Teachers' Perception on English Instruction and Academic Performance as Mediated by Teacher Practices: Basis for an Action Plan

Manilyn B. Rosal, Richard S. Mula, Kim C. Abico

School Of Advanced Studies Bohol Island State University- Clarin Campus

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0493

Received: 23 July 2026; Accepted: 28 July 2026; Published: 06 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Bridging the gap between English instruction and student achievement requires stronger communication support, enhanced teacher proficiency, and more responsive classroom practices, this study examined teachers' perceptions of English instruction and the academic performance of learners in Mathematics and Science, with classroom practices as a mediating variable. It utilized an adapted survey-questionnaire to gather data to 97 Key Stage 1 teachers of Sagbayan District, purposively selected as being affected by the transition of MTB to English instruction. Findings revealed that teachers generally hold a moderately positive perception of English instruction, although students' ease in addressing inquiries in English indicating some difficulty in communication. In terms of classroom practices, results showed consistent implementation of English instruction strategies, yet challenges related to teachers' proficiency in English as a medium of instruction emerged as the weakest area. Despite these concerns, learners demonstrated a high level of academic achievement, with most classified as Very Satisfactory and a significant proportion as Outstanding, yielding a highly positive overall performance. However, mediation analysis indicated that teachers' perceptions do not have a statistically significant direct effect on academic performance, and classroom practices do not significantly mediate this relationship, with the total effect also found to be non-significant. It is recommended to strengthen learners' English communication confidence through structured speaking activities and supportive classroom environments, enhance teachers' English proficiency and EMI competence through continuous professional development, sustain and improve learner-centered and interactive classroom practices, utilize assessment data more effectively for targeted instructional interventions, and encourage future researchers to employ mixed-methods or qualitative approaches to gain deeper insights into English instruction experiences.

Keywords: Classroom Practices, Teachers', Proficiency, Performance, English Instructions

INTRODUCTION/ RATIONALE

Language has always been an integral part of education. It serves not just as a course of study but also as the primary vehicle for disseminating and learning other subjects. The Department of Education (DepEd) in the Philippines integrated this concept through the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) program, initially established by DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009, and subsequently reinforced by DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2012. The use of the learner's first language as the medium of instruction from Kindergarten to Grade 3 was also mandated by the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic Act 10533). The primary objective of MTB-MLE is to facilitate learning through the usage and use of the best language of the children to improve comprehension, critical thinking, and early literacy. Malone (2007) and Cummins (2000) point out that the first language provides a good basis for learning additional languages.

Furthermore, education systems experiencing linguistic transition encounter a pivotal moment where teaching efficacy and student results are closely linked. The shift from Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) to English as the medium of instruction has both benefits and challenges, particularly in core

subjects such as Science and Mathematics. In the initial phases of education, learners are acquiring their language abilities and conceptual understanding simultaneously, which means teachers play a crucial role in integrating language and content (Cummins, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978).

Nevertheless, a substantial gap remains in research that simultaneously examines the translation of educators' ideas into classroom behaviours and, importantly, how these practices operate as a mediating factor influencing students' academic performance. This study aimed to evaluate teachers' attitudes of English education and analyse how these views, influenced by classroom practices, connect to students' academic achievement in Science and Mathematics. The study used a mediation technique to have a more profound insight into the effect of teacher-related factors on student achievement.

The study proved invaluable in offering context-specific guidance for treatment and instructional support to teachers shifting to English as the medium of teaching. The results of this study will be used to develop an action plan to improve instructional practices, increase teacher readiness, and ultimately improve student performance in core subjects. In the Sagbayan District, where this transition is underway, evidence-based insights are crucial for guaranteeing that policy improvements provide substantial and equitable educational progress for young learners.

METHODOLOGY

Design. This study utilized a quantitative, non-experimental mediation research design to investigate the mediating role of teachers practices on the relationship between teachers' perception and English instructions.

