languages and now we have nineteen, I think that is too ambitious”. Participants recommended that in light of the huge scale of national implementation, DepEd should employ the assistance of other organisations in order to reach all schools and NDL groups: “the job is bigger, so much bigger than just one organisation or even two, or DepEd and two organisations” (Participant 7, NGO). Interestingly, support from NGOs and HEIs was also noted as a key aid under Question 3.

---

m ‘Pinoy’ is an informal demonym referring to Filipino people.

n Brother Armin Luistro is the current Secretary of DepEd.
4.3. **RESEARCH QUESTION 3: AIDS TO IMPLEMENTATION**

In addition to challenges, this study also sought to identify aids which have supported the implementation of MTB MLE in Mindanao, so that these aids may be strengthened in order to minimise some of the opposing challenges identified. Again, the following presentation and discussion of results is based on the assumption outlined in Section 3.3.4. Based on this assumption, the most important aids found in this study was support from NGOs and HEIs, closely followed by support from community members and the existence of policy.

Table 5 summarises the concepts and codes identified during data analysis related to the third research question (‘what has aided in the adoption and implementation of national MTB MLE through DO 74?’). For a full breakdown of the frequency of each code, see Appendix H. The distribution of codes among participant groups is shown in Appendix J.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPTS</th>
<th>CODES: AIDS</th>
<th># OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MENTION OR INFERENCE</th>
<th># OF TIMES MENTIONED OR INFERRER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORT FROM OUTSIDE DepEd</strong></td>
<td>NGO/HEI support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign aid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL WILL</strong></td>
<td>Existence of policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support from President/DepEd Secretary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General enthusiasm of all stakeholders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGO advocacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1. **SUPPORT FROM OUTSIDE DepEd**

The concept of ‘support from outside DepEd’ covered support from NGOs and HEIs, foreign aid agencies and the community. It is interesting to note that, under this research question, support from outside DepEd was the only concept cited by all three participant groups as it was only concept mentioned by participants from the school-level group. As with challenges, this study has found that teachers and principals inevitably focus on aids in their most immediate surroundings.

NGO and HEI support was the most frequently mentioned aid within this theme, as it was mentioned seven participants. UNESCO has also noted the importance of including NGOs as implementers in MTB MLE (UNESCO, 2007a), particularly for language mapping, orthography development, advocacy and community mobilisation, given their experience running programs...
prior to government programs were set up. One participant (Participant 3, DepEd) attributed the benefit of NGO/HEI support to their responsiveness: “they have been great help with implementing MTB MLE (because they have) the flexibility for them to do quick action, to quickly respond to such initiatives”. This is in contrast to DepEd, whose centralised structure makes it difficult to respond to any issue quickly.

A second important aid found within this concept was support from individuals in the community, particularly community elders. This aid was mentioned by six participants. Participant 8, a school Principal, acknowledges: “elders have plenty of skill, plenty of knowledge”. As noted by Casquite (2010) and others, MTB MLE materials are most effective when they are developed with community support, and are based on community knowledge and values. Further, other studies in the Philippines have found that the highest achieving schools in the country consistently had a strong parent, teacher and community association (quoted in Luz, 2008, p. 48). Therefore it is not surprising that participants in all groups noted this community support as an important aid in MTB MLE implementation.

Support from persons at the school level was cited by three participants as an aid to implementation. Two participants referred to school actors giving financial support to MTB MLE: for example, Participant 10 stated that “our Principal, financially he helped us in giving the activities for our children from his financial honoraria every month”. Participants 1 and 2 (DepEd) also acknowledged that teachers and principals had worked both in material development and in advocacy on behalf of the program.

4.3.2. Political Will

The second concept identified under this research question was ‘political will’. The most frequently mentioned code in this concept group was ‘the existence of supportive policies’, mentioned by six participants. Three participants commented on the security and recognition that the policies have granted their MTB MLE programs as an aid to implementation. Participant 6 (NGO) summarises: “people were more confident to try things; they knew that no one was going to slap them down anymore, they knew that they had verification from the DepEd Order”. Policy, as a manifestation of political will and official support, is a vital condition for successful MTB MLE programs (Dutcher, 2003, 2004). This is in line with the findings of Question 1, in section 4.1, which shows that the policy environment present in the Philippines is supportive of MTB MLE programs.
A second intrinsically linked code is ‘support from DepEd Secretary/President’, mentioned by three participants. Supportive policy is representative of the support that the Filipino President and the DepEd Secretary have lent to MTB MLE in recent years. Participant 2 (DepEd) mentions the various high level agencies that are in support of MTB MLE implementation: “we have a very supportive Secretary and all the executives… we have support from the Department, from the Secretary and of course from our Government”. Bautista et al. (2009) observe that support from DepEd leadership is essential for education reform in the Philippines due to the high degree of influence an individual secretary is able to yield.

