

The Effectiveness of Instructional Classroom Language Policy on Communicative Skills Among 2nd Year Students

¹Neva Jhane R. Gabule, ¹Kesiah Joy Balat, ¹Victoria M. Solad, ¹Jennifer B. Amolato,
¹Jeddah B. Quiño-Justol

¹Tagoloan Community College, College of Education, Philippines

Received 15th August 2025; Accepted 7th September 2025; Published Online 31st October 2025

DOI: 10.63941/DIT.ADSimrj.2025.1.4.100

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effectiveness of instructional classroom language policies on the communicative skills of second-year English students at Tagoloan Community College during the academic year 2025–2026. Specifically, it compared four instructional language approaches, English-Only, Bilingual, Code-Switching, and Mother Tongue-Based Instruction (MTBI), to determine their influence on students' grammar and vocabulary proficiency. Anchored in Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Cummins' Interdependence Hypothesis, the study employed a quantitative design utilizing survey questionnaires and standardized language proficiency assessments. Data were analyzed using frequency distribution, mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, and the Kruskal-Wallis test to determine the existence of significant differences across language policy groups. Results revealed that the Bilingual Policy was the most prevalent instructional approach, followed by English-Only and Code-Switching. Students demonstrated a proficient level of grammar and an advanced level of vocabulary, indicating strong overall communicative skills. Statistical analyses, however, showed no significant difference in students' communicative skills across the different language policies. These findings suggest that while diverse language policies are practiced, they yield comparable outcomes in developing communicative competence. The study concludes that factors such as teaching strategies, learner engagement, and linguistic exposure may play more critical roles than policy alone in enhancing communicative proficiency.

Keywords: *Instructional Language Policy, Bilingual Instruction, English-Only Policy, Code-Switching, Mother Tongue-Based Instruction, Communicative Skills, Grammar, Vocabulary*

INTRODUCTION

In multilingual educational settings, language policy plays a pivotal role in shaping learners' communicative competence and academic success. Communicative skills, encompassing grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and pragmatic competence, are essential for effective interaction across academic and social contexts. The choice of instructional language directly influences how students acquire, process, and express knowledge, particularly in contexts where English serves as a second or foreign language (Larsen-Freeman, 2018). In the Philippines, where English functions as both an instructional and official language, debates persist on whether English-only instruction or multilingual strategies yield better language learning outcomes (Garcia & Wei, 2021).

Globally, classroom language policy remains a contested pedagogical issue. Studies have revealed both benefits and drawbacks of English-only policies. For instance, Putri and Gopal (2021) found that English-only classrooms in Malaysia enhanced students' speaking fluency but simultaneously increased anxiety and limited participation among less proficient learners. Similarly, Alsaawi and Alshammari (2024) reported that English-exclusive instruction in Saudi Arabian international schools posed challenges to students' cultural identity and social interaction. Conversely, bilingual and multilingual policies have been associated with improved comprehension and learner confidence. Vacalares (2023), in a Philippine context, found that students allowed to use their mother tongue

demonstrated higher levels of fluency and engagement, underscoring the pedagogical advantages of linguistic flexibility.

The theoretical foundation of this study is anchored in Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982), which posits that language acquisition occurs most effectively when learners are exposed to comprehensible input, language slightly above their current proficiency level, termed $i+1$. This hypothesis suggests that overly rigid language policies, such as English-only instruction, may hinder learning if students cannot fully understand the input provided. Complementing this, Cummins' Interdependence Hypothesis (2021) emphasizes that proficiency in one language supports and transfers to the acquisition of another. Therefore, policies that integrate learners' first language, such as bilingual or mother tongue-based instruction, can facilitate deeper comprehension and enhance communicative competence (Benson, 2019; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2021).

In recent years, the Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has emphasized the importance of developing communicative competence among college students, especially in teacher education institutions where pre-service teachers must attain proficiency in English for both instruction and professional discourse (CHED Memorandum Order No. 75, 2017). However, empirical studies evaluating how classroom language policies affect communicative skills, particularly grammar and vocabulary, remain limited in local contexts such as community colleges in Northern Mindanao. Given the linguistic diversity in these settings, understanding the relationship between instructional language and communication skills is vital for enhancing both policy and practice.