Environment and Respondents. The study was conducted in the Municipality of Sagbayan with 24 barangays and with 21 public schools elementary under the Sagbayan District. Further, the respondents of the study were the public elementary school teachers of Sagbayan district Kindergarten and key stage 1 teachers who were purposively selected a total of 97 respondents on this study.

Instrument. The questionnaire utilized in this study consisted of three major parts designed to assess teachers' perceptions, classroom practices, and students' academic achievement regarding English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI). Part I measured teachers' perceptions using eight (8) indicators adapted from Nur et al. (2022), focusing on students' comprehension, confidence, engagement, and language development, and was rated through a four-point Likert scale. Part II evaluated teachers' classroom practices and EMI implementation through forty (40) items adapted from Arega et al. (2024), covering instructional practices, student evaluation, classroom management, challenges in EMI implementation, and coping strategies. The instrument was adopted with permission from the author without modifications. Part III included learners' quarterly assessment results to determine academic achievement and examine its relationship with teachers' perceptions and practices. The questionnaire demonstrated high reliability, with reliability indices of 0.87 for Part I and 0.92 for Part II.

Procedure. Prior to the conduct of the study, letters requesting permission were submitted to the Dean of the College of Advanced Studies, Campus Director, Division School Superintendent, School District Supervisor, and school heads, with the approved letter from the Superintendent attached to the request for the Sagbayan District Public School District Supervisor. To identify the participants, the researcher secured lists from the principals' offices and obtained consent from the respondents for the use of students' quarterly Mathematics and Science grades as measures of academic achievement. The survey questionnaires were administered in Sagbayan Central Elementary Schools and retrieved after one week. After data collection, the responses were consolidated, statistically treated, analyzed, and presented in tabular form, followed by the presentation of findings, conclusions, and recommendations, which served as the basis for the proposed action plan.

Statistical Treatment. To determine the level of teachers' perception on English instruction, weighted mean and standard deviation was used. To determine the level of learners' academic performance, frequency and percentage was utilized. To determine the significant relationship as mediated by classroom practices between teachers' perception and academic performance, and path analysis was used in the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teachers' Perception on English Instruction

Table 1 presents the level of teachers' perception on the use of English as a medium of instruction in Mathematics and Science among 97 respondents. It summarizes the responses using statistical measures such as the mean and standard deviation, along with their corresponding descriptive interpretations.

Table 1 Level of Teachers' Perception on English Instruction in Mathematics and Science N=97

Perceptions	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1. The students will improve their speaking ability significantly when taught in English	2.77	0.67	Positive
2. The students will improve their reading ability significantly when taught in English	2.75	0.65	Positive
3. The students learn effectively when instructed in English	2.57	0.63	Positive
4. Learners learn better when instructed in English	2.56	0.58	Positive
5. The majority of students comprehend everything I say in English	2.48	0.61	Moderately Positive
6. The majority of students feel secure working in groups in English	2.44	0.61	Moderately Positive
7. The majority of learners comprehend English course materials and textbooks	2.43	0.58	Moderately Positive
8. The majority of students are at ease addressing inquiries in English	2.38	0.57	Moderately Positive
Composite	**2.55**	**0.62**	Moderately Positive

The statistics demonstrate that the teachers have a good attitude toward the use of English as a medium of instruction in Mathematics and Science in general. The highest mean is in the statement "The students will improve their speaking ability significantly when taught in English" (M = 2.77, SD = 0.67) followed by the improvement in reading ability (M = 2.75, SD = 0.65). The results indicate that teachers strongly associate the teaching of English with the development of communicative competences, mainly the productive and receptive capacities of the language. This is in keeping with the Social Cognitive Theory which states that learning happens through interaction and language use, therefore reiterating the idea that exposure to English increases the students' linguistic competence (Bandura, 2021).

On the other hand, the least mean is observed in "Majority of students are comfortable in responding questions in English "(M = 2.38, SD = 0.57) and comprehension-related concerns including understanding the course materials (M = 2.43, SD = 0.58). The data imply that teachers value the advantages of skill development, but are confused regarding the confidence and knowledge of students in practical classroom situations. This is confirmed by recent findings that language barriers can deter active engagement even where there are perceived advantages of training (Dearden, 2019; Macaro et al., 2020).

