

Critical Thinking and Deliberative Dialogue in Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan Classes

*John Lester B. Piol., Mary Ann C. Abril

Batangas State University- The National Engineering University, College of