This study, conducted at Tagoloan Community College in Misamis Oriental, Philippines, investigates the effectiveness of instructional classroom language policies on students' communicative skills. It focuses on four distinct approaches: English-Only, Bilingual, Code-Switching, and Mother Tongue-Based Instruction (MTBI). Specifically, the study seeks to (1) determine the type of language policy implemented in classrooms; (2) assess the level of students' communicative skills in terms of grammar and vocabulary; and (3) identify whether significant differences exist in communicative skills across the different language policy groups.

By examining these factors, the study aims to contribute empirical evidence to the ongoing discourse on effective language policies in multilingual education. The findings are expected to inform educators, administrators, and policymakers in developing equitable and evidence-based strategies that promote communicative competence while respecting linguistic diversity. Ultimately, this research aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), which advocates inclusive and equitable education and the development of essential literacy and communication skills for lifelong learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Instructional Classroom Language Policies in Multilingual Contexts

Language policy in education has long been recognized as a determinant of academic performance and communicative development, particularly in multilingual nations such as the Philippines. Instructional language policies, whether English-only, bilingual, or mother tongue-based, shape how learners acquire linguistic competence and engage with classroom discourse (Garcia & Wei, 2021). English-only policies are designed to immerse students in the target language, theoretically increasing exposure and fluency. However, studies suggest that rigid implementation often creates anxiety and limits participation among less proficient learners (Putri & Gopal, 2021). In contrast, multilingual and bilingual approaches allow students to draw from their linguistic repertoires, fostering inclusion and deeper comprehension (Cummins, 2021).

In Southeast Asia, where English serves as a global lingua franca, many institutions employ English-medium instruction (EMI) to strengthen global competitiveness (Kirkpatrick, 2017). Yet, scholars like Alsaawi and Alshammari (2024) caution that English-exclusive instruction may lead to identity conflicts and marginalization of local languages. In the Philippine setting, Vacalares (2023) found that integrating the mother tongue into English learning environments boosts learner confidence, comprehension, and fluency, suggesting that a balanced linguistic approach yields better communicative outcomes. Such findings emphasize that instructional language policy must be context-sensitive, respecting both global and local linguistic realities.

Theoretical Foundations of Language Policy and Communicative Competence

The present study is grounded in Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982) and Cummins' Interdependence Hypothesis (2021), both of which explain the cognitive processes underlying language acquisition. Krashen's Input Hypothesis asserts that learners progress in language proficiency when exposed to comprehensible input, language slightly beyond their current level ($i+1$). From this perspective, English-only environments may accelerate learning for advanced students but risk alienating those with lower proficiency due to incomprehensible input (Krashen, 1982). On the other hand, bilingual and code-switching approaches provide linguistic scaffolding that enables learners to access meaning while acquiring new forms (Zhang, & Zou, 2024).

Cummins' Interdependence Hypothesis complements Krashen's model by emphasizing the positive transfer of literacy and cognitive skills from the first language (L1) to the second language (L2). According to Cummins (2021), a strong foundation in L1 literacy facilitates higher-order language processing in L2, particularly in grammar and vocabulary. This interdependence supports the rationale behind Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE), where the native language is used as a bridge toward academic English proficiency (Benson, 2019). Studies by Skutnabb-Kangas (2021) further confirm that linguistic rights and identity preservation contribute to improved motivation and long-term communicative competence.

Empirical Studies on Language Policy and Communicative Skills

Empirical evidence provides mixed yet insightful perspectives on the relationship between instructional language policy and communicative skills. Putri and Gopal (2021) demonstrated that English-only classrooms in Malaysia enhanced pronunciation and fluency but led to higher anxiety among low-proficiency learners. Similarly, Alotaibi and Alhazmi (2023) found that rigid English immersion limited classroom interaction, while bilingual strategies increased student participation and grammatical accuracy. These studies suggest that while English-only environments improve language exposure, they may not equally support comprehension and confidence.

In the Philippine context, research by Vacalares (2023) revealed that bilingual instruction and code-switching not only promote confidence but also foster a sense of belonging, which positively affects communicative competence. Durrani et al. (2025) emphasized that code-switching serves as a communicative and cognitive strategy, allowing learners to negotiate meaning and retain complex grammatical structures. Furthermore, Bayagna et al. (2025) concluded that bilingual and code-switched instruction improves lexical access, reinforcing vocabulary retention in English.