The composite mean of 2.55 (SD = 0.62) as Moderately Positive indicates that the teachers' perceptions are positive but not highly positive. The slightly medium standard deviation suggests a stable yet conservative attitude of responders. That is, teachers perceive the potential of English instruction, but also, analytically, the present constraints, particularly around student preparedness and understanding. Constructivist Learning Theory suggests that learning becomes effective when students actively construct meaning, so a limited understanding can impair the value of English as a medium (Vygotsky, in Schunk, 2020).

This finding also corresponds to earlier studies indicating that although English medium instruction (EMI) contributes to academic and language development, its success depends on learners' language proficiency and contextual support systems (Graham et al., 2021; Rose et al., 2021). Therefore, notwithstanding the teachers'

positive attitudes towards English instruction, the average grade highlights the necessity for scaffolding strategies to fill the gaps in understanding and build up the students' confidence.

Teachers Classroom Practices

Table 2 shows the level of teachers' classroom practices in implementing English instruction in teaching Mathematics and Science. The data are organized based on computed mean scores, standard deviations, and their equivalent descriptive interpretations.

Table 2 Level of Teacher Classroom Practices on English Instruction in Teaching Math and Science N=97

Indicators	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
1. Coping Strategies Requiring Resource Utilization	3.34	0.49	Highly Practiced
2. Contextualized Coping Strategies	3.31	0.50	Highly Practiced
3. Lesson Introduction, Presentation and Summary	3.16	0.55	Practiced
4. Student Evaluation and Instruction Provision	3.00	0.50	Practiced
5. Classroom Management Techniques	3.00	0.47	Practiced
6. Lack of Training, Interest, English as Medium of Instruction Integration, and Excessive use of Multilingual	2.73	0.65	Practiced
7. Challenges Related to Teachers' Proficiency in English as Medium of Instruction	2.49	0.60	Practiced
Composite	**3.00**	**0.54**	**Practiced**

The data demonstrate that teachers employ classroom methods actively in teaching English in Mathematics and Science. The mean scores were highest for Coping Strategies Requiring Resource Utilization (M = 3.34, SD = 0.49) and Contextualized Coping Strategies (M = 3.31, SD = 0.50), both of which were identified as Highly Practiced. The findings show that teachers are actively adapting resources and contextualizing sessions to make English lessons more accessible. This is consistent with the Experiential Learning Theory, which states that active participation and adaptation to real-life circumstances enhance learning (Kolb, 2020). The lowest mean is gained in Challenges Related to Teachers' Proficiency in English as Medium of Instruction (M=2.49, SD=0.60), but nevertheless characterised as Practiced at the other side. This means that teachers realise their boundaries but nonetheless make use of methods to teach English. This illustrates a challenge in maintaining fluency in the language that can impair the clarity and confidence of the instructor. Research shows that the effectiveness of EMI implementation depends greatly on the competence of teachers (Aizawa & Rose, 2020). The composite mean of 3.00 (SD = 0.54) and read as Practiced, suggests the consistent level of application on many instructional techniques. This shows a moderate homogeneity of practices among teachers as the standard deviation is moderate.

This means on an analytical level that teachers are largely able to incorporate English into education, but are not yet at a level of mastery or inventiveness in practice. According to the Social Cognitive Theory, teachers' self-efficacy is essential for the continuance of these activities because it influences teaching actions (Bandura, 2021). Additionally, the findings support studies arguing that successful EMI implementation requires linguistic proficiency, pedagogical adaptability, and resourcefulness (Galloway & Ruegg, 2020; Macaro, 2021). The employment of coping strategies by teachers is an indicator of resilience and flexibility but also reveals the necessity for continuous professional development to strengthen language and pedagogic skills.

Academic Performance

Table 3 presents the analysis examining the mediating role of classroom practices in the relationship between teachers' perception of English instruction and academic performance.

