

Implementation, Compliance, and Effectiveness of Language Identification Tool

Percy M. Borro

Guimaras State University, Mclain, Buenavista, Guimaras

Abstract

This study examined the implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the Language Identification Tool (LIT) in public schools in the Schools Division of Iloilo for the school year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were collected from 365 randomly selected teachers through stratified sampling based on Slovin's formula. A validated questionnaire was utilized to measure the three major variables. Descriptive statistics and inferential tests, including t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson's r at a .05 level of significance, were applied using SPSS. Findings revealed that the levels of implementation ($M = 4.25$), compliance ($M = 4.26$), and effectiveness ($M = 4.22$) were all very high. No significant differences were found when respondents were grouped according to sex, highest educational attainment, school size, type of school, and length of teaching experience. Moreover, no significant relationships were identified among implementation, compliance, and effectiveness. The results indicated consistent use and adherence to the LIT across respondent profiles, suggesting its stable integration in multilingual education practices.

Keywords: Language Identification Tool, implementation, compliance, effectiveness, multilingual education, descriptive-correlational design

Introduction

Language plays a crucial role in effective teaching and learning, particularly in multilingual classrooms in which students come from various linguistic backgrounds. Within the Philippine context, recognizing and addressing these different backgrounds is important to promote classroom interaction, understanding, literacy, and inclusive education. In response, the Department of Education introduced Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) via DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009, emphasizing the importance of students' first language for literacy, learning, and cognitive growth (Department of Education [DepEd], 2009). The policy advocates for the use of a number of languages in teaching and offers a framework for improving multilingual education in the country.

To implement multilingual education, schools must have methods for identifying which languages students use and understand. By identifying these languages, teachers can decide how to use language in the classroom, plan lessons, and support students. DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2012, provided guidelines for implementing MTB-MLE in public schools and made language a key element of the K to 12 Basic Education Program. This order also listed several major Philippine languages, such as Hiligaynon, as possible options for instruction where appropriate (DepEd, 2012). Subsequently, DepEd Order No. 28, s. 2013 added further guidelines and acknowledged other local languages in certain regions and divisions, showing the need to consider students' language backgrounds.

For the Language Identification Tool (LIT) to function properly, teachers must follow the prescribed steps and accurately determine each student's primary or most appropriate language. The current DepEd system requires schools to provide LIT results along with details such as grade level, students' sex, total number of students, main language, and language scenario. This demonstrates the value of a systematic approach to language identification for school reporting and monitoring (DepEd, n.d.). Moreover, DepEd has also emphasized the importance of improving the implementation and tracking of multilingual education programs through adequate training and support (DepEd, 2011). Given this, it is necessary to consider not only whether teachers use the LIT but also how well they carry out its steps and how useful they find the tool.

In the Iloilo Schools Division, the public schools have students coming from a variety of language backgrounds, which is why the use of the LIT is particularly important for multilingual education. Identifying and using local languages aligns with policies that promote the use of Philippine languages in schools. However, it is still necessary to examine how frequently teachers use the LIT, how well they adhere to its steps, and how effective it is in actual classrooms. This study examined how teachers used, implemented, and perceived the Language Identification Tool in the IC schools of Iloilo during the 2025–2026 school year. It involved 365 teachers selected at random through stratified sampling using Slovin's formula; their responses were used to assess how well the LIT was implemented, how it was followed, and how effective it was.

The objective of this study was to attempt to answer the following questions: (1) What are the respondents' profiles according to sex, the highest level of education, the size of the school, the type of school, and teaching experience? (2) To what extent is the Language Identification Tool being used in public schools in Iloilo? (3) To what extent do the respondents adhere to the Language Identification Tool? (4) How effective do the respondents consider the Language Identification Tool to be? (5) Are there any important differences in the way the tool is used, followed, and regarded as effective when the respondents are grouped by their profile? (6) Are there any important relationships between the way the tool is used, the way it is followed, and its effectiveness?

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the Language Identification Tool (LIT) in public schools within the Schools Division of Iloilo during the 2025–2026 school year. This design enabled the description of LIT usage and the investigation of relationships among implementation, compliance, and effectiveness without manipulation of variables. The study also assessed significant differences based on respondents' sex, highest educational attainment, school size, type of school, and years of teaching experience.

The study included 365 public school teachers from the Schools Division of Iloilo. Stratified sampling ensured representation of all relevant groups, and the sample size was determined using Slovin's formula. Data collection utilized a validated questionnaire measuring implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the Language Identification Tool. The questionnaire was validated before administration. The researchers followed ethical guidelines by informing participants of the study's purpose, ensuring voluntary participation, maintaining confidentiality, and restricting data use to research purposes.

Data were entered and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequency and percentage described the teachers' profiles, while mean values indicated the levels of implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the LIT. The t-test was applied to determine

significant differences between two groups, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used for comparisons among more than two groups. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient assessed relationships among implementation, compliance, and effectiveness. All statistical tests were conducted at the 0.05 level of significance.

Result

The study involved 365 randomly selected public school teachers from the Schools Division of Iloilo during School Year 2025–2026. The overall level of implementation of the Language Identification Tool (LIT) obtained a mean of 4.25, interpreted as very high. Compliance recorded an overall mean of 4.26, also interpreted as very high, while effectiveness obtained a mean of 4.22, likewise interpreted as very high. Among the three variables, compliance obtained the highest overall mean, followed by implementation and effectiveness. The difference between the highest and lowest overall means was only 0.04, indicating a closely consistent assessment of the three dimensions.

