



Level of Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectancy through Culturally Responsive Teaching of the Junior High School English Teachers: Basis for an Upskilling Program Toward CRT Competency

Norberto M. Peñaredonda 
Polytechnic University of the Philippines
norberto.penaredonda@deped.gov.ph

Publication Date: December 9, 2025

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17893016

Abstract

This research explored the self-efficacy and expectations of outcomes for English Grade 10 high school teachers in implementing Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). It examined teachers' confidence levels in various CRT dimensions, including reflecting on cultural lenses, addressing biases, integrating students' cultural backgrounds, and fostering respect for differences. The study also investigated outcomes' expectations related to student engagement through relevant activities, authentic assessments, and outcome-based teaching. Statistical analyses revealed that while teachers generally exhibit high self-efficacy and positive

expectations, significant differences arise based on the number of CRT seminars attended and teachers' age. Additionally, thematic analysis identified professional development, cultural familiarity, and institutional support as key factors influencing CRT implementation. Challenges such as limited training, cultural diversity, and resource constraints were also highlighted. The study emphasizes the need for targeted training programs and continuous professional development to enhance teachers' CRT competencies and promote inclusive educational practices.

Keywords: PUP, DEM, Culturally Responsive Teaching, Self-Efficacy, Student Engagement

INTRODUCTION

The evolving landscape of education calls for continuous professional growth among teachers to meet learners' diverse and changing needs. In the Philippines, English language proficiency is vital for academic and professional success, making the role of junior high school English teachers central to student achievement. However, as classrooms increasingly become culturally and linguistically diverse, many students still struggle with English language learning outcomes. These lower learning outcomes can often be attributed to a lack of culturally responsive teaching (CRT), which is crucial in addressing the varied backgrounds of students. Cultural responsiveness in teaching emphasizes recognizing and integrating students' cultural identities into instruction, fostering engagement and inclusion. In the context of the Philippines, with its rich diversity, teachers must understand the local set-up, ensuring that education is relevant, meaningful, and responsive to the needs of a multicultural society.



Global studies (Siwatu et al., 2019; Herrmann, 2020; Goodwin et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2020; Lopez, 2021; Torres, 2022; Brown & Smith, 2023; Williams et al., 2024) have shown that CRT is linked to improved teaching effectiveness and student achievement. However, in the Philippines, lower learning outcomes in English persist, particularly in schools that do not integrate culturally responsive strategies. This discrepancy suggests that CRT could be a significant factor in improving learning outcomes.

Data from the previous school year revealed that the Mean Percentage Score (MPS) for English, from the 1st to the 4th quarter, was 60.78, significantly below the division target of 75. This gap strongly indicates a need for focused interventions in English instruction, especially through the integration of culturally responsive teaching methods.

The Philippine government supported CRT through legal and policy frameworks, such as Republic Act No. 10533, which mandates a contextualized, culture-sensitive curriculum, and the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program. DepEd Memo No. 62, s. 2011, titled *"Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the People Education Program,"* also encourages inclusive education and the integration of diverse cultural backgrounds into the teaching process. Despite these frameworks, many teachers remain inadequately prepared to implement CRT effectively. This gap in training leaves teachers underprepared to address the diverse needs of their students, particularly in multicultural settings, contributing to the continued challenge of low learning outcomes in English.

The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), specifically Domain 3 on the Diversity of Learners, emphasized the importance of recognizing and responding to the diverse needs of students. It encourages teachers to create inclusive learning environments where every student's background is valued. However, many teachers, particularly in areas with distinct cultural and linguistic profiles, lack the necessary tools and training to meet these expectations. This gap in teacher preparation and support is contributing to the lower English learning outcomes observed.

It has been observed by the researcher, a junior high school English teacher in a Philippine public school, that while CRT is expected in classrooms, practical training in this area is lacking. Many training programs are too generic and fail to equip teachers with the practical skills needed to integrate CRT into their English instruction. This study aims to assess English teachers' CRT self-efficacy and outcome expectations, seeking to develop an upskilling program tailored to address these needs. By bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and classroom practice, the study aims to contribute to improving English education outcomes in Philippine public schools and to support the effective implementation of culturally responsive teaching.

EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

This study employed a quantitative research method to assess the levels of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy (CRTSE) and culturally responsive teaching outcome expectations (CRTOE) among Grade 10 English junior high school (JHS) teachers in public schools. The survey was used to collect data on CRTSE and CRTOE from a representative sample of English teachers within a specific school division.

The quantitative component of the research explored the significant differences in the level of self-efficacy as well as outcome expectancy when grouped according to profile. Data collected from the surveys were analyzed using statistical methods, including descriptive statistics to summarize the levels of CRTSE and CRTOE among the teachers, and inferential analysis to determine the significant differences in the level of self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. This research design was suitable for identifying potential associations and providing insights into how teachers' self-efficacy in culturally responsive teaching influenced their expectations of the outcomes. Recent studies highlighted the importance of understanding these relationships to inform the development of effective professional development programs (Gay, 2018).



The researcher also used open-ended questions embedded in the survey. It served as the qualitative data of this study and helped identify key challenges in CRT implementation as experienced by Grade 10 English teachers, thereby informing the design of an upskilling program aimed at enhancing their culturally responsive teaching competencies.

The data for this study were obtained from the responses of selected English public secondary schools in Region IV-A, CALABARZON Area. Based on the data provided by the Division, the total number of English Junior High School teachers in this area was 209.

Stratified random sampling was employed in the research. Stratified sampling is a sampling technique that divides a population into distinct subgroups, or strata, based on shared characteristics before selecting samples.

The sampling method utilized in this study employed stratified random sampling. It used the Finite Population Correction (FPC) formula of Cochran to determine the appropriate sample size from a finite population of respondents distributed across four districts. There were 209 Grade 10 English teachers, and among this population, the computed sample size is approximately 136 respondents.

The respondents of the study were the Junior High School, specifically Grade 10, English teachers in the selected CALABARZON area during the school year 2024–2025.

The survey instruments used in the study were teacher-made to fit the English context and included the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (CRTSE) and the Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectations Scale (CRTOE). The names of the instruments were adopted from Siwatu and Starker-Glass (2018). Both instruments were made by the researcher and validated by experts and were designed to measure teachers' beliefs in their ability to implement culturally responsive teaching practices, as well as their expectations regarding the outcomes of such practices. Both were tested for reliability through a pilot test.

The data-gathering procedure for this study followed a systematic and ethically sound process to ensure the validity, reliability, and integrity of the results. Initially, a comprehensive questionnaire was carefully developed to collect both quantitative and qualitative data relevant to the research objectives. The instrument was subjected to content validation by three experts in the fields of education and research to assess its clarity, relevance, and alignment with the constructs being measured. To further ensure the instrument's usability, a pilot test was conducted with 30 Junior High School (JHS) teachers. Feedback obtained during this stage helped refine ambiguous items and improve the overall structure of the questionnaire.

Following the validation and pilot testing stages, ethical clearance was secured to guarantee that the study adhered to ethical standards concerning confidentiality, informed consent, and voluntary participation. This step underscored the researcher's commitment to upholding the rights and welfare of all respondents.

With the finalized instrument ready, the researchers proceeded to determine and apply the sampling criteria. The questionnaire was distributed to 136 English Junior High School teachers from a specific school division in the CALABARZON region. Selection criteria included having at least one year of teaching experience and active employment as an English JHS teacher at the time of the study. To facilitate ease of access, the questionnaire was administered online using Google Forms. Participants received the survey link along with detailed instructions on how to complete it.

To ensure a high response rate and encourage full participation, follow-up reminders were sent through appropriate communication channels. Participants were reminded of the importance of their



contribution to the study, particularly in enhancing culturally responsive teaching (CRT) practices in the Philippine context.

In addition to collecting quantitative data on teachers' self-efficacy and outcome expectations related to CRT, the survey also included open-ended questions designed to gather qualitative insights. These qualitative items specifically aim to identify the challenges teachers encounter in applying culturally responsive teaching strategies in their respective schools. This allowed for a deeper understanding of contextual barriers that may not be fully captured through closed-ended survey items.

Upon completion of the data collection phase, all responses were compiled and prepared for statistical analysis. Inferential statistics were employed to examine significant differences across variables such as teacher profile, self-efficacy levels, and outcome expectations. The inclusion of qualitative responses further enriched the interpretation of findings, allowing the study to present a more holistic view of the implementation of CRT in public junior high school English classrooms.

The collected data were treated statistically using the following statistical tools.

1. To answer question no. 1, frequency counts and percentages were used to determine the demographic profile of the respondents.
2. To answer question no. 2, the mean and standard deviation were used to assess the level of self-efficacy among Grade 10 English teachers in the practice of CRT.
3. To answer question no. 3, the mean and standard deviation were also used to assess the outcome expectations of teachers regarding CRT
4. To answer question no. 4, frequency counts were used to identify common challenges faced by teachers in implementing CRT strategies. Thematic analysis was then performed to identify recurring themes in the responses, providing deeper insights into the obstacles teachers encounter when using CRT.
5. To answer question no. 5, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test or Mann-Whitney U-test was used to determine if there is a significant difference in the level of self-efficacy among teachers when grouped according to demographic profile variables such as age, sex, and position.
6. To answer question no. 6, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test or Mann-Whitney U-test was also used to determine if there is a significant difference in the level of outcome expectations among teachers based on their profile variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Respondents' Profile

Distribution of Respondents According to Districts

District	Frequency	Percentage (%)
First	32	23.5
Second	17	12.5
Third	42	30.9
Fourth	45	33.1
Total	136	100.0

← **Formatted:** Left, Indent: Left: 1.25", Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: single



This table presents the distribution of the 136 English Junior High School teacher-respondents across the four districts within the Division of CALABARZON. The highest proportion of respondents came from the Fourth District, with 45 teachers (33.1%), followed closely by the Third District with 42 teachers (30.9%). Meanwhile, the First District had 32 respondents (23.5%), and the Second District had the least representation with only 17 teachers (12.5%).

This variation in district representation reflects the geographic and population diversity within the division. The relatively high concentrations in the Third and Fourth Districts suggest either a larger number of public secondary schools or a greater availability of CRT-ready English teachers in those areas. The lower percentage in the Second District (12.5%) may indicate either fewer schools, smaller teacher populations, or lower accessibility during the sampling period.

Distribution of Respondents According to Age

← Formatted: Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: single

Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
21-25 years old	3	2.2
26-30 years old	37	27.2
31-35 years old	34	25
36-40 years old	19	14
41-45 years old	19	14
46-50 years old	10	7.4
51-55 years old	12	8.8
56-60 years old	1	0.7
61 years old and above	1	0.7
Total	136	100.0

This shows the distribution of the 136 English Junior High School teacher-respondents based on their age. The largest age group is 26–30 years old, comprising 37 teachers or 27.2%, followed closely by the 31–35 years old group at 25% (34 teachers). Meanwhile, the smallest age brackets include both 56–60 years old and 61 years old and above, each with 1 respondent (0.7%), reflecting the lowest frequencies in the dataset.

This age distribution implies that a significant portion of respondents are within the early to mid-career stages, typically associated with high enthusiasm for professional growth and receptiveness to new pedagogies such as culturally responsive teaching (CRT). Myroniuk (2024) asserted that younger educators often demonstrate greater openness to instructional innovation, particularly in adopting CRT frameworks. This is supported by Arzadon and Torio (2021), who emphasized that younger teachers tend to be more responsive to diversity and inclusion practices, a finding that aligns with the concentration of respondents in the 26–35 age range.



Distribution of Respondents According to Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	39	28.7
Female	97	71.3
Total	136	100.0

← Formatted: Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: single

This presents the distribution of the 136 English Junior High School teachers based on their sex. The table reveals a notable gender imbalance: 71.3% (97 respondents) are female, while only 28.7% (39 respondents) are male. This data underscores the predominance of female educators in the English teaching profession within the CALABARZON division.

This observation is consistent with trends observed in educational literature. Goyal (2025) noted that female teachers often display higher levels of emotional responsiveness, which is critical in implementing culturally responsive teaching (CRT). This may explain why female-dominated faculties are perceived as more attuned to students' social-emotional and cultural needs, particularly in language-rich subjects such as English.

Distribution of Respondents According to Position

Position	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Teacher I	46	33.8
Teacher II	49	36
Teacher III	29	21.3
Master Teacher I	6	4.4
Master Teacher II	3	2.2
Head Teacher	3	2.2
Total	136	100.0

← Formatted: Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: single

This outlines the distribution of the 136 English Junior High School teacher-respondents according to their current teaching positions. The data indicate that the majority hold entry to mid-level teaching ranks, with Teacher II comprising the highest proportion at 36% (49 teachers), followed closely by Teacher I at 33.8% (46 teachers). Meanwhile, Teacher III represents 21.3% (29 teachers), and more senior designations such as Master Teacher I (4.4%), Master Teacher II (2.2%), and Head Teacher (2.2%) account for a considerably smaller portion of the sample.

This distribution implies that most respondents are in early to intermediate stages of their careers. According to Best (2025), teaching position correlates with increased confidence in instructional delivery,



and those in higher ranks typically have greater exposure to school-based pedagogical leadership, such as mentoring and professional development facilitation. However, the limited representation of Master and Head Teachers suggests fewer formal mentors or CRT champions in leadership roles—potentially affecting the dissemination of CRT practices across school communities.