Three participants commented on the ‘general enthusiasm of all stakeholders’ as an aid to MTB MLE implementation. Participant 6 (NGO) describes: “I have seen how people became so pumped up and interested and excited about it becoming a law”. Participant 2 (DepEd) goes as far as stating that “we don’t hear anymore opposition to the Mother Tongue”. This is important, given that “acceptance is the hallmark of good language planning and policy implementation” (Haugen cited in Mesthrie, 2002, p. 398). Support from a range of stakeholders is required for a MTB MLE program to be sustainable (Chiatoh, 2011).

4.3.3. Knowledge

Knowledge was the third important concept identified in relation to the final research question. Under the previous research question, knowledge was noted as an important challenge, so it is interesting to note that five participants noted this area as an aid to MTB MLE implementation as well.

Specifically, four participants referred to ‘NGO advocacy’ as having increased stakeholders’ knowledge of MTB MLE. Participant 5 (NGO) said that advocacy “helped a lot” and “had a huge impact” on MTB MLE implementation. The efforts of advocacy can be seen in the code ‘general enthusiasm’. This aid is of particular interest given its potential to counteract the challenge of ‘lack of public knowledge’ noted above. This idea will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

Finally, two DepEd participants noted that training had assisted in growing their understanding and appreciation of MTB MLE, and thus in its implementation. It is interesting to note that the two participants who mentioned training as an aid also saw ‘lack of teacher training’ to be a challenge under Question 2. Further, while only participants in the DepEd group commented on training as an aid, participants from all groups noted teacher training as a challenge (see Appendix

* Advocacy here refers to awareness raising and lobbying by NGOs.
G). Participant 2 (DepEd) notes: “during the span of two years we were sent to trainings and that is where we understood and we valued the DepEd Order 74". Participant 2, also from DepEd, comments that she had 50 days of training abroad on MTB MLE. In contrast, teachers interviewed who are implementing MTB MLE have only received 5 days training to date (see section 5.2.2.). Given the findings of Paulson (2012) that teacher training is an important factor in successful MTB MLE programs in the Philippines, and the comments of these two participants on their own positive experiences with extended training, recommendations on training will be drawn in the following Chapter.

4.4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY MAKERS AND RESEARCHERS

Four recommendations are given. Each reinforces the aids to MTB MLE implementation identified in this study while addressing the known challenges to implementation:

Ensure supportive political environment is present

This study has shown that the policy environment in the Philippines is supportive of MTB MLE, and that key informants believe that this has been a beneficial aid in the implementation of MTB MLE. Therefore countries initiating a national level MTB MLE program should ensure that supportive policies are in place to enable local stakeholders to feel secure, confident and sufficiently supported to accept and implement MTB MLE.

Focus on training at the local level to empower teachers, principals and regional DepEd staff.

This study has shown that lack of training has been a challenge in MTB MLE implementation, and that teachers rely heavily on the centralised DepEd to create curriculum and materials. Training should be delivered to all local stakeholders, including teachers, principals, school administrators and regional DepEd staff, in order to help them understand the theory of MTB MLE, but also to empower them to work together to create a localised education system, and thus reduce reliance on the central office. This is not something that can happen overnight, but is rather a long term investment in training and empowerment.

Extend partnerships with NGOs, HEIs and community groups

Government initiated MTB MLE is relatively new in many countries, including the Philippines. Previously, most MTB MLE programs were run by NGOs, HEIs and community groups. Therefore government bodies partnering with NGOs, HEIs and community groups maximise on the experience, capabilities and strengths of each of these groups to achieve the best outcome for NDL students.
Ensure sufficient additional funds are available for early years of implementation

The initial years of MTB MLE implementation require a considerable investment of funds to develop learning materials, print them, train teachers and raise awareness. New MTB MLE programs should ensure that the necessary start-up funding investment is available for these activities. Once established, the MTB MLE program should cost no than traditional education systems (Halaoui, 2003; Vawda & Patrinos, 1998) and there are in fact savings produced through reduced student repetitions and drop outs (Chiswick, et al., 1996; Dutcher & Tucker, 1995).

