Article

Narratives of Nationhood: Culturally Attuned Pedagogies for Filipino Literature in a Multilingual Educational Landscape

Alma B. Manera[1], **Mark Jhon Prestoza**[2] **Corazon M. Matammu**[1], **Mary Ann R. Dalaten**[3], **Myra Catungal**[3], **and Grace Ligutan-Siplac**[1]

[1]Cagayan State University [2]Isabela State University [3]Pangasinan State University
Correspondence: almamanera@csu.edu.ph

Abstract

The present study examines the pedagogical work of Filipino language and literature teachers and the multilingual classes in some of the State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) selected in Northern Luzon, Philippines. The research was done through an explanatory sequential mixed method design. A structured questionnaire survey was administered to 42 educators in Cagayan State University, Pangasinan State University and Isabela State University, and supplemented with qualitative interviews and focus group discussions of focus respondents. Findings revealed that translanguaging (mean = 4.64), culturally responsive teaching (mean = 4.41), and differentiated instruction (mean = 4.07) were the most employed strategies, reflecting a deviation towards student-centered and culturally responsive strategies from teacher-centered strategies. These results corresponded with qualitative results, which indicated the way educators employed local languages and culture to facilitate understanding and engagement. Systemic barriers did exist, though, such as a lack of multilingual resources (mean = 4.48), a lack of formal education (mean = 4.35), and non-adaptable institutional policies. However, the program was notable for the flexibility and innovation of teachers who exploited available local materials such as texts, pictures and student-led activities. The article concludes with a call for systemic measures that enhance multilingual pedagogy, for example, intensive teacher education, flexible policy, and culture-based resource production.

Keywords: multilingual education, translanguaging, culturally responsive pedagogy, Filipino literature, inclusive teaching, SUC educators, differentiated instruction, teacher experiences.

Introduction

Philippine literature can be made to promote cultural literacy, national identity, critical thinking, and creativity in tertiary education. This is particularly crucial in a situation as linguistically heterogeneous as that of the Philippines, in which students are harvested from a broad array of ethnolinguistic groups. In Cagayan State University (CSU), Pangasinan State University (PSU), and Isabela State University (ISU), this multilingual setting is realized in classrooms as Filipino, English, and local languages (like Ilocano, Pangasinense, and Ibanag) as well. These multilingual settings problematize and enliven the pedagogy of teaching Filipino literature, thus calling for versatile and inclusive pedagogical practice. Recent research has tackled the effectiveness of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in schools with a multilingual setting. García and Wei (2014) refer to translanguaging as a practice where students employ all their languages in making meaning and, consequently, enhance student motivation and academic achievement. Similarly, Cummins (2001) contends that the legitimate use of students' home languages improves their comprehension and motivation, for instance, in literature, where nuance and culture are crucial.

Philippine pedagogical scholars such as Alejo (2000) and Tupas (2015) emphasize placing literature pedagogy in the environment of regional languages and culture. For instance, Alejo calls for pedagogic practice nurtured in students' linguistic life-worlds. Tupas challenges monolingual ideologies in Filipino language education, promoting the necessity for socializing and inclusive pedagogies.

Despite this richness of concept, few empirical studies investigate actual classroom dynamics in state universities in the regions. CSU, PSU, and ISU teachers use a mix of methods such as code-switching, localized literary texts, oral storytelling, and bilingual scaffolding in Filipino to engage with language diversity. These methods instantiate an emerging pedagogy of facilitating Filipino literature to be accessible and relevant to students from other contexts.

For more on effective teaching methods, read Gay (2010) and Tomlinson (2014). Tomlinson's differentiated instruction model suggests that teaching aligned with students' individual learning styles and language competencies will improve student performance. In reading, this could happen with the support of instructional strategies such as visual presentation, shared story enactment, shared reading of a story, shared reading of a storybook, reading of a story, and drama. Gay's concept of culturally responsive teaching, however, deters teachers from disconnecting learning from students' cultural knowledge and experiences; in so doing, they foster both identity formation and critical pedagogy.