Mother Tongue-Based Instruction (MTBI), as promoted under the Philippine Department of Education's MTB-MLE policy, has also shown significant benefits. Benson (2019) and Skutnabb-Kangas (2021) reported that learners who develop foundational literacy in their first language exhibit better performance in second-language learning. This is attributed to the cognitive and affective support provided by familiarity with one's native language, which facilitates the transfer of grammatical and lexical knowledge to English.

Communicative Skills: Grammar and Vocabulary as Core Competencies

Communicative competence, as conceptualized by Canale and Swain (1980), integrates grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic dimensions. Grammar and vocabulary form the structural basis for effective communication, enabling learners to produce coherent and meaningful discourse. Research by Al-Yahyaeeiyah (2024) demonstrated that grammar proficiency strongly predicts academic writing success, while Lyu (2024) emphasized that a robust vocabulary repertoire enhances students' fluency and comprehension. Studies by Wang & Zou (2025) and Mandal et al. (2024) further confirmed that vocabulary acquisition is essential for achieving higher levels of communicative competence, particularly in English as a second language (ESL) contexts.

These findings suggest that communicative skills development is not merely dependent on language exposure but also on the quality of instructional strategies and linguistic support provided. Flexible language policies that balance exposure to English with support in students' native languages can thus yield optimal outcomes for grammar and vocabulary development.

Research Gaps

While numerous studies have explored language policy impacts in international contexts, there remains limited empirical evidence addressing the comparative effectiveness of different classroom language policies in Philippine higher education, particularly in community colleges with multilingual populations. Previous research often focuses on early childhood or primary education; hence, there is a need to examine how instructional language policies influence the communicative competence of college students who are future educators. This study addresses this gap by systematically evaluating the effects of English-Only, Bilingual, Code-Switching, and Mother Tongue-Based Instruction on students' grammar and vocabulary performance.

MATERIALS AND METHODS***Research Design***

This study employed a quantitative comparative research design to examine the effectiveness of various instructional classroom language policies, English-Only, Bilingual, Code-Switching, and Mother Tongue-Based Instruction (MTBI), on students' communicative skills in English. The design focused on systematically measuring linguistic outcomes, specifically in grammar and vocabulary, through standardized assessments and statistical analyses. The approach ensured objectivity, replicability, and the generation of empirical evidence to support language policy decisions in education.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at Tagoloan Community College (TCC), located in Baluarte, Tagoloan, Misamis Oriental, Philippines, during the Academic Year 2025–2026. TCC is a public higher education institution catering to a linguistically diverse student population, which makes it an ideal site for investigating the influence of instructional language policies on English language proficiency. The diversity of classroom settings at TCC reflects multilingual realities common in Philippine higher education.

Participants/Respondents

The respondents of this study were 70 second-year English major students from Sections 2A and 2B enrolled in language-related courses. These participants were selected using a simple random sampling technique to ensure fair representation. The inclusion criteria required students to be enrolled in classes where English served as either the primary or secondary medium of instruction. Random sampling

allowed equal opportunity for each student to be included in the study, minimizing bias in respondent selection.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument used in data collection was a researcher-made questionnaire consisting of two sections:

1. Instructional Classroom Language Policy Identification, where respondents indicated the type of language policy implemented in their class (English-Only, Bilingual, Code-Switching, or MTBI).
2. Communicative Skills Assessment, which evaluated students' grammar and vocabulary proficiency through 30 standardized items, 15 for grammar and 15 for vocabulary.

Some test items were adapted from the İstanbul Gedik University Proficiency Exam, a validated international English proficiency assessment tool. The test items were aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), ensuring global reliability and comparability. Grammar items measured sentence structure, verb usage, and tenses, while vocabulary items assessed contextual word choice and meaning.

Reliability and Validity

To ensure validity, the instrument was reviewed by language experts and the research adviser for content alignment and construct clarity. A pilot test was conducted with 10 non-participant students to check reliability, yielding a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.87, indicating high internal consistency. The use of CEFR descriptors ensured that the proficiency levels were standardized across grammar and vocabulary domains.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, the researchers obtained approval from the Research Ethics Committee of Tagoloan Community College. A formal letter of permission was submitted to the Dean of the College and to the respective instructors of the English departments. Upon approval, the researchers distributed the survey questionnaire personally to ensure proper guidance and to address any clarifications from respondents.