Therefore an initial investment upfront in MTB MLE will repaid over time.

4.5. Areas for Further Research

As a partial component of a Masters level course with limited time and resources, this study has drawn preliminary conclusions and recommendations which are based on in-country research and are consistent with the literature. However, several areas for further research are suggested:

National survey of the major challenges and aids

This study utilised a qualitative methodology and a representative sample of ten key informants. It would be of interest to see if the same conclusions could be drawn from a wider sample of informants, including informants from different regions nationally. This could be done through a survey, using the challenges and aids identified in this study as the foundation for developing a quantitative survey tool. In this way, findings could be more statistically generalisable to broader contexts (Yin, 2009).

Best practice in government and NGO/HEI/community partnering

One of the recommendations given in this study is for government to strengthen its partnerships with NGOs, HEIs and community groups. However, it was beyond the scope of this study to provide any further recommendations on how this can be done. Though UNESCO has produced several texts on the topic of best practice in MTB MLE generally (eg. UNESCO, 2005b, 2007a, 2007b), the current context in the Philippines would provide unique insights into how government can and should work with non-government groups to implement MTB MLE both locally and on a national scale. This could be done through a series of case studies from schools that have demonstrated both good and bad examples of government/non-government partnerships. Case studies could incorporate interviews with key community members, including elders, teachers, parents and NGO representatives, as well as storytelling, informal conversation, and observation.
**Economic analysis of funding required for initial start-up of national MTB MLE**

Another recommendation given in this study is to ensure that sufficient additional funds are provided in the planning of a new national MTB MLE program. Further economic analysis is needed to determine the required level of funding and the most appropriate manner in which these funds should be distributed. For example, for a language with limited existing literature, and around 1 million speakers of early primary school age, what level of funding is required to establish a quality MTB MLE curriculum, provide sufficient teacher and administrator training, and distribute learning materials to students? While the answer to this question is highly contextualised, there may be general recommendations that an economic analysis could draw which would be useful both for the Philippines as they contemplate scale up, and for other countries planning a new program.

**Stakeholders’ motivations for supporting MTB MLE**

One participant in the present study commented that he believed many proponents of MTB MLE in the Philippines were in favour of this style of education because of the proven benefits it has for second language (English) acquisition. He, on the other hand, supports a rights-based perspective on the topic. This topic would surely make for a thought-provoking study into stakeholder motivations for supporting MTB MLE, which in turn could have beneficial implications for advocacy groups. Ruiz’s (1988) orientations to language could be utilised in such a study.
5. Conclusion

This dissertation has examined Filipino MTB MLE policies and their implementation in Mindanao, among the most ethnically and linguistically diverse areas in the Philippines. Employing grounded theory case study methodology, data was collected from original policy documents and SSIs with key informants in Manila and Mindanao. Although the scope of this research allowed only ten in-country informants to be interviewed, those chosen represent the main stakeholder groups at each level of Ricento and Hornberger’s (1996) layers of language policy dissemination and implementation, thus adding validity to the findings. The findings of this study reflect the major themes evident in the MTB MLE literature and can be considered as an additional exemplar in this body of knowledge. Further research in the Filipino context including a larger sampling pool is recommended.

This study has not tested the validity of MTB MLE as an educational alternative, which is well proven in the literature. Instead, the concern of this research was to determine the level of support the current policies have created for MTB MLE, the challenges which have been encountered in the implementation of these policies, and the aids which have facilitated their implementation.

This study has found that the policies which underpin the national MTB MLE program may be considered supportive according to current thinking on MTB MLE policy, articulated through Malone’s (2007) framework. Further, these policies are approved of by almost all stakeholders, who note that this has created an environment where stakeholders feel confident and encouraged to accept and implement MTB MLE.