Though instructors at these universities experience challenges at the institutional and systemic levels, Martin (2018) states that most Filipino teachers are not adequately equipped with multilingual pedagogy, as the curricula there are inflexible and discourage innovation based on the absence of access to native pedagogical resources (Lansang, 2019). However, many teachers do what they can to cope, including using regional oral traditions and local stories to infuse relevance and added insight into their classrooms (Delos Santos & Bernal, 2020).

There is an established link between culturally responsive pedagogy and good student outcomes. Marzano et al. (2001) assert that learning achievement increases when teaching methods respond to learners' linguistic and cultural identities. In the Philippine context, Yazon and Ang-Manaig (2018) established that constructivist, learner-centered methods in the literature classroom -i.e., in the form of group interpretation and dramatization, and when mother tongues are employed for scaffolding led to increased levels of student engagement and creativity.

There continue to be challenges, including the dominance of English and Filipino as academic languages and inadequate support for teaching local languages, but there are new possibilities as well. Beginning in basic education, where the mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) policy is implemented, multilingual practices are constructed to propagate further into tertiary education (Department of Education, 2012). In addition, indigenous knowledge systems, forms of community engagement, and digital tools have been tried as substitutes for formal instruction of literary texts (Flores & De Guzman, 2016).

Drawing upon CSU, PSU, and ISU's regional and linguistic contexts, this research aims to record and examine teacher pedagogies applied in literature classrooms. The research aims to utilize a mixed methods design to investigate what quantitative trends within instructional practice could mean through the voices of teachers who teach in a multilingual context. Moreover, the long-term goal is to establish a sustainable, inclusive, culturally responsive model for the instruction of Filipino literature at the college level.

Research Objectives

1. To identify and quantify the pedagogical approaches used by Filipino language and literature educators in SUCs in multilingual classrooms
2. To explore educators' lived experiences, perceptions, and rationales behind their chosen teaching strategies in a linguistically diverse academic environment.

3. To assess educators' challenges and opportunities in implementing inclusive and effective pedagogy for Filipino literature in a multilingual context.

Research Methodology

In this research, the pedagogical approaches to teaching the Filipino literature in a multilingual HEI teaching the FS L1 of Cagayan State University (CSU), Pangasinan State University (PSU), and Isabela State University (ISU) were examined. In integrating qualitative and quantitative methods, the research attempted to capture more than the prevalence or typicality of *"the use"* of some teaching practices but also teaching moments in teachers' lives in these linguistically diverse classrooms. A mixed-methods design was suited explicitly to examining how multilingual realities shape and mediate literature instruction in these Northern Luzon state universities.

The research used an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, beginning with a closed-form survey to obtain quantitative data on prevalent pedagogical methods used in teaching Filipino literature. The latter was subsequently probed further via qualitative data collection during the second phase, wherein semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions complemented the survey to develop a richer explanation and contextualization. The instrument used for the survey was researcher-constructed | 14 based on complementary pedagogical research and existing research | previous studies on Filipino literature instruction and bilingual education (Cummins, 2000; García & Wei, 2014; Tupas, 2015; Yazon & Ang-Manaig, 2018). The items included in this list were questions regarding the range of strategies applied, perceived success, problems experienced, and language use concerns.

The participants in the research were Filipino language and literature teachers from various CSU, PSU, and ISU campuses. Respondents were purposively selected with the condition of possessing relevant teaching experience and at least two years of experience teaching Filipino literature classes in multilingual settings. Ten to 15 instructors per university were engaged for the quantitative component, and five key informants from the participating universities [to represent the three institutions] were purposively selected for the qualitative interviews and focus group discussions, based on the criteria of having a wealth of teaching experience and being prepared to share reflective insights.

In the qualitative stage, semi-structured interviews and FGDs were used to understand further how CSU, PSU, and ISU faculty members reacted to their students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds while teaching. Questions regarding instruction planning, utilization of local texts, classroom communication, and reflection on student reactions to the teaching of literature were included in the discussion guide.