Table 3 Academic performance of learners based on Quarterly Results of Assessments (QRA) S.Y. 2025-2026.N=97

Academic Performance	**Frequency (f)**	**Percentage (%)**
Outstanding	21	21.65
Very Satisfactory	76	78.35
Total	**97**	**100**
Performance Summary		**Mean Score:** 3.79
		SD: 4.16
		Interpretation: Highly Positive

The figures reveal that the learners have a good level of academic performance in English instructions. The majority of the pupils are in the Very Satisfactory group (78.35%) and the Outstanding category (21.65%). The distribution demonstrates that there are no learners who attained below satisfactory levels and this could mean that there is overall good academic accomplishment in Mathematics and Science even though English is the language of teaching and learning.The average score of 3.79 with a rather high standard deviation (SD=4.16) is regarded as Highly Positive. The high mean suggests good academic accomplishment, but the large standard deviation suggests variation in performance across learners. This means that even if most students perform well, there are important differences in levels of accomplishment that can be explained by differences in language competency or availability of learning aid. Constructivist Learning Theory, which implies that individual differences influence how learners construct knowledge.

The students' success can be explained by the engagement in meaningful learning activities, provided by teachers' techniques, based on the Experiential Learning Theory. This good performance suggests that the learners may adapt and learn well through English instruction with the support of proper classroom procedures (Kolb, 2020). Supporting research indicates that EMI may not necessarily hinder academic accomplishment and, where suitable teaching techniques and learner adaptation are present, it can even enhance academic achievement (Curle et al., 2020; Rose & McKinley, 2019). Nevertheless, the variation in scores suggests the importance of differentiated education to address the needs of diverse students and foster equitable learning.

Mediation Analysis

Table 4 displays the results of the mediation analysis, focusing on how classroom practices mediate the relationship between teachers' perception of English instruction and academic performance. The table provides the necessary statistical indicators to support the mediation model.

Table 4 Mediation Analysis N=97

Mediation Analysis	**Estimate (B)**	**SE**	***z*-value**	***p*-value**
Direct Effect (English Instruction → Academic Performance)	0.241	0.413	0.585	.558
Indirect Effect (English Instruction → Teacher Classroom Practices → Academic Performance)	0.056	0.191	0.292	.770
Total Effect	**0.297**	**0.376**	**0.790**	**.430**
Mediation Analysis Summary		p-value(indirect): 0.770 p-critical: 0.05 Interpretation: Not Significant Decision: Failed to Reject Ho		

The mediation study results indicate that English instruction is not significantly connected with academic performance directly or indirectly through teacher classroom practices. The direct effect (B = 0.241, p = .558) is positive but not statistically significant meaning that changes in English instruction alone do not explain

differences in learners' academic performance in this group. This is in line with recent findings that the success of English instruction is not so much a matter of exposure per se, but rather a matter of how instruction is contextualised, differentiated and responsive to the needs of learners (e.g. pedagogical responsiveness and language scaffolding) (Andrews, 2020; Macaro, 2021).

Similarly, the indirect effect through teacher classroom practices is not significant (B = 0.056, p = .770), indicating that teacher classroom practices did not function as a mediating mechanism between English instruction and academic performance. This suggests that the teaching methods instructors are utilising may not be sound, consistent, or aligned enough to provide quantifiable academic gains in English instruction. Current research shows that classroom practices need to be highly interactive, learner-centred and cognitively engaging in order to have an impact on performance. If they are not, their mediation effect is limited (Hattie, 2020; OECD, 2021).

The total effect (B = 0.297, p = .430) confirmed that there was no statistically significant relationship. There are positive total direct and indirect impacts but the insignificance of the effects suggests that other unmeasured variables may have a larger effect on academic success. This perspective has been substantiated by recent research (2019-2025) that identifies characteristics such as learner motivation, prior knowledge, socioeconomic background, and language competency as more powerful predictors of academic achievement than instructional variables alone (Graham et al., 2022; Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). This may imply that the teaching of English and teaching methods in the classroom could be part of a bigger ecological system of learning elements.