Although a supportive environment is in place, a number of challenges to successful implementation of MTB MLE in Mindanao were identified. The most common challenges cited by informants and supported by the literature were the lack of teacher training provided and the difficulties in producing appropriate learning materials. Aids to implementation were also found; the most important of these being support from groups outside of the government such as NGOs, HEIs, community members, teachers and principals. The aids found in this study should be strengthened by DepEd in order to minimise some of the opposing challenges identified.

Based on the findings of this study, four recommendations for future MTB MLE programs and the scale up of existing MTB MLE programs were drawn and four recommendations for further research suggested.
To conclude this study, the words of one participant seem salient:

“It is only when we implement something that we realise that we still have to do it. This is a work in progress. We are all learning... it will not happen overnight. The most important thing is that we were able to start and we were able to legalise.”

The Philippines has taken a bold step in becoming the first South East Asian country to put national MTB MLE policy in place and to implement it across 19 language groups. Though there are still many challenges to be addressed, there are also opportunities to strengthen those things which are working and supporting MTB MLE implementation. What is positive and encouraging is that policy makers, implementers and teachers together have taken the first steps in creating an education system that is inclusive of students from all language backgrounds. It is anticipated that the findings and recommendations of this study drawn from the Filipino example will be of benefit to policy makers and researchers both in the Philippines, as DepEd seeks to scale-up of its current MTB MLE program, and abroad, as other countries seek to legislate and implement new national MTB MLE programs.
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7. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Map of Mindanao Region (MINDANAO MAPS, 2010)
Appendix B: Language Map of Southern Philippines (Lewis, et al., 2013)
Appendix C: Plain Language Statement and Consent Form – Participants

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Participants

| Date:                      | ............................................ |
| Full Project Title:       | Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education Policy and Implementation in Mindanao, Philippines |
| Principal Researcher:     | Dr. Max Kelly |
| Student Researcher:       | Naomi Fillmore |

You are invited to take part in this research project. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without penalty and without the need to give a reason. This research is being conducted independently and is not affiliated with any organisation other than Deakin University and the researchers listed above.

Once you have read this form and agree to participate, please sign the attached consent form. You may keep this copy of the Plain Language Statement. You may withdraw your consent at any stage by signing and returning the attached Withdrawal of Consent form.

The purpose of this research is to explore the drivers, barriers and challenges for adopting and implementing the DepEd Order No. 74 Institutionalizing Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education, and other policies related to Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE).

Participation in the project will involve an interview, during which you will be asked questions relating your experiences legislating and/or implementing policies related to MTB MLE. With your consent, I will be audio recording the interview for later transcription and analysis.

Your name will not be used and your responses will not be attributed to you personally without further permission being obtained. Your responses are confidential and your privacy will be respected. To comply with Australian government requirements, all data will be securely stored at Deakin University for a period of one year.

Plain Language Statement & Consent Form to Participants
HAE-14-017: Version 1: 26 Feb 2014
Ethics approval
This project has been approved by the Human Ethics Advisory Group of Deakin University (valid to 10/03/2018).

Complaints
If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:

The Manager, Research Integrity
Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125
Telephone: 9251 7129
research-ethics@deakin.edu.au

Further information
If you require further information or have any problems concerning this project, you can contact the researcher:

Naomi Fillmore
+61 (7) XXXX
XXX@deakin.edu.au

You may also contact the following representative in the Philippines:

Pia XXX
+63 (2) XXX XXX
XXX@XXX.com
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Participant

Date: ........................................
Full Project Title: Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education Policy and Implementation in Mindanao, Philippines
Reference Number: HAE-14-017

I have read and I understand the attached Plain Language Statement.

I freely agree to participate in this project according to the conditions in the Plain Language Statement.

I also understand and agree that my interview will be audio recorded.

I have been given a copy of the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form to keep. The researcher has agreed not to reveal my identity and personal details, including where information about this project is published, or presented in any public form.

Participant’s Name (printed)  ........................................................................................................

Signature ............................................................ Date ........................................

Please hand this consent form back to the researcher before beginning the interview.
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Participants

Withdrawal of Consent Form
(To be used for participants who wish to withdraw from the project)

Date: ...........................................
Full Project Title: Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education Policy and Implementation in Mindanao, Philippines
Reference Number: HAE-14-017

I hereby wish to WITHDRAW my consent to participate in the above research project and understand that such withdrawal WILL NOT jeopardise my relationship with Deakin University or any other organisation.

Participant’s Name (printed) ..............................................................

