



Teachers' Lived Experiences in Integrating Technology, Culture, and Grammar for Language Instruction

Gernie Ronn M. Tumbokon^{1 2}

¹West Visayas State University, Iloilo City, Philippines

²Aklan State University-Ibajay, Aklan, Philippines

Corresponding Author Emails: gernieronntumbokon@wvsu.edu.ph
tumbokon.gernieronntumbokon@asu.edu.ph

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i5.2753>

APA Citation: Tumbokon, G. R. M. (2026). Teachers' Lived Experiences in Integrating Technology, Culture, and Grammar for Language Instruction. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 8(5). 536-571
<https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i5.2753>

Received: 15/07/2026	Abstract
Accepted: 20/09/2026	<i>The study explored Filipino English teachers' lived experiences in integrating technology, culture, and grammar instruction in multilingual classrooms at Aklan State University-Ibajay, Aklan, Philippines. Despite various national and international initiatives, the teachers encountered difficulties in technology-driven instruction when teaching students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, which affected grammar learning. A descriptive qualitative study was conducted using purposive sampling to select seven (7) Filipino English teachers. The interviews included fifteen (15) semi-structured questions developed from the three (3) core research questions and focused on technology, culture, and grammar instruction. Reflexive thematic analysis was used to analyze interview transcripts. Four themes were constructed from the participants' responses: (1) culturally responsive grammar instruction in multilingual contexts, (2) technological and AI integration: opportunities and constraints, (3) navigating learner diversity and fostering critical thinking, and (4) ethical and moral dimensions of grammar teaching. The findings show that teachers integrated grammar, culture, and digital technology through contextualized instruction. Grammar teaching was connected to learners' languages, cultural experiences, prior learning, and communicative contexts, while digital tools supported learning, feedback, and engagement. However, effective technology integration depended on teacher mediation, appropriate tool selection, multilingual support, and responsible AI use. This integration required alignment between technology, pedagogical practices, learner needs, and classroom conditions.</i>
Keywords: Filipino English Teachers, Grammar Instruction, Technology Integration, Artificial Intelligence in Education, Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, Multilingual Classrooms	

Introduction

Exploring the Filipino English teachers' experiences in integrating technology, culture, and grammar shows how pedagogy, cultural identity, and digital technology meet within multilingual classrooms. Teachers use technology for grammar instruction to assist both language learning and learner engagement. Teachers integrate technology into their lessons for grammar instruction using digital and multimedia resources (Flojo, 2024; Azarcon-Sanchez et al., 2024). In Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) contexts, teachers deal with students' diverse languages and develop lessons that affirm their cultural and local identities (Velasco, 2025; Oda & Vizconde, 2021). Teachers can teach grammar while supporting students' literacy development through Baybayin and other indigenous scripts in technology-mediated activities (Eslit, 2024).

In addition, grammar lessons can benefit from technology by becoming more interactive and responsive to students' needs. Ancheta (2022) states that a teacher can incorporate traditional methods as well as the preferences of today's learners through resources like learning management systems, online exercises, and grammar apps. Teaching English to 21st-century learners will not be effective without the integration of technology. This viewpoint is also advocated by the Department of Education as well as the Commission on Higher Education. According to Justol and Potane (2024), teachers create a more engaging, learner-centered experience through digital platforms when they are confident and competent. Bautista Jr. et al. (2022) further noted that teachers' willingness to innovate their pedagogy and adjust to evolving technologies affects the use of digital tools and English language teaching.

As part of language instruction, grammar has a crucial role since it explicitly teaches grammatical structures and improves students' ability to use them accurately and confidently, as well as their overall language abilities (Hervina et al., 2022; Alqahtani, 2022). The integration of technology in language teaching requires teachers' pedagogical as well as technological knowledge while considering sociocultural factors that are important in relation to its application in different cultures (Novita et al., 2022). In the Philippines, teaching techniques incorporate both grammar and technology to address widespread issues including unequal internet access as students rely too heavily on their native languages (Hervina et al., 2022).

Research on English language teaching using technology is expanding, yet limited research examines how teachers interact with technology in the classroom and make instructional choices, while many studies focus on students (Herdina & Ningrum, 2023). To provide effective grammar teaching in challenging multilingual classrooms, culturally sensitive methods may be used to take into account learners' language backgrounds and cultural contexts (Yoon, 2023). The inclusion of technology in English language instruction creates a more accessible educational environment where students may be exposed to language and cultural experiences.

Additionally, investigating gaps in teaching is a reflection that needs to happen which would enhance policymakers' efforts in educational development. Advancements in artificial intelligence are being perfected to make personalized grammar instruction much more accessible (Bozkurt et al., 2023). Such advanced technology assists learners with self-regulation due to the recent use of artificial intelligence (AI) devices in classrooms. Many educational practices have changed for students, such as providing more feedback after giving wrong answers and the use of digital devices to support learning (Al Hakim et al., 2022). Teachers must be able to use the benefits of technology effectively. The quality of the teachers, not the demands of technology, will determine the level of holistic success. The study explored the experiences of Filipino English teachers in response to AI-mediated grammar instruction in different linguistic environments (Cabato, 2025).

Recent studies reveal that computer- and mobile-assisted language learning can enhance learner autonomy and provide access to authentic input. However, whether this happens depends on how the teacher designs and mediates instruction (Rosqueta, 2025). Teachers in the Philippine context must have digital literacy and be responsive to their learners, guiding them to integrate technology meaningfully in the teaching of English (Rosero et al., 2025). AI-aided tools in classrooms can provide feedback for personalized learning. However, feedback and recommendations depend on the teachers who use them. To align technology with the needs of multilingual classrooms, teacher-centered inquiry must continue. According

to Garrido and Niez (2025), higher-order language skills, along with content, are achieved through these approaches, which enhance students' engagement and contextual relevance.

Furthermore, current education policies in the Philippines emphasize the importance of teacher competence in the effective integration of technology into language instruction. Key policies from national directives, including the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 75, Series of 2017, and Department of Education Order No. 21, Series of 2019, emphasize the use of digital tools and technology to support multilingual and inclusive learning environments. Yet, recent studies reveal that actual classroom practices often diverge from these policy goals, reflecting gaps in implementation and teacher preparedness (Balbada, 2025; Justol & Potane, 2024). Understanding how teachers deliver their instruction in classroom can give valuable insights into what they need to learn more around AI-written instruction and classroom practices to help support teaching (Caliboso, 2025).

The use of artificial intelligence in the Philippines has been examined primarily in selected teaching contexts. According to Dayagbil et al. (2025), despite teachers' positive perceptions regarding AI tools, their actual use in teaching and learning is contingent upon teachers' confidence in using these tools and their access to them. In a study of elementary teachers in DepEd Dingras District I, Rosqueta (2025) found that teachers' use of AI-related tools and traditional teaching materials was often modified based on classroom realities and learning needs. According to Sibug et al. (2024), teachers believe that AI tools may enhance teaching efficiency, particularly when used in reflective teaching sessions. As universities and colleges work to achieve their digitalization goals, further inquiry should examine AI integration within culturally inclusive, ethically informed, and pedagogically sound approaches. By doing so, English language teaching in the Philippines can benefit from technological advancements while preserving multilingual and cultural identities.

Involving the use of technology in teaching English to students will result in more engaged learners (Ramos et al., 2025). Filipino English teachers make use of various digital tools to make their learners more participatory. Also, these tools enable them to provide instant feedback to learners, and teachers from different parts of the Philippines use the many languages of the classroom (Justol & Potane, 2024); their ability to understand and use technology will also play a vital role (Çebi et al., 2022). Successful teaching hinges upon high-quality instruction. Much involves the use of tools that guide students as they learn and culturally responsive methods that relate learning to students' personal experiences (Salgado et al., 2024; Caingcoy, 2023; Camiring-Picpican et al., 2025).

The research aims to explore how the teachers in the Philippines interpret and respond appropriately to culture and race when they incorporate technology in the teaching of grammar. Using culturally responsive teaching can contribute to greater awareness and retention while generally helping learners become more successful and have a better understanding throughout their school careers. Legislation around the world that incorporates students' cultural backgrounds has been shown to improve the students' English vocabulary and skills (Salgado et al., 2024). International studies accentuate the benefits of acknowledging students' native languages and cultural perspectives as capable compensations for the knowledge they already possess (Matiso, 2024). A culturally responsive approach has bridged the boundaries between sociocultural backgrounds and digital tools, making virtual learning more accessible and easier to use. In accordance with Camiring-Picpican et al. (2025), teachers need to acknowledge their students' home

languages, communication styles, and individual identities in order to tailor instruction to diverse learner needs.

Several classroom studies involving students from different backgrounds have shown that teachers should ensure clear explanations of grammar for standardized testing. For example, a song about selling candy can be used to teach vocabulary and the action of selling (Marpaung et al., 2025). The inclusion of technology in the classroom greatly benefits grammar instruction by presenting a variety of interactive lessons, instant feedback options, and helpful in-class guidance all while being pertinent to the various languages involved. Based on Justol and Potane (2024), carefully designed lesson plans offer students the engagement and skill development they need to excel in the 21st-century classroom. Information from these new methods is translated into professional development alternatives and curriculum revisions in an attempt to build bridges between technology and its meaningful use of technology (Agregado, 2023).

Many classroom studies conducted in the Philippines have stressed the need for explicit grammar instruction, especially when students are from diverse cultural backgrounds. Amalia et al. (2025) showed that songs and everyday activities need to shift vocabulary and grammatical structures when culturally relevant materials are utilized. Using technology in classrooms helps to improve grammar lessons by providing interactive lessons. With instant feedback and scaffolding support for multilingual learners, a well-designed lesson plan encourages learners' engagement and 21st-century skills development (Justol & Potane, 2024). Changes in the teaching methods are later reflected in professional development programs and curriculum revisions, connecting the use of technology with meaningful pedagogical practices (Poquita & Opeña, 2025; Agregado, 2023). The reviewed studies indicate that growth in students' understanding of English grammar can also come from their cultural backgrounds. By accepting their culture and identity, students can focus better on their studies and thus improve their grammar.

Similarly, Magbanua (2024), found that multilingual classrooms face the difficulty of improving grammar education while catering to each student's language and culture. While studies have found that improving culturally aware teaching promotes learning and engagement, very few recent publications discuss integrating technology with cultural and linguistic sensitivity to improve the effectiveness of grammar education (Camiring-Picpican et al., 2025). Also, Roque et al. (2025) demonstrate that superior language proficiency is achievable among multicultural students while creating an inclusive learning environment by utilizing technology and encouraging students' interactivity.

In relation to technology-mediated grammar instruction, Celik and Kara (2024) found that using Web 2.0 significantly enhanced tertiary English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' grammatical competence, motivation, and attitudes towards learning English. The students from the treatment group made important gains due to the structure of the instructional design. Tu (2022) also conducted a study of secondary school pupils using EdTech tools for grammar learning. The research shows that digital settings allow for more active learning, more creativity in lessons, and a deeper understanding of grammar. These works show that technology-mediated grammar teaching is quite promising, although there is a considerable cultural and linguistic correspondence with ideology (Yoon, 2023). There is not much research examining grammar teaching with attention to technology, and students' diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds represent an important gap for further inquiry.

Research within the multilingual milieu of the Philippines emphasizes the connection among culture, language, and technology in grammar teaching. According to Bernardo

(2023), when teachers connect grammar lessons with learners' cultural identities in an ESL classroom, these are referred to as "teachable culture moments". Teachers have beliefs about language that impact their implementation of MTB-MLE in their classrooms. Velasco (2025) shows this by including students' languages in grammar lessons. Research on the impact of technology integration on grammar learning indicates that technology-enhanced language-learning tools improve engagement and give immediate feedback, while Kahoot! is a gamified quiz-based platform that has been shown to increase overall language proficiency among EFL learners, thereby enhancing active engagement and participation in grammar practice through its interactive features (Chin & Chang, 2024). Similarly, a mixed-method study in a Mexican EFL classroom found that using Duolingo significantly improved learners' test scores and fostered more positive attitudes toward English, indicating that the app enhances language proficiency and engagement when integrated into classroom instruction (Peláez-Sánchez & Velásquez-Durán, 2023).