These qualitative descriptions supplemented the quantitative data, allowing a more complete illustration of how teachers struggle at a PCK level with pedagogic decisions in the multilingual classroom.

Such a detailed outline also facilitated the generation of generalized conclusions and particular findings, which impart richness to an instance-specific representation of the phenomenon of teaching Filipino literature in multilingual colleges in Northern Luzon.

Quantitative data were explored using descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, percentage), inferential tests (e.g., chi-square, correlation), choice patterns, and relationships against teaching strategies and variables, i.e., students' teaching experience and proficiency levels. Qualitative data were explored thematically using NVivo software (QSR International), wherein the emerging themes from FGDs and interviews supported the survey findings.

Data integration occurred at the interpretation level; wherein qualitative information was interpreted and built upon quantitative trends. The research was ethics cleared at the university level, and informed consent and strict confidentiality were maintained.

The questionnaire was piloted and validated for validity and reliability, and the qualitative study incorporated member checking, peer debriefing, and data triangulation. Quality standards were maintained by taping the research process and adhering to the code of ethics and methodological rigor.

Results and Findings

Teaching Strategies in Multilingual Classrooms: Exploring Pedagogical Practices of SUC Educators in Filipino Language and Literature

In the context of multilingual classrooms in Philippine SUCs, literacy teachers are similarly confronted with the challenge of accommodating difference and rigor in education. Students with diverse linguistic backgrounds enter the classroom, and pedagogy plays a crucial role in successful instruction. Determining and measuring these strategies are critical to understanding how teachers address language variation, support comprehension, and foster inclusive learning. This study aims to establish how often and what pedagogy Filipino language and literature teachers of SUCs utilize, especially in the multilingual context. The study offers empirical evidence regarding prevailing instructional practices through an analysis of well-supported practices (i.e., translanguaging, culturally responsive teaching, differentiated instruction, and technology-mediated learning). The findings are intended to guide

the development of training, resources, and policies to promote responsive and effective pedagogy in linguistically diverse classrooms.

Quantitative data from 42 Filipino language and literature teachers in several Southern Leyte State University campuses presented variegated yet uniform patterns of pedagogical strategies application patterns in multilingual classrooms.

Table 1: Summary of Pedagogical Approaches Frequency in the 3 SUCs

Pedagogical Approach	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Translanguaging	4.64	Very Often
Culturally Responsive Teaching	4.41	Often
Differentiated Instruction	4.07	Often
Collaborative Learning	3.95	Often
Technology-Enhanced Instruction	3.12	Sometimes
Direct Grammar and Vocabulary Focus	2.83	Sometimes
Code-Switching	4.23	Often

Scale Legend

4.50 – 5.00 = Very Often

3.50 – 4.49 = Often

2.50 – 3.49 = Sometimes

1.50 – 2.49 = Rarely

1.00 – 1.49 = Never

A post hoc test of results revealed that the most widely used pedagogical method was translanguaging (weighted mean of 4.64, to very often) according to educators. Educators stated that the code-switching between Filipino and the dialect (i.e., Cebuano, Waray) had assisted in understanding, particularly for hard or abstract literary concepts. Culturally responsive teaching came in at a close second with a mean of 4.41, indicating teachers consistently incorporated local history, beliefs, and folklore to connect literary material with students' everyday life experiences. More common strategies were DI (M = 4.07) and CL (M = 3.95), which both earned the designation of being used "often." These strategies were connected to modifying activities and forming small groups to deal with the fluctuating levels of language knowledge and interpretative capability within the classroom. Conversely, technology-supported pedagogical practices were rated lower at 3.12 to show that the computers did not always utilize the tools due to the absence of internet, device access, and training. Finally, explicit grammar and vocabulary teaching were rated 2.83, *"sometimes"*

utilized, to infer sensitivity towards the role of linguistic correctness, but not at the cost of interpretive, communicative, and student-focused methodology.