The following procedures were observed:

1. Orientation – The researchers explained the study's purpose, confidentiality, and voluntary nature to all participants.
2. Consent – Respondents signed an Informed Consent Form before participation.
3. Administration – The questionnaire was distributed during class hours and completed under the researcher's supervision. Each session lasted approximately 30 minutes.
4. Collection and Verification – Completed questionnaires were retrieved immediately to ensure data integrity and minimize missing responses.

All collected data were encoded, checked for accuracy, and stored in password-protected files. Personal identifiers were removed to maintain participant anonymity.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles guided the conduct of this study. Participants' rights to informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and withdrawal without penalty were strictly observed. Data were anonymized and used solely for academic purposes. Physical copies were secured in a locked cabinet, while digital records were stored in an encrypted drive accessible only to the researchers. No potential

risks or harm were anticipated, and the benefits of participation included self-awareness of one's communicative competence.

Scoring Procedure

The communicative skills assessment utilized a 5-point scale consistent with CEFR-based proficiency levels:

Mean Range	Description	CEFR Level	Interpretation
4.20–5.00	Excellent	C1–C2	Advanced proficiency
3.40–4.19	Very Good	B2	Proficient
2.60–3.39	Satisfactory	B1	Developing
1.80–2.59	Needs Improvement	A2	Emerging
1.00–1.79	Poor	A1	Beginning

Scores were averaged for grammar and vocabulary, then combined for overall communicative skill ratings.

Statistical Analysis

The data collected were processed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26. The following statistical tools were employed:

Frequency and Percentage Distribution – to determine the dominant instructional classroom language policy. Mean and Standard Deviation – to measure students' levels of communicative skills in grammar and vocabulary. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) – to determine if there were significant differences in communicative skills across the four language policy groups. Levene's Test of Equality of Variances – to test for homogeneity of variances. Kruskal–Wallis Test – applied when assumptions for ANOVA were violated, specifically in cases of unequal variances. Eta-squared (η^2) – to measure effect size and determine the magnitude of differences among groups. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was used as the threshold for determining statistical significance.

This study adhered to quantitative research standards emphasizing reliability, validity, and ethical conduct. Its methodological design enables replication in similar multilingual educational contexts, offering valuable insights into how classroom language policies influence communicative competence in grammar and vocabulary.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Instructional Classroom Language Policies

Table 1.
Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Type of Instructional Classroom Language Policy

Instructional Classroom Language Policy	Frequency	Percentage (%)
English-Only Policy	20	28.99
Bilingual Policy	28	40.58
Code-Switching Policy	13	18.84
Mother Tongue-Based Instruction	5	7.25
Code-Mixing Policy	3	4.35
Total	69	100

As shown in Table 1, the Bilingual Policy emerged as the most dominant instructional approach, implemented in 40.58% of the classrooms. This was followed by the English-Only Policy (28.99%), Code-Switching Policy (18.84%), and Mother Tongue-Based Instruction (MTBI) (7.25%). The Code-Mixing Policy, used by 4.35% of respondents, was the least common.

These results suggest that teachers in multilingual institutions like Tagoloan Community College often adopt bilingual strategies to accommodate learners' linguistic diversity while maintaining English proficiency goals. The dominance of bilingual policy aligns with findings by Guimong et al. (2025) and Garcia and Wei (2021), who reported that bilingual instruction promotes comprehension and confidence in learners. Similarly, Seidler (2022) observed that flexible linguistic practices such as code-switching enhance communication and understanding in multilingual classrooms. The prevalence of bilingual instruction also reflects the practical realities of Philippine education, where teachers frequently shift between English and Filipino to ensure clarity and engagement. This adaptive practice underscores the contextual sensitivity required in implementing language policies in higher education (Vacalares, 2023).