Alongside these technological developments, some studies emphasize the importance of continuing professional development in addressing cultural and educational issues as technology has advanced teaching. This has been a crucial difficulty to be faced by 21st-century instructors (Narreddy et al., 2025). Studies on reflective practices, mentorship, and institutional support show how teachers deal with problems like limited access to technology, varying levels of technical skills, and the alignment of classroom materials (Trust & Whalen, 2020). In this context, Macaro et al. (2020) argue that most in this situation are comprised of applying practical models culturally while also incorporating the various technologies that are used daily.

From a theoretical standpoint, this study is grounded in three theoretical frameworks: Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP), and Sociocultural Theory (SCT) to explore how Filipino English teachers navigate technology, culture, and grammar instruction in multilingual classrooms.

Originally proposed by Mishra and Koehler, the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework was subsequently examined and extended by Saubern et al. (2020). This framework discusses how to address modern problems in using technology in classrooms. Contextual knowledge and new information and communications technology, including AI-enhanced learning tools, are emphasized by studies as important aspects or conditions in teachers' implementation of TPACK (Brianza et al., 2024; Ning et al., 2024). Research shows that contextual knowledge and readiness for integrating advanced digital tools, including AI-enhanced learning tools, are critical for teachers' TPACK implementation (Bautista Jr. et al., 2022).

Studies show that structured professional development can aid in the enhancement of educators' technological, pedagogical, and content competencies, especially in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (Drajati et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2024). In a multilingual context, TPACK programming creates additional incentives for equitable and language-sensitive application of digital technologies by directing teachers' attention to students' linguistic progress, interests, and needs (Durham, 2024). Also, insights from sociocultural theory are indispensable for TPACK application since teachers' recognition of different cultural concepts and their experience with the wider environment may affect their success in giving technology an appropriate cultural context (Novita et al., 2022).

Subsequently, Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP) is the study's focus, where cultural and language awareness are brought into the classroom. With the help of CRP, teachers can connect with their students by fostering and valuing their languages, cultures, and local

norms. It can help adapt instruction to the background of the learner. Using culturally relevant contexts in grammar instruction enhances students' engagement and understanding. According to Caingcoy (2023), students' learning experiences matter. Similarly, Salgado et al. (2024) acknowledge that recognizing learners' identities enhances levels of engagement and understanding. According to Cawaling-Mauntol and Padua (2022), teachers reflect regional languages in CRP. When these elements are considered together, they show that culturally relevant teaching promotes an inclusive and effective learning environment.

Then, the third framework is Sociocultural Theory (SCT), which views learning as socially mediated and knowledge as co-constructed through collaboration. Recent studies show that peer engagement and scaffolded dialogue help in language development (Çelik & Baturay, 2024). By facilitating engagement across an array of language and cultural contexts, technology-rich classrooms promote authentic collaborative learning (Lei & Phongsatha, 2023). Also, culturally responsive integration of technology enhances engagement and equitable outcomes while supporting the alignment of instruction with learners' social and cultural backgrounds (Animashaun et al., 2024). In the Philippine context, collaborative strategies grounded in sociocultural principles have been shown to improve student participation and achievement (Santiago, 2025).

Studies have shown that when technology-supported instruction is combined with appropriate culturally responsive practices, there can be an increase in student engagement in classrooms and support for students in learning a new language effectively (Cheng et al., 2021). Sociocultural Theory posits that the classroom is a social arena in which learning takes place through social interaction and cultural engagement. This theory stresses the joint sharing of knowledge (Owunna et al., 2025).

Consistent with this sociocultural perspective, the TPACK framework unites content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and technological knowledge to foster meaningful and engaging instruction as advocated by Lestari et al. (2023) and Ammade et al. (2020). Learning through technology-enabled instruction can also help students with rule-based learning disabilities learn grammar better. Indeed, assistive technologies have been shown to support English learning outcomes among students with disabilities through personalized and adaptive instructional experiences that improve the language skills of learners with disabilities (Prystiananta et al., 2025). When used together, these frameworks shed light on how teachers can use these tools to make instructional choices that enhance and facilitate language learning.

Methods

The study used a descriptive qualitative design to provide a detailed description of phenomena as they emerge in their natural context (Creswell & Poth, 2023). Specifically, this design was employed to explore Filipino English teachers' experiences in integrating technology, culture, and grammar instruction for language instruction. Semi-structured interviews were used to elicit detailed accounts of participants' experiences, allowing them to describe the opportunities and challenges they encountered in language instruction. This descriptive approach is especially applicable in the context of Philippine multilingual classrooms where teachers instruct learners based on their various linguistic backgrounds. According to Plata and Macawile (2022), teachers utilize translanguaging to assist learners in the process of learning things, understanding and learning from experience, and solving problems.

Participants and Sampling

The study focused on seven (7) Filipino English teachers, specifically professors and instructors, from Aklan State University-Ibajay, Aklan, Philippines. Participants were purposely selected to explore their insights into the relationship of grammar instruction related to technology and culturally responsive pedagogy. There are various ways to involve culture in grammar, such as experience, class level, exposure, and digital tools.

Furthermore, the principle of data saturation guided the consideration of sample adequacy, with data collection continuing until saturation was reached (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022). The participants were carefully selected to guarantee that their responses would directly address the main purpose of the study (Nyimbili & Nyimbili, 2024). More specifically, the experiences of the teachers serve to point up how technology and culture get to shape the grammar instruction in the Philippine settings. Purposive sampling was used to select participants in this research as one of the common methods practiced in qualitative research. Participants were purposively selected based on certain characteristics that were relevant enough to the objectives (Ahmad & Wilkins, 2025; Campbell et al., 2020).

In purposive sampling, a sample in qualitative research is selected based on their grammar teaching experience, technology use, knowledge of culturally responsive pedagogy and willingness to participate voluntarily. Exclusion criteria included teacher without grammar instruction experience, those lacking technological proficiency, and those individuals unable to attend the interview schedule, indicated that the process allowed the participants to give detailed information within the study context (Campbell et al., 2020). Purposive sampling is useful for improving the qualitative data collection, as precise analysis enhances the credibility of the results.

In the case of the selection of teachers, it was assured that they taught English grammar, were experienced in using digital tools for teaching, were knowledgeable about culturally responsive pedagogy and agreed to participate of their own will. Exclusion criteria were set for those without grammar instruction experience, prior use of digital technology in teaching, and those who could not commit to the interview schedule (Ahmad & Wilkins, 2025; Campbell et al., 2020). The approach allowed participants to provide detailed information within the study context (Campbell et al., 2020). Using purposive sampling improves the quality of qualitative research by ensuring that identified participants can provide useful information, while precise analysis of the study results enhances credibility (Ahmad & Wilkins, 2025).

The data saturation principle justified the participation of seven (7) participants in the study. Saturation happens when additional interviews do not result in the emergence of new themes. Furthermore, saturation provides a recognized standard of adequacy (Guest et al., 2020). Hennink and Kaiser (2022) indicate that saturation occurs when participants are information-rich and interview procedures are comprehensive. Research shows that thematic saturation can be achieved with fewer than ten (10) participants when the study is focused (Guest et al., 2020). In the study, the selected participants offered multiple focused experiences which ensured that the research captured comprehensive themes and ensured credibility (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022). Combining purposive sampling with saturation principles strengthened the reliability of the analysis (Guest et al., 2020).

Instrument

The study gathered data for this research through semi-structured, in-depth one-on-one interviews (Karhulahti & Backe, 2021). This method merges the formal nature of structured interviews with a conversational style of interviewing which gives participants an opportunity to share their practices without being hindered (Nguyen, 2025). Although some structure is necessary, the semi-structured interviews allow the interviewers not to be limited by the interview guide and to keep a record of the developments and interesting insights (Creswell & Poth, 2023).

Interviews were organized according to the participants' availability and readiness to participate. Based on their convenience, the interviews were carried out in person or online. Each session lasted 20 to 30 minutes, thus giving participants enough time to express themselves without constraining further questions (Alibrahim & Alsadoon, 2022). The use of semi-structured interviews was found to be particularly effective for exploring educational experiences because these interviews encourage participants' initiative in talking while at the same time helping the interviewer to keep the session within the scope of the research (Creswell & Poth, 2023).

Research Questions

This study aimed to explore Filipino English teachers' lived experiences in integrating technology, culture, and grammar instruction within multilingual English classrooms. Specifically, it sought to address the following research questions:

1. How do Filipino English teachers describe their experiences in integrating culture and grammar instruction in multilingual English classrooms?
2. What opportunities and challenges do Filipino English teachers encounter in integrating digital technology into grammar instruction?
3. How do Filipino English teachers integrate digital technology while considering learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how do they perceive its influence on learners' engagement and learning?

Data Collection

Prior to data collection, permission to conduct the study was secured from the Campus Director through a formal request letter. Participants who met the inclusion criteria were then recruited. Those who agreed to be interviewed were provided with a participant letter and an information sheet outlining the purpose and procedures, confidentiality measures and participant rights. There was information on the right to withdraw at any stage without any consequences. Only those who voluntarily signed the informed consent form were included in the study (Xu et al., 2020). A fifteen (15)-item questionnaire guide derived from the three (3) core research questions was used during the interviews.

The questionnaire guide consisted of fifteen (15) questions derived from the three (3) core research questions, allowing participants to elaborate on their responses while keeping the discussion relevant to the study. Probing questions were used to encourage participants to provide clarifications, explanations, and specific examples (Robinson, 2023). Semi-structured interviews necessitate the use of not only a structured sequence of questions but traditional

interview formats as well (Busetto et al., 2020; Robinson, 2023). In addition to that, the number of probing questions was also kept to a minimum to enable the interviewer to complete the interviews within a reasonable period (Robinson, 2023).

All interviews were planned according to the participants' convenience and were conducted purely face-to-face. This mode of data collection has been shown to enrich data as it offers deeper contextual information, increases rapport, and helps with non-verbal observations, which enhance interpretive validity (Namey et al., 2022). Each session lasted 20 to 30 minutes, and participants' voices were recorded with their permission to better capture their responses, including their undertones and inflections that may give deeper insights into their experiences (Ubaedillah et al., 2021).

After the interview, the recordings were transcribed verbatim, capturing participants' exact words, including pauses and tone of voice, along with the context. For transcripts in Filipino or any other local language, English translations were provided to capture the meaning of the participants' expressions, with participants consulted for clarity if needed (Chand, 2025). Similarly, to increase credibility, the participants reviewed the transcript summaries through member checking to validate or correct their responses (Soysal & Türkmen, 2024). All data, including audio recordings, transcriptions, translations, and consent forms, were stored securely and were accessible only for use in the study.

Data Analysis

Using reflexive thematic analysis (RTA), the data gathered were analyzed to interpret the meaning of participants' experiences. This is a methodological framework that provides an interpretative analytical approach to developing themes (Byrne, 2022). This approach is applied to experiences that are culturally situated, such as those of Filipino English teachers regarding grammar instruction, teaching practices, technology, learner diversity in multilingual classrooms, and ethical issues. This kind of analysis works well for complex and context-bound phenomena because of its flexibility and depth (Byrne, 2022).