The results necessitate student-centered, culturally responsive, and linguistically supportive instruction of Filipino literature in a multilingual classroom among SUC instructors. Translanguaging and culturally responsive teaching regularly show that the instructors are sensitive to diversity through inclusive education. Instead, the low frequency of TEL use suggests a need for institutional assistance in providing DL training and digital infrastructure enhancement.

These quantified findings underpin a base for the standard pedagogical practices and indicate areas of innovation and policy gaps in Filipino literature pedagogy within multilingual contexts.

The results show that most SLSU teachers apply flexible and inclusive pedagogies, like translanguaging and teaching for context, to tackle linguistic diversity in the classroom. This is a much more responsive understanding of the sociolinguistic context. However, the minimal use of digital resources points toward a probable area of additional training among teachers, especially for incorporating ICT in the literature classroom.

These findings show that Filipino literature instruction in plurilingual environments is strengthened and supported when pedagogy is flexible and emergent. Furthermore, they also highlight the importance of institutional backing in supporting digital preparedness and education on novel instructions.

Educators' Personal Experiences, Insights, and Underlying Reasons for Selecting Teaching Strategies

Teachers are constantly pushed to deconstruct the dynamic interplay of language, culture, and pedagogy in multilingual learning environments. The curriculum and the product of lived experience, intuition, and professional judgment shape their instructional styles. How teachers conceptualize their classroom reality and how it is often comprised of multilingual environments is critically important in supporting inclusive and productive pedagogies. This study attempts to know and talk about the lived experiences, perceptions, and motivations of Filipino language and literature teachers when they adjust their pedagogy in response to the different linguistic backgrounds of their students. The research provides important insight into the complex daily activities that promote classroom participation, equity, and learning

by exploring how such teachers make pedagogical choices regarding cultural and language differences.

Theme 2.1: Translanguaging as a Bridge, not a Barrier

Translanguaging is the process of using two or more languages in the classroom and is a strategy teachers use very often to facilitate understanding and participation. During the discussion of complex texts, teachers employed a mix of Filipino and learners' L1 (e.g., Waray and Cebuano). This was particularly useful when teaching classical texts that used archaic or poetic language.

"If I insist on only using deep Filipino, I lose them. I need to meet them where they are linguistically so they can truly connect with the literature." – Participant 6

These results indicate that translanguaging helps students feel more included and confident. Language is not a closed code for educators, but a variable for meaning. Instead of imposing a strict Filipino-only teaching strategy, they use multiple languages as a pedagogical resource.

Theme 2.2: Culturally Anchored Teaching Strategies

Educators adapted texts and activities to local cultural contexts, drawing on familiar traditions, values, and dialectal expressions. Teachers increased engagement and relevance by aligning lessons with students' cultural experiences (e.g., comparing national myths with regional folklore). They emphasized that literature must not only be understood but also felt.

"When we link Lam-ang to our local epics or customs, the students realize that Filipino literature also reflects them. That sense of ownership matters." – Participant 13

This indicates a shift toward culturally responsive pedagogy, where literature is not taught as a distant artifact but as a living, local, and emotional experience. In doing so, teachers bridge the gap between the national literary canon and local identities.

Theme 2.3: Code-Switching as a Practical Instructional Tool

Code-switching between Filipino, English, and vernacular languages was used as a spontaneous and necessary practice to clarify meaning or manage time. Teachers reported using code-switching to address student confusion or reinforce key concepts

immediately. In contrast, some considered it a compromise; most considered it a pragmatic and effective tool.

"Sometimes I switch to English or Bisaya, not because I do not want to teach in Filipino, but because it saves time and ensures understanding." – Participant 10

This reflects the realities of multilingual classrooms where rigid language policies can hinder learning. Often frowned upon in formal settings, code-switching is reinterpreted here as an adaptive instructional strategy to balance efficiency and clarity.