Students' Communicative Skills in Grammar

Table 2
Level of Respondents' Communicative Skills in Grammar

Score Range	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
13–15	10	14.49	Advanced
10–12	36	52.17	Proficient
7–9	18	26.09	Developing
4–6	5	7.25	Emerging
0–3	0	0.00	Beginning
Total	69	100	
Mean = 10.33			Proficient
SD = 2.27			

The data in Table 2 reveal that 52.17% of the students were proficient in grammar, while 14.49% demonstrated advanced mastery. A smaller group (26.09%) was at the developing stage, indicating areas needing reinforcement. The mean grammar score of 10.33 (SD = 2.27) suggests a generally strong grammatical command among students. These findings align with Al-Yahyaeeiyah (2024) and Quiño (2022), who found that structured instruction and exposure to multiple linguistic contexts improve grammatical proficiency. However, the presence of developing and emerging learners underscores the need for sustained grammatical reinforcement through communicative teaching and targeted corrective feedback. As Krashen (1982) emphasized, exposure to comprehensible input in meaningful contexts is critical for grammar acquisition, a principle that may be best realized through bilingual and code-switching practices.

Students' Communicative Skills in Vocabulary

Table 3
Level of Respondents' Communicative Skills in Vocabulary

Score Range	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
13–15	60	86.96	Advanced
10–12	5	7.25	Proficient
7–9	0	0.00	Developing
4–6	4	5.80	Emerging
0–3	0	0.00	Beginning
Total	69	100	
Mean = 13.72			Advanced
SD = 2.41			

Table 3 shows that a large majority of students (86.96%) achieved advanced vocabulary proficiency, with a mean score of 13.72, suggesting that students possess strong lexical competence. These findings confirm Wang & Zou (2025) and Mandal et al. (2024), who found that vocabulary knowledge significantly predicts communicative fluency and comprehension. The advanced vocabulary

performance may be attributed to students' regular exposure to English media and academic materials, as well as the bilingual and code-switching environments that facilitate contextual vocabulary retention. Lo (2025) further support this interpretation, asserting that multimodal and interactive learning contexts strengthen lexical acquisition. Thus, while language policies differ, consistent engagement with English through instruction and informal exposure contributes to vocabulary enrichment.

Overall Communicative Skills of Students

Table 4
Overall Communicative Skills of Students

Score Range	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
25–30	35	50.72	Advanced
19–24	29	42.03	Proficient
13–18	2	2.90	Developing
7–12	3	4.35	Emerging
0–6	0	0.00	Beginning
Mean = 24.10			Advanced
SD = 4.02			

Overall, the majority of students (50.72%) demonstrated advanced communicative competence, followed by 42.03% who were proficient. The high mean score (24.10) suggests that, regardless of language policy, students possess well-developed communicative abilities in grammar and vocabulary combined. This aligns with Malgoubri (2025) and Seidler (2022), who observed that multilingual learning environments encourage flexibility and confidence in communication. Moreover, Guimong et al. (2025) found that bilingual education enhances cognitive engagement and cultural awareness, leading to better communicative outcomes. These findings collectively reinforce the idea that communication proficiency depends more on instructional quality and learner interaction than on the strict enforcement of any single language policy.

Differences in Communicative Skills Across Language Policies

Table 5
Summary of ANOVA and Kruskal–Wallis Test Results

Communicative Skill	Statistical Test	P-value	Decision on H ₀	Interpretation
Grammar	ANOVA	0.609	Fail to Reject	No significant difference
Vocabulary	Kruskal–Wallis	0.707	Fail to Reject	No significant difference
Overall Communicative Skills	ANOVA	0.563	Fail to Reject	No significant difference

Statistical analysis revealed no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) in students' grammar, vocabulary, and overall communicative skills across the four instructional language policies. This suggests that the type of classroom language policy did not significantly affect students' communicative competence.

This finding aligns with Bialystok (2015) and Cummins (2021), who assert that language learning success depends less on language exclusivity and more on the quality of input and interaction. The results also support Skutnabb-Kangas (2021), who emphasized that pedagogical scaffolding and comprehensible input are more influential than the medium of instruction itself. The small effect sizes ($\eta^2 = 0.041$ – 0.045) further indicate that factors such as teaching methods, learner motivation, and extracurricular exposure may have a greater impact than policy differences. These findings echo Alotaibi and Alhazmi (2023), who found that teacher-student interaction quality was a stronger predictor of communicative performance than the language of instruction.

Interpretation and Implications

The findings imply that while institutional language policies set the framework for instruction, communicative skill development transcends linguistic boundaries. Effective teaching strategies, interactive classroom environments, and students' self-directed learning habits play more crucial roles than policy alone. The evidence suggests that bilingual and code-switching practices, rather than being seen as barriers, can serve as effective pedagogical tools for comprehension and participation (Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021; Zhang, & Zou, 2024).