All interviews were transcribed verbatim and the transcripts were repeatedly reviewed with regular reference to the original audio recordings, which helped prevent alterations to the linguistic variants and contextual meaning of the participants. This helps in the drafting of reports that are closer to the real communicative experience (Byrne, 2022). The studies show that RTA was successful when applied rigorously through prolonged engagement and sustained analysis of the participants' experience data. Going back to audio recordings for listening and transcripts for reading is said to help capture qualitative language data and its different language features and patterns. This process is in line with current methodological practices. The outcome of these actions has highlighted the necessity for the sustained engagement of researchers with language tutors' assessment literacy and pedagogical identity, particularly within TESOL contexts (Kim, 2025; Truong & Lambert, 2025).

The coding phase used a line-by-line inductive process rather than a codebook to allow meaningful units to emerge from the participants' own language. RTA requires rigorous and valid coding rather than rigid category assignment of this sort. Both explicit and implicit aspects of the data emerged, such as teacher practices and the use of technologies. Through the joint focus on diversity and compatibility of content, the more implicit dimensions, such as ethical values, culture-mediated attitudes toward the content, came to the surface (Byrne, 2022; Kim, 2025). For instance, qualitative research on language tutors using reflexive thematic analysis revealed their teaching and assessment practices and the influence of tutor

identity and language assessment literacy on pedagogy, thus highlighting the interplay among assessment, curriculum, and pedagogy (Kim, 2025).

Afterward, using thematic mapping and narrative summaries in relation to the research questions, the codes were organized into candidate themes following Braun and Clarke's reflexive thematic analysis (Byrne, 2022). RTA has been applied in language education to understand context-bound teacher experiences. Strandberg (2025) analyzed what teachers think and experience when they teach grammar with the help of authentic texts. Ousseini (2023) studied EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. According to Floris et al. (2024), teachers' engagement in research has been analyzed, while technology-mediated language teaching was examined by Nogaibayeva and Yersultanova (2025). The studies show that using thematic mapping and integrative summarizing allows for the rigorous analysis of data to ensure that themes reflect meaningful and patterned data grounded in the lived experiences of the research participants.

Results and Discussion

The findings are structured around the three research questions and the four themes constructed from the participants' responses: (1) Culturally Responsive Grammar Instruction in Multilingual Contexts, (2) Technological and AI Integration: Opportunities and Constraints, (3) Navigating Learner Diversity and Fostering Critical Thinking, and (4) Ethical and Moral Dimensions of Grammar Teaching.

Table 1 shows the relationship between the research questions and themes by identifying the themes that directly address each research question.

Table 1: Relationship Between Research Questions and Emergent Themes

Research Questions	Emergent Themes
RQ1. How do Filipino English teachers describe their experiences in integrating culture and grammar instruction in multilingual English classrooms?	Theme 1: Culturally Responsive Grammar Instruction in Multilingual Contexts; Theme 3: Navigating Learner Diversity and Fostering Critical Thinking
RQ2. What opportunities and challenges do Filipino English teachers encounter in integrating digital technology into grammar instruction?	Theme 2: Technological and AI Integration: Opportunities and Constraints; Theme 4: Ethical and Moral Dimensions of Grammar Teaching
RQ3. How do Filipino English teachers integrate digital technology while considering learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how do they perceive its influence on learners' engagement and learning?	Theme 1: Culturally Responsive Grammar Instruction in Multilingual Contexts; Theme 2: Technological and AI Integration: Opportunities and Constraints; Theme 3: Navigating Learner Diversity and Fostering Critical Thinking; Theme 4: Ethical and Moral Dimensions of Grammar Teaching

Collectively, the themes indicate that culture, technology, learner diversity, and ethical considerations are not experienced by teachers as isolated aspects of grammar instruction. Rather, the participants described grammar instruction as a contextualized practice in which learners' linguistic and cultural resources, technological conditions, classroom strategies, and teacher mediation interact.

(1) Integrating Culture and Grammar Instruction in Multilingual English Classrooms

This section addressed research question one (1), primarily through theme one (1), Culturally Responsive Grammar Instruction in Multilingual Contexts, and theme three (3), Navigating Learner Diversity and Fostering Critical Thinking. The participants described grammar instruction as closely connected to learners' cultural experiences, linguistic backgrounds, prior exposure to English, and ways of using language across different contexts.

Theme 1: Culturally Responsive Grammar Instruction in Multilingual Contexts

The participants consistently described local culture and learners' existing linguistic experiences as important entry points for grammar instruction. Participant one (P1) emphasized beginning with learners' local context:

“In practice, when you teach a foreign language, an international language as uh, that, you always begin with the local context so that it becomes culturally responsive, culturally responsive, and that learners would. Feel that learning a new language does not make them alien.” [***In practice, when you teach a foreign language, an international language as uh, that, you always begin with the local context so that it becomes culturally responsive, culturally responsive, and that learners would. Feel that learning a new language does not make them alien.***] (P1). This response positions local context as a means of making English instruction culturally responsive rather than detached from learners' existing experiences. The participants' description suggests that grammar instruction is not understood solely as a transmission of linguistic rules, but as an instructional practice that can be situated within learners' familiar cultural environment.

Participants further connected learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds with their exposure to English:

Participant one (P1) also noticed that, “Be exposed to it. You know, now, as early as two three-year-old. Three-year olds, children are exposed to English when they watch cartoons, you know, and all uh...other shows that can be accessed through mobile mobile devices. So that's how, you know, I think uh their cultural and linguistic backgrounds uh affect their understanding of English grammar, although it depends again, on the developmental phase, because I have seen young children who are good. You know, they practice what they...they learn or what they hear from the shows that, you know, they view and. This is a personal experience.” [***Be exposed to it. You know, actually now, as early as two three-year-old. Three-year olds, children are exposed to English when they watch cartoons, you know, and all uh...other shows that can be accessed through mobile mobile devices. So that's how, you know, I think uh their cultural and linguistic backgrounds uh affect their understanding of English grammar, although it depends again, on the developmental phase, because I have seen young children who are good. You know, they practice what they...they learn or what they hear from the shows that, you know, they view and. This is a personal experience.***] (P1)

The response highlights that learners encounter English through various cultural and technological environments before or alongside formal classroom instruction. Consequently, participants' responses indicate that learners' prior exposure forms part of the context features considered when approaching English grammar.

Participant two (P2) similarly described grammar instruction through a specific Filipino cultural orientation:

“Uhm, if you talk about cultural, cultural background no, as a Filipino teacher, teaching English, basically, uh, my culture will always come from the culture of a Filipino. Na that, that we're really particular when it-...when it comes to grammar, to pronunciation, to diction, how we deliver, how, how we deliver our speech. And that's what we intend noh, that what's we intend, for our students to-to, to also have that kind of skills.” [*“Uhm, if you talk about cultural, cultural background no, as a Filipino teacher, teaching English, basically, uh, my culture will always come from the culture of a Filipino. Na that, that we're really particular when it-...when it comes to grammar, to pronunciation, to diction, how we deliver, how, how we deliver our speech. And that's what we intend noh, that what's we intend, for our students to-to, to also have that kind of skills.”*] (P2)

This response shows how the participants' own cultural and linguistic positioning informs expectations regarding grammar, pronunciation, diction, and speech delivery. Culture therefore appears not only as material incorporated into lessons, but also as part of teachers' understandings of appropriate language use.

Participant two (P2) also described storytelling, code switching, and bilingual explanation as part of culturally situated instruction:

“In culture, it is very easy because I love to tell stories and I think uh, uh, they remember the story, not the grammar anymore. However, they're still learning when it comes to culture. However, when it comes to technology and you're going to speak in straight English, more or less, the students could not follow. There is a need to code switch or you have to use the bilingual from English and then wha-what you call that? Taglish.” [*“In culture, it is very easy because I love to tell stories and I think uh, uh, they remember the story, not the grammar anymore. However, they're still learning when it comes to culture. However, when it comes to technology and you're going to speak in straight English, more or less, the students could not follow. There is a need to code switch or you have to use the bilingual from English and then wha-what you call that? Taglish.”*] (P2)

The response demonstrates that teachers respond to comprehension difficulties by drawing on bilingual resources. The use of storytelling and Taglish also illustrates how cultural and linguistic resources can operate alongside explicit attention to grammar.

Participant four (P4) described grammar as dependent on the communicative setting:

“I'm very meticulous when it comes to, uh, the structure of the language. So, I'm very strict and straightforward when it comes to the usage of language, whether it's written or spoken. I listen carefully to the structure and how the language is used, even in the choices of words. Uh, I usually teach grammar in the different settings, uh, because the English language can be used in a different manner, or the way you talk or speak with a friend. It's different when you use the language, professionally speaking, or in a more formal setting. So, uh, being a Filipino is very meticulous with the choices of words and the grammar itself. Uh, my students become more aware of, uh, the grammar or the structure that they use.” [*“I'm very meticulous when it comes to, uh, the structure of the language. So, I'm very strict and straightforward when it comes to the usage of language, whether it's written or spoken. I listen carefully to the structure and how the language is used, even in the choices of words. Uh, I usually teach grammar in the different settings, uh, because the English language can be used in a different manner, or the way you talk or speak with a friend. It's different*”]

when you use the language, professionally speaking, or in a more formal setting. So, uh, being a Filipino is very meticulous with the choices of words and the grammar itself. Uh, my students become more aware of, uh, the grammar or the structure that they use.”] (P4)

Rather than presenting grammatical correctness as completely detached from context, the participant distinguishes informal interpersonal language from professional and formal language. This suggests that teachers attend to the relationship between grammatical structures and the communicative circumstances in which those structures are used.

Participant five (P5) similarly associated Filipino cultural expectations with grammatical accuracy:

“...while, on the other hand, it is an advantage because, culturally speaking, Filipinos are very meticulous when it comes to grammar. Okay, a simple error in grammar or even in pronunciation. It's a big deal for us Filipinos. Uh, we are very particular, uh, to it. So, uh, with regards to that, uh, integrating it into, uh, teaching, uh, we are focused more on the structures of the, uh, language itself. [...] while, on the other hand, it is an advantage because, culturally speaking, Filipinos are very meticulous when it comes to grammar. Okay, a simple error in grammar or even in pronunciation. It's a big deal for us Filipinos. Uh, we are very particular, uh, to it. So, uh, with regards to that, uh, integrating it into, uh, teaching, uh, we are focused more on the structures of the, uh, language itself.”] (P5).

Participant six (P6) situated grammar instruction within a Filipino and multilingual setting.

“As a uh, Filipino teacher handling uh, English grammar because we also have grammar in Filipino...” [“As a uh, Filipino teacher handling uh, English grammar because we also have grammar in Filipino...”] (P6).

The multilingual dimension became more explicit when Participant six (P6) explained:

“So, students bring different mother tongues and linguistic habits. So, these echoes, again, Chomsky's ideas about uh, universal grammar where learners try to make sense of English using any structures influenced by their uh, first language or mother tongue (Slabakova, 2021; Kim & Joo, 2021). So, I also consider Freud's insight that early language experiences and emotional associations shape confidence (Lee & Jang, 2023; Driver, 2024). So cultural identity becomes part of their linguistic schema. And I use these as entry points for deeper understanding, uh. The same uh, with Bronfenbrenner's uh, concept of ecosystems (Grolig, 2020). Like the micro-systems we're in is the uh, ground of each learners or students or human to develop their first language. So, the family, friends, teachers, churchmates. Those are the uh, first environment that shapes their mother tongue or first language.” [“So, students bring different mother tongues and linguistic habits. So, these echoes, again, Chomsky's ideas about uh, universal grammar where learners try to make sense of English using any structures influenced by their uh, first language or mother tongue (Slabakova, 2021; Kim & Joo, 2021) associations shape confidence (Lee & Jang, 2023; Driver, 2024). So cultural identity becomes part of their linguistic schema. And I use these as entry points for deeper understanding, uh. The same uh, with Bronfenbrenner's uh, concept of ecosystems (Grolig, 2020). Like the micro-systems we're in is the uh, ground of each learners or students or human to develop their first language. So, the family, friends, teachers, churchmates. Those are the uh, first environment that shapes their mother tongue or first language.”] (P6).