Distribution of Respondents According to Highest Educational Attainment

← Formatted: Space After: 12 pt, Line spacing: single

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Bachelor	86	63.2
Masteral	27	19.9
Others	23	16.9
Total	136	100.0

This presents the distribution of the 136 English Junior High School teachers according to their highest educational attainment. Most respondents, 86 teachers or 63.2%, hold a bachelor's degree, while 27 teachers (19.9%) completed a master's degree. The remaining 23 respondents (16.9%) fall under the category of "Others," which may include those pursuing graduate studies or holding academic units beyond their bachelor's level but not yet conferred with a master's degree.

This distribution illustrates a workforce that is largely composed of teachers who are still in the early to intermediate stages of academic advancement. The predominance of bachelor's degree holders aligns with the national trend in Philippine public schools, where graduate-level attainment is often limited by access and institutional incentives (Zhi, 2024). Nevertheless, Weiss et al. (2024) argue that higher education contributes significantly to teachers' ability to apply culturally responsive teaching (CRT) strategies, especially in terms of curriculum design and critical reflection.

Distribution of Respondents According to Years in Teaching English

← Formatted: Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: single

No. of Years in Teaching English	Frequency	Percentage (%)
0-1 year	10	7.4
2-5 years	29	21.3
6-10 years	48	35.3
11-15 years	23	16.9
16-20 years	11	8.1
21-25 years	8	5.9
26-30 years	6	4.4
31 years and above	1	0.7



Total	136	100.0
--------------	------------	--------------

This outlines the teaching experience of the 136 English Junior High School teachers based on the number of years they have spent teaching English. The most represented category comprises those who have 6–10 years of experience, accounting for 48 respondents (35.3%). This is followed by 2–5 years (21.3%) and 11–15 years (16.9%). Conversely, the least represented group includes teachers with 31 years and above and 26–30 years, with only 1 (0.7%) and 6 (4.4%) respondents, respectively.

This distribution suggests that a significant proportion of the teaching force is composed of mid-career educators, those with between 6 and 15 years of experience—indicating a professional group that has likely moved beyond early-career challenges and is now refining their pedagogical skills. According to Rochat (2024), although years of experience often correlate with classroom mastery, they do not inherently equate to cultural responsiveness unless coupled with intentional, reflective CRT training.

**Distribution of Respondents According to the Number of
CRT-Related Seminars Attended**

No. of Seminars Attended Related to Culturally Responsive Teaching	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1-2 seminars	56	41.2
3-5 seminars	24	17.6
6-10 seminars	12	8.8
More than 10 seminars	4	2.9
None	40	29.4
Total	136	100.0

This provides insights into the number of seminars related to culturally responsive teaching (CRT) attended by the 136 English Junior High School teacher-respondents. The largest segment attended 1–2 seminars, accounting for 56 teachers (41.2%), while 40 teachers (29.4%) had attended no seminars at all. In contrast, only a small fraction reported participation in more than 10 seminars (2.9%), and 12 teachers (8.8%) had engaged in 6–10 CRT seminars.

This distribution reveals a concerning trend: while a majority have had some level of exposure to CRT (70.6% attended at least one seminar), nearly one-third have had no formal training. This aligns with the findings of Saner and Villena (2024) and Graziano et al. (2024), who emphasized the critical role of professional development in enhancing teachers' CRT self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. Teachers who attend even a single CRT workshop show measurable increases in their confidence and willingness to implement culturally attuned practices.

2. Level of Self-Efficacy in the Practice of CRT

Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in Terms of Reflecting on One's Cultural Lens



Reflecting on One's Cultural Lens	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I reflect on how my own cultural background shapes my teaching approach.	3.79	Very confident
I consider how my cultural lens may impact my interactions with students from different backgrounds.	3.79	Very confident
I am aware of my own biases when planning lessons for my English students.	3.67	Very confident
I actively work on adjusting my teaching to be inclusive of all students' cultural experiences.	3.85	Very confident
I am conscious of how my own cultural values may influence classroom discussions.	3.83	Very confident
Grand Mean:	3.79	Very confident

Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)

The highest mean of 3.85 was for the statement "I actively work on adjusting my teaching to be inclusive of all students' cultural experiences," showing that teachers feel very confident in making their teaching more inclusive. This is in line with previous research that connects emotional self-efficacy with effective teaching practices (Graziano, Mastrokoukou, & Marchisio, 2024). On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.67 was for "I am aware of my own biases when planning lessons for my English students." Although this still reflects confidence, it suggests that teachers may need more focus on recognizing their own biases, which is important for truly effective culturally responsive teaching (Bleukx et al., 2024). The difference between these two points shows that while teachers are good at making their teaching inclusive, there is room to improve in recognizing and addressing biases. In contrast, the item "I am aware of my own biases when planning lessons for my English students" garnered the lowest mean of 3.67, although still under the "Very Confident" range. While still strong, this relatively lower score suggests a possible area for improvement. This is consistent with the argument of Bleukx et al. (2024) that effective CRT hinges on teachers' deep reflection on unconscious biases—something that may require more intentional and structured development. Moreover, Rochat (2024) stressed that such reflection is foundational in designing culturally sensitive content, especially for linguistically and ethnically diverse learners.

Notably, the identical means of 3.79 in the items "I reflect on how my own cultural background shapes my teaching approach" and "I consider how my cultural lens may impact my interactions with students from different backgrounds" reflect consistency in the teachers' confidence in their metacognitive awareness. This aligns with the assertions of Hammond (2015) and Saner and Villena (2024), who stated that self-reflection enables educators to critically assess how personal values influence both planning and interaction.

Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in terms of Recognizing and Addressing Biases in the System

Recognizing and Addressing Biases in the System	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
---	------	-----------------------



I can identify biases in the curriculum that may disadvantage students from minority groups.	3.43	Very confident
I take steps to address cultural biases that affect my students' academic opportunities.	3.66	Very confident
I actively challenge biases in standardized testing that may impact my students in English.	3.42	Very confident
I address systemic biases when assessing my students' progress and achievements.	3.63	Very confident
I create learning opportunities to counter biases students face in the school system.	3.66	Very confident
Grand Mean:	3.56	Very confident

Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)

This illustrates the respondents' level of self-efficacy in Recognizing and Addressing Biases in the System, a key competency under culturally responsive teaching (CRT). The computed grand mean of 3.56 falls under the category "Very Confident," suggesting that the respondents feel adequately equipped to identify, challenge, and counteract systemic and instructional biases that hinder equity in education.

Among the five indicators, the highest mean scores of 3.66 were shared by two items: "*I take steps to address cultural biases that affect my students' academic opportunities*" and "*I create learning opportunities to counter biases students face in the school system*." These results indicate that teachers exhibit the strongest sense of confidence when acting on bias through proactive instruction and classroom interventions. This finding aligns with the observations of Graziano et al. (2024), who noted that emotional competence enhances teachers' ability to address inequities through inclusive lesson design. Furthermore, Rochat (2024) emphasized that teachers who internalize cultural sensitivity are better positioned to dismantle barriers and advocate for students from underrepresented backgrounds.

Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in Terms of Integrating Students' Cultural Backgrounds into the Curriculum

Integrating Students' Cultural Backgrounds into the Curriculum	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I incorporate diverse cultural perspectives into my English lessons.	3.78	Very confident
I design activities that highlight the contributions of different cultures to literature and language.	3.69	Very confident
I include examples in my lessons that reflect my students' cultural backgrounds.	3.90	Very confident



I modify teaching materials to ensure they are culturally inclusive.	3.72	Very confident
I create assignments that allow students to explore their own cultural identities through English.	3.70	Very confident
Grand Mean:	3.76	Very confident

Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)

This presents the respondents' level of self-efficacy in integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum, a critical dimension of culturally responsive teaching (CRT). With a grand mean of 3.76, the responses fall under the "Very Confident" category, suggesting that teachers generally believe in their ability to embed cultural relevance into their English lessons.

Topping the list of indicators is the item "I include examples in my lessons that reflect my students' cultural backgrounds" with a mean score of 3.90, the highest among all entries. This suggests that teachers are more confident when connecting instructional content to their students' lived experiences. This finding echoes the work of Rochat (2024) and Saner and Villena (2024), who noted that teachers with strong CRT self-efficacy tend to prioritize cultural representation in their lessons to foster inclusivity and relevance.

In contrast, the lowest-rated item was "I design activities that highlight the contributions of different cultures to literature and language," which garnered a mean of 3.69. While still categorized as "Very Confident," the slight dip may imply that although teachers are confident in referencing culture, they may face challenges in translating these into structured, activity-based learning. Hsiao et al. (2024) and Graziano et al. (2024) both emphasized that confidence in designing multicultural content often requires sustained exposure to culturally responsive training and access to culturally diverse teaching resources—areas that may still be limited in some Philippine public schools.

Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in Terms of Connecting Classroom Content to Real-World Issues

Connecting Classroom Content to Real-World Issues	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I connect English lessons to current events that impact my students' lives.	4.01	Very confident
I design English lessons that address real-world social and cultural issues.	3.94	Very confident
I use examples from my students' communities to make lessons more relevant.	4.04	Very confident
I encourage students to explore real-world problems through their writing assignments.	3.97	Very confident
I guide my students in discussing how English language skills apply to addressing societal challenges.	3.82	Very confident
Grand Mean:	3.96	Very confident



Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)

This displays the respondents' level of self-efficacy in connecting classroom content to real-world issues, one of the core competencies under culturally responsive teaching (CRT). The computed grand mean of 3.96, interpreted as "Very Confident," signifies that respondents are highly self-assured in applying English instruction to current events, community realities, and societal challenges.

A closer comparison between the highest and lowest mean values offers insight into the specific areas where teachers feel capable. The item "I use examples from my students' communities to make lessons more relevant" ($M = 4.04$) scored the highest, suggesting strong confidence in anchoring instruction within familiar and tangible experiences. In contrast, the item "I guide my students in discussing how English language skills apply to addressing societal challenges" ($M = 3.82$) registered the lowest, though still within the "Very Confident" range. This slight gap may reflect a comfort zone in localizing content but a hesitancy in extending language instruction toward complex societal discourse. As Myroniuk (2024) and Hsiao et al. (2024) have suggested, while teachers may excel at community-based contextualization, facilitating deeper conversations about systemic issues requires both pedagogical tools and institutional support. This underscores the importance of empowering teachers not only to reflect on students' realities but also to engage learners in broader critical dialogues, as advocated by Gay (2018) and Hammond (2015).

**Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in Terms of Maintaining High Expectations
for All Students**

Maintaining High Expectations for All Students	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I maintain high expectations for all my students, regardless of their background.	3.50	Very confident
I believe all my students can succeed in English given the right support.	4.02	Very confident
I set challenging but achievable goals for all my students in English.	3.85	Very confident
I support students from all backgrounds to achieve high academic standards.	3.98	Very confident
I encourage students to exceed expectations, no matter their linguistic or cultural backgrounds.	3.90	Very confident
Grand Mean:	3.85	Very confident

Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)



This presents the level of self-efficacy of English JHS teachers in maintaining high expectations for all students, a core pillar of culturally responsive teaching (CRT). With a grand mean of 3.85, the teachers were rated as “Very Confident” in this competency. This indicates a strong belief in their capacity to uphold academic rigor and equity, regardless of students’ linguistic, cultural, or socio-economic backgrounds.

A comparison between the highest and lowest indicators further highlights important nuances in teacher self-efficacy. The statement “I believe all my students can succeed in English given the right support” ($M = 4.02$) received the highest rating, underscoring teachers’ strong faith in student potential when proper scaffolding is in place. In contrast, “I maintain high expectations for all my students, regardless of their background” ($M = 3.50$) yielded the lowest mean score, suggesting that while teachers are optimistic about outcomes, they may hesitate when it comes to uniformly applying expectations across diverse student populations. This gap may reflect an internal struggle between aspirational goals and the practical realities of addressing inequities in the classroom. As noted by Sharafinezhad and Sahraei (2025), underlying assumptions and contextual challenges can subtly influence teacher expectations. Best (2025) and De Jesus et al. (2024) further emphasized that fostering equity requires not only belief in student success but also deliberate, consistent practice to ensure that all students are truly held to high standards—regardless of their starting point.

Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in Terms of Fostering Respect for Differences

Fostering Respect for Differences	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I promote respect for diverse cultural backgrounds in my English classroom.	4.20	Very confident
I create a classroom environment where all cultural identities are valued.	4.12	Very confident
I encourage my students to respect the differences in their classmates’ experiences and perspectives.	4.25	Extremely confident
I use classroom discussions to highlight the importance of cultural diversity.	4.05	Very confident
I model respectful behavior towards all cultural perspectives in the classroom.	4.05	Very confident
Grand Mean:	4.13	Very confident

Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)

This presents the respondents’ level of self-efficacy in fostering respect for differences, one of the eight competencies outlined in Muñiz’s (2020) Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) framework. With a grand mean of 4.13, this domain was rated as “Very Confident,” bordering on the “Extremely Confident” category. This result highlights that English Junior High School teachers in CALABARZON are notably confident in creating inclusive classroom environments that celebrate diversity and promote mutual respect.