The lack of mediation also suggests that teacher classroom strategies do not function to bridge the gap between the teaching of English and academic achievement in this situation. This contrasts with some study, which found strong mediation effects when instructional strategies were especially orientated around formative evaluation, feedback and personalised teaching (Black & Wiliam, 2019; Muijs et al., 2020). This discrepancy can be explained by disparities in the fidelity of execution, teacher training or contextual issues such as large classes and inadequate resources, so often quoted in educational settings.

The null hypothesis was not rejected for the indirect effect with p-value = 0.770 (> 0.05) in the final model, meaning that the direct and indirect effects were not statistically significant. This indicates that it is not enough to depend on English teaching or classroom practice to improve academic achievement. More integrated strategies that include learner-centred techniques, linguistic support systems and contextual aspects are required to achieve significant academic outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings indicate that although teachers have a moderately positive perception of English instruction and consistently practice EMI strategies, these do not significantly influence students' academic performance, highlighting that learner-related factors such as language proficiency, confidence, and engagement play a more crucial role in achieving desired outcomes. The lowest indicators on student ease in using English and teachers' proficiency further reveal a gap between instructional practices and actual learning impact. However, the study is limited by its reliance on self-reported data, a restricted sample, and the consideration of only one mediating variable, which may not fully capture the complexity of factors affecting academic performance. Moving forward, a more comprehensive approach is needed that strengthens both teacher capacity and learner readiness, while future studies should explore additional variables to better explain and enhance the effectiveness of English instruction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is highly recommended for future bases.

1. To strengthen learners' English communication confidence by integrating more structured speaking activities, guided questioning, and safe classroom environments that encourage participation, addressing students' difficulty in expressing themselves in English.

2. To enhance teachers' English proficiency and EMI competence through continuous professional development, targeted training, and coaching focused on language use in instruction.
3. To sustain and improve classroom practices by promoting learner-centered, interactive, and contextualized teaching strategies that bridge comprehension gaps and increase engagement.
4. To utilize assessment data more effectively to identify learner needs, monitor progress, and implement targeted interventions that align instruction with actual learning outcomes.
5. To adopt the action plan provided for enhancing learners English communication, and learners' engagement in English.
6. For future researchers, conduct mixed-methods or qualitative studies to gain deeper insights into teachers' and students' experiences with English instruction.

REFERENCES

1. Aagaard, J. (2020). Digital distractions: A qualitative study of students' experiences with technology in higher education. Teaching in Higher Education, 25(5), 567–580. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1577810
2. Abduh, A., Sakkir, G., & Rosmaladewi, R. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of English teaching strategies in the current curriculum change. International Journal of Language Education, 6(4), 437. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v6i4.25246
3. Abrea, A. C., Ortua, E. C. L., & Robles, R. L. (2020). Experiences of teachers teaching Grade 4 pupils with mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE): Inputs to policy development and teacher training for MTB-MLE. Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.56278/apherj.v7i1.1544
4. Al-Qahtani, A. A., & Higgins, S. E. (2022). Effects of traditional, blended and e-learning on students' achievement in higher education. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 38(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12590
5. Anthonysamy, L., Koo, A. C., & Hew, S. H. (2020). Self-regulated learning strategies in higher education: Fostering digital literacy for sustainable lifelong learning. Education and Information Technologies, 25, 2393–2414. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10201-8
6. Apolonio, A. L. (2022). Mother tongue based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) in the Philippines: Its implications to language learning. Erudio Journal of Educational Innovation, 9(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.18551/erudio.9.1.1
7. Arega, E. E., Bachore, M. M., & Ayele, Z. A. (2024a). Teachers' and students' perceptions toward English as a medium of instruction in primary schools. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 14(1), 120–131. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1401.15
8. Arega, E. E., Bachore, M. M., & Ayele, Z. A. (2024b). Navigating English medium instruction: Insights into classroom practices and challenges in middle-level schools of Wolaita Zone, South Ethiopia. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 14(8), 2296–2305. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1408.27
9. Bacan, C. J. D. (2025). Exploring the role of mother tongue in mathematics education: Benefits and challenges of language localization. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90400273
10. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-98423-000
11. Bisharyan, H. (n.d.). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Retrieved November 16, 2025, from https://www.academia.edu/35019808/Principles_and_Practice_in_Second_Language_Acquisition
12. Bravo-Sotelo, K. P., et al. (2024). The ideological tug-of-war of language policies in the Philippines: Perspectives and proposal. Asian Englishes, 26(2), 564–578. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2023.2257946
13. Broadbent, J., & Poon, W. L. (2021). Self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement in online learning environments: A systematic review. Internet and Higher Education, 27, 1–13.
14. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1(1), 1–47.