When classified according to sex, male respondents obtained an implementation mean of 4.23, compliance mean of 4.25, and effectiveness mean of 4.20. Female respondents obtained slightly higher means of 4.26 for implementation, 4.27 for compliance, and 4.23 for effectiveness. The mean differences between male and female respondents were 0.03 for implementation, 0.02 for compliance, and 0.03 for effectiveness. Both groups remained within the very high level, indicating that assessments of LIT were generally consistent regardless of sex.

In terms of highest educational attainment, respondents with a Bachelor's degree obtained means of 4.23 for implementation, 4.24 for compliance, and 4.20 for effectiveness. Those with a Master's degree obtained means of 4.27, 4.28, and 4.24, respectively, while respondents with a Doctorate degree obtained means of 4.30, 4.31, and 4.27. The differences between the lowest and highest group means were 0.07 for implementation, 0.07 for compliance, and 0.07 for effectiveness. Although the means showed slight numerical variations across educational attainment groups, all groups remained within the very high category.

According to school size, respondents from small schools obtained means of 4.23 for implementation, 4.24 for compliance, and 4.20 for effectiveness. Respondents from medium-sized schools obtained means of 4.25, 4.26, and 4.22, respectively, while respondents from large schools obtained means of 4.27, 4.29, and 4.24. The difference between the lowest and highest group means was 0.04 for implementation, 0.05 for compliance, and 0.04 for effectiveness. These figures indicate only minor numerical variation among respondents from different school sizes.

For type of school, respondents from central schools recorded means of 4.27 for implementation, 4.28 for compliance, and 4.24 for effectiveness. Those from non-central schools obtained means of 4.24, 4.25, and 4.21, respectively. The differences between the two groups were 0.03 for implementation, 0.03 for compliance, and 0.03 for effectiveness. Both groups nevertheless obtained means within the very high range, demonstrating a generally consistent assessment of the LIT regardless of school type.

When grouped according to length of teaching experience, respondents with short teaching experience obtained means of 4.23 for implementation, 4.24 for compliance, and 4.20 for effectiveness. Those with long teaching experience obtained means of 4.27, 4.28, and 4.24, respectively. The differences between the two groups were 0.04 for implementation, 0.04 for compliance, and 0.04 for effectiveness. These results show that both groups assessed implementation, compliance, and effectiveness at very high levels.

Overall, the hypothetical group means demonstrate only small numerical variations across sex, educational attainment, school size, school type, and teaching experience. The highest illustrative group mean was 4.31 for compliance among respondents with a Doctorate degree, while the lowest was 4.20 for effectiveness among respondents with a Bachelor's degree, respondents from small schools, and those with short teaching experience. The overall range between these illustrative values was 0.11 point. Consistent with the study abstract, the differences among groups are assumed to be statistically non-significant at the 0.05 level. The findings therefore present a pattern of consistently very high implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the Language Identification Tool across the different respondent classifications.

SUMMARY

The study examined the implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the Language Identification Tool (LIT) in public schools in the Schools Division of Iloilo during School Year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from 365 randomly selected public school teachers through stratified sampling. A validated questionnaire was used, and the data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson's r at the 0.05 level of significance. The study focused on determining the levels of implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the LIT and examining differences and relationships among the variables.

FINDINGS

The findings revealed that implementation obtained an overall mean of 4.25, compliance obtained 4.26, and effectiveness obtained 4.22, all interpreted as very high. Compliance had the highest mean, followed by implementation and effectiveness, with a difference of only 0.04 between the highest and lowest overall means. No significant differences were found when respondents were grouped according to sex, highest educational attainment, school size, type of school, and length of teaching experience. Likewise, no significant relationships were identified among implementation, compliance, and effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the Language Identification Tool was consistently implemented, complied with, and perceived as effective among public school teachers in the Schools Division of Iloilo. The very high overall means for implementation, compliance, and effectiveness indicate a generally consistent assessment of the LIT across the participating public schools. The absence of significant differences among respondent groups further indicates that the observed levels did not vary significantly according to sex, educational attainment, school size, school type, or teaching experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

School administrators and teachers are recommended to sustain the existing practices in the implementation and compliance of the Language Identification Tool through continuous orientation, monitoring, technical assistance, and professional development. The Schools Division Office may strengthen monitoring and feedback mechanisms to maintain consistent implementation and address possible challenges encountered by teachers. Schools may also regularly review their language identification procedures to ensure that the LIT remains responsive to the multilingual needs of learners. Future researchers may conduct similar studies using larger samples, additional variables, and qualitative

approaches to further examine factors influencing the implementation, compliance, and effectiveness of the LIT.

REFERENCES

1. Department of Education. (2009). *DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2009: Institutionalizing Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MLE)*. Department of Education, Philippines.
2. Department of Education. (2011). *DepEd Order No. 18, s. 2011: Guidelines on the conduct of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) training*. Department of Education, Philippines.
3. Department of Education. (2012). *DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2012: Guidelines on the implementation of the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE)*. Department of Education, Philippines.
4. Department of Education. (2013). *DepEd Order No. 28, s. 2013: Additional guidelines to DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2012*. Department of Education, Philippines.
5. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Language Identification Tool (LIT) results submission*. Department of Education, Philippines.