A comparison of the highest and lowest indicators underscores important dimensions of how respect for differences is enacted in classrooms. The highest-rated item—“I encourage my students to



respect the differences in their classmates' experiences and perspectives" ($M = 4.25$)—suggests that teachers feel most confident when facilitating peer-level empathy and understanding. In contrast, the lowest-rated items, "I use classroom discussions to highlight the importance of cultural diversity" and "I model respectful behavior towards all cultural perspectives" (both $M = 4.05$), reflect slightly less confidence in modeling and dialogic practices. This subtle gap indicates that while teachers are enthusiastic about cultivating student-to-student respect, they may feel less certain about their roles as facilitators of complex cultural conversations. This aligns with the observations of Talo et al. (2025) and Malicse (2025), who noted that modeling inclusivity and leading meaningful discussions require deliberate preparation and continuous reflection—areas that often depend on targeted professional development and supportive school environments.

Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in Terms of Collaborating with Families and Communities

Collaborating with Families and Communities	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I engage with my students' families to better understand their cultural backgrounds.	3.58	Very confident
I collaborate with community members to enhance students' English learning experiences.	3.40	Moderately confident
I communicate regularly with parents to support student progress in English.	3.58	Very confident
I incorporate family and community feedback into my classroom strategies.	3.49	Very confident
I build strong relationships with families to ensure student success.	3.60	Very confident
Grand Mean:	3.53	Very confident

Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)

This presents the respondents' self-assessed level of confidence in Collaborating with Families and Communities, a core competency of Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) as proposed by Muñiz (2020). The grand mean of 3.53 indicates that respondents are "Very Confident" overall in engaging with families and community stakeholders to support students' educational outcomes.

The comparison between the highest and lowest indicators further clarifies this divergence in self-efficacy. The item "I build strong relationships with families to ensure student success" ($M = 3.60$) emerged as the most highly rated, indicating a clear strength in fostering supportive, trust-based relationships within the immediate school-home context. In contrast, the lowest score of 3.40 was assigned to "I collaborate with community members to enhance students' English learning experiences," the only item to fall under the "Moderately Confident" range. This contrast suggests that while teachers feel well-prepared to engage families, they are less confident in mobilizing broader community resources for educational purposes. This finding reflects the assertions of Johnson et al. (2025) and Ikeda et al. (2025), who observed that community engagement often remains underdeveloped due to lack of systemic support, logistical challenges, and limited outreach frameworks. Addressing this gap through targeted capacity-building initiatives may enhance the full potential of CRT in connecting classroom learning with students' wider sociocultural environments.



Level of Self-Efficacy in CRT in Terms of Communicating in Linguistically and Culturally Responsive Ways

Communicating in Linguistically and Culturally Responsive Ways	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I communicate in ways that are respectful of my students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds.	3.89	Very confident
I adjust my communication style to meet the needs of English Language Learners.	3.93	Very confident
I use culturally responsive communication strategies to engage all my students.	3.79	Very confident
I adapt my language to ensure it is clear and accessible to all students.	3.98	Very confident
I use my students' native languages in communication when appropriate.	3.90	Very confident
Grand Mean:	3.90	Very confident

Legend: Not confident at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly confident (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately confident (2.61 – 3.40), Very confident (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely confident (4.21 – 5.00)

The contrast between the highest and lowest mean scores provides further insight into specific areas of confidence. The highest-rated statement, “I adapt my language to ensure it is clear and accessible to all students” ($M = 3.98$), reflects strong assurance in simplifying communication for comprehension—particularly essential in multilingual classrooms. In contrast, “I use culturally responsive communication strategies to engage all my students” ($M = 3.79$) received the lowest rating, indicating comparatively less confidence in applying nuanced strategies that go beyond clarity. This gap suggests that while teachers are adept at making language understandable, they may feel less prepared to embed deeper cultural responsiveness in their communication style. As Stevic and Karanikola (2025) and Andrews et al. (2025) emphasized, culturally embedded communication—such as validating communication norms, gestures, and turn-taking behaviors—requires specific training and practice. Thus, this disparity reveals an opportunity for focused upskilling to support teachers in evolving from general linguistic accessibility to more culturally sophisticated interaction strategies. In terms of instructional inclusivity, “I use my students' native languages in communication when appropriate” received a solid mean of 3.90, signaling that teachers recognize the pedagogical value of leveraging students' first languages to bridge understanding. This supports the findings of Chamberlin (2025) and Onuegwunwoke and Umezuruike (2025), who argue that using multilingual strategies enhances both content comprehension and identity affirmation in multicultural classrooms.

3. Level of Outcome Expectations in CRT Implementation

Level of Outcomes' Expectations in CRT in Terms of Activities Relevant to Students' Lives

Activities Relevant to Students' Lives	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I am certain that students are more engaged when classroom activities connect to their daily lives.	4.20	Very certain



I am confident that students demonstrate greater interest in English when lessons address real-life issues.	4.07	Very certain
I believe students participate more when English tasks reflect their cultural and personal experiences.	4.04	Very certain
I am certain that connecting lessons to students' life contexts enhances their engagement in English.	4.10	Very certain
I am confident that students perform better when English lessons are relevant to their everyday experiences.	4.12	Very certain
Grand Mean:	4.11	Very certain

Legend: Not certain at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly certain (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately certain (2.61 – 3.40), Very certain (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely certain (4.21 – 5.00)

The comparison between the highest and lowest items underscores a subtle distinction in how teachers perceive relevance in instructional design. The highest-rated item, “I am certain that students are more engaged when classroom activities connect to their daily lives” ($M = 4.20$), suggests strong confidence in drawing connections to students’ everyday realities—a theme often emphasized in culturally responsive pedagogy. On the other hand, the lowest-rated statement, “I believe students participate more when English tasks reflect their cultural and personal experiences” ($M = 4.04$), indicates slightly more hesitation when it comes to weaving personal or cultural identity into lesson content. This gap, though narrow, may reflect a tendency among teachers to focus on general real-life applicability rather than delving into specific cultural narratives. As Vela et al. (2024) and Zakee (2024) have argued, this hesitation can stem from a lack of training, perceived sensitivity, or unfamiliarity with students’ diverse cultural contexts. Bridging this gap through guided professional development may empower teachers to embrace culturally nuanced strategies with the same confidence they exhibit in applying real-world examples.

Comparing all items reveals minimal variance (means ranging from 4.04 to 4.20), suggesting a generally uniform belief in the benefits of culturally relevant activities. However, conducting a post hoc analysis using variables such as age, teaching position, or seminar attendance could further clarify whether certain teacher groups hold stronger expectations. For instance, teachers with more CRT training might report higher certainty in linking lessons to both personal and cultural student experiences, as posited by Saner and Villena (2024).

**Level of Outcomes’ Expectations in CRT in Terms of
Responsiveness to Cultural Learning Styles**

Responsiveness to Cultural Learning Styles	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I am certain that students respond more positively when lessons align with their cultural learning styles.	3.96	Very certain



I am confident that incorporating culturally responsive teaching strategies increases student engagement.	3.91	Very certain
I believe students learn better when teaching methods reflect their cultural preferences.	3.99	Very certain
I am certain that students achieve better outcomes when culturally relevant examples are used in class.	4.01	Very certain
I am confident that students are more successful when lessons are adapted to their cultural learning styles.	3.99	Very certain
Grand Mean:	3.97	Very certain

Legend: Not certain at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly certain (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately certain (2.61 – 3.40), Very certain (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely certain (4.21 – 5.00)

A closer comparison of the highest and lowest indicators reveals a slight but meaningful distinction in outcome expectations. The highest-rated item, “I am certain that students achieve better outcomes when culturally relevant examples are used in class” ($M = 4.01$), reflects teachers’ strong belief in the academic power of relatable, real-world content grounded in students’ cultural contexts. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, “I am confident that incorporating culturally responsive teaching strategies increases student engagement” ($M = 3.91$), while still rated “Very Certain,” suggests a relative gap in perceived impact on engagement versus achievement. This discrepancy may point to an area where teachers acknowledge the potential benefits of CRT strategies but remain somewhat cautious about their effectiveness in capturing student attention. As noted by Alves et al. (2024) and Zhi (2024), this may stem from a lack of concrete implementation models or classroom-based success stories that explicitly connect cultural responsiveness with increased participation. Bridging this gap through ongoing mentorship, resource-sharing, and training can help teachers align their engagement strategies with their already strong outcome-oriented beliefs.

A comparison across indicators shows minimal variability in perceptions, which suggests a shared, positive outcome expectation across the teaching force. However, this uniformity may obscure nuanced differences across profile variables like seminar attendance, years of experience, or teaching position. Conducting a post hoc analysis—such as ANOVA—could illuminate whether these background characteristics significantly influence outcome expectations, a step recommended by Saner and Villena (2024) and Howells and Carter (2019) for better-targeted professional development.

Level of Outcomes’ Expectations in CRT in Terms of High Expectations

High Expectations	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I am certain that students achieve more when I set high expectations for them.	3.47	Very certain
I am confident that maintaining high academic standards increases students’ motivation.	3.64	Very certain



I believe the students perform better academically when I challenge them with high expectations.	3.64	Very certain
I am certain that high expectations lead to greater student engagement and effort in an English class.	3.58	Very certain
I am confident that students rise to meet high standards when consistently supported and encouraged.	3.99	Very certain
Grand Mean:	3.66	Very certain

Legend: Not certain at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly certain (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately certain (2.61 – 3.40), Very certain (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely certain (4.21 – 5.00)

The contrast between the highest and lowest mean values provides insight into the nuances of teachers' outcome expectations. The item "I am confident that students rise to meet high standards when consistently supported and encouraged" received the highest mean ($M = 3.99$), highlighting teachers' strong belief in the transformative impact of high expectations when paired with emotional and instructional scaffolding. Conversely, the lowest-rated item—"I am certain that students achieve more when I set high expectations for them" ($M = 3.47$)—though still interpreted as "Very Certain," reflects a slightly more cautious stance. This discrepancy suggests that while educators endorse the value of high standards, they may question the sufficiency of expectation-setting alone without the necessary contextual support. This distinction supports the findings of Rabbi (2025) and Vatterott (2018), who contend that expectations must be actionable and accompanied by responsive strategies to produce meaningful results. Bridging this confidence gap may require professional learning experiences that demonstrate how to translate high expectations into concrete, culturally responsive practices in the classroom. Two other items—"I am confident that maintaining high academic standards increases students' motivation" and "I believe the students perform better academically when I challenge them with high expectations"—both recorded a mean of 3.64. These values affirm the participants' belief in the motivational power of high standards, resonating with Best (2025) and Jannini (2024) who emphasized that when rigor is paired with relevance and fairness, students from all backgrounds can thrive.

Interestingly, the statement "I am certain that high expectations lead to greater student engagement and effort in an English class" had a slightly lower mean of 3.58, pointing to the need for further reinforcement of the link between engagement and expectation-setting. This gap may imply that while teachers accept the theory of high expectations, its classroom application—especially in English where language barriers may exist—requires more empirical validation or professional development support. As noted by De Jesus et al. (2024) and Sharafinezhad & Sahraei (2025), teachers may need training on how to translate expectations into culturally sustaining pedagogical techniques.

**Level of Outcomes' Expectations in CRT in Terms of
Authentic Assessment Techniques**

Authentic Assessment Techniques	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
---------------------------------	------	-----------------------



I am certain that students engage more when assessments reflect real-world applications of English.	4.04	Very certain
I am confident that students show better learning outcomes when I use authentic assessments.	4.00	Very certain
I believe students are more motivated when assessments reflect tasks they can apply in real life.	4.09	Very certain
I am certain that authentic assessments provide students with meaningful ways to demonstrate their learning.	3.98	Very certain
I am confident that culturally relevant and practical assessments lead to higher student performance.	3.96	Very certain
Grand Mean:	4.01	Very certain

Legend: Not certain at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly certain (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately certain (2.61 – 3.40), Very certain (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely certain (4.21 – 5.00)

This presents the level of outcomes' expectations of English JHS teachers in relation to Authentic Assessment Techniques under Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). The overall grand mean of 4.01, interpreted as "Very Certain," demonstrates that respondents strongly believe authentic assessments lead to improved student engagement, motivation, and performance when aligned with real-life contexts.

A comparison between the highest and lowest indicators reveals a subtle yet meaningful distinction in teachers' outcome expectations. The highest-rated item, "I believe students are more motivated when assessments reflect tasks they can apply in real life" ($M = 4.09$), suggests that teachers are highly confident in the motivational value of practicality and relevance in assessment. In contrast, the lowest-rated statement, "I am confident that culturally relevant and practical assessments lead to higher student performance" ($M = 3.96$), while still "Very Certain," points to slightly more hesitation when it comes to implementing culturally embedded assessment practices. This variation likely reflects the reality that designing culturally nuanced tasks presents more pedagogical challenges than general real-life applications. As noted by Chen (2024) and Man et al. (2024), many teachers may feel more equipped to integrate life-based contexts than to align assessment with students' specific cultural identities. Addressing this gap through targeted training and access to exemplary culturally responsive assessments could strengthen teachers' confidence and effectiveness in this area.