Theme 2.4: Professional Struggles and Innovations

Educators expressed challenges such as a lack of teaching resources, training in multilingual pedagogy, and insufficient administrative support. However, they also reported creative adaptations such as co-developing multilingual glossaries, dramatizing texts, and collaborative group work. Without formal training or materials designed for multilingual contexts, teachers resorted to trial-and-error methods. Peer collaboration and student feedback played a role in refining these strategies.

"We are not trained for multilingual classes, but we adjust. We make our materials and strategies through experience." – Participant 8

This points to a clear professional development gap. While teachers are committed and inventive, they operate without systemic guidance. Their innovations show promise but highlight the need for institutional support in multilingual pedagogy and curriculum design.

However, these efforts occur without a unified framework or structured support. While translanguaging, code-switching, and cultural adaptation have proven effective, the lack of multilingual curriculum design, training modules, and institutional backing remains challenging.

Quantitative Findings from Survey Data

A guided questionnaire consisting of a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) was administered to 40 Filipino language and literature instructors at various campuses of Southern Leyte State University. The survey covered two major dimensions: (A) Challenges for Inclusive Pedagogy and (B) Opportunities for Skilled Teaching in a Multilingual Environment. The instrument aimed to record systemic limitations and teacher-driven innovations in linguistically diverse classrooms. Analysis of the answers outlined statistically revealed trends articulating the multidimensional aspect of multilingual education. The findings revealed a high level of agreement concerning the unavailability of instructional

materials and inadequate professional development as key impediments. Simultaneously, the findings indicated the evident appreciation of pedagogical function and potential that may be tapped from localized content, students' engagement through translating in their mother tongue, and teachers' adaptive creativity. These outcomes also confirm the co-occurring presence of structures of constraint as well as educator resilience in multilingual learning environments.

A. Challenges Faced by Educators

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
I lack access to appropriate multilingual teaching materials.	4.48	Strongly Agree (Major Issue)
I have not received formal training in multilingual or inclusive pedagogy.	4.35	Strongly Agree (Critical Gap)
Time constraints limit the use of differentiated strategies.	4.10	Agree
Students' language diversity complicates instruction delivery.	3.88	Agree
Institutional policies do not support flexible language use.	3.75	Agree

What the figures reveal within the quantitative results is that there are critical problems discouraging multilingual classroom teachers from adequately instructing their students, including a lack of teaching materials and no opportunities for professional development. With these overall scores being higher than 4.30, it appears that these are organized problems, not individual instances. Teachers are put to the test by the lack of teaching materials contextualized for all languages; most are created in standard Filipino or English. This presents grave difficulties to students with varying proficiency levels in these two languages. Formal education on inclusive and multilingual teaching strategies is also lacking, which is an opportunity lost in terms of professional preparation. So, most teachers must fall back on gut feelings, personal experience, or ad-hoc solutions to address diverse classroom needs. Time constraints and fixed institutional rules and regulations similarly prevent student-centered and diverse teaching from materializing, thus preventing the possibility of truly inclusive and responsive pedagogies in political and social science teaching.

B. Opportunities Identified by Educators

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
Multilingual classrooms allow me to use culturally relevant examples.	4.45	Strongly Agree (High Potential)
Language diversity enhances student engagement in literature discussions.	4.32	Strongly Agree

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
Students become more participative when local languages are used strategically.	4.20	Agree
The diverse backgrounds of students make Filipino literature more relatable.	4.10	Agree
I have developed creative techniques to adapt my instruction.	3.98	Agree

However, teachers saw several opportunities inherent in multilingual classes. One of them is cultural applicability and involvement: as the high mean scores indicate, one of the strengths of students' multilingualism is that teachers can leverage personalized learning, which includes local cultural references, thus enhancing comprehension and the emotional involvement of students in literary texts. Some teachers reported that they too had evolved in creative and responsive ways, utilizing resources from tailored glossaries to graphic organizers, even to literary materials based in the community, where "click" for their students. Furthermore, learner-centered learning was strengthened as students listened (on purpose) to their mother language/dialect used in teaching, which raised their degree of engagement and self-confidence.