For educational policymakers, these results highlight the need to balance English proficiency goals with linguistic inclusivity. Rather than mandating a rigid English-only policy, institutions may adopt flexible, learner-centered approaches that respect linguistic diversity while ensuring communicative competence in English.

The Bilingual Policy was the most commonly implemented classroom language approach. Students exhibited proficient grammar and advanced vocabulary, resulting in strong overall communicative skills. Statistical tests revealed no significant differences in communicative skills across the four language policy groups. Findings underscore that instructional quality and linguistic flexibility, rather than policy rigidity, most effectively enhance communicative competence.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effectiveness of various instructional classroom language policies, English-Only, Bilingual, Code-Switching, and Mother Tongue-Based Instruction (MTBI), on the communicative skills of second-year English students at Tagoloan Community College. Guided by Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982) and Cummins' Interdependence Hypothesis (2021), the study aimed to determine whether language policy significantly influences students' performance in grammar and vocabulary.

The findings revealed that the Bilingual Policy was the most widely implemented instructional approach, reflecting the linguistic diversity of classrooms in Philippine higher education. Students generally demonstrated proficient grammar and advanced vocabulary, resulting in high overall communicative competence. However, the statistical analyses (ANOVA and Kruskal–Wallis tests) indicated no significant differences in communicative skills across the four language policy groups. This suggests that the type of language policy alone does not determine communicative proficiency, as learners across all instructional contexts achieved similar levels of competence.

These results underscore that language learning outcomes depend more on instructional quality, teaching strategies, and learner engagement than on policy restrictions. Exposure to multiple languages through bilingual or code-switching environments may enhance comprehension and participation without compromising English proficiency. In essence, the study highlights the importance of flexible, context-sensitive language policies that value both English mastery and learners' linguistic identities.

This research contributes to the ongoing discourse on language-in-education policies in multilingual societies. It supports the idea that communicative competence can flourish under diverse instructional conditions when educators prioritize meaningful interaction, cultural inclusivity, and learner-centered pedagogy. The findings also align with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), which promotes equitable, inclusive, and effective learning for all.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

For Educators. Teachers should adopt flexible language teaching strategies that integrate English with learners' native languages when necessary. Techniques such as code-switching, translanguaging, and contextualized grammar instruction can help bridge comprehension gaps while maintaining high communicative standards.

For Academic Institutions. Colleges and universities should develop institutional language policies that are inclusive and reflective of students' linguistic diversity. A bilingual or multilingual framework may be more effective than an exclusive English-only policy, especially in community-based educational settings.

For Curriculum Developers. Integrate communicative language teaching (CLT) principles and task-based learning into language curricula. These approaches emphasize authentic language use, critical thinking, and interaction, factors proven to enhance grammar and vocabulary acquisition.

For Policymakers. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and related agencies should revisit national language policy guidelines to ensure they align with current empirical evidence supporting bilingual and mother tongue-based instruction. Policy flexibility should be encouraged, allowing institutions to tailor language policies to their students' linguistic contexts.

For Future Researchers. Future studies may extend this research by including qualitative components, such as classroom observations or interviews, to capture the lived experiences of teachers and students under different language policies. Expanding the study to other regions and educational levels could further validate the generalizability of findings.

In conclusion, this study reaffirms that effective communication skills develop through interaction, comprehension, and engagement, not through language exclusivity. Language policies should empower rather than restrict, recognizing that multilingualism is not a barrier but a valuable resource for education. A dynamic, learner-centered approach to classroom language use will better prepare Filipino students to communicate confidently in both local and global contexts

REFERENCES

- Alotaibi, A., & Alhazmi, A. (2023). Bilingual education and classroom engagement: A comparative study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(4), 210–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijal.2023.02.004>
- Alsaawi, A., & Alshammari, M. (2024). Cultural implications of English-only instruction in Saudi Arabian international schools. *Journal of Language Policy and Education*, 18(2), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlpe.2024.02.005>
- Al-Yahyaeeiyah, A. H. K. (2024). The Effect of Using a Flipped Classroom Strategy on Female Omani Grade Eleven Students' Grammar Learning and Their Motivation Toward Learning English (Master's thesis, Sultan Qaboos University (Oman)). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/f0ae1ddfcc841dcda3a2bdc011a90287/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y>
- Bayagna, H.K. (2025). The influence of face-to-face social interaction on grammar skills among english students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.64637/631269>.