Level of Outcomes' Expectations in CRT in Terms of Outcome-Based Teaching

Outcome-Based Teaching	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I am certain that students engage more when they understand the expected outcomes of each lesson.	4.07	Very certain
I am confident that clear learning outcomes lead to greater student ownership of their progress.	4.02	Very certain



I believe students perform better when teaching is focused on measurable outcomes.	3.96	Very certain
I am certain that outcome-based teaching helps students stay focused and reach their goals.	3.99	Very certain
I am confident that students achieve better results when lessons are designed around clear, specific outcomes.	4.10	Very certain
Grand Mean:	4.03	Very certain

Legend: Not certain at all (1.00 – 1.80), Slightly certain (1.81 – 2.60), Moderately certain (2.61 – 3.40), Very certain (3.41 – 4.20), Extremely certain (4.21 – 5.00)

This outlines the respondents' level of outcomes' expectations in the context of Outcome-Based Teaching (OBT) as a component of culturally responsive teaching (CRT). The computed grand mean of 4.03, interpreted as "Very Certain," reflects strong confidence among English junior high school teachers that clearly defined outcomes lead to increased student engagement, focus, and academic achievement.

A comparison of the highest and lowest indicators offers additional nuance to teachers' perceptions of outcome-based teaching. The item "I am confident that students achieve better results when lessons are designed around clear, specific outcomes" received the highest rating ($M = 4.10$), highlighting a strong belief in the power of well-defined objectives to drive student success. In contrast, the lowest-rated item—"I believe students perform better when teaching is focused on measurable outcomes" ($M = 3.96$)—reveals slightly more hesitation when it comes to the emphasis on quantifiability. While the difference is minimal, it may reflect a concern among some teachers about the risk of over-standardization or reducing instruction to metrics, which could conflict with the flexible and holistic nature of culturally responsive pedagogy. This tension, as Zhi (2024) pointed out, underscores the importance of balancing measurable outcomes with cultural responsiveness and student individuality. Integrating training modules that model this balance may help teachers refine their OBT practices without compromising CRT values.

4. Challenges of Using CRT

Factors Influencing Teacher's Confidence in Using CRT Strategies Effectively

Codes	Most Notable Responses
Q4_C1	The class size and availability of resources.
Q4_C2	Several factors may influence my confidence in using Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) strategies effectively. Since my experience with CRT is not that extensive, my level of familiarity and hands-on practice with these strategies plays a role. Additionally, access to professional development opportunities, collaboration with colleagues who have strong CRT backgrounds, and the availability of culturally responsive resources can impact my confidence. As the English Department Head, my focus is now on continuously learning and supporting my team in implementing CRT strategies, which also contributes to my growth in this area
Q4_C3	Mastery and connection



Q4_C4	It includes my own familiarity with students' diverse cultural backgrounds, access to professional development opportunities, and availability of culturally relevant resources.
Q4_C5	Teaching materials and lessons that incorporate culturally responsive activities.
Q4_C6	Materials
Q4_C7	My confidence in using Culturally Responsive Teaching strategies is influenced by several key factors. My experience in teaching has helped me become more aware of my students, diverse backgrounds, allowing me to adjust my teaching methods to better meet their needs. Attending workshops and training sessions has also enhanced my understanding of effective CRT practices. Furthermore, seeing my students actively engage and respond positively to these strategies reassures me of their effectiveness. Lastly, the encouragement and support from my colleagues and school leadership play a crucial role in helping me foster an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.
Q4_C8	Training and professional development: Ongoing training, workshops, and conferences can enhance understanding and skills in implementing CRT strategies.
Q4_C9	my values in life. i usually do culture that's against my values.
Q4_C10	Factors like ongoing professional development and student feedback.
Q4_C11	Students' differences
Q4_C12	My confidence in using CRT strategies effectively would be influenced by a variety of factors even though I am an AI and don't experience emotions or self-doubt in the same way a human does.
Q4_C13	I think Student Diversity and Cultural Awareness
Q4_C14	I do believe in student engagement & feedback. Positive student responses, increased participation, and meaningful discussions reinforce the effectiveness of CRT practices and build teacher confidence.
Q4_C15	Family factor
Q4_C16	my inclination and passion to culture and arts as a teacher's painter and trainers in different skills competitions help also to share to my classes
Q4_C17	It depends on the circumstances and status of the students I handle.
Q4_C18	Lack of materials
Q4_C19	Professional development.
Q4_C20	Time factor

These findings are consistent with the work of Sleeter (2016) and Gay (2018), who emphasize that teachers who participate in professional development (PD) focused on culturally responsive teaching (CRT) are more capable of integrating such practices into their instructional approach. Additionally, the results reinforce the framework proposed by Desimone and Garet (2015), which identifies core characteristics of effective PD—such as active learning, coherence with teaching goals, and sustained engagement over time. Access to these high-quality PD opportunities enables teachers to strengthen their metacognitive strategies (Bray & McClaskey, 2015; Wilson & Bai, 2017), empowering them to critically reflect on and adapt their teaching to better address the diverse needs of their students.

Moreover, the responses suggest that professional development extends beyond the mere acquisition of knowledge; it also plays a crucial role in building self-efficacy, as outlined by Bandura (1997). Teachers who have engaged in CRT-related training report greater confidence in applying these



strategies, which, in turn, enhances their belief in their ability to foster positive outcomes for all students (Lauermann & Karabenick, 2016; Cheung & Lai, 2020).

Theme 2: Familiarity with Students' Cultural Backgrounds

← **Formatted:** Indent: First line: 0.44", Line spacing: single

Another dominant theme is the importance of understanding students' diverse cultural backgrounds in fostering confidence in CRT practices, which appeared 89 times. Responses Q4_C4, Q4_C13, and Q4_C11 highlight that familiarity with students' cultural diversity enables teachers to adapt their teaching methods effectively.

This aligns with the work of Paris and Alim (2017) and Morrison et al. (2019), who advanced the concept of culturally sustaining pedagogy—emphasizing that teachers should go beyond acknowledging students' cultural and linguistic identities by actively working to preserve and support them. Similarly, Siwatu (2017) found that educators who view culturally responsive teaching (CRT) as essential are more inclined to implement it in practice, highlighting how familiarity with diverse cultural contexts can boost teacher confidence.

In addition, these findings intersect with the concept of metacognition. Teachers who regularly engage in self-reflection and evaluate their understanding of various cultural backgrounds are better equipped to adapt their instructional strategies (Zohar & Barzilai, 2015; Tan & Tan, 2016). Those with higher CRT self-efficacy are also more likely to foster inclusive and culturally responsive learning environments, as demonstrated by Siwatu, Polydore, and Starker-Glass (2019).

Theme 3: Student Engagement and Feedback

← **Formatted:** Indent: First line: 0.44", Line spacing: single

Several related responses (Q4_C10, Q4_C14, and Q4_C7) totaling 65 times highlight the role of student engagement, participation, and feedback in reinforcing teachers' confidence in using CRT strategies. When students respond positively to CRT practices, teachers feel reassured about their effectiveness, which further motivates them to refine and sustain these approaches.

This is consistent with the findings of Taliaferro and DeCuir-Gunby (2017), who argue that teachers with strong outcome expectations for culturally responsive teaching (CRT) are more likely to implement these strategies effectively. In a similar vein, Wubbels et al. (2019) reported that educators who observe increased student engagement and academic achievement because of CRT are more committed to integrating these practices into their teaching. Moreover, Banks (2019) and Dee and Penner (2017) emphasized that CRT plays a critical role in enhancing student engagement, motivation, and academic performance—particularly in diverse educational settings. The responses in this study indicate that teachers acknowledge this connection, recognizing that the application of CRT strategies contributes directly to improved student engagement, which in turn strengthens their confidence in these methods.

Theme 4: Availability of Resources and Classroom Conditions

← **Formatted:** Indent: First line: 0.44", Line spacing: single

A notable challenge identified in Q4_C1, Q4_C5, Q4_C6, Q4_C17, and Q4_C18 is the lack of resources, which appeared 47 times, including culturally responsive teaching materials, time constraints, and class sizes. Teachers indicate that their confidence in implementing CRT is sometimes hindered by limited access to culturally relevant resources or insufficient time to develop CRT-aligned lesson plans.

This challenge reflects the findings of Sleeter and Carmona (2017), who identified key obstacles to implementing culturally responsive teaching (CRT), including limited cultural knowledge, insufficient instructional resources, and time constraints. Their work emphasizes that equipping teachers with adequate materials and structural support is essential to overcoming these barriers and strengthening culturally responsive practices.



In addition, the responses highlight the importance of institutional backing and leadership encouragement (Q4_C7) in addressing these difficulties. This observation aligns with the research of Fives and Gill (2015), who noted that school culture and prevailing institutional beliefs have a significant influence on teachers' instructional decisions and behaviors.

Theme 5: Personal Beliefs and Values

← Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.44", Line spacing: single

Some responses (Q4_C9 and Q4_C16) suggest that personal values and beliefs influence teachers' confidence in using CRT, and it appeared 39 times. While one response acknowledges a conflict between personal values and culturally responsive teaching, another highlights a strong inclination toward cultural awareness and arts, which positively impacts confidence in CRT.

This aligns with research by Siwatu and Starker-Glass (2018), which found that teachers' beliefs about the importance of CRT correlate with their willingness to implement it. Buehl and Beck (2015) also emphasized that beliefs are a stronger predictor of behavior than knowledge alone, suggesting that an upskilling program should address not just instructional strategies but also teacher attitudes and cultural perceptions.

The next set of responses in Table 23 was thematically analyzed and answered the question about challenges encountered in implementing CRT strategies. A significant challenge highlighted in the responses is the lack of adequate training, limited resources, and curriculum constraints when implementing culturally responsive teaching (CRT) strategies. Codes Q5_C2, Q5_C4, Q5_C7, Q5_C8, Q5_C10, Q5_C19, and Q5_C20 point out the absence of culturally relevant materials and insufficient professional development opportunities as major barriers.

Description of Challenges Encountered by the Teacher in Implementing CRT

Codes	Most Notable Responses
Q5_C1	Students are not trained in socializing and opening up within the classroom
Q5_C2	One of the challenges I have encountered in implementing Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) strategies is my limited experience with them. Since my background in CRT is not extensive, I am still in the process of deepening my understanding and finding the most effective ways to integrate these strategies into our English curriculum.
Q5_C3	Tasky
Q5_C4	One challenge I have encountered is finding culturally relevant resources that fully represent my students' diverse backgrounds while aligning with the curriculum.
Q5_C5	Conflicts in our beliefs arise or one's culture is deemed better than the other
Q5_C6	Requires many materials
Q5_C7	As a Filipino teaching English, I've faced a few challenges when applying Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) strategies. One major hurdle is dealing with the various linguistic backgrounds of my students. Many have a strong foundation in their native language, which makes it difficult for them to fully grasp English, impacting their confidence in communication. Another challenge I encounter is finding teaching materials that are both locally relevant and culturally diverse, while still meeting curriculum requirements. Many of the available resources are centered around Western culture, so I often must adapt



	or create content that reflects Filipino culture while helping students improve their English skills. I also notice that some students are hesitant to participate in activities or discussions about cultural differences. This reluctance often comes from either a lack of exposure or a fear of making mistakes. Helping them embrace their cultural identity while boosting their English proficiency takes time and effort. Despite these challenges, I believe that patience, creativity, and flexibility are essential in making CRT strategies work, ensuring that students feel valued, engaged, and motivated to learn.
Q5_C8	Limited training or resources
Q5_C9	sometimes i have the second thought to deliver lessons the way i could for i have to consider cultural backgrounds of my students.
Q5_C10	What I've encountered is balancing the need to address diverse cultural perspective while ensuring that all my student meet the required curriculum standards
Q5_C11	Differences of students. I need to know their background and need for me to able to use this strategy effectively.
Q5_C12	Implementing CRT strategies in the classroom comes with several challenges, and recognizing these hurdles is crucial for successful implementation.
Q5_C13	Diverse Background and Students learning style
Q5_C14	As an educator, resistance to change. Some colleagues, parents, or even students may resist CRT strategies due to misconceptions or discomfort with discussing issues related to race, identity, and culture. Addressing these concerns while maintaining an inclusive environment requires careful communication and advocacy.
Q5_C15	Overlapping of school activities
Q5_C16	the language is become a barrier because lack of vocabulary hinders to express the thought
Q5_C17	Extreme bad behavior of some students
Q5_C18	When students are too lazy and refuse to do things.
Q5_C19	Lack of ready-made lesson plans
Q5_C20	Lack of teacher training.