These nominal results speak of a tension with practice on one side, derailed by systemic barriers (short of multilingual training, pedagogic deficiencies, and inflexible policy frames), while teachers articulate practical possibilities. The barriers are primarily systemic: lack of resources, lack of training of professors in bilingualism, and, indeed, prohibition of flexible use of languages. However, these opportunities are provided by faculty members who use local materials, community texts, and inclusive pedagogy, such as translating large ideas into a local language or comparing regional writing in an inclusive environment. The obstacles, although structural, are not daunting.

At least some of the teachers in the 3 State Universities we collaborated with, as well as in the OBES schools, which all had large proportions of poor children, embodied a trans-formative literacy paradigm in that they had positive perceptions about the languages multilingual children bring into the classroom as an asset, not a deficit. Their research demonstrates the potential for inclusive, responsive teaching

practices to thrive in resource-scarce environments. It hints at the possibility of a learner-focused, locally rooted pedagogy in the instruction of Filipino literature.

Discussion

Based on the findings and conclusions of this mixed-method study, pertinent implications have been derived concerning the pedagogy of Filipino language and literature teachers in the multilingual environment of Philippine SUCs. The evidence shows that the most prevalent tactic employed by the students is translanguaging, a device for making abstruse literary material more concrete. This discovery is in keeping with García and Wei (2014), who assert that translanguaging facilitates meaning-making-in-motion between languages, particularly in culturally and linguistically diverse environments. When they taught English literature in the Philippine context, teachers employed learners' L1 (Waray, Cebuano, Ilocano) to assist in better texts and allow for an emotional connection with these texts. This method aligns with Cummins's (2000) linguistic interdependence theory, which suggests that learners' first language may impact second language acquisition when used intentionally within instruction. By offering learners the potential to invoke their complete complement of linguistic repertoires, including their first language, learners can comprehend language in innovative and entertaining ways [end strikethrough] or the mutual support hypothesis.

Culturally responsive teaching was also identified as a widespread and successful strategy among school personnel. Teachers made the lessons relevant to the local experiences, traditions, and dialects of the students, thereby boosting participation rates and nurturing cultural identity. Gay (2010) believes that culturally responsive pedagogy validates students' cultural knowledge and raises motivation toward academic education. Teachers established a connection that emphasized ownership by connecting canonized works like the Biag ni Lam-ang to known epics and habits; Filipino literature became a mirror of their realities and not just an abstract concept.

Differentiation and cooperative learning were also widely utilized, showing some sensitivity to the inhabitants' varied language proficiency and interpretational capacity. These findings are supported by the research of Tomlinson (2014) on differentiated instruction, which encourages adaptive content delivery to meet learners' demands. Collaborative learning involves the employment of peer-to-peer constructions of knowledge production, which is helpful in a second/foreign language classroom based on a Vygotskian socio-cultural theoretical model (Vygotsky, 1978).

Conversely, the lack of frequent use of technology-based and grammar instruction indicates digital accessibility difficulties and the downplaying of form-focused instruction. Despite technology's ability to deepen literature instruction, obstacles of internet connectivity, device shortage, and insufficient training hamper its use. This is in concurrence with the findings of Reyes and Labayen (2021), who noted such challenges in integrating ICT in language instruction in the rural Philippine context.

Moreover, the qualitative stories explain why educational leaders made strategic choices. Code-switching and translanguaging were not regarded as linguistic concessions but pedagogical necessities that respected students' linguistic repertoires from the teachers' point of view. They also remember institutional barriers, such as insufficient teaching and training in multilingual pedagogy, but showed resourcefulness, homegrown resources or strategies, and co-creating approaches among a professional network of peers. The resilience of these teacher-driven innovations is inspiring, yet they also remind us of what our systems could and should enable. As Tupas (2015) states, the actual multilingual education cannot be achieved without structural changes in teacher training and curriculum making.