- Benson, C. (2019). Transitions in mother tongue-based education: Language transfer and literacy development. *International Review of Education*, 65(2), 149–168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09774-3>
- Bialystok, E. (2015). Bilingualism and the development of executive function: The role of attention. *Child development perspectives*, 9(2), 117–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12116>
- Bonacina-Pugh, F., da Costa Cabral, I., & Huang, J. (2021). Translanguaging in education. *Language Teaching*, 54(4), 439–471. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000173>
- Canale, M. (1987). The Measurement of Communicative Competence. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 67–84. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500001033>
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2017). *CHED Memorandum Order No. 75, series of 2017: Policies, standards, and guidelines for teacher education programs*. <https://ched.gov.ph/cmo-75-s-2017>
- Cummins, J. (2021). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of language policies and practices*. *Multilingual Matters*. https://www.multilingual-matters.com/page/detail/rethinking-the-education-of-multilingual-learners/?SF1=work_id&ST1=VIEW-1309
- Durrani, A. S., Mushtaq, A., & Fatima, N. (2025). Socio-pragmatic effects of code switching and code mixing of ESL learner university students' language proficiency in Pakistan. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*, 3(3), 1594–1604. <https://doi.org/10.63878/cjssr.v3i3.1145>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2021). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-43451-1>
- Guimong, R. V., Quilang, A., Yamis, E., Arante, M. & Quiño-Justol, J. B. (2025). The Effectiveness of Code-mixing on English Language Skills Among Grade 10 Students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation*, 3(2), 310–329. <https://doi.org/10.17613/v740w-dsy49>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2017). *The development of English as a lingua franca in ASEAN*. In *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 138–150). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315717173-12/development-english-lingua-franca-asean-andy-kirkpatrick>
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press. http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Complexity and ELF: A matter of nonteleology. *World Englishes*, 37(1), 75–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12304>
- Lo, A. W. (2025). Unlocking CLIL success: exploring the interplay between students' self-regulation levels, linguistic challenges and learning outcomes in Hong Kong secondary education. *Language and education*, 39(2), 433–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2024.2314135>

- Lyu, Y. (2024). Gamification as Bridge of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations in Chinese Post-secondary Education. <https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/sq87c1161>
- Malgoubri, I. (2025). Empowering Multilingual Learners Through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy and Arts-Based Learning in Burkina Faso (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/04f47e45eb876d731fbd9aebbceb696b/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Mandal, J., David, N., Mota, K., Ilagan, K., & Fernandez, J. (2024). The English Language Proficiency Level of the College Students: ACQUIRE (The Ability and Comprehensive Quality of Universal Integration and Regulation of English Language). <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4900979>
- Putri, N., & Gopal, R. (2021). The impact of English-only policy on language fluency and classroom participation. *Asian EFL Journal*, 28(4), 55–74. <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Quiño, J. B. (2022). Students' perception and satisfaction of google classroom as instructional medium for teaching and learning. *Canadian Journal of Educational and Social Studies*, 2(2), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.53103/cjess.v2i2.22>
- Seidler, C. J. (2022). Weaving ethnic identity: Discovering the threads of multilingual diversity in the fabric of group identity among Karen communities of Denver, Colorado (Master's thesis, The University of North Dakota). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/17338be8fb2c0dd56cf215246094bc54/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2021). Multilingual education works: From the periphery to the center. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Multilingual-Education-Works-From-the-Periphery-to-the-Center/Skutnabb-Kangas/p/book/9780367569395>
- Vacalares, S. T. (2023). English-only versus mother tongue: An analysis on students' fluency and self-confidence. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(2), 1148–1159. Retrieved from <https://ejournals.ph>
- Wang, C., & Zou, B. (2025). AI versus teachers and peers: a comparative study on speaking performance, willingness to communicate, self-perceived communicative competence and foreign language anxiety. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, (0). <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2024-0310>
- Zhang, R., & Zou, D. (2024). Self-regulated second language learning: A review of types and benefits of strategies, modes of teacher support, and pedagogical implications. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(4), 720-765. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2055081>