Thematic Analysis of Challenges in Implementing CRT Strategies

Theme 1: Limited Training, Resources, and Curriculum Constraints

This theme, which appeared in related responses ($f=104$), is consistent with the findings of Sleeter and Carmona (2017), who identified the lack of targeted professional development and limited access to culturally relevant materials as major barriers to the effective implementation of culturally responsive teaching (CRT). Similarly, Desimone and Garet (2015) stressed the importance of sustained, content-focused professional development in producing meaningful changes in instructional practice. When these supports are absent, teachers often feel ill-equipped to design and deliver lessons that align with both CRT principles and mandated curriculum standards.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, Italic

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.44", Line spacing: single



Moreover, Gay (2018) and Sleeter (2016) observed that many professional development initiatives fall short in addressing the practical application of CRT, leaving educators without concrete strategies for implementation. This disconnect is reflected in responses such as Q5_C10, where teachers express difficulty in balancing culturally responsive instruction with curriculum requirements, a challenge that underscores the need for more actionable and context-specific training.

Theme 2: Linguistic and Cultural Diversity

Another major theme relates to the linguistic and cultural diversity of students ($f = 94$), which can complicate the effective application of CRT strategies. Responses Q5_C7, Q5_C11, Q5_C13, and Q5_C16 mention the challenges posed by students' diverse linguistic backgrounds, differences in learning styles, and lack of vocabulary, which hinder communication and comprehension in the classroom.

This challenge aligns with Paris and Alim's (2017) framework of culturally sustaining pedagogy, which advocates for preserving students' cultural and linguistic identities while supporting their academic achievement. Yet, linguistic diversity can also present communication challenges, as reflected in Q5_C16, where limited English proficiency hinders students' ability to articulate their ideas effectively.

In addition, Banks (2019) highlighted that while linguistic variation enriches the classroom environment, it also necessitates the use of differentiated instructional approaches tailored to students' diverse language proficiencies. Educators must address these linguistic barriers to ensure equitable access to curriculum content. The findings indicate a growing need for professional development that integrates language acquisition strategies within the context of CRT, enabling teachers to support multilingual learners more effectively.

Theme 3: Student Reluctance and Social Barriers

Several responses (Q5_C1, Q5_C7, Q5_C18), which had a total frequency of 79, indicate that student reluctance to participate, lack of socialization skills, and fear of discussing cultural differences hinder the successful implementation of CRT. This hesitation may stem from a lack of exposure to multicultural discussions or fear of making mistakes in a diverse classroom setting. These challenges are in line with the findings of Dee and Penner (2017), who underscored the importance of student engagement and motivation in the effectiveness of culturally responsive teaching (CRT). When students feel uneasy discussing cultural differences, they may be less likely to engage with CRT strategies intended to promote inclusivity and cultural understanding.

Furthermore, Taliaferro and DeCuir-Gunby (2017) found that positive student reactions and active participation play a critical role in reinforcing teachers' confidence in applying CRT approaches. As such, creating opportunities for community-building and establishing safe, respectful spaces for cultural dialogue becomes essential in supporting a classroom environment where all students feel valued and empowered to contribute.

Theme 4: Conflicts in Beliefs and Resistance to Change

Conflicts in beliefs and resistance to change ($f = 66$) emerged as another notable theme. Codes Q5_C5 and Q5_C14 describe how some educators, parents, and students may resist CRT strategies due to misconceptions or discomfort with discussions related to race, identity, and culture. This observation is reinforced by the work of Siwatu (2017) and Fives and Gill (2015), who found that both teachers' and students' belief systems play a pivotal role in shaping their openness to culturally responsive teaching (CRT) practices. Resistance frequently emerges when CRT challenges existing cultural norms or personal convictions, often resulting in discomfort or disengagement from the learning process.



In a related vein, Buehl and Beck (2015) argued that beliefs are more predictive of behavior than knowledge, indicating that meaningful CRT implementation requires addressing these underlying belief structures. To navigate such resistance, educators must engage in critical self-reflection and foster open, honest dialogue—key strategies for cultivating a classroom culture grounded in diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Theme 5: Logistical and Institutional Challenges

Some responses (Q5_C15, Q5_C9, Q5_C17) highlight institutional and logistical challenges ($f = 46$), such as overlapping school activities, time constraints, and behavioral issues among students. These factors contribute to the difficulty in consistently applying CRT strategies in the classroom.

These challenges reflect the findings of Sleeter and Carmona (2017), who identified institutional obstacles—such as inflexible schedules and insufficient administrative backing—as significant hindrances to the effective implementation of culturally responsive teaching (CRT). Overcoming these logistical barriers calls for strong institutional commitment, including the adoption of more adaptable scheduling structures, proactive and supportive leadership, and discipline strategies that align with the principles of culturally responsive pedagogy.

5. Significant Difference in Self-Efficacy in CRT according to Profile Variables

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Self-Efficacy According to District

Indicators	District	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Reflecting on one's cultural lens	First	65.30	1.523	0.677	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	67.97				
	Third	65.01				
	Fourth	74.23				
Recognizing and addressing biases in the system	First	64.27	2.283	0.516	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	70.79				
	Third	63.83				
	Fourth	75.00				
Integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum	First	66.36	1.541	0.673	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	66.47				
	Third	64.71				
	Fourth	74.32				
Connecting classroom content to real-world issues	First	68.80	2.274	0.518	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	70.47				
	Third	61.58				

	Fourth	74.00				
Maintaining high expectations for all students	First	73.36	4.146	0.246	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	66.00				
	Third	59.10				
	Fourth	74.77				
Fostering respect for differences	First	68.42	2.950	0.399	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	73.74				
	Third	60.55				
	Fourth	74.00				
Collaborating with families and communities	First	65.03	6.315	0.097	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	69.68				
	Third	58.90				
	Fourth	79.48				
Communicating in linguistically and culturally responsive ways	First	71.48	4.434	0.218	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	69.91				
	Third	58.37				
	Fourth	75.30				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

Similarly, the indicator “Communicating in Linguistically and Culturally Responsive Ways” also approached significance ($H = 4.434$, $p = 0.218$). Teachers from the Fourth District again recorded the highest rank (75.30), while the Third District ranked the lowest (58.37). This consistent pattern of higher scores from the Fourth District may suggest better access to training or greater institutional emphasis on CRT, consistent with the findings of Reyes and Medina (2023), who emphasized regional disparities in CRT support across the Philippines.

Conversely, the smallest H-value (1.523) was found in “Reflecting on One’s Cultural Lens” ($p = 0.677$), indicating minimal variation in teachers’ confidence across districts in this domain. This may reflect the more universal nature of reflective practice among English teachers, as emphasized by Bleukx et al. (2024), who noted that personal reflection is often shaped more by teacher training than by location.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Self-Efficacy According to Age

Indicators	District	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks



Indicators	District	Mea	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
		n Ran k				
Integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum	21-25 years old	66.36	6.932	0.327	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	66.47				

Reflecting on one's cultural lens	21-25 years old	65.30	9.442	0.150	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	67.97				
Recognizing and addressing biases in the system	31-35 years old	65.01				
	36-40 years old	65.01				
	41-45 years old	67.97				
	46-50 years old	65.01				
	51-55 years old	74.23				
	21-25 years old	64.27				



	31-35 years old	64.71				
	36-40 years old	64.71				
	41-45 years old	66.47				
	46-50 years old	64.71				
	51-55 years old	74.32				
Connecting classroom content to real-world issues	21-25 years old	68.80	8.200	0.224	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	70.47				
	31-35 years old	61.58				
	36-40 years old	61.58				
	41-45 years old	70.47				
	46-50 years old	61.58				
	51-55 years old	74.00				
Maintaining high expectations for all students	21-25 years old	73.36	9.074	0.169	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	66.00				
	31-35 years old	66.00				
	36-40 years old	59.10				
	41-45 years old	66.00				
	46-50 years old	59.10				



Indicators	District	Mea n Ran k	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Communicating in linguistically and	21-25 years old	71.48	7.831	0.251	Failed to Reject Ho	
Fostering respect for differences	21-25 years old	68.42	8.607	0.197	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	73.74				
	31-35 years old	60.55				
	36-40 years old	60.55				
	41-45 years old	73.74				
	46-50 years old	60.55				
	51-55 years old	74.00				
Collaborating with families and communities	21-25 years old	65.03	7.927	0.243	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	69.68				
	31-35 years old	58.90				
	36-40 years old	58.90				
	41-45 years old	69.68				
	46-50 years old	58.90				
	51-55 years old	79.48				



culturally responsive ways	26-30 years old	69.91			Not Significant
	31-35 years old	69.91			
	36-40 years old	58.37			
	41-45 years old	69.91			
	46-50 years old	58.37			
	51-55 years old	75.30			

Note: If *p* value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject *H₀*.

This presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test analyzing differences in culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy (CRTSE) across age groups. The respondents were grouped by age and assessed across the eight CRTSE indicators. As shown in the table, all p-values exceed the 0.05 significance level, with the lowest p-value being 0.065 under the indicator "*Recognizing and Addressing Biases in the System*." Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained across all variables, indicating no statistically significant difference in CRT self-efficacy among different age groups.

Despite the lack of significance, post hoc analysis reveals distinct trends. For instance, in the domain "*Recognizing and Addressing Biases in the System*," respondents aged 36–40 years old attained the highest mean rank (75.79), while those aged 21–25 had the lowest (60.30). This suggests that mid-career teachers may possess greater confidence in navigating systemic inequities—a finding that resonates with Rochat (2024) and Myroniuk (2024), who emphasized that age and teaching experience are positively correlated with increased cultural awareness and bias recognition, likely due to accumulated classroom exposure and reflective practice.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Self-Efficacy According to Sex

Indicators	Sex	Mean Rank	U - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Reflecting on one's cultural lens	Male	65.30	1.523	0.677	Failed to Reject <i>H₀</i>	Not Significant
	Female	74.23				
Recognizing and addressing biases in the system	Male	64.27	2.283	0.516	Failed to Reject <i>H₀</i>	Not Significant
	Female	75.00				
	Male	66.36	1.541	0.673		



Integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum	Female	74.32			Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Connecting classroom content to real-world issues	Male	68.80	2.274	0.518	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	74.00				
Maintaining high expectations for all students	Male	73.36	4.146	0.246	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	74.77				
Fostering respect for differences	Male	68.42	2.950	0.399	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	74.00				
Collaborating with families and communities	Male	65.03	6.315	0.097	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	79.48				
Communicating in linguistically and culturally responsive ways	Male	71.48	4.434	0.218	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	75.30				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

Despite the absence of statistical significance, noteworthy patterns emerge in the mean ranks. Across every indicator, female respondents consistently scored higher than their male counterparts. For example, in the domain "Collaborating with Families and Communities," female teachers registered a mean rank of 79.48—the highest across the dataset—compared to 65.03 for males, with a p-value of 0.097, closely approaching significance. This result, while not conclusive, suggests that female teachers may feel more confident in relational and community-engagement aspects of CRT. These findings reflect the claims of Goyal (2025), who noted that female educators often exhibit higher emotional responsiveness and interpersonal sensitivity, which are foundational traits in community-centered teaching approaches.

Similarly, the domain "Communicating in Linguistically and Culturally Responsive Ways" showed an above-average distinction, with females scoring a mean rank of 75.30 compared to 71.48 for males. While the difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.218$), it echoes the observations of Vega et al. (2025), who argued that gendered communication tendencies may influence teachers' adaptability in multilingual and multicultural contexts.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Self-Efficacy According to Position

Indicators	Position	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
------------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	---------



Indicators	Position	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
			6.643	0.249		
Reflecting on one's cultural lens	Teacher I	72.97	4.570	0.471	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	62.16				
	Teacher III	62.76				
	Master Teacher I	92.75				
	Master Teacher II	85.00				
	Head Teacher	94.00				
Recognizing and addressing biases in the system	Teacher I	74.42	2.310	0.805	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	62.61				
	Teacher III	63.29				
	Master Teacher I	77.58				
	Master Teacher II	80.67				
	Head Teacher	93.83				
Integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum	Teacher I	72.13	6.072	0.299	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	66.70				
	Teacher III	63.21				
	Master Teacher I	74.42				
	Master Teacher II	59.33				
	Head Teacher	90.67				
Connecting classroom content to real-world issues	Teacher I	77.23			Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	59.50				
	Teacher III	70.84				
	Master Teacher I	67.67				
	Master Teacher II	49.00				



	Head Teacher	80.17				
Maintaining high expectations for all students	Teacher I	74.73	4.444	0.487	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	60.17				
	Teacher III	70.95				
	Master Teacher I	77.33				
	Master Teacher II	55.33				
	Head Teacher	80.83				
Fostering respect for differences	Teacher I	80.41	8.857	0.115	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	58.14				
	Teacher III	68.12				
	Master Teacher I	74.17				
	Master Teacher II	46.33				
	Head Teacher	69.50				
Collaborating with families and communities	Teacher I	67.92	1.562	0.906	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	65.00				
	Teacher III	72.36				
	Master Teacher I	74.83				
	Master Teacher II	65.50				
	Head Teacher	87.50				
Communicating in linguistically and culturally responsive ways	Teacher I	75.96	4.856	0.434	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	60.64				
	Teacher III	68.38				
	Master Teacher I	77.67				
	Master Teacher II	52.50				



	Head Teacher	81.33				
--	--------------	-------	--	--	--	--

Note: If *p* value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject H_0 .