This response provides particularly explicit evidence that teachers understand learners' mother tongues, linguistic habits, cultural identities, and social environments as relevant to English grammar learning.

Participant seven (P7) likewise connected grammar, formality, and code switching.

“Uh, you really have to observe, you know, the proper... the proper delivery, the proper grammar, the proper intonation and you have to really... you really need to speak fluently and, uh, uh, effectively, you know, if we really are talking about a formality. And, uh, when you speak of, uh... when we teach informi- informal, uh, you can also... uh, sometimes we could, uh... students are using code switching-... wherein, uh, they speak English but they use the... their- their mother tongue or their first language.” *[Uh, you really have to observe, you know, the proper... the proper delivery, the proper grammar, the proper intonation and you have to really... you really need to speak fluently and, uh, uh, effectively, you know, if we really are talking about a formality. And, uh, when you speak of, uh... when we teach informi-informal, uh, you can also... uh, sometimes we could, uh... students are using code switching-... wherein, uh, they speak English but they use the... their- their mother tongue or their first language.] (P7).*

Taken together, these responses answer research question one (1) by showing that teachers describe culture and grammar as interconnected through local context, Filipino cultural expectations, learners' mother tongues, code-switching, prior exposure, and the distinction between formal and informal language use. The findings are consistent with recent research on culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy, which emphasizes culturally relevant curricula and the use of learners' full communicative repertoires in multilingual classrooms (Wesley-Nero & Donley, 2024).

The findings also correspond with Liao and Li's (2023) finding that culturally responsive teaching can support learners' engagement with multiple cultural perspectives and critical meaning-making in English as a Foreign Language contexts. In the present findings, however, culturally responsive instruction is described specifically through grammar-related practices such as contextualized language use, code-switching, storytelling, and attention to learners' linguistic backgrounds.

Theme 3: Navigating Learner Diversity and Fostering Critical Thinking

The second theme addressing research question one (1) is Navigating Learner Diversity and Fostering Critical Thinking. Participants described adapting grammar instruction according to learners' prior exposure, cultural backgrounds, interests, difficulties, and communicative needs.

Participant three (P3) explained:

” I'm not a traditional, I'm not a traditional teacher, that's asking them to do the spelling, to do-do the memorizing, whatever that they need to memorize. But I'm the kind of, of, of teacher that I am more on with, I am more on with, how they think uhm, how they think critically noh. *[I'm not a traditional, I'm not a traditional teacher, that's asking them to do the spelling, to do-do the memorizing, whatever that they need to memorize. But I'm the kind of, of, of teacher that I am more on with, I am more on with, how they think uhm, how they think critically noh.] (P3).*

The response indicates a movement away from an exclusive memorization-centered orientation toward attention to learners' critical thinking.

Participant one (P1) emphasized determining learners' existing exposure to English:

As a...as a Filipino, I have learned the challenges of learning English. So when I teach English, I see to it that, you know, I know the level of exposure of my learners to the language so that I can tailor with my instruction to their experience as well as to their expectations, because times are changing, so..."[*As a...as a Filipino, I have learned the challenges of learning English. So when I teach English, I see to it that, you know, I know the level of exposure of my learners to the language so that I can tailor with my instruction to their experience as well as to their expectations, because times are changing, so...*"] (P1).

Participant seven (P7) described the challenge of teaching grammar to culturally diverse learners:

"Uh, for me as a language teacher, it is really challenging to, uh, teach grammar, uh, considering, uh, technology and culturally diverse, uh, uh, with, with, uh, culturally diverse students, because, uh, you know, our students now, uh, when we speak of different, uh, diverse background, uh, you really need to use or employ different strategies suited for, uh, that kind of learner or group of learners. [*Uh, for me as a language teacher, it is really challenging to, uh, teach grammar, uh, considering, uh, technology and culturally diverse, uh, uh, with, with, uh, culturally diverse students, because, uh, you know, our students now, uh, when we speak of different, uh, diverse background, uh, you really need to use or employ different strategies suited for, uh, that kind of learner or group of learners.]* (P7).

Participant five (P5) similarly described a change in instructional perspective:

"Uh, I became more open minded. Uh. Because exposure, exposure to these different types of learners with different, uh, uh, cultural background. It gives me this new perspective that learning a certain language is not particular with a single strategy. And since language is dynamic..." [*"Uh, I became more open minded. Uh. Because exposure, exposure to these different types of learners with different, uh, uh, cultural background. It gives me this new perspective that learning a certain language is not particular with a single strategy. And since language is dynamic..."*] (P5).

Participant two (P2) described prioritizing students' expression before grammatical correction:

"I think I'm going to introduce that to my students that when we talk of ESL, English as a Second Language, uh, one question, uhm, one word is not enough. They have to talk and talk, not minding the grammar uh, first, but their ability to say their ideas and then later on, uh, you have to check the grammar." [*"I think I'm going to introduce that to my students that when we talk of ESL, English as a Second Language, uh, one question, uhm, one word is not enough. They have to talk and talk, not minding the grammar uh, first, but their ability to say their ideas and then later on, uh, you have to check the grammar."*] (P2)

Participant four (P4) emphasized the teacher qualities required when working with diverse learners:

“So, for me, uh, teaching grammar goes beyond fluency. At the same time, it requires, you know, patience, empathy, creativity, adaptability, and especially when dealing with culturally diverse and varied or different types of learners.” [*“So, for me, uh, teaching grammar goes beyond fluency. At the same time, it requires, you know, patience, empathy, creativity, adaptability, and especially when dealing with culturally diverse and varied or different types of learners.”*] (P4).

Participant two (P2) further described step-by-step instruction and multilingual support:

“Now, (pause) although they have difficulty, I think uh, it is not a hindrance. We need to use the technology often for the mastery and then I also introduce another if they have mastered already that, the, kind of technology or application. Say, for example, I'm using Canva. Canva is very useful in the reporting, not so much in the grammar. However, when you give instructions, you really have to do it step by step. As I said, (pwedeng) three, you have to use two languages plus the vernacular.” [*Now, (pause) although they have difficulty, I think uh, it is not a hindrance. We need to use the technology often for the mastery and then I also introduce another if they have mastered already that, the, kind of technology or application. Say, for example, I'm using Canva. Canva is very useful in the reporting, not so much in the grammar. However, when you give instructions, you really have to do it step by step. As I said, (pwedeng) three, you have to use two languages plus the vernacular.”*] (P2).

Participant three (P3) described adjusting instruction according to learners' interests:

“Uhm...ang ganda lang nga ng set-up ngayon, ng generation ngayon, kase tinatanggap na natin yung inclusivity. Hindi kagaya ng dati ...When it comes to, when it comes to, teaching na kinakailangan ganoon lang talaga. Oo naranasan ko parin during my time, ganoon lang talaga. ...Uhm, just for example, ako na klaseng teacher ito ang ito ang interest mo, ito yung expertise mo, tapos yung students mo are more on arts, artistic. Hindi na magiging interesado saakin, kae ang ang, ang expertise ko is ano eh, technical writing eh...So you, m-mo i-adjust para magmeet kayo halfway.” [*Um, the setup now, the generation now is actually good because we already accept inclusivity. Not like before when it comes to, when it comes to teaching it used to be that it had to be done exactly that way. Yes, I still experienced that during my time. It was really just like that. Um, just for example, I'm kind of a teacher whose interest is this. This is my expertise. And then your students are more into arts, artistic, they won't be interested in me anymore because my, my, my expertise is, um, technical writing. So, you need to adjust in order to meet them halfway. [smiled]*] (P3).

These responses answer research question one (1) by showing that teachers describe multilingual grammar instruction as adaptive. Learner diversity is addressed through assessment of prior exposure, differentiated strategies, multilingual explanation, attention to learners' interests, and opportunities for learners to express ideas before grammatical correction. This orientation is compatible with recent work describing culturally and linguistically responsive teaching as a practice that recognizes learners' communicative repertoires and seeks to move beyond deficit-oriented views of multilingual learners (Wesley-Nero & Donley, 2024).

(2) Opportunities and Challenges in Digital Technology Integration

This section addressed research question two (2) through theme two (2), Technological and AI Integration: Opportunities and Constraints, with theme four (4), Ethical and Moral

Dimensions of Grammar Teaching, extending the discussion to the ethical challenges associated with digital language production and AI-supported work.

Theme 2: Technological and AI Integration: Opportunities and Constraints

The participants described technologies as providing opportunities for grammar practice, feedback, learner productivity, and access to instructional resources, while simultaneously identifying constraints related to access, facilities, teacher preparedness, and appropriate use of artificial intelligence (AI).

Participant four (P4) described instructional opportunities provided by technology:

“So, technology has a significant influence on students' grammatical competence, and you know, communication based on their habits. On the other hand, uh, what I'm seeing is that it provides instant access to the resources such as grammar checking tools, uh, online exercises and interactive platform that will help them practice their grammar, also their uh, accent or even their speaking so they can receive immediate feedback about what they have written or how to improve their speech. and also internalize you know, grammar rules more effectively. So yeah, uh, I'm offering those to the students in order for them to improve themselves even without a teacher.” [***“So, technology has a significant influence on students' grammatical competence, and you know, communication based on their habits. On the other hand, uh, what I'm seeing is that it provides instant access to the resources such as grammar checking tools, uh, online exercises and interactive platform that will help them practice their grammar, also their uh, accent or even their speaking so they can receive immediate feedback about what they have written or how to improve their speech. and internalize you know, grammar rules more effectively. So yeah, uh, I'm offering those to the students for them to improve themselves even without a teacher.”***] (P4)

This response directly associates technology with grammar competence, access to resources, and immediate feedback.

Participant three (P3) addressed the growing presence of artificial intelligence (AI) in learners' outputs:

“With, with, with the, with the advancement of technology right now, especially with AI, diba? Uhm, most likely, most of their output talaga...is coming, is coming from AI - generated uh, output. So, I think uhm, one of the adjustments, one of the adjustments that, that I do usually is, that uhm, I accept it already, I accept it already the, the, the realization that most students rely on AI. But then, but then, with, with, with that acceptance, you know, with that acceptance, they have also to make sure to assess them if the things that they ask for the AI to do it for them, alam nila kung ano, at alam nila ang pinapagawa nila, alam nila kung ano ang sinasubmit nila, so yun.” [***“With the advancement of technology right now, especially with AI, most of their outputs are most likely AI-generated. So, I think one of the adjustments that I usually make is that I already accept the reality that most students rely on AI. But with that acceptance, they also have to make sure to assess whether they know the things they ask AI to do for them, whether they know what they are doing, and whether they know what they are submitting. That's it.”***] (P3).

The participant accepts the presence of artificial intelligence (AI) while emphasizing that students should understand what AI produces for them. Thus, AI is positioned as a tool whose use requires learner accountability.

Participant four (P4) similarly established a boundary around artificial intelligence (AI) use:

“You can integrate AI on your strategies, but do not rely on AI. Okay? Especially for your students. Yes, nowadays AI is very popular, and it is somewhat, uh, the top notch or the top goal in technology, uh, innovation. But still, uh, you go back to the roots of, uh, being a person or being a human being...” *[You can integrate AI on your strategies, but do not rely on AI. Okay? Especially for your students. Yes, nowadays AI is very popular, and it is somewhat, uh, the top notch or the top goal in technology, uh, innovation. But still, uh, you go back to the roots of, uh, being a person or being a human being...] (P4).*

The response emphasizes that AI should function as a supporting tool rather than a substitute for teacher guidance and human judgement in technology-supported instruction. However, technology integration was also associated with structural constraints.