Signature .......................................................... Date .........................

Please email this form to:
Naomi Fillmore
nXXX@deakin.edu.au
Appendix D: Semi-structured Interview Script

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCRIPT

Full Project Title: Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education Policy and Implementation in Mindanao, Philippines
Researcher: Naomi Fillmore

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to explore the drivers, barriers, challenges and opportunities for adopting and implementing policies related to Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE) in the Philippines, and particularly in the regions of Mindanao. This information will contribute to my Master’s thesis, which I will be happy to share with you when it is complete in June.

Remember that your participation is voluntary and the interview can be stopped any time. I will be audio recording the interview for later transcription and analysis. Your name will not be used and your responses will not be attributed to you personally. Your responses are confidential and your privacy will be respected. I would like to know your honest opinion and experiences. I am interested in your personal opinions and experiences.

Do you have any questions for me?

Discussion Questions

I have prepared some questions as a starting point for our discussion. These are just a starting point; you are free to speak about anything you think is relevant, and I may ask for further information as well.
1. You have been selected to participate in this research because of your involvement in planning or implementing Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE) programs. Tell me more about this involvement.
   1.1. Do you have any experience with MTB MLE in the Mindanao regions? If so please expand on this experience.

2. Are you familiar with the 2009 DepEd Order No. 74 Institutionalizing Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education ('the policy')?
   2.1. What is your opinion of this policy? Why?
   2.2. If you could, are there any changes would you make to this policy? Why?
   2.3. What other DepEd policies are relevant to the MTB MLE program/s you are involved in? How do they interact with the Order 74.?

3. Tell me about when DepEd Order No. 74 came into effect in 2009.
   3.1. What did you think about the policy at this time? Why?
   3.2. Has your opinion changed over time? How? Why?
   3.3. What did different groups think about the policy at this time? Eg. DepEd staff/ NGOs/ schools/ teachers/ school communities?
   3.4. Do you think their opinions have changed over time? How? Why?
   3.5. In your experience, what have been the challenges in implementing this policy?
   3.6. What has supported or aided the implementation of this policy?

4. Tell me about your MTB MLE program/s.
   4.1. What effect has the 2009 policy had on the MTB MLE program/s you are involved in?
   4.2. What other factors have influenced your program/s in the last 5 years?
   4.3. How do you think this policy and future DepEd policies will affect your program/s in the future?
   4.4. What do you think about the future of the MTB MLE program/s you are involved in?