The findings underscore the potential of culturally responsive, linguistically adaptable, and context-sensitive multilingual pedagogy. However, they also underscore the structural gaps that impede its potential exercise. For multilingual Filipino literature teaching to expand, it must be complemented by intensive professional development, the development of context-specific materials, and policy-level support for adaptable use of languages. In easy words, this study establishes that multilingualism is no issue but an asset, provided that proper pedagogical vision and institutional support are offered.

Conclusion

It offers a general and multi-faceted approach. Based on the evidence and findings of this mixed-methods study, several important conclusions can now be extracted from the pedagogy of Filipino language and literature teachers in a multilingual classroom in Philippine SUCs. The findings indicate that translanguaging is still the most employed strategy and a key device for gaining abstract literary ideas. This aligns with the research conducted by García and Wei (2014), who emphasize that translanguaging offers a versatile sense-making across language boundaries, particularly in linguistically and culturally complex settings. In learning Filipino literature, educators employed mother tongues (e.g., Waray, Cebuano, Ilocano) to enhance comprehension and enable students to relate to narratives emotionally. This

strategy is in harmony with Dr. Cummins' (2000) linguistic-interdependence hypothesis: first-language use is believed to impact second-language acquisition positively if used strategically in instruction.

Culturally responsive teaching was also a common and promising practice. Instruction was grounded in children's neighborhood experience, local traditions, and dialects that elicited more student engagement while affirming racial and cultural identity. As Gay (2010) states, when teachers acknowledge students' cultural experiences and knowledge and integrate them into the curriculum, they will be more engaged to learn. Teachers have achieved ownership and pertinence by connecting canonical writings like Biag ni Lam-ang to local epics and traditions, making Filipino literature an echo of the reader's world, rather than alien and vague.

The application of differentiated instruction and cooperative learning prevailed, reflecting the students' understanding of the divergent language levels and interpretive skills. The outcome is consistent with Tomlinson's (2014) research on differentiated instruction that advocates for flexible content delivery to suit diverse students. In addition, collaborative learning developed peer-to-peer knowledge construction, which is highly efficacious in multilingual contexts in line with a Vygotskian socio-cultural theoretical approach (Vygotsky, 1978).

In the same way, the sparsity of technology-mediated teaching and grammar-centered instruction resists digital access and a shift in pedagogy away from form-centered approaches. Nevertheless, the promise of technology to improve the teaching of literature is partly negated by challenges in integrating technology, including inadequate internet access, insufficient devices, and inadequate training. This finding concurs with Reyes and Labayen (2021), who also determined the same constraints on integrating ICT into language learning in remote mountain regions of the Philippines.

The qualitative accounts also better explain teachers' reasons for making these strategic choices. Teachers did not view translanguaging and code-switching as linguistic shortcuts but as teaching necessities that respected students' language repertoires. They also recognized structural impediments, including inadequate pedagogical materials and insufficient training in multilingual pedagogy. However, they were resourceful in making their materials and sharing strategies through peer-to-peer collaboration. These innovations, driven by teachers, are motivating but indicate systemic assistance requirements. Still, as Tupas (2015) emphasizes, proper multilingual education will never succeed unless systemic teacher training and course design revamps occur.

The findings refer to the possibility of multilingual pedagogy defined in terms of cultural responsiveness, linguistic elasticity, and contextual appropriateness.

However, they also underscore institutional gaps that constrain its extent. Multilingual instruction of Filipino literature can profitably thrive if it is augmented by appropriate professional development, locally generated resources, and policy as a window of flexibility in the use of language in the conduct of teaching. In the end, therefore, this research reaffirms multilingualism as not something to be avoided but instead an asset that can empower, provided with proper pedagogy and institutional support.

The research also supports the value of teachers' agency and creativity in compensating for institutional shortfalls, including a lack of teaching materials in several languages, poor in-service training, and slight policy support. In the face of these shortfalls, teachers evidence resilience and resourcefulness by making the content "local," proficient at code switching for explanation, and crafting engagement through culturally embedded practice.