Participant four (P4) stated:

“The issue there is what we call the digital divide. So, the uh, digital divide, which means that not everyone has equal access to internet connection. So, while many learners are comfortable with online tools like their cellphones, or multimedia resources, which is available in their areas. Of course, we cannot limit it to the places where students don’t have internet connection. So, you know, we need to make them participate in our classroom.” *[“The issue there is what we call the digital divide. So, the uh, digital divide, which means that not everyone has equal access to internet connection. So, while many learners are comfortable with online tools like their cellphones, or multimedia resources, which is available in their areas. Of course, we cannot limit it to the places where students don’t have internet connection. So, you know, we need to make them participate in our classroom.”] (P4).*

This identifies unequal internet access as a barrier to technology-supported participation.

Participant five (P5) described a teacher-level challenge:

“And, uh, technology wise. If you, if, uh, a teacher is like me, for example, who came from and was trained without using these technologies to teach, it is quite difficult if you are not the kind of a person who is willing to put an extra effort and time to learn.” *[“And, uh, technology wise. If you, if, uh, a teacher is like me, for example, who came from and was trained without using these technologies to teach, it is quite difficult if you are not the kind of a person who is willing to put an extra effort and time to learn.”] (P5).*

Participant two (P2) described a related challenge involving learners’ technological exposure and grammatical knowledge:

“As a Filipino teacher of English grammar, it is expected that now that we are in the 20th, 21st century, students are expected to be well-versed or are techie. Unfortunately, maybe because when they were in the DepEd, they were not allowed or exposed to using their cellphone(s). That is why it is very hard for me as an English teacher to correct their grammar, simple grammar such as subject-verb agreement, as well uh, uh, especially in the pronouns. It is very hard for them. If I’m going to analyze, they have not mastered the part of speech.” *[“As a Filipino teacher of English grammar, it is expected that now that we are in the 20th, 21st century, students are expected to be well-versed or are techie. Unfortunately, maybe*

because when they were in the DepEd, they were not allowed or exposed to using their cellphone(s). That is why it is very hard for me as an English teacher to correct their grammar, simple grammar such as subject-verb agreement, as well uh, uh, especially in the pronouns. It is very hard for them. If I'm going to analyze, they have not mastered the part of speech.”] (P2).

Participant seven (P7) emphasized the need for teacher judgment in technology selection:

“...you really still need to be creative. Not even with the, uh, advanced technologies, uh, advanced technological breakthroughs. Still a teacher should still be creative and judicious enough in selecting the best technological, uh, tool or equipment that are, uh, suited for the learners. Uh, another is still, uh, passion must be there for a teacher.” [“... you really still need to be creative. Not even with the, uh, advanced technologies, uh, advanced technological breakthroughs. Still a teacher should still be creative and judicious enough in selecting the best technological, uh, tool or equipment that are, uh, suited for the learners. Uh, another is still, uh, passion must be there for a teacher.”] (P7).

Participant seven (P7) also described institutional limitations:

“...we have, uh, very limited, uh, technological facilities. Uh, although there are a lot that we could implement, or could we use. However, with, uh, limited resources of the university or of the school. So, it's really challenging for you as a teacher that, uh, you wish to implement that kind of, uh, tool or that, uh, facility. However, uh, there is no facility. That's why it's really challenging.” [“...we have, uh, very limited, uh, technological facilities. Uh, although there are a lot that we could implement, or could we use. However, with, uh, limited resources of the university or of the school. So, it's really challenging for you as a teacher that, uh, you wish to implement that kind of, uh, tool or that, uh, facility. However, uh, there is no facility. That's why it's really challenging.”] (P7).

The participant distinguishes institutional resource limitations from the broader issue of learners' internet access.

Participant one (P1) described the perceived benefits of technology and gamification:

“Uh, communication courses, we now have integrated technology because it's always a trend, you know, especially the announcements that we would shift to asynchronous learning. So, you have to use technology. And I find that when you integrate technology into your lessons, learn has become more receptive and, uh, more productive as uh, as compared to when you do the instruction in the classroom, tell them to accomplish an assignment or accomplish an activity. And when you integrate, you know, interactive games activity. I think that's, uh, that's one, noh...you know, when you somehow gamify the. Implementation of your lessons, that helps a lot. And it gives them grammar practice.” [“Uh, communication courses, we now have integrated technology because it's always a trend, you know, especially the announcements that we would shift to asynchronous learning. So you have to use technology. And I find that when you integrate technology into your lessons, learn has become more receptive and, uh, more productive as uh, as compared to when you do the instruction in the classroom, tell them to accomplish an assignment or accomplish an activity. And when you integrate, you know, interactive games activity. I think that's, uh, that's one, noh...you know, when you somehow gamify the. Implementation of your lessons, that helps a lot. And it gives them grammar practice.”] (P1).

These responses addressed research question two (2) by showing that teachers perceived digital technologies as providing immediate feedback, grammar practice, learning resources,

gamification, and opportunities for learner productivity. However, teachers also mentioned unequal levels of access to the internet, the lack of institutional technological resources, the lack of technological knowledge, and the need for careful choice of technology as obstacles to effective use of digital technology in the classroom.

These findings are consistent with Tseng et al. (2022), who stated that to integrate technology effectively, it is necessary to have technological knowledge and understand the technology and its relation to language and pedagogy. The research of Liu et al. (2023) is also linked to our data, as the authors focused on the importance of teachers' understanding, the role of TPACK in teaching and learning, and pedagogical design.

The recent study of Generative AI also proved the findings of the study conducted, as demonstrated by Kohnke (2024), who admitted that learners defined GenAI and grammar-checking technologies as supporting them in language learning but also highlighted the risks of using them.

Theme 4: Ethical and Moral Dimensions of Grammar Teaching

Theme four (4) extended research question two (2) by showing that digital technology introduces ethical considerations that cannot be separated from language and grammar instruction. Participant six (P6) stated:

“So, I guide students to use language responsibly and effectively because that is being uh, guided supposedly by teachers from uh, moral reasoning stages, how they are responsible in using language as the stages goes up.” [*“So, I guide students to use language responsibly and effectively because that is being uh, guided supposedly by teachers from uh, moral reasoning stages, how they are responsible in using language as the stages goes up.”*] (P6).

The participant explicitly connects language instruction with responsible language use and moral reasoning.

Participant six (P6) further explained:

“So, I make grammar as a bridge between uh, students' uh, live experiences and academic expectations. So, this practice reflects again uh, to Vygotsky, who emphasized contextual learning and Goldberg who is uh, highlighting moral reasoning. So, I incorporate topics like respect, empathy, and responsible online behavior. So, grammar becomes a tool for ethical communications, not just for correctness.” [*“So, I make grammar as a bridge between uh, students' uh, live experiences and academic expectations. So, this practice reflects again uh, to Vygotsky, who emphasized contextual learning and Goldberg who is uh, highlighting moral reasoning. So, I incorporate topics like respect, empathy, and responsible online behavior. So, grammar becomes a tool for ethical communications, not just for correctness.”*] (P6).

The response broadens the purpose of grammar beyond correctness by positioning grammatical instruction as connected to ethical communication, respect, empathy, and responsible online behavior.

Participant six (P6) also described ethical concerns associated with technology:

“Technology, sentence, like Chomsky's theory that exposure to rich input supports language development, students interact with diverse sentence structures daily (Slabakova, 2021). However, it also exposes them to moral dilemmas like uh, plagiarism or misinformation which uhm, ties into Goldberg's moral reasoning. So, my role is to help them navigate this responsibly while reinforcing proper grammar (Tirri, 2023).” [***“Technology, sentence, like Chomsky's theory that exposure to rich input supports language development, students interact with diverse sentence structures daily (Slabakova, 2021). However, it also exposes them to moral dilemmas like uh, plagiarism or misinformation which uhm, ties into Kohlberg's moral reasoning. So, my role is to help them navigate this responsibly while reinforcing proper grammar (Tirri, 2023).”***] (P6).

Participant six (P6) identified another challenge:

“Usually a major challenge is uh, students' reliance on informal digital language with conflicts with formal grammar. This tension uh, reflects Kohlberg's level of moral development (Tirri, 2023). So, students often stay in conventional stage, so, imitating peer norms online. So, I must uh, guide them toward higher responsibility in language use. Another challenge is uh, emotional resistance. Something like Freud recognized when students fear correction or feel overwhelmed by technology. [***Usually a major challenge is uh, students' reliance on informal digital language with conflicts with formal grammar. This tension uh, reflects Kohlberg's level of moral development. So, students often stay in conventional stage, so, imitating peer norms online (Tirri, 2023). So, I must uh, guide them toward higher responsibility in language use. Another challenge is uh, emotional resistance. Something like Freud recognized when students fear correction or feel overwhelmed by technology.”***] (P6).

Participant one (P1) focused specifically on AI-generated work and authorship:

“Ah, that's one that's one tricky question. You know, with the introduction of AI tools, it is now difficult to uh, pinpoint actually whether what they are submitting to you is their own work or an AI generated work. So. That's one. And so my, my way of doing it is I verify, you know, so I try to verify by way of asking them, making them explain the work, to see whether there is consistency between their thoughts and the thoughts expressed in their work. That's one of the, you know, challenges and how I.” [***Ah, that's one that's one tricky question. You know, with the introduction of AI tools, it is now difficult to uh, pinpoint actually whether what they are submitting to you is their own work or an AI generated work. So. That's one. And so my, my way of doing it is I verify, you know, so I try to verify by way of asking them, making them explain the work, to see whether there is consistency between their thoughts and the thoughts expressed in their work. That's one of the, you know, challenges and how I.”***] (P1).

Participant three (P3) similarly described the problem of learners' dependence on artificial intelligence (AI):

Unfortunately, for example, you ask them to submit an essay about this, and then your assessment would be like, uhm. Hey, uhm, ano yung, ano yung nilagay mo dito sa introduction mo? Wala silang masagot. Because basically, uh, yung, yung entire output is talagang denepende nalang talaga nila doon sa, sa AI. Ayun, I don't know if you have experienced that, na ni hindi nga nila alam, kung anong ni-nilagay nila doon sa mga conclusion nila.” [***Unfortunately, for example, you ask them to submit an essay about this, and then your assessment would be like, uhm. hey um what is um what did you put here in your introduction what are your thoughts no what are your ideas that you placed here in***]

the introduction they can't answer anything because basically all the the entire output really depended on the AI there I don't know if you have experienced that that they don't even know what they put in their conclusions.”] (P3).

These findings answer the challenge dimension of research question two (2) by showing that technology integration is not only a matter of access and technical competence. Teachers also encounter questions concerning authorship, learner responsibility, plagiarism, misinformation, informal digital language, and learners' ability to explain AI-supported outputs (Javier & Moorhouse, 2024; Cong-Lem et al., 2024). Recent research similarly identifies academic integrity, originality, overreliance, and equitable access as important considerations in AI-supported language education (Kohnke, 2024; Crompton & Burke, 2024).

(3) Digital Technology, Learner Backgrounds, Engagement, and Learning

This section addressed research question three (3), collectively through four themes. Theme (1) establishes the cultural and linguistic conditions that teachers consider; theme two (2) describes the technological opportunities and constraints; theme three (3) explains how teachers adapt digital and grammatical instruction to learner diversity; and theme four (4) identifies the ethical conditions surrounding technology-mediated language learning.

The findings suggest that technology is not described as a standalone intervention. Instead, its perceived value depends on whether teachers can select and adapt technological resources according to learners' backgrounds, abilities, interests, and access conditions.