5. Is there anything else you would like to add?

   Thank you for your participation! Salamat!
**Appendix E: Policy analysis Against Malone’s Directives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTIVES (SUMMARISED FROM MALONE, 2007)</th>
<th>QUOTES FROM POLICY DOCUMENT</th>
<th>LOCATION OF QUOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Statement regarding (a) <strong>purposes</strong>, <strong>goals</strong> and intended <strong>outcomes</strong> relating to the program, based on an (b) <strong>understanding of the language</strong> situation in the country</td>
<td>(a) “The Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE) aims to develop the following area: 1. Language development which established a strong education for success in school and for lifelong learning 2. Cognitive development which focuses on Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS); 3. Academic development which prepares the learner to acquire mastery of competencies in each of the learning areas; and 4. Socio-cultural awareness which enhances the pride of the learner’s heritage, language and culture.” (b) “The lessons and findings of various local initiatives and international studies in basic education have validated the superiority of the use of the learner’s mother tongue or first language in improving learning outcomes and promoting Education for All (EFA).”</td>
<td>DO 16 (2012), Guidelines, Clause A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Directives regarding the <strong>languages to be used</strong></td>
<td>“Eight (8) major languages or Lingua Francas and others as cited below shall be offered as a learning area and utilized as language of instruction.... Tagalog; Kapampangan; Pagasines; Iloko; Bikol; Cebuano; Hiligaynon; Waray; Tausug; Maguindanao; Maranao; and Chabocano.”</td>
<td>DO 16 (2012), Clause 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Directives regarding use of students’ L1 and period which it is to be used as LOI</td>
<td>“The learners’ Mother Tongue (L1) shall be used as the medium of instruction (MOI) in all domains/learning areas from Kindergarten through Grade 3 except Filipino (L2) and English (L3). The L1 will continuously be used as MOI in a transition or bridging process (L1-L2-L1 or L2-L1-L2) through Grade 3.”</td>
<td>DO 16 (2012), Guidelines, Clause B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Directives regarding the <strong>agencies and organisations</strong> that will be involved</td>
<td>“DepEd shall formulate the design and details of the enhanced basic education curriculum.” “DepED, CHED and the TESDA shall formulate the appropriate strategies and mechanisms to ensure a smooth transition...”</td>
<td>RA 10533 (2012), Section 5 RA 10533 (2012), Section 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Directives regarding (a) <strong>implementation</strong>, including (b) <strong>assignment of responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>(a) “During the first three years of implementation, the enclosed “MLE Bridging Plan” may be used for reference for both teaching and curriculum development” (b) “All Regional Directors and Superintendents are hereby enjoined to promote and encourage local participation...”</td>
<td>DO 74 (2009), Clause 6 DO 74 (2009), Clause 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Directives regarding how <strong>financial support</strong> will be provided</td>
<td>“The budgetary requirement of the programs under this Rule shall be ensured by the national government.”</td>
<td>IRR of RA 10533 (2012), Section 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Directives regarding how the policy will be <strong>incorporated into existing education systems</strong></td>
<td>“The Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB MLE) shall be implemented in all public schools, specifically in Kindergarten, Grade 1, 2 and 3 as part of the K to 12 Basic Education Program”</td>
<td>DO 16 (2012), Clause 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Participants opinion on DO 74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>DepEd</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total # participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 1</td>
<td>P 2</td>
<td>P 3</td>
<td>P 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed but overall positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar with policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G: Challenges to MTB MLE Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Codes: Challenges</th>
<th>DepEd</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>School</th>
<th># of participants</th>
<th># of times mentioned or inferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Lack of financial resources</td>
<td>xx x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>xx xx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production of learning materials</td>
<td>xx x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x xxx</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of learning materials</td>
<td>xxx x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx x</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer of learning materials</td>
<td>xxx x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx xx</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge/Habits</strong></td>
<td>Lack of teacher knowledge/training</td>
<td>xxx x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>xx o o o</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of public knowledge</td>
<td>xxx xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xxx xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of DepEd knowledge</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived superiority of English</td>
<td>oo x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x o</td>
<td>o o</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing teaching habits</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o o</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of DepEd</strong></td>
<td>Centralised structure</td>
<td>xx xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>o o</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of consultation/partnership</td>
<td>x xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers assigned from outside community</td>
<td>o xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent changes in administration</td>
<td>o x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation strategy</strong></td>
<td>Ability to reach small languages</td>
<td>x xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large scale of implementation</td>
<td>xxx x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging period into English</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of implementation</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-inclusion of early childhood education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Factors</strong></td>
<td>Armed conflict in Mindanao</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Aids to MTB MLE Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Codes: Aids</th>
<th>DepEd</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>School</th>
<th># of participants</th>
<th># of times mentioned or inferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support from outside DepEd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/HEI support</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign aid</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>xxx x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School support</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Will</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of policy</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from President/DepEd Secretary</td>
<td>x xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General enthusiasm of all stakeholders</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO advocacy</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Legend:*
- x: Mentioned
- o: Inferred
# Appendix I: Challenges by Participant Group

## Challenges by participant groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Knowledge / Habits</th>
<th>Nature of DepEd.</th>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>External Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of learning materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of learning materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of learning materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teacher knowledge/training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of DepEd knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived superiority of English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing teaching habits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on centralised structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers assigned from outside community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent changes in administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to reach small languages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale of implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging period into English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-inclusion of early childhood education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed conflict in Mindanao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of mentions and inferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th># of School participants</th>
<th># of NGO participants</th>
<th># of DepEd participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of learning materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of learning materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of learning materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teacher knowledge/training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of DepEd knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived superiority of English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing teaching habits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on centralised structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers assigned from outside community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent changes in administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to reach small languages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale of implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging period into English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-inclusion of early childhood education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed conflict in Mindanao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Aids By Participant Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aids by participant groups</th>
<th># of School participants</th>
<th># of NGO participants</th>
<th># of DepEd participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO/HEI support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign aid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from President/DepEd Secretary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General enthusiasm of all stakeholders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO advocacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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