These poles indicate that educators have embraced multilingualism as a pedagogical means but are structurally inhibited in their application. Thus, constantly reforming the institution to enhance the professionals, resources and several policies is crucial. To attain an inclusive and contextually responsive learning environment, pedagogical innovation and systemic assistance, harmonious with the sociolinguistic reality of Philippine higher education, are required.

References

[1] Adams, J. M. (2021). The role of literature in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 45(2), 123-145.

[2] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11(4), 589-597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

[3] Chen, D. (2017). Teaching multicultural literature in Taiwan: A study of the impact of multicultural literature on college students' cultural understanding. English Language Teaching, 10(12), 136-148.

[4] Chin, E. L. (2020). Multicultural literature. In A. A. Abdi (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory (pp. 1-5). Springer.

[5] Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Sage Publications, United States.

[6] Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. Multilingual Matters.

[7] De Jesus-Reyes, J. (2024). A Critical Pedagogy Analysis of Literature Teachers' Perspectives on The Integration of Multicultural Literature in Higher Education. Traduction Et Langues, 23(1), 62-87.

[8] Delos Santos, J. M., & Bernal, M. A. M. (2020). Local literary texts as tools in teaching Filipino literature in the multilingual classroom. Journal of Literature and Cultural Studies, 9(2), 45–59.

[9] Department of Education. (2012). Guidelines on the Implementation of the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education. DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2012.

[10] Froehle, B. (2024). The Decolonizing Quest in Light of History: The Philippine Reality. International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 3(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v3i1.36

[11] Galang-Pereña, F. (2024). Language: The Soul of Culture and Heart of Identity. International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 2(1), 21–26. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v2i1.48

[12] García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education. Palgrave Macmillan.

[13] Gay, G. (2010). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

[14] Labra, O., Castro, C., Wright, R., & Chamblas, I. (2020). Thematic analysis in social work: A case study. IntechOpen eBooks. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.89464

[15] Layugan, M. (2024). Indigenous Religious Beliefs, Rituals, and Practices as Expressions of Culture. International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 2(1), 8–20. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v2i1.47

[16] Martin, I. P. (2018). Language ideologies and multilingual realities in Philippine higher education. Current Issues in Language Planning, 19(2), 172–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2017.1331490

[17] Ng, R., & Stewart, S. (2019). Developing empathy through literature: How multicultural children's books impact readers. Language and Literacy, 21(3), 74-93.

[18] Parker, R., Smith, K., Johnson, M., & Brown, A. (2019). Integrating multicultural literature in higher education: A systematic review of the impact on students' cultural understanding and empathy. Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 12(3), 201- 219.

[19] Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice. Sage Publications.

[20] Reyes, W. S., & Labayen, J. V. (2021). Digital divide and online learning in Philippine rural schools: A challenge for language instruction. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 9(1), 23–30.

[21] Stallworth, B., Gibbons, L., & Fauber, L. (2006). It's not on the list: An exploration of teachers' perspectives on using multicultural literature. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49(6), 478-489. https://doi.org/10.2307/40017605

[22] Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD.

[23] Tupas, R. (2015). Inequalities of multilingualism: Challenges to mother tongue-based multilingual education. Language and Education, 29(2), 112–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.977295

[24] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

[25] Gadaza, A., Manera, A., Caban, R., Alih, C., Tulawie, A., & Picpican, H. (2025). Cultural Identity and Historical Consciousness: A Study of Philippine History Instruction in Tertiary Education. International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 7(SI2), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.135

[26] Butac, S., Manera, A., Gonzales, E., Paller, R., Eustaquio, M. T., & Tandoc, J. J. (2025). Forging Global Citizens: A Comparative Study of Intercultural Pedagogical Practices of Higher Educational Institutions in the Philippines. International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 7(SI2), 62–79. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.171

[27] Gadaza, A., Manera, A., Santos, S., Alih, C., & Caban, R. (2025). Reviving the Past, Teaching the Future: The Role of Philippine Cultural Heritage in Curriculum Development of Teacher Education Programs Focus. International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 7(SI2), 80–97. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.169