Participant six (P6) described the growing integration of technology and AI in educational practices:

“Of course, teachers must be updated, must be aware of the trend. Like nowadays, we are using AIs in most of ways, most of the actions and decisions are using AI. It's just our task to be uh, aware enough if they are fairly using uh, such things, trending tools. Culturally, in Philippines, maybe not all, not really all students are relying too much on AI, or uhm, responsible use of AI. So, the teacher will be the one who will guide them how to manage the balance in use of AI. Because sometimes, relying too much on AI could lead to a negative effect to those students. only grammar, but the rest of courses we have.” [“Of course, teachers must be updated, must be aware of the trend. Like nowadays, we are using AIs in most of ways, most of the actions and decisions are using AI. It's just our task to be uh, aware enough if they are fairly using uh, such things, trending tools. Culturally, in Philippines, maybe not all, not really all students are relying too much on AI, or uhm, responsible use of AI. So, the teacher will be the one who will guide them how to manage the balance in use of AI. Because sometimes, relying too much on AI could lead to a negative effect to those students. only grammar, but the rest of courses we have.”] (P6)

Participant three (P3) emphasized that technology can increase learners' interest in writing by providing support for their learning:

“If students learn to be wise about the benefits of technology, it is going to improve their communication ... not all students become better writers straight away, but some students become more interested in writing because they know there's something that can help them.” [“If students learn to be wise about the benefits of technology, it is going to improve their communication ... not all students become better writers straightaway, but some students

become more interested in writing because they know there's something that can help them.”] (P3).

Participant five (P5) highlighted how educational background and access to technological resources can shape learners' familiarity with technology:

“...lack of, uh, technological equipment for instructions during my college days while learning how to become a, uh, language teacher since I came from a public school. Okay. Uh, a product of a public school. So, uh, the school is not well funded by the government, so I have the disadvantage when it comes to, uh, usage of technology and integrating it into, uh, teaching practices, while, on the other hand, it is an advantage because, culturally speaking, Filipinos are very meticulous when it comes to grammar.” [“... lack of, uh, technological equipment for instructions during my college days while learning how to become a, uh, language teacher since I came from a public school. Okay. Uh, a product of a public school. So, uh, the school is not well funded by the government, so I have the disadvantage when it comes to, uh, usage of technology and integrating it into, uh, teaching practices, while, on the other hand, it is an advantage because, culturally speaking, Filipinos are very meticulous when it comes to grammar.”] (P5).

The participants therefore perceive engagement and learning as connected to the appropriateness of the instructional approach rather than to the presence of technology alone. This interpretation is consistent with research emphasizing pedagogical design in technology-enhanced language education rather than technology adoption in isolation (Liu et al., 2023).

The findings further indicate that cultural and linguistic responsiveness can operate together with technology. Learners may require bilingual or multilingual explanation, step-by-step guidance, and culturally familiar contexts while using digital tools. In this sense, technology does not eliminate the need for culturally responsive instruction. Instead, it adds another layer to teachers' decisions concerning how grammar should be presented and practiced.

Recent work on culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy similarly emphasizes the importance of learners' full communicative repertoires and culturally relevant curricula when teaching multilingual learners (Wesley-Nero & Donley, 2024).

Participant seven (P7) stressed the need to adapt instructional strategies to learners from diverse backgrounds:

“Uh, considering, uh, technology and culturally diverse, uh, uh, with, with, uh, culturally diverse students, because, uh, you know, our students now, uh, when we speak of different, uh, diverse background, uh, you really need to use or employ different strategies suited for, uh, that kind of learner or group of learners.” [“uh, considering, uh, technology and culturally diverse, uh, uh, with, with, uh, culturally diverse students, because, uh, you know, our students now, uh, when we speak of different, uh, diverse background, uh, you really need to use or employ different strategies suited for, uh, that kind of learner or group of learners.”] (P7).

This suggests that technology is perceived as complementary to, rather than a replacement for, teacher involvement. This position is also compatible with recent evidence that AI can support language learning while requiring teacher mediation and attention to ethical and pedagogical conditions (Kohnke, 2024; Ekizer, 2025).

Lastly, research question three (3) is answered by the convergence of the four (4) themes: teachers describe technology integration as most meaningful when it is connected to learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, adapted to learner diversity, used to support engagement and practice, and accompanied by human guidance and ethical attention.

Theoretical Interpretation of the Findings

The findings become more analytically meaningful when interpreted through the three theoretical frameworks underpinning the study: Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP), and Sociocultural Theory (SCT). Rather than treating these frameworks as separate explanatory categories, the findings indicate that the three intersect in teachers' actual descriptions of grammar instruction.

(1) Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Technology Integration as Contextual Pedagogical Decision-Making

The findings supported TPACK by demonstrating that teachers do not describe technology as effective merely because a digital tool is available. Participant four (P4) identified grammar-checking tools, online exercises, interactive platforms, and immediate feedback as opportunities, while Participant seven (P7) emphasized that teachers must be "creative and judicious" in selecting technological tools suited to learners. Participant five (P5), meanwhile, identified teacher preparedness as a challenge, and Participant seven (P7) described limited institutional facilities.

These perspectives are consistent with Tseng et al. (2022), who found that language-teaching TPACK research emphasizes the relationship between technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge and that technology integration cannot be reduced to technological competence alone. The participants' responses extend TPACK by illustrating that, in multilingual grammar classrooms, technology selection is also closely connected with linguistic and cultural responsiveness.

The participants did not discuss technology simply in terms of whether it was available or easy to use. They described selecting tools according to learner needs, using multiple languages, providing step-by-step instructions, considering learner interests, and maintaining teacher involvement. Thus, the findings suggest that technology integration in grammar instruction is simultaneously a technological, pedagogical, content, and contextual decision.

The application of TPACK is refined by highlighting structural conditions. Participant four's (P4) response to the digital divide and participant seven's (P7) description of limited institutional facilities demonstrate that teachers' technological knowledge cannot by itself overcome unequal access to technological resources. TPACK, as reflected in these responses, operates within material and institutional conditions that shape what teachers can implement.

This pedagogical decision-making is also reflected in Liu et al. (2023), who identified pedagogical design as an important area requiring greater attention in technology-enhanced language education research. The participants' emphasis on selecting, adapting, and sequencing technological activities provides qualitative evidence of this teacher-as-designer role.

(2) Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: Grammar as a Culturally and Linguistically Situated Practice

The findings provided particularly strong support for CRP through the participants' emphasis on local context, Filipino cultural identity, mother tongues, code-switching, storytelling, learner experiences, and learner interests.

Participant one's (P1) response that teachers should "always begin with the local context" directly illustrates a culturally situated approach to language instruction. Participant two's (P2) discussion of Filipino expectations regarding grammar, pronunciation, and diction shows that teachers' cultural identities also shape how they conceptualize language instruction. Participant six's (P6) discussion of mother tongues, linguistic habits, cultural identity, family, friends, teachers, and churchmates further demonstrates that language learning is understood within a broader social and cultural environment. This aligns with Wesley-Nero and Donley (2024), who identified culturally relevant curricula and the use of learners' full communicative repertoires as important dimensions of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy.

Notably, CRP can be extended to grammar instruction. The participants did not describe culture only as supplementary content added to English lessons. Instead, culture was connected to grammatical choices, formal and informal language, code-switching, pronunciation, diction, storytelling, and learners' prior experiences. This suggests that grammar itself can become a site for culturally responsive teaching. Further support is provided by Liao and Li (2023), whose study of culturally responsive teaching in English as a Foreign Language instruction found that culturally responsive practices can create opportunities for learners to engage with multiple perspectives and critical meaning-making. In the present study, this orientation appears through teachers' attention to learners' backgrounds and their adjustment of grammar instruction to different groups of learners.

At the same time, the findings reveal a productive tension within culturally responsive grammar instruction. Participants simultaneously emphasized cultural responsiveness and grammatical meticulousness. Participant four (P4) and Participant five (P5) described strong attention to grammatical structure, while other participants emphasized code-switching, multilingual resources, learner expression, and contextual adaptation. Rather than treating these positions as contradictory, the findings indicate that teachers negotiate between grammatical form and contextual meaning according to learners and communicative situations.

(3) Sociocultural Theory: Learning Through Mediation, Interaction, and Cultural Resources

The findings also strongly corresponded with SCT because participants repeatedly described learning as mediated through language, culture, social relationships, technology, and teacher support.

Participant six (P6) explicitly described learners' first-language development through family, friends, teachers, and churchmates and connected cultural identity with linguistic development. Participant two (P2) described bilingual and multilingual support through English, Taglish, and the vernacular. Participant seven (P7) described code-switching between English and learners' mother tongues. These responses demonstrate that learners'

existing linguistic resources are not external to the learning process but form part of the social and cultural resources through which meaning is constructed.

Recent SCT literature in language education emphasizes mediation, interaction, cultural resources, and the role of pedagogical activity in second language development (Lantolf et al., 2020; Poehner & Lu, 2024). In particular, SCT views learning and development as mediated through social interaction and culturally available resources, including language.

Building on this perspective, digital technology can become another mediational resource within multilingual grammar instruction. Participant four (P4) described grammar-checking tools, online exercises, interactive platforms, and immediate feedback; participant one (P1) described gamification and grammar practice; and participant three (P3) and participant four (P4) discussed AI-supported work. However, the participants simultaneously emphasized that technology requires teacher mediation.

This distinction is important because the findings do not portray digital tools as independent agents of learning. Instead, teachers select, explain, monitor, evaluate, and contextualize their use. In this respect, the findings refine an SCT interpretation of technology-mediated learning by positioning digital tools within a broader network of teacher mediation, learner resources, language practices, and institutional conditions.

A related contextual constraint emerges in the use of technology as a mediational resource. When learners become overly dependent on AI and cannot explain their own outputs, the technology may no longer function as a scaffold for independent learning. Participant one (P1) and participant three (P3) described this concern directly. Kohnke (2024) similarly identified overreliance and academic integrity as important issues in the use of GenAI for language learning. Thus, from an SCT perspective, the central issue is not simply whether technology is present, but how technological resources are mediated through teacher guidance, learner participation, linguistic resources, and socially situated activity.

Conclusion

The study explored how Filipino English teachers are integrating grammar with culture and digital technology. The results suggest that grammar instruction is not seen as a mere focus on grammatical form. Instead, grammar instruction practices are contextualized according to learners' prior learning experiences in both language and culture. This includes taking into consideration the learners' prior exposure to English, multilingualism, and available technology. Based on four (4) coherent themes, the results show that culturally responsive grammar instruction involves the teaching of grammatical forms in connection with familiar contexts, learners' languages, cultural experiences, and communicative situations. Specifically, digital tools provide more opportunities for learning, feedback, and engagement, but the value of digital technology lies in the ability to select, adapt, and mediate digital tools according to learner needs and classroom conditions.

The results of the research indicate that there are challenges to be tackled apart from access and technological competence. The teachers mentioned unequal internet access, institutional facilities, various levels of teacher capacity, inappropriate technology selection, dependence on AI, the issue of authorship, plagiarism, misinformation, and the problems connected with the explanation of AI-generated outputs. The findings also highlight teacher verification of AI-generated outputs to ensure learner understanding, authorship, and responsible AI use. These results mean that technology needs to be integrated in a meaningful

way because the implementation of various digital tools is not enough for achieving success. It requires teacher mediation, adaptation of teaching methods, linguistic support, and responsible use of technology.