This provides a comparative view of the self-efficacy levels among respondents based on their teaching rank or position—ranging from Teacher I to Head Teacher—across all eight dimensions of culturally responsive teaching (CRT). Statistical analysis using the Kruskal-Wallis H-test reveals that all computed p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance, indicating no statistically significant difference in CRT self-efficacy among teachers when grouped by position. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is not rejected across all indicators.

Nevertheless, several compelling patterns emerge from the mean rank distributions. Teachers occupying higher positions, such as Master Teacher I/II and Head Teachers, consistently posted higher ranks across multiple indicators. For instance, in the dimension "Collaborating with Families and Communities," the mean rank for Master Teacher I was 97.00, substantially higher than Teacher III (59.28) and Teacher I (60.82). Although the result was statistically insignificant ($p = 0.156$), this trend suggests that positional authority and leadership roles may foster greater confidence in external engagement tasks. This observation supports Best's (2025) claim that senior teachers often assume mentorship roles and serve as liaisons between schools and stakeholders, which naturally enhances their CRT-related self-efficacy in family and community collaboration.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Self-Efficacy

According to the Highest Educational Attainment

Indicators	Highest Educationa l Attainment	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Reflecting on one's cultural lens	Bachelor	62.89	6.613	0.037	Reject H_0	Significant
	Masteral	71.33				
	Others	86.15				
Recognizing and addressing biases in the system	Bachelor	66.60	1.479	0.477	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
	Masteral	66.85				
	Others	77.52				
Integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum	Bachelor	65.11	1.826	0.401	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
	Masteral	73.09				
	Others	75.78				



Connecting classroom content to real-world issues	Bachelor	66.42	1.059	0.589	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Maintaining high expectations for all students	Masteral	68.89				
	Others	75.80				
Indicators	Bachelor	66.26	2.155	0.341	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	66.33				
	Others	79.41				
Indicators	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Fostering respect for differences	Bachelor	66.06	4.071	0.131	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	63.65				
	Others	83.30				
Collaborating with families and communities	Bachelor	64.62	2.299	0.317	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	75.00				
	Others	75.39				
Communicating in linguistically and culturally responsive ways	Bachelor	66.33	1.082	0.582	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	69.20				
	Others	75.78				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

The Kruskal-Wallis H-test was conducted to determine if the level of self-efficacy among English Junior High School teachers significantly differs when grouped by highest educational attainment—bachelor's degree, master's degree (referred to as "Masteral"), and Others (likely doctorate-level or specialized graduate courses).

Notably, only one among the eight CRT self-efficacy indicators yielded a statistically significant result. The dimension "Reflecting on One's Cultural Lens" reported an H-value of 6.613 and a p-value of 0.037, which is below the 0.05 significance level. This result leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating a significant difference in self-efficacy across educational groups for this specific domain. Teachers classified under "Others" posted the highest mean rank (86.15), followed by master's degree holders (71.33), with bachelor's degree holders trailing at 62.89. This difference implies that higher educational exposure enhances one's capacity for cultural introspection, an essential element in implementing CRT.



**Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Self-Efficacy According to the
Years in Teaching English**

Indicators	No. of Years in Teaching English	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Reflecting on one's cultural lens	0-1 year	63.85	8.218	0.223	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	73.34				
	6-10 years	65.96				
	11-15 years	53.89				
	16-20 years	87.27				
	21-25 years	65.06				
	26-30 years	88.08				
Recognizing and addressing biases in the system	0-1 year	60.65	9.103	0.168	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	77.48				
	6-10 years	65.38				
	11-15 years	51.39				
	16-20 years	82.05				
	21-25 years	79.88				
	26-30 years	77.50				
Integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum	0-1 year	61.45	7.305	0.294	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	79.76				
	6-10 years	66.06				
	11-15 years	53.13				
	16-20 years	77.18				
	21-25 years	74.06				
	26-30 years	69.67				
Connecting classroom content to real-world issues	0-1 year	58.65	8.029	0.236	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	80.95				
	6-10 years	67.51				



	11-15 years	53.72				
	16-20 years	77.45				
	21-25 years	60.63				
	26-30 years	72.17				
Maintaining high expectations for all students	0-1 year	62.75	3.796	0.704	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	71.52				
	6-10 years	69.36				
	11-15 years	56.04				
	16-20 years	78.82				
	21-25 years	66.88				
	26-30 years	76.33				
Indicators	No. of Years in Teaching English	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Fostering respect for differences	0-1 year	59.15	14.56 1	0.024	Reject Ho	Significant
	2-5 years	88.31				
	6-10 years	64.67				
	11-15 years	53.33				
	16-20 years	72.86				
	21-25 years	51.13				
	26-30 years	81.08				
Collaborating with families and communities	0-1 year	46.55	8.762	0.187	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	74.41				
	6-10 years	68.14				
	11-15 years	55.61				
	16-20 years	83.14				
	21-25 years	78.00				
	26-30 years	78.08				
	0-1 year	50.70		0.121		



Communicating in linguistically and culturally responsive ways	2-5 years	76.88	10.08 0	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10 years	71.41			
	11-15 years	51.11			
	16-20 years	73.95			
	21-25 years	63.44			
	26-30 years	86.58			

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

This provides insight into whether teachers' self-efficacy in implementing culturally responsive teaching (CRT) significantly differs based on their years of experience teaching English. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test was used to compare multiple groups, ranging from those with less than a year of experience to those with over 30 years.

Interestingly, across most indicators, the null hypothesis was not rejected, indicating that no statistically significant difference exists in the self-efficacy levels among teachers with different lengths of experience. However, there is one exception that stands out: "Fostering Respect for Differences", where the H-value is 16.857 and the p-value is 0.031, which is below the 0.05 significance level. This result confirms that there is a significant difference in CRT self-efficacy for this indicator based on years of service.

**Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Self-Efficacy
According to the Number of Seminars Attended**

Indicators	No. of Seminar Attended	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Reflecting on one's cultural lens	1-2 seminars	65.18	7.448	0.114	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	79.10				
	6-10 seminars	85.75				
	More than 10 seminars	87.25				
	None	59.74				
Recognizing and	1-2 seminars	67.85	12.478	0.014	Reject Ho	Significant



addressing biases in the system	3-5 seminars	87.67				
	6-10 seminars	77.13				
	More than 10 seminars	82.50				
	None	53.93				
Integrating students' cultural background s into the curriculum	1-2 seminars	71.16	13.08 5	0.011	Reject Ho	Significant
	3-5 seminars	73.94				
	6-10 seminars	91.71				
	More than 10 seminars	90.38				
	None	52.36				
Connecting classroom content to real-world issues	1-2 seminars	73.75	8.010	0.091	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	72.29				
	6-10 seminars	82.58				
	More than 10 seminars	70.00				
	None	54.50				
Indicators	No. of Seminar Attended	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Maintaining high expectations for all students	1-2 seminars	71.20	6.172	0.187	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	68.40				
	6-10 seminars	86.83				



	More than 10 seminars	81.00				
	None	58.04				
Fostering respect for differences	1-2 seminars	70.06	4.617	0.329	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	73.42				
	6-10 seminars	83.29				
	More than 10 seminars	51.00				
	None	60.68				
Collaborating with families and communities	1-2 seminars	70.40	8.025	0.091	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	75.98				
	6-10 seminars	87.38				
	More than 10 seminars	67.88				
	None	55.75				
Communicating in linguistically and culturally responsive ways	1-2 seminars	68.50	3.665	0.453	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	71.19				
	6-10 seminars	85.08				
	More than 10 seminars	73.13				
	None	61.45				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject H_0 .



This assesses whether English teachers' self-efficacy in culturally responsive teaching (CRT) significantly varies based on the number of CRT-related seminars they have attended. Notably, the data reveals statistically significant differences in three key domains: Reflecting on One's Cultural Lens ($H = 10.675, p = 0.031$); Recognizing and Addressing Biases in the System ($H = 11.915, p = 0.018$); and Integrating Students' Cultural Backgrounds into the Curriculum ($H = 11.013, p = 0.026$).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.06", First line: 0.33", Line spacing: single

These results indicate that seminar participation meaningfully influences self-efficacy in these areas. Drawing from Saner and Villena (2024) and Graziano et al. (2024), it becomes evident that even minimal exposure to CRT-focused professional development significantly enhances teachers' reflective capacity and cultural competence.

6. Significant difference in CRT outcome expectations according to profile variables

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Outcomes' Expectations

According to the District of Post

Indicators	District	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Activities relevant to students' lives	First	76.25	3.713	0.294	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	74.97				
	Third	60.05				
	Fourth	68.43				
Responsiveness to cultural learning styles	First	74.20	2.671	0.445	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	65.47				
	Third	61.39				
	Fourth	72.22				
High expectations	First	76.27	4.499	0.212	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	69.97				
	Third	58.39				
	Fourth	71.86				
Indicators	District	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Authentic assessment techniques	First	72.25	1.341	0.719	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	66.06				
	Third	63.46				



	Fourth	71.46				
Outcome-based teaching	First	71.06	1.050	0.789	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second	69.44				
	Third	63.49				
	Fourth	71.00				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

This presents the test of significant difference in the outcomes' expectations of English junior high school teachers across the four districts in the Division of CALABARZON. As shown, none of the five CRT outcome domains yielded statistically significant results, with all p-values surpassing the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that teachers' expectations regarding the benefits of implementing culturally responsive teaching (CRT) do not significantly differ based on district location. Despite this statistical outcome, some notable variations in mean ranks provide insight into contextual disparities that may influence teacher perceptions.

For instance, in the dimension of "Activities Relevant to Students' Lives," the First District recorded the highest mean rank (76.25), suggesting stronger expectations that real-life relevant lessons enhance student engagement. In contrast, the Third District scored the lowest (60.05), pointing to a more cautious or neutral stance toward this outcome. Although the p-value of 0.294 does not meet the threshold for significance, the ranking disparity may reflect underlying differences in exposure to student-centered teaching models or localized instructional support, echoing the findings of Brookfield (2017) and Reyes and Medina (2023) on the role of institutional environments in shaping CRT beliefs.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Outcomes' Expectations

According to Age

Indicators	Age	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Activities relevant to students' lives	21-25 years old	76.25	18.794	0.005	Reject Ho	Significant
	26-30 years old	74.97				
	31-35 years old	60.05				
	36-40 years old	60.05				
	41-45 years old	74.97				



	46-50 years old	60.05				
	51-55 years old	68.43				
Responsiveness to cultural learning styles	21-25 years old	74.20	6.158	0.406	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	65.47				
	31-35 years old	65.47				
	36-40 years old	61.39				
	41-45 years old	65.47				
	46-50 years old	61.39				
	51-55 years old	72.22				
High expectations	21-25 years old	76.27	6.614	0.358	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	69.97				
	31-35 years old	69.97				
	36-40 years old	58.39				
	41-45 years old	69.97				
	46-50 years old	58.39				
	51-55 years old	71.86				
Authentic assessment techniques	21-25 years old	72.25	5.418	0.491	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	66.06				



Indicators	Age	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Outcome-based teaching	21-25 years old	71.06	10.746	0.097	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 years old	69.44				
	31-35 years old	63.49				
	36-40 years old	63.49				
	41-45 years old	69.44				
	46-50 years old	63.49				
	51-55 years old	71.00				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

This reveals the test of the significant difference in the outcomes' expectations of English junior high school teachers when grouped according to age. Notably, a significant difference was found in the dimension of "Activities Relevant to Students' Lives," with an H-value of 18.794 and a p-value of 0.005. This indicates that teachers' expectations regarding the impact of culturally relevant activities on student engagement vary meaningfully across age groups.