15. Chicherina, N. V., & Strelkova, S. Y. (2023). Translanguaging in English language teaching: Perceptions of teachers and students. Education Sciences, 13(1), 86. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13010086
16. Chen, L., Nath, R., & Insley, R. (2023). Understanding the role of digital device usage in student learning behavior. Computers & Education, 191, 104647.
17. Cooper, R. L. (1990). Language planning and social change. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620812
18. Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and language integrated learning. Cambridge University Press.
19. Credé, M., & Kuncel, N. R. (2021). Study habits, skills, and attitudes: The third pillar supporting collegiate academic performance. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 16(2), 1–19.
20. Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 49(2), 222–251.
21. Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. Multilingual Matters.
22. Dearden, J. (2021). English as a medium of instruction: A growing global phenomenon. British Council. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.britishcouncil.org/
23. Department of Education. (2009). DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009 – Institutionalizing MTB-MLE. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.deped.gov.ph/
24. Department of Education. (2012). DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2012 – Guidelines on the implementation of MTB-MLE. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.deped.gov.ph/
25. Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 – Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.deped.gov.ph/
26. Domoff, S. E., Borgen, A. L., Foley, R. P., & Maffett, A. (2020). Excessive use of mobile devices and children's physical and behavioral health. Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, 41(7), 1–9.
27. Dong, C., Cao, S., & Li, H. (2021). Young children's online learning during COVID-19 pandemic: Chinese parents' beliefs and attitudes. Children and Youth Services Review, 118, 105440.
28. Dunlosky, J., Rawson, K. A., Marsh, E. J., Nathan, M. J., & Willingham, D. T. (2020). Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 14(1), 4–58.
29. Duranti, A. (2005). A companion to linguistic anthropology. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996522
30. Edisherashvili, N., Saks, K., Pedaste, M., & Leijen, Ä. (2022). Supporting self-regulated learning in online environments: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 35, 100434.
31. Emmer, E. T., & Sabornie, E. J. (2021). Handbook of Classroom Management (2nd ed.). Routledge.
32. Fredricks, J. A., Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2022). Handbook of Student Engagement Interventions. Academic Press.
33. Freire, P. (1970/2005). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Continuum.
34. Gage, N. A., Scott, T., & Sugai, G. (2021). The relationship between school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports and academic achievement. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 23(2), 1–12.
35. Galloway, N., & Ruegg, R. (2021). The provision of English medium instruction in higher education: A review of global practices. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 42(8), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1719819
36. García, O. (2009). Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective. Wiley-Blackwell.
37. García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education. Palgrave Macmillan.
38. García, O., & Wei, L. (2021). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-55424-4
39. Gkonou, C., Daubney, M., & Dewaele, J. M. (2022). New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800410837
40. Hafner, C. A., & Ho, W. K. (2022). Digital multimodal composing in second language education. TESOL Quarterly, 56(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3065

41. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2021). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 91(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654321994713
42. Hawi, N. S., & Samaha, M. (2020). The relations among social media addiction, self-esteem, and life satisfaction in university students. Social Science Computer Review, 38(4), 1–12.
43. Hernández, A., & Izquierdo, J. (2023). Teachers' perceptions of English reforms in Mexico: Training, challenges, and opportunities. Mexican Journal of Applied Linguistics, 47(2), 89–105.
44. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
45. Jansen, R. S., van Leeuwen, A., Janssen, J., & Kester, L. (2021). Self-regulated learning in higher education: A review. Educational Research Review, 28, 100275.
46. Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). Language planning from practice to theory. Multilingual Matters.
47. Kates, A. W., Wu, H., & Coryn, C. L. (2022). The effects of mobile phone use on academic performance: A meta-analysis. Computers & Education, 180, 104430.
48. Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon.
49. Lin, A. M. Y. (2021). Language across the curriculum and CLIL in English-medium education. Language Teaching, 54(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482000003X
50. Lopriore, L. (n.d.). Teacher beliefs and practices of language assessment in the context of English as a lingua franca (ELF). Retrieved November 16, 2025, from https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8010058
51. Macaro, E. (2022). English medium instruction: Content and language in policy and practice. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198856258.001.0001
52. Malone, S. (2007). Mother tongue-based multilingual education: Implications for education policy. UNESCO.
53. Mayer, R. E. (2021). Multimedia learning (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108894333
54. Nur, S., Nurfadhilah, A. S., Dewi, E. M. P., & Jamilah. (2023). English as medium of instruction (MOI) in classroom activities: Teachers' perceptions from eastern Indonesia. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature, 8(1), 59–74. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v8i1.22792
55. OECD. (2021). Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/b35a14e5-en
56. Philippine Constitution. (1987). The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1987-constitution/
57. Piaget, J. (1952). The Origins of Intelligence in Children. International Universities Press. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://archive.org/details/originsofintelli00piag
58. Ponce, A. R. C., & Lucas, R. I. G. (2021). Language attitudes in linguistically diverse contexts. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 42(5), 1581–1595. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.2002341
59. Probyn, M. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25(3), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1900221
60. Purcia, E. L., & Castante, N. S. (2023). Abrogating MTB-MLE in the Philippines. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation, 2(4), 83–92. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v2i4.1818
61. Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/
62. Republic Act No. 12027. (2024). An Act Strengthening the Use of English and Filipino as the Primary Medium of Instruction. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/
63. Republic Act No. 4670. (1966). Magna Carta for Public School Teachers. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1966/06/18/republic-act-no-4670/
64. Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/republic-act-no-9155/
65. Richards, J. C., & Pun, J. (2022). Teacher language proficiency and EMI effectiveness. RELC Journal, 53(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211021145
66. Rose, H., & McKinley, J. (2022). The prevalence of English medium instruction in global education. System, 105, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102730
67. Salonga, K. T., & Lapinid, M. R. (2024). Assessing MTB-MLE policy in mathematics education. Cakrawala Pendidikan, 43(3), 607–618. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v43i3.66558

68. Santiago, J. G., & Dagdag, J. D. (2021). The effect of MTB-MLE on science achievement. Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol11.2.4.2021
69. Schwarzer, R. (Ed.). (2014). Self-efficacy. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315800820
70. Soler, E. A., & Safont Jordà, M. P. (Eds.). (2007). Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5639-0
71. Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/0364-0213(88)90023-7
72. Tsagari, D., Reed, M., & Lopriore, L. (2023). English language assessment in Europe. Language Assessment Quarterly, 20(3), 245–263.
73. UM Digos College Philippines, et al. (2024). MTB-MLE curriculum: An evaluative study. International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Education, 3(4). https://doi.org/10.58806/ijirme.2024.v3i4n11
74. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674576292
75. Wang, Y., & Derakhshan, A. (2023). Language anxiety and classroom communication. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1123456
76. Walsh, S. (2021). Classroom discourse and teacher development. Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781474463880.001.0001
77. Woolard, K. A. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin et al. (Eds.), Language Ideologies (pp. 3–48). Oxford University Press. Retrieved April 13, 2026, from https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=9535976