In addition, the three theoretical frameworks clarify this complex relationship. According to Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge, teachers must employ their knowledge of technology, pedagogy, and content to respond to contextual and institutional circumstances. Culturally Responsive Pedagogy describes how learners' languages, local culture, learner experiences, and identities become resources for grammar instruction. Sociocultural Theory conceptualizes learning as mediated by the teacher and through language, culture, interaction, and digital technology. Therefore, the findings reveal that the most plausible explanation of technology-mediated grammar instruction in multilingual English classrooms can be understood as an integrated process in which digital technology is mediated through pedagogical choices and shaped by learners' contextual needs.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings have several practical implications for English language education in the Philippine context. First, teacher professional development should move beyond general digital literacy and focus on the pedagogical use of technology for grammar instruction. Training should include evaluating digital and AI tools, designing technology-supported grammar activities, integrating multilingual scaffolding, assessing AI-assisted outputs, and developing culturally responsive digital materials based on learners' local languages, experiences, and communicative contexts.

Second, curriculum design should explicitly connect grammar, culture, multilingualism, and digital literacy. Grammar activities should incorporate local contexts, authentic communicative situations, bilingual or multilingual resources, and appropriately selected digital tools rather than treating technology as separate from language instruction.

At the institutional level, effective policy implementation should include institutional support. Schools and higher education institutions should translate technology-integration policies into actionable provisions for teacher training, digital infrastructure, equitable access, and responsible AI use. They should also establish clear guidelines for acceptable AI use in language-related academic work, including expectations concerning attribution, verification, and authorship. Since participants identified unequal access as a concern, technology policies should not assume uniform access to digital resources but should consider low-connectivity and alternative learning arrangements.

Future research should extend the findings of this study by examining evidence beyond teacher-reported experiences. Future studies may incorporate classroom observations, learner perspectives, analysis of digital instructional materials, and technology-mediated grammar activities. Cross-regional studies may also examine differences in language ecology, technological access, and institutional support.

Finally, the findings of the study should be examined in light of their limitations. The involvement of seven (7) Filipino English teachers from one Philippine higher education institution does not mean that the results of the study are applicable to all Filipino English teachers or multilingual English classrooms. The implementation of purposive sampling and semi-structured interviews implies that the findings do not relate to actual classroom and

learner outcomes but only to what research participants report. Moreover, the interviews were not long enough, limiting the degree of contextual richness of experience in some cases.

Additionally, the study concentrated on teachers' views but did not substantiate the evidence of digital technology use with field notes, students' achievement data, or instructional materials. The limitations mentioned above restrict the transferability of the study outcomes and suggest that further research should be performed with the use of different data sources and on a broader scale.

Taken together, the research shows that the three constructs under investigation, namely digital technology, culture, and grammar instruction, are intertwined in teachers' pedagogical decision-making regarding their pedagogical practices in multilingual English classrooms. Their successful use from a practical standpoint will hardly happen without teachers' ability to contextualize digital technology, awareness of learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and ability to maintain the balance between digital technology and human interaction.

References

- Agregado, C. J. O. (2023). Trends and challenges in teaching grammar in the 21st century learning perspective: Their influence on learner's performance. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 6(5), 151–190. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v6i5p111>
- Ahmad, M., & Wilkins, S. (2025). Purposive sampling in qualitative research: A framework for the entire journey. *Quality & Quantity*, 59(2), 1461–1479. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-02022-5>
- Al Hakim, V. G., Yang, S.-H., Liyanawatta, M., Wang, J.-H., & Chen, G.-D. (2022). Robots in situated learning classrooms with immediate feedback mechanisms to improve students' learning performance. *Computers & Education*, 182, 104483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104483>
- Alibrahim, A., & Alsadoon, E. (2022). Exploring intervention of e-textbook in schools: Teachers' perspectives. *South African Journal of Education*, 42(4), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v42n4a2167>
- Alqahtani, A. (2022). Review and analysis of theories underlying grammar teaching methodologies. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(4), 80–91. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no4.6>
- Amalia, N., Nugraha, R. F., Fikri, M. S., & Farid, R. N. (2025). Integrating local culture in English learning: Developing ESP materials for arts education students. *Journal of English Educational Study*, 8(1), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v8i1.4375>
- Ammade, S., Mahmud, M., Jabu, B., & Tahmir, S. (2020). TPACK model-based instruction in teaching writing: An analysis on TPACK literacy. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(2). <https://ojs.unm.ac.id/ijole/article/view/12441>
- Ancheta, J. R. (2022). Language learning through digital media: Investigating the strategies among selected international students in the Philippines. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(11), 208–226. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.21.11.12>
- Animashaun, E. S., FAMILONI, B. T., & Onyebuchi, N. C. (2024). Implementing educational technology solutions for sustainable development in emerging markets. *International*

- Journal of Science and Research Archive, 12(1), 2428–2434.
<https://doi.org/10.30574/ijstra.2024.12.1.1045>
- Azarcon-Sanchez, I., Chua, L., & Saranza, C. (2024). Evaluating 21st-century skills in English language teaching (ELT) in Surigao del Norte, Philippines: A needs assessment for teachers' development. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(5), 2919–2937. <https://www.ijsshr.in/v7i5/Doc/50.pdf>
- Balbada, E. (2025). Exploring Filipino language educators' perceptions and pedagogical adaptations in AI-integrated instruction. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(SI3), 261–274. <https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI3.327>
- Bautista Jr., A. P., Balibrea, D. M., & Bleza, D. G. (2022). Filipino teachers' attitudes towards distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(2), 232–250. <https://ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/download/4883/pdf>
- Bernardo, A. S. (2023). Philippine English and Global Englishes-inspired grammar teaching. *Asian Englishes*, 26(1), 174–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2023.2174532>
- Bozkurt, A., Xiao, J., Lambert, S., Pazurek, A., Crompton, H., Koseoglu, S., Farrow, R., Bond, M., Nerantzi, C., Honeychurch, S., Bali, M., Dron, J., Mir, K., Stewart, B., Costello, E., Mason, J., Stracke, C. M., Romero-Hall, E., Koutropoulos, A., ... Jandrić, P. (2023). Speculative futures on ChatGPT and generative artificial intelligence (AI): A collective reflection from the educational landscape. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 18(1), 53–130. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7636568>
- Busetto, L., Wick, W., & Gumbinger, C. (2020). How to use and assess qualitative research methods. *Neurological Research and Practice*, 2, Article 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z>
- Brianza, E., Schmid, M., Tondeur, J., & Petko, D. (2024). Is contextual knowledge a key component of expertise for teaching with technology? A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education Open*, 7, 100201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100201>
- Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity*, 56(3), 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Cabato, J. U. (2025). From awareness to practice: Exploring the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of secondary ESL teachers in the Philippines toward ChatGPT in education. *LatIA*, 3, 360. <https://doi.org/10.62486/latia2025360>
- Caingcoy, M. E. (2023). Culturally responsive pedagogy: A systematic overview. *Diversitas Journal*, 8(4), 3203–3212. <https://philarchive.org/rec/CAICRP>
- Caliboso, J. (2025). Bridging language, technology and learning: A qualitative exploration of AI integration in English language pedagogy at Isabela State University. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(SI3), 353–366. <https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI3.387>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Camiring-Picpican, H., Flores, K., Caban, R., Mohadali, S., Galdonez, D., & Alih, C. (2025). Pedagogical innovations based on Philippine cultural practices: A framework for

- culturally responsive teaching in higher education. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(SI2), 433–451. <https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.168>
- Cawaling-Mauntol, J., & Padua, S. A. (2022). Uncovering diversity in social studies through culturally responsive pedagogy among indigenous students in the Philippines. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 2(12), 88–104. <https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/1-IJAMS-December-88-104.pdf>
- Çebi, A., Bahçekapılı Özdemir, T., Reisoğlu, İ., & Çolak, C. (2022). From digital competences to technology integration: Re-formation of pre-service teachers' knowledge and understanding. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 113, 101965. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101965>
- Celik, B., & Kara, S. (2024). Reaping the fruits of technology-integrated grammar instruction in EFL classes at the tertiary level through Web 2.0 tools. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 18(1), 18–36. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10973103>
- Çelik, F., & Baturay, M. H. (2024). The effect of metaverse on L2 vocabulary learning, retention, student engagement, presence, and community feeling. *BMC Psychology*, 12, 58. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01549-4>
- Chand, S. P. (2025). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis. *Advances in Educational Research and Evaluation*, 6(1), 303–317. <https://doi.org/10.25082/AERE.2025.01.001>
- Cheng, M.-M., Lacaste, A. V., Saranza, C., & Chuang, H.-H. (2021). Culturally responsive teaching in technology-supported learning environments in marine education for sustainable development. *Sustainability*, 13(24), 13922. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132413922>
- Chin, J. Y., & Chang, B. (2024). Investigating the impact of Kahoot! on EFL grammar learning. *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Computers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.58459/icce.2024.4952>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2017). CHED Memorandum Order No. 75, series of 2017: Policies, standards and guidelines for Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd). <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CMO-No.-75-s.-2017.pdf>
- Cong-Lem, N., Tran, T. N., & Nguyen, T. T. (2024). Academic integrity in the age of generative AI: Perceptions and responses of Vietnamese EFL teachers. *Teaching English with Technology*, 24(1), 28–47. <https://doi.org/10.56297/FSYB3031/MXNB7567>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2023). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://www.sagepub.com/shop/buy-a-book/qualitative-inquiry-and-research-design-5-266033>
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2024). The educational affordances and challenges of ChatGPT: State of the field. *TechTrends*, 68, 380–392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-024-00939-0>
- Dayagbil, F. T., Boholano, H. B., & Sumalinog, G. G. (2025). Are they in or out? Exploring pre-service teachers' knowledge, perceptions, and experiences regarding artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching and learning. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1665205. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1665205>

- Department of Education. (2019, August 22). Policy guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program (DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/DO_s2019_021.pdf
- Drajati, N. A., So, H.-J., Rakerda, H., Ilmi, M., & Sulistyawati, H. (2023). Exploring the impact of TPACK-based teacher professional development (TPD) program on EFL teachers' TPACK confidence and beliefs. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 20(2), 300–315. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2023.20.2.5.300>
- Driver, M. (2024). Realities of comfort and discomfort in the heritage language classroom: Looking to transformative positive psychology for juggling a double-edged sword. *The Modern Language Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12899>
- Durham, C. (2024). Centering equity for multilingual learners in preservice teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 75(3), 347–360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871231223460>
- Ekizer, F. N. (2025). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on English language teaching: A meta-analysis. *Acta Psychologica*, 260, 105649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105649>
- Eslit, E. R. (2024). Pedagogical explorations: Digital “Baybayin” and cultural narratives in the post-pandemic college techscape. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 8(1), 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v8n1.2303>
- Flojo, L. O. (2024). Grammar teaching through multimedia and development of Grade 7 online language skills. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 27(3), 250–257. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14006489>
- Floris, F. D., Widiati, U., Renandya, W. A., & Basthomi, Y. (2024). Engagement with research: A qualitative study of English department teachers' experiences and insights. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9, 100846. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100846>
- Garrido, R. R., & Niez, R. A. (2025). Contextualizing mother tongue-based multilingual education: Pedagogical strategies in kindergarten to Grade 3 classrooms in the Philippines. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(10), 959–974. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i10.11139>
- Grolig, L. (2020). Shared storybook reading and oral language development: A bioecological perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 1818. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01818>
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & Chen, M. (2020). A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research. *PLOS ONE*, 15(5), e0232076. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232076>
- Hennink, M., & Kaiser, B. N. (2022). Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests. *Social Science & Medicine*, 292, 114523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523>
- Herdina, G. F., & Ningrum, A. S. B. (2023). Teachers' perceptions and challenges in integrating technology in English reading course: A systematic research review. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v8i1.19133>
- Hervina, H., Afdaleni, A., & Taslim, F. (2022). Examining the roles of grammar instruction in language teaching. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 2(2), 391–396. <https://www.bajangjournal.com/index.php/JIRK/article/view/2915>

- Javier, D. R. C., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2024). Developing secondary school English language learners' productive and critical use of ChatGPT. *TESOL Journal*, 15(2), e755. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.755>
- Justol, D. D., & Potane, J. D. (2024). Demographics and technology integration in teaching English: The relationship between teachers' technology self-efficacy and performance. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 12(3), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-12-3-4>
- Karhulahti, V.-M., & Backe, H.-J. (2021). Transparency of peer review: A semi-structured interview study with chief editors from social sciences and humanities. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 6, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-021-00116-4>
- Kim, H. A. (2025). Profiling the dynamics among assessment, curriculum, and pedagogy shaped by language tutor identity and language assessment literacy: A reflexive thematic analysis of TESOL in community settings. *TESOL in Context*, 34(1), 169–190. <https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2025vol34no1art2150>
- Kim, K., & Joo, K.-J. (2021). L1 transfer in the interpretation of L2 reflexive pronouns by child learners of Korean. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 25(6), 1529–1544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211028907>
- Kohnke, L. (2024). Exploring EAP students' perceptions of GenAI and traditional grammar-checking tools for language learning. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100279>
- Kohnke, L., & Ulla, M. B. (2024). Embracing generative artificial intelligence: The perspectives of English instructors in Thai higher education institutions. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An International Journal*, 16(4), 653–670. <https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2024.16.030>
- Lantolf, J. P., Xi, J., & Minakova, V. (2020). Sociocultural theory and concept-based language instruction. *Language Teaching*, 54(3), 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000348>
- Lee, J.-A., & Jang, I. C. (2023). From linguistic insecurity to confidence: Language emotion and ideology in South Korean study-abroad students' post-journey reflections. *Linguistics and Education*, 77, 101206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101206>
- Lei, J., & Phongsatha, T. (2023). Research on the construction of technology-rich classroom learning environment to develop English language learning and higher-order thinking. *International Journal of Sociologies and Anthropologies Science Reviews*, 3(5), 271–282. <https://doi.org/10.60027/ijssar.2023.3276>
- Lestari, F. R. A., Syarifah, E. F., & Fakhruddin, A. (2023). Exploring the implementation of technological pedagogical and content knowledge (TPACK) in teaching English at senior high school. *Papanda Journal of English Education*, 2(2), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.56916/pjee.v2i2.933>
- Liao, H., & Li, L. (2023). Facilitating EFL learners' intercultural competence through culturally responsive teaching in oral English classrooms. *System*, 115, 103070. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103070>
- Liu, T., Zhang, Z., & Gao, X. (2023). Pedagogical design in technology-enhanced language education research: A scoping review. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 6069. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15076069>

- Magbanua, J. J. (2024). Enhancing English grammar skills of Grade 9 students through the use of an English grammar application. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 11(2), 394–405. <https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v11i2.66180>
- Macaro, E., Tian, L., & Chu, L. (2020). First and second language use in English medium instruction contexts. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(3), 382–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818783231>
- Marpaung, D. N., Maru'ao, N., Daeli, H., & Zega, R. (2025). Analysis of using song in English vocabulary mastery to young learners. *Global Education Journal*, 3(3), 53–64. <https://journal.civiliza.org/index.php/gej/article/view/1045>
- Matiso, N. H. (2024). Optimising culturally responsive pedagogies in multicultural English second language classrooms. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(11), 384–401. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.11.20>
- Narreddy, C., Joordens, S., & Prompiengchai, S. (2025). Harnessing large language models for scalable and effective formative assessment in higher education: A review. *Trends in Higher Education*, 4(4), 65. <https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu4040065>
- Namey, E., Guest, G., O'Regan, A., Godwin, C. L., Taylor, J., & Martinez, A. (2022). How does qualitative data collection modality affect disclosure of sensitive information and participant experience? Findings from a quasi-experimental study. *Quality & Quantity*, 56(4), 2341–2360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01217-4>
- Nguyen, L. V. (2025). Culturally responsive AI scaffolding in collaborative language education: Exploring sociocultural adaptations across diverse learning contexts. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 5(10), 353–367. <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i10.3551>
- Ning, Y., Zhang, C., Xu, B., Zhou, Y., & Wijaya, T. T. (2024). Teachers' AI-TPACK: Exploring the relationship between knowledge elements. *Sustainability*, 16(3), 978. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16030978>
- Nogaibayeva, A., & Yersultanova, G. (2025). 'It is not the same as a classroom teacher': A qualitative study of foreign language teachers' perspectives on artificial intelligence-supported tools in Kazakhstan. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 17(4), Article ep599. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/17405>
- Novita, D., Purwati, O., & Anam, S. (2022). In-service EFL teachers' sociocultural-based TPACK beliefs and practices: Voice of teachers and students. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, 23(1), 278–293. <https://callej.org/index.php/journal/article/view/381>
- Nyimbili, F., & Nyimbili, L. (2024). Types of purposive sampling techniques with their examples and application in qualitative research studies. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 5(1), 90–99. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0419>
- Oda, R., & Vizconde, C. J. (2021). Nanung epektu na? (What's the effect?): Impact of mother tongue based multilingual education (MTB MLE) policy on language use and language attitudes of 5th graders in Pampanga, the Philippines. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.59960/9.a1>
- Ousseini, H. (2023). EFL teachers' cognitions and practices in grammar teaching: A qualitative multiple case study from Niger. *Education Journal*, 12(5), 240–248. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20231205.18>
- Owunna, R., Ajobi, A. O., & Akintoke, V. A. (2025). Enhancing academic performance through social interaction: A theoretical exploration of Social Cognitive Theory.

International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(3S), 2656–2666.
<https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0204>

- Peláez-Sánchez, I. C., & Velásquez-Durán, A. (2023). The impact of Duolingo in developing students' linguistic competence: An aspect of communicative language competences. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 49, e252467. <https://educa.fcc.org.br/pdf/ep/v49/1517-9702-ep-49-e252467.pdf>
- Plata, S., & Macawile, K. L. (2022). Translanguaging as a resource for teaching and assessment: Perceptions of senior high school teachers. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, 4(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.59588/2961-3094.1022>
- Poehner, M. E., & Lu, X. (2024). Sociocultural theory and corpus-based English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(3), 1256–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3282>
- Poquita, J. C., & Opeña, H. A. (2025). Cultural context and English language acquisition and proficiency among Indigenous secondary students: An ethnographic study. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 6(9), 221–232. <https://uijrt.com/articles/v6/i9/UIJRTV6I90019.pdf>
- Prystiananta, N. C., Noviyanti, A. I., & Udhiyanasari, K. Y. (2025). The impact of assistive technologies in enhancing English learning outcomes for students with disabilities: A meta-narrative analysis. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(2), 296–308. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n2p296>
- Ramos, A., Lee, H., & Mabuan, R. A. (2025). Exploring the relationship among preservice teachers' e learning readiness, learning engagement, and learning performance in HyFlex learning environments. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 26(2), 89–110. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v26i2.8165>
- Robinson, O. C. (2023). Probing in qualitative research interviews: Theory and practice. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 20(3), 382–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2023.2238625>
- Roque, J., Sangaban, R., & Zacaria, K. (2025). Culturally responsive pedagogy in elementary English instruction. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(7), 424–435. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.315>
- Rosero, R. M., Mangoma, M. C. B., Manuel, A. R., Padua, J. D. C., Palaguitang, K. T., Velasco, F. T., Velasco, C. J. M., Waguina, S. M., & Magday, W. D., Jr. (2025). Exploring AI-Bot in an ESL Filipino flipped classroom: A sequential mixed-methods study. *Social Science and Human Research Bulletin*, 2(05), 153–159. <https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHRB/2025-3050-0503>
- Rosqueta, L. R. A. (2025). Perceptions and challenges: A qualitative inquiry of elementary teachers' experiences with AI-powered tools in DepEd Dingras District I. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 51(6), 1078–1088. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2025/v51i62059>
- Saubern, R., Urbach, D., Koehler, M., & Phillips, M. (2020). Describing increasing proficiency in teachers' knowledge of the effective use of digital technology. *Computers & Education*, 147, 103784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103784>
- Salgado, R. M., Koike, P. S., Maglasang, R., & Minoza, J. (2024). Overcoming linguistic and cultural barriers in English language learning: An exploration of culturally responsive

- pedagogy. The English Teacher, 53(2), 91–108. <https://meltajournals.com/index.php/TET/article/view/837>
- Santiago, C. M. (2025). ‘Generative AI made me do this’: Exploring the potential of ChatGPT-assisted collaborative action research in science higher education: A case in the Philippines. Educational Action Research. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2025.2568018>
- Sibug, V. B., Vital, V. P., Miranda, J. P. P., Fernando, E. Q., Gamboa, A. B., Hernandez, H. E., Bansil, J. A., Penecilla, E. M., & Gonzales, D. D. (2024). Teachers’ perspectives on integrating AI tools in classrooms: Insights from the Philippines. In A. Kashiwara et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Computers in Education* (pp. 743–748). Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education. <https://doi.org/10.58459/icce.2024.4964>
- Slabakova, R. (2021). Second language acquisition. In N. Allott, T. Lohndal, & G. Rey (Eds.), *A companion to Chomsky*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119598732.ch14>
- Soysal, Y., & Türkmen, S. (2024). Reinterpreting the member checking validation strategy in qualitative research through the hermeneutics lens. *Qualitative Inquiry in Education: Theory & Practice*, 2(1), 42–63. <https://doi.org/10.59455/qietp.19>
- Strandberg, A. (2025). Grammar coming alive: Swedish L1 teachers' reflections on using authentic texts when teaching grammar. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 69(1), 108–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2263530>
- Tseng, J.-J., Chai, C. S., Tan, L., & Park, M. (2022). A critical review of research on technological pedagogical and content knowledge (TPACK) in language teaching. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(4), 948–971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1868531>
- Ubaedillah, U., Pratiwi, D. I., Huda, S. T., & Kurniawan, D. A. (2021). An exploratory study of English teachers: The use of social media for teaching English on distance learning. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 361–372. <https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v5i2.753>
- Tirri, K. (2023). The moral teacher in global transition: The 2022 Kohlberg Memorial Lecture. *Journal of Moral Education*, 52(3), 261–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2022.2142540>
- Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 189–199. <https://doi.org/10.70725/307718pkpjuu>
- Truong, T. T. T., & Lambert, C. (2025). Learner-generated content and teachers collaborative planning on using memes in English as a foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 59(S2), S161–S172. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3398>
- Tu, T. H. P. (2022). The effects of using education technology tools on learning grammar for students in secondary school. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 1(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.22115>
- Velasco, Y. P. (2025). The interplay between language ideologies and mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) policy implementation in the Philippines. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34, 765–775. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00894-7>

- Wesley-Nero, S., & Donley, K. (2024). Culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy: Examining teachers' conceptualizations of affirmative instructional practices for multilingual learners. *TESOL Journal*, 15(4), e881. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.881>
- Xu, A., Baysari, M. T., Stocker, S. L., Leow, L. J., Day, R. O., & Carland, J. E. (2020). Researchers' views on, and experiences with, the requirement to obtain informed consent in research involving human participants: A qualitative study. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 21, 93. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-020-00538-7>
- Yoon, B. (2023). Research synthesis on culturally and linguistically responsive teaching for multilingual learners. *Education Sciences*, 13(6), 557. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13060557>
- Zhou, X., Padron, Y., & Waxman, H. (2024). English as a foreign language teachers' technology professional development needs. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 11(1), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.52380/ijcer.2024.11.1.631>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Gernie Ronn M. Tumbokon is a graduate student in the Master of Arts in Education, major in Language Teaching (English), at West Visayas State University, Iloilo City, Philippines. His research interests include applied linguistics, English language teaching, English for Specific Purposes, sociolinguistics, multilingualism, and technology-enhanced language education.