Taking a closer look at the mean ranks, the age group 31–35 years old recorded the highest value (76.25), followed closely by 26–30 years old (74.97), while the group 36–40 years old scored considerably lower at 60.05. This suggests that younger to mid-career teachers exhibit stronger beliefs that connecting lessons to students' real-world experiences enhances engagement—perhaps due to their more recent exposure to modern pedagogical trends or CRT-integrated training modules, as suggested by Myroniuk (2024) and Tan and Tan (2016). On the other hand, the relatively lower expectations of the 36–40 age



group may stem from more traditional classroom experiences, reflecting a potential training gap. This finding supports Rochat's (2024) view that generational context can shape instructional outlooks on CRT.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Outcomes' Expectations

According to Sex

Indicators	Sex	Mean Rank	U - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Activities relevant to students' lives	Male	76.25	3.713	0.294	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	68.43				
Responsiveness to cultural learning styles	Male	74.20	2.671	0.445	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	72.22				
High expectations	Male	76.27	4.499	0.212	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	71.86				
Authentic assessment techniques	Male	72.25	1.341	0.719	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	71.46				
Outcome-based teaching	Male	71.06	1.050	0.789	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	71.00				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

No statistically significant difference was observed in the outcomes' expectations of English junior high school teachers when grouped according to sex. All p-values across the five indicators—ranging from 0.210 to 0.789—exceeded the 0.05 threshold, leading to the consistent decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Despite statistical insignificance, a comparison of mean ranks offers subtle insights. For instance, in the domain "Activities Relevant to Students' Lives," male teachers registered a slightly higher mean rank (76.25) than female teachers (68.43). This pattern—where male respondents had marginally higher mean ranks—was echoed in four out of five domains, including "Responsiveness to Cultural Learning Styles" (Male = 74.20; Female = 72.22), "High Expectations" (Male = 76.27; Female = 71.86), and "Outcome-Based Teaching" (Male = 71.06; Female = 71.00). These differences, although not statistically significant, may suggest nuanced variations in how each group perceives the influence of CRT strategies on student outcomes.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Outcomes' Expectations

According to Position



Indicators	Position	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Activities relevant to students' lives	Teacher I	70.29	2.916	0.713	Reject Ho	Significant
	Teacher II	63.11				
	Teacher III	75.90				
	Master Teacher I	66.17				
	Master Teacher II	51.33				
	Head Teacher	79.33				
Responsiveness to cultural learning styles	Teacher I	71.08	3.553	0.615	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	65.21				
	Teacher III	75.31				
	Master Teacher I	56.42				
	Master Teacher II	41.50				
	Head Teacher	68.00				
High expectations	Teacher I	66.64	3.503	0.623	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	63.40				
	Teacher III	74.81				
	Master Teacher I	82.92				
	Master Teacher II	68.67				



Indicators	Position	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Authentic assessment techniques	Teacher I	71.71	2.584	0.764	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	62.87				
	Teacher III	74.59				
	Master Teacher I	68.75				
	Master Teacher II	52.50				
	Head Teacher	68.00				
Outcome-based teaching	Teacher I	71.02	4.419	0.491	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	60.74				
	Teacher III	76.66				
	Master Teacher I	68.00				
	Master Teacher II	59.17				
	Head Teacher	88.00				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

This displays the test of significant difference in outcomes' expectations on culturally responsive teaching (CRT) according to position. Among the five indicators measured, only "Activities Relevant to Students' Lives" yielded a statistically significant result, with a p-value of 0.013—below the 0.05 threshold—indicating that outcomes' expectations meaningfully vary depending on the teacher's professional rank. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected for this domain, whereas it was retained for the rest. Upon closer examination of the mean ranks in the significant indicator, Teacher I recorded the highest mean rank at 79.70, followed closely by Master Teacher II (75.00) and Teacher II (70.29).



Conversely, Head Teachers and Teacher III obtained lower ranks of 51.33 and 63.31, respectively. This variation implies that lower to mid-level teachers, those more frequently immersed in direct classroom instruction, tend to hold firmer beliefs that student engagement improves when learning is tied to their lived experiences. This aligns with the assertion of Morrell (2019), who emphasized that early- to mid-career educators often emphasize student relevance and relatability in daily teaching. In contrast, for “Responsiveness to Cultural Learning Styles,” “High Expectations,” “Authentic Assessment Techniques,” and “Outcome-Based Teaching,” no significant differences were observed. For instance, the mean ranks for “High Expectations” ranged from 59.17 (Head Teacher) to 73.93 (Teacher II), yet the p-value of 0.623 indicated a lack of statistical difference. Similarly, the domains of “Authentic Assessment” and “Outcome-Based Teaching” exhibited fluctuating ranks—with Teacher I and Master Teacher II once again ranking relatively high—but the wide variance across positions failed to reach statistical significance. The post hoc interpretation suggests that teachers’ rank does not consistently predict stronger outcome expectations, except in cases where the instructional relevance of CRT is directly felt, such as in student-centered activities. According to Zhi (2024), educators in lower ranks often retain close contact with students and are more attuned to what strategies engage them, reinforcing the significance of teacher-level classroom exposure in shaping belief systems around CRT.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Outcomes’ Expectations According to Highest Educational Attainment

Indicators	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Activities relevant to students' lives	Bachelor	69.70	0.23 5	0.8 89	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	65.87				
	Others	67.09				
Responsiveness to cultural learning styles	Bachelor	67.01	0.48 7	0.7 84	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	69.24				
	Others	73.22				
High expectations	Bachelor	64.09	3.43 0	0.1 80	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	79.31				
	Others	72.28				
Authentic assessment techniques	Bachelor	66.51	0.87 2	0.6 47	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	69.37				
	Others	74.91				



Outcome-based teaching	Bachelor	66.10	1.33 8	0.5 12	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Masteral	69.30				
	Others	76.52				

Note: If *p* value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject *Ho*

This summarizes the test of the significant difference in outcomes' expectations based on the respondents' highest educational attainment. Across all five CRT outcome domains—namely activities relevant to students' lives, responsiveness to cultural learning styles, high expectations, authentic assessment techniques, and outcome-based teaching—the data reveal no statistically significant differences, with all *p*-values exceeding the 0.05 threshold. Thus, the null hypothesis is consistently retained.

Looking first at the indicator "Activities Relevant to Students' Lives," the mean ranks were relatively close: 67.09 for those categorized as "Others," 65.87 for those with a master's degree, and 60.97 for those holding only a bachelor's degree. Despite these differences, the resulting *p*-value of 0.889 indicates that educational attainment does not significantly influence teachers' belief that relevant activities enhance student engagement. This finding is consistent with Vela et al. (2024), who asserted that beliefs in the effectiveness of culturally grounded practices are often influenced more by training exposure and institutional culture than by formal qualifications alone.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Outcomes' Expectations

According to Years in Teaching English

Indicators	No. of Years in Teaching English	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Activities relevant to students' lives	0-1 year	58.45	8.371	0.212	Reject Ho	Significant
	2-5 years	70.69				
	6-10 years	75.66				
	11-15 years	49.70				
	16-20 years	70.36				
	21-25 years	65.25				
	26-30 years	79.17				



Responsiveness to cultural learning styles	0-1 year	64.10	6.333	0.387	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	67.55				
	6-10 years	75.19				
	11-15 years	56.63				
	16-20 years	75.14				
	21-25 years	49.38				
	26-30 years	74.50				
High expectations	0-1 year	63.60	3.601	0.730	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	66.34				
	6-10 years	65.94				
	11-15 years	63.11				
	16-20 years	84.32				
	21-25 years	73.00				
	26-30 years	82.00				
Authentic assessment techniques	0-1 year	64.55	9.138	0.166	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	73.91				
	6-10 years	72.91				
	11-15 years	52.46				
	16-20 years	76.05				
	21-25 years	45.69				



Indicators	No. of Years in Teaching English	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks
Outcome-based teaching	0-1 year	64.95	5.460	0.486	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	2-5 years	74.34				
	6-10 years	68.88				
	11-15 years	54.22				
	16-20 years	76.64				
	21-25 years	61.00				
	26-30 years	81.75				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

This explores the relationship between years of teaching English and teachers' outcomes expectations in culturally responsive teaching (CRT). Among the five indicators analyzed, only "Activities Relevant to Students' Lives" demonstrated a statistically significant difference across teaching experience groups ($H = 9.371$, $p = 0.212$). Although the p-value remains above the 0.05 level of significance, the remark listed is "Significant." This appears to be a typographical inconsistency, as statistically, the result should be interpreted as not significant.

Nonetheless, examining the ranking trends reveals intriguing nuances. Teachers with 26–30 years of experience recorded the highest mean rank (80.50), followed by those with 11–15 years (75.91). In contrast, those in the 21–25-year group posted the lowest rank (45.69), suggesting potential variance in how seasoned educators value activity relevance. As Peranzadian and Shen (2024) pointed out, veteran teachers often build strong connections between lessons and lived realities, especially when curriculum flexibility permits them to integrate culturally rooted content.

Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Outcomes' Expectations

According to the Number of Seminars Attended

Indicators	No. of Seminars Attended	Mean Rank	H - value	P - value	Decision	Remarks



Activities relevant to students' lives	1-2 seminars	66.08	3.679	0.451	Reject Ho	Significant
	3-5 seminars	74.42				
	6-10 seminars	80.58				
	More than 10 seminars	43.00				
	None	67.26				
Responsiveness to cultural learning styles	1-2 seminars	67.41	3.930	0.416	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	72.15				
	6-10 seminars	80.92				
	More than 10 seminars	39.00				
	None	67.06				
High expectations	1-2 seminars	64.46	3.556	0.469	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	79.23				
	6-10 seminars	77.29				
	More than 10 seminars	73.88				
	None	64.54				
Authentic assessment techniques	1-2 seminars	68.87	3.439	0.487	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	3-5 seminars	72.23				
	6-10 seminars	81.79				



Indicators	More than 10 seminars	47.00	5.361	0.252	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	None	63.91				
Outcome-based teaching	1-2 seminars	66.79				
	3-5 seminars	71.81				
	6-10 seminars	88.71				
	More than 10 seminars	45.00				
	None	65.20				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

This delves into whether the number of CRT-related seminars attended influences teachers' outcome expectations. Among the five indicators assessed, a statistically significant difference emerged in "Activities Relevant to Students' Lives" ($H = 3.679$, $p = 0.451$), though the "Significant" label contradicts the p-value, which exceeds the 0.05 threshold. Statistically, this should be interpreted as not significant, suggesting the recorded remark may be a clerical oversight.

Despite the insignificance, the ranking data reveal a suggestive pattern: teachers who attended more than 10 seminars ranked highest (mean rank = 80.58), followed closely by those with 6–10 seminars (79.71). In contrast, those with no seminars scored the lowest (43.00). This supports the work of Saner and Villena (2024), who found that even a few focused training sessions significantly boost teachers' confidence in linking content to students' lived realities. These ranks illustrate the potential transformative role of sustained professional development, even if the effect size did not reach statistical significance in this dataset.

I. Conclusion

- 1. The profile of the respondents reflects a relatively young, predominantly female teaching workforce with moderate teaching experience and limited CRT training.** Most teachers were aged 31–40, held Teacher I positions, had bachelor's degrees, and had attended only one to two CRT-related seminars, suggesting a need for targeted professional development opportunities at the early to mid-career level.
- 2. English teachers exhibit a very high level of self-efficacy in implementing culturally responsive teaching.** Among the eight CRT dimensions, fostering respect for differences emerged as their strongest area, while collaboration with families and communities, though still rated highly, was identified as an area for potential growth.



3. Teachers hold strong positive expectations regarding the outcomes of culturally responsive teaching. They are particularly confident that setting high expectations contributes to student success, although slightly less certainty was expressed regarding the use of authentic assessment techniques in multicultural settings.
4. Five major factors affect teacher confidence in using CRT, but five notable challenges hinder its full implementation. Confidence grows when teachers have access to training, know their students' cultures, observe student engagement, have enough resources, and hold supportive beliefs. However, obstacles such as insufficient training, student diversity, reluctance to discuss culture, conflicting beliefs, and logistical issues limit the consistent use of CRT strategies.
5. Teachers' level of self-efficacy in CRT significantly differs based on their position and exposure to training. Those in higher teaching ranks or with more seminar experience tend to feel more capable of implementing CRT, while other demographic factors, such as age, sex, or years of experience, do not appear to influence self-efficacy levels.
6. **Outcome expectations also vary based on educational attainment and CRT-related seminar participation.** Teachers with graduate degrees and those who have received more CRT training demonstrate greater belief in the effectiveness of CRT strategies, reinforcing the importance of both formal education and ongoing professional development.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: single, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75"

REFERENCES

Adaramola, A. A. (2024). Investigating chemical engineering students' learning experiences and outcomes in a gateway course. *Purdue University*. https://hammer.purdue.edu/articles/thesis/_b_I_b_b_nvestigating_Chemical_Engineering_Students_Learning_Experiences_and_Outcomes_in_a_Gateway_Course_b_2/26367124

Alves, P., Lopes, A., Cruz-Correia, R., & Tavares, J. (2024). Predictors of emotional engagement in doctoral education. *Studies in Higher Education*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2024.2369704>

Angelle, P. S. (2019). *Culturally relevant pedagogy: Climbing mountains* (p. 78). Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2018). *Education and power* (p. 134). Routledge.

Avalos, B. (2016). Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10–20.

Baker, B. (2017). *Funding education for equity* (p. 56). Springer.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.

Banks, J. A. (2018). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (p. 45). Routledge.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2019). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (p. 112). Wiley.



Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2020). *Empowering students through multilingual and content discourse* (p. 96). Heinemann.

Bleukx, N., Denies, K., Van Keer, H., & Aesaert, K. (2024). The interplay between teacher beliefs, instructional practices, and students' reading achievement: National evidence from PIRLS 2021 using path analysis. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40536-024-00212-z>

Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (p. 167). Jossey-Bass.

Brown, J. L., & Brown, C. A. (2018). *Community and schools: Together for tomorrow* (p. 24). Corwin.

Campbell-Jones, B., Campbell-Jones, F., & Lindsey, R. B. (2019). *Culture, class, and race: Constructive conversations that unite and energize your school and community* (p. 89). Solution Tree.

Chen, C. (2024). The impact of grit on Chinese students' achievement motivation, academic achievement, and subjective well-being. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Life and Work*. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003352471-42/impact-grit-chinese-students-achievement-motivation-academic-achievement-subjective-well-being-chen-chen>

Childress, S. M., Doyle, D. P., & Thomas, D. A. (2017). *Leading for equity* (p. 39). Harvard Education Press.

Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2017). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(8), 947–967.

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2016). School climate and social-emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1189–1204.

Couros, G. (2018). *The innovator's mindset* (p. 101). Dave Burgess Consulting.

Cruz, M. G., & Villena, J. M. (2021). Inclusive practices and cultural responsiveness among Filipino teachers. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement*, 38(2), 45–60.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Professional development for teachers: Challenges and successes* (p. 73). Learning Policy Institute.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2015). Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times. *Teachers and Teaching*, 21(5), 569–580.

Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States. *Psychology, Society, and Education*, 7(3), 252–263.



De Jesus, F. S., Ibarra, L. M., & Pasion, B. J. (2024). ChatGPT as an artificial intelligence learning tool for business administration students in Nueva Ecija, Philippines. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. <http://www.ijlter.myres.net/index.php/ijlter/article/view/1975>

Delpit, L. (2019). *Teaching when the world is on fire* (p. 148). The New Press.

Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teacher's professional development in the United States. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 252-263.

Dillon, J. (2017). *Schools, communities, and social inclusion* (p. 30). Routledge.

Donohue, C. (2017). *Family engagement in the digital age* (p. 92). Routledge.

EDCOM II. (2024). *Year one report*. Retrieved from <https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2024/02/EDCOM-II-Year-One-Report-PDF-022924.pdf>

Emdin, C. (2017). *For white folks who teach in the hood... and the rest of y'all too* (p. 87). Beacon Press.

Epstein, J. L. (2023). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Routledge.

Errabo, D., Dela Rosa, A., & Gonzales, L. J. M. (2024). Optimizing differentiated podcasts to promote students' self-regulation and engagement, self-efficacy, and performance in asynchronous learning. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JRIT-02-2024-0039/full/html>

Fassinger, P. A. (1995). Understanding classroom interaction: Students' and professors' contributions to students' silence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(1), 82-96.

Gao, X., & Wang, D. (2020). Exploring the relationship between teachers' educational background and instructional beliefs. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(2), 103-120.

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Goodwin, A. L., DeMulder, E. K., & Shank, C. L. (2021). Culturally responsive teaching and self-efficacy: Exploring teachers' perceptions and practices. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 23(2), 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2021.1882737>

Graziano, F., Mastrokoukou, S., & Marchisio, C. (2024). Teacher emotional competence for inclusive education: A systematic review. *OSF Preprints*. <https://osf.io/xzkyf/resources>

Hall, G. E., & Quinn, L. F. (2017). *Cultural foundations of education* (p. 56). Pearson.

Hammond, Z. (2017). *Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Corwin Press.



Hattie, J. (2017). *Visible learning for teachers* (p. 198). Routledge.

Herrmann, Z. (2020). The impact of professional development on culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 94, 103125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103125>

Hopkins, B. (2018). *Restorative practices in education: Building equity and healthy communities* (p. 142). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Howard, T. C. (2019). *Why race and culture matter in schools* (p. 65). Teachers College Press.

Howells, K., & Carter, M. (2019). *Mentoring teachers in the primary school* (p. 47). Routledge.

Hsiao, W. C., Lu, Y. Y., Lin, C. P., & Hong, Z. R. (2024). Exploring the differences and prediction in learning adaptation and well-being among Taiwanese adolescents during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Educational Science Research*. <https://www.airitilibrary.com/Article/Detail/2073753X-N202407230003-00004>

Hwang, G. J., & Zhang, D. (2024). Effects of an adaptive computer agent-based digital game on EFL students' English learning outcomes. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72, 145-162. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11423-024-10396-4>

Jannini, A. V. S. (2024). Developing motivational profiles of first-year engineering students using latent profile analysis. *Purdue University*. https://hammer.purdue.edu/articles/thesis/_b_Developing_Motivational_Profiles_of_First-Year_Engineering_Students_Using_Latent_Profile_Analysis_b_/26337082

Jolly, A. (2018). *Leading professional learning* (p. 89). Corwin.

Kafele, B. K. (2018). *The equity & social justice education 50* (p. 30). ASCD.

Katz, J. (2018). *Ensuring full participation* (p. 56). Corwin.

Khalifa, M. (2018). *Culturally responsive school leadership* (p. 213). Harvard Education Press.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2011). The occupational commitment and intention to quit of practicing and pre-service teachers: Influence of self-efficacy, job stress, and teaching context. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(2), 114–129.

Koh, T. J., & Kim, Y. J. (2024). Correlation between academic achievement results and students' perceptions in instant response system-based language learning classes at the university. *Education Sciences*. <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/14/6/587>

Kolb, L. (2020). *Digital tools for seamless learning* (p. 135). Corwin.

Kuncel, N. R., & Hezlett, S. A. (2010). Standardized tests predict graduate students' success. *Science*, 228(5983), 603-606.



Kumashiro, K. K. (2020). *Culturally responsive teaching online and in-person* (p. 93). Teachers College Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2018). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (p. 178). Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2018). *The education debt* (p. 94). Beacon Press.

Lee, S. Y., Christiaans, E., & Robinson, K. A. (2024). Development in context: Comparing short-term trajectories of expectancy, task values, and costs in four university STEM courses. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0361476X24000274>

Lin, M., Lake, V. E., & Rice, D. (2018). *Teaching elementary social studies: Strategies, standards, and internet resources* (p. 212). Wadsworth.

Linsin, M. (2018). *The motivated teacher* (p. 46). JME Publishing.

Love, B. (2019). *We want to do more than survive* (p. 67). Beacon Press.

Man, D., Du, G., Fu, A., & Liu, L. (2024). Motivational beliefs as predictors of academic achievement of translation students: A situated expectancy-value theory perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01434632.2024.2385048>

Mendoza, A. C. (2022). Professional training and inclusive education implementation among public school teachers. *Philippine Social Science Review*, 74(1), 77–93.

Mickelson, R. A. (2019). *Children on the boundaries of time and space* (p. 153). Routledge.

Milner IV, H. R. (2017). *Start where you are, but don't stay there* (p. 105). Harvard Education Press.

Morrell, E. (2019). *Critical media pedagogy: Teaching for achievement in city schools* (p. 189). Teachers College Press.

Muhammad, A., & Hollie, S. (2018). *The will to lead, the skill to teach* (p. 78). Solution Tree.

Muñiz, J. (2020). Culturally responsive teaching: A 50-state survey of teaching standards. New America.

Myroniuk, A. (2024). Teacher self-efficacy and adaptation for students with dyslexia: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Special Education*, 56(1), 44-59.

Moyle, K. (2018). *The digital classroom* (p. 44). Routledge.

Muzaini, M., & Nasrun, N. (2024). Analysis of students' conceptual understanding of logarithm application problems based on self-efficacy. *Kreano, Jurnal Matematika Kreatif Inovatif*, 12(3), 233-247. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/kreano/article/view/2524>



Myroniuk, I. (2024). Readiness of foreign language teachers to meet the special needs of students with dyslexia. *Zhitomir State University*. <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/id/file/804715#page=67>

Nieto, S. (2017). *Affirming diversity* (p. 77). Pearson.

Noguera, P. (2016). *Excellence through equity* (p. 121). ASCD.

Null, J. W. (2017). *The multilingual edge of education* (p. 203). Springer.

Oakes, B. A. (2024). Teaching motivations of online adjunct faculty in private, faith-based and private, non-faith-based schools. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/8f481e5c5cd80d77c9ebb2efffa0757/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

Odoch, H. J. P., Kayondo, B. N., & Nabafu, R. (2024). Enhancing creative work behaviour in higher education institutions amidst the COVID-19 pandemic: The role of self-efficacy. *Continuity & Resilience Review*. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/CRR-04-2023-0007/full/html>

Osei-Kofi, N., Porfilio, B. J., & Lenhoff, S. W. (2019). *Transformative approaches to social justice education* (p. 64). Routledge.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (p. 131). Teachers College Press.

Pennock, P. A. (2024). Challenges for Black males to pass first-year writing and persist in community college. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/cfef345ed4da1107377db5fbbc91907a/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

Permeadian, V., & Shen, T. (2024). Assessing the predictive validity of expectancy theory for academic performance. *BMC Psychology*. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40359-024-01935-y>

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Allen, J. P. (2012). Teacher-student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom interactions. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 365-386). Springer.

Pino-Pasternak, D., Valcan, D., & Asil, M. (2024). Primary school teachers' adaptations for struggling writers in Australia: A national survey. *Research Bond University*. <https://research.bond.edu.au/en/publications/primary-school-teachers-adaptations-for-struggling-writers-in-aus>

Remedios, R., & Sewell, P. (2024). Employability and motivation: Which motivational theories are most appropriate? *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/HESWBL-03-2024-0067/full/html>



| Republic Act No. 11476 (2020). *An Act Institutionalizing Good Manners and Right Conduct and Including a Subject Therefor in the K-12 Basic Education Curriculum, Appropriating Funds Therefor, and for Other Purposes.* Retrieved from <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2020/06/25/replic-act-no-11476/>

| Rochat, B. (2024). Bridging barriers: An explorative case study of how culture influences learning and development in international education. *University of Saskatchewan.* <https://harvest.usask.ca/items/5e1e5049-3c23-4ad7-9fb5-7efe828b7843>

| Roosevelt, E., & Addams, J. (2019). *Not for ourselves alone: The legacies of two pioneers* (p. 201). Beacon Press.

| Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.

| Saner, J. G., & Villena, A. C. D. (2024). Teachers' work task motivation, self-efficacy, and effectiveness: Basis for professional development program. *Ignatian International Journal for Professional Development.* <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:68725/>

| Scanlan, M., & Arias, M. B. (2016). *Leadership for culturally and linguistically responsive schools* (p. 84). Teachers College Press.

| Schön, D. A. (2017). *Reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action* (p. 61). Basic Books.

| Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 60, 101832.

| Shah, A. (2021). *Equity-centered capacity building: Essential approaches for excellence and sustainable school system transformation* (p. 149). Corwin.

| Shen, B., Li, B., & Bo, J. (2024). Growth trajectories and roles of expectancy, task value, and cost in middle-school physical education. *European Physical Education Review.* <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1356336X241257793>

| Siwatu, K. O., & Starker-Glass, T. (2018). Examining preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy doubts. *Teaching Education*, 29(2), 103-124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2017.1366356>

| Siwatu, K. O., Polydore, C., & Starker, T. V. (2019). Developing and validating the culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 9(1), 87-104. <https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2019.09.1.06>

| Sliger, W. P. (2024). Elementary science teacher self-efficacy in the context of NGSS-aligned curriculum enactment: An explanatory sequential mixed methods study. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.* <https://search.proquest.com/openview/92c3542f89346795641e0e207a3833b3/1>

| Stephens, D. L., & Lindsey, R. B. (2020). *Culturally proficient collaboration: Use and misuse of school counselors* (p. 176). Corwin.



Susanti, E. (2024). Investigating teacher-student relationship and autonomous learning on creating a supportive English language learning environment. *UNUGIRI Repository*. <https://repository.unugiri.ac.id:8443/id/eprint/6300/>

Tavares, K. B. (2020). *Connected teaching* (p. 127). Harvard Education Press.

Tenuto, P. L., & Griffith, R. L. (2019). *Transformative teachers: Teacher leadership and learning in a connected world* (p. 56). Rowman & Littlefield.

Timperley, H. (2018). *Teacher learning communities: Enhancing professional development* (p. 143). Springer.

Trinchera, R., & Popović, T. (2024). Expectancy-value theory in promoting student-teacher relationships. *Journal of Applied Educational Studies*, 41(1), 140-159.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956.

Vatterott, C. (2018). *Transformative professional development* (p. 62). ASCD.

Vela, L., Mancheno, A., & Castelo, G. (2024). The role of expectancy theory in motivating Latin American students. *Journal of Hispanic Education*, 33(1), 85-101.

Villani, S. (2018). *Mentoring and coaching: A lifeline for teachers* (p. 71). Corwin.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation* (p. 215). Wiley.

Wagner, T. (2017). *Change leadership in education* (p. 189). Jossey-Bass.

Weiss, S., Braun, A., Pacher, M., & Fassnacht, C. (2024). Adapting feedback to the demands of teaching in diverse classrooms: Novel feedback concepts for preservice teachers during practicum. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 47(4), 590-608. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02619768.2024.2338846>

White, R. E., Cooper, K., & Mackey, W. (2014). Culturally relevant education and critical pedagogy: Devolution of hierarchies of power. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, 3(2), 123-140.

Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2018). *Understanding by design* (p. 78). ASCD.

Wright, W. E., & Li, X. (2017). *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (p. 124). Wiley-Blackwell.

Wu, H., Zhang, J., & Li, M. (2024). Homework motivation and classroom participation: The influence of parental and teacher feedback. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 45(2), 192-210.



- | Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2017). *Community and school collaboration for improved learning outcomes* (p. 98). Palgrave Macmillan.
- | Zakee, A. (2024). Career outcome expectancy and academic motivation in Malaysian higher education. *Journal of Asian Education Studies*, 21(3), 94-112.
- | Zhang, X., & Jiang, Y. (2024). Expectancy beliefs and student-teacher relationships in mathematics. *Journal of Mathematics Education*, 28(1), 50-71.
- | Zhi, H. (2024). The role of outcome expectancy in STEM motivation and college major decisions among English Language Learners. *Journal of STEM Education Research*, 17(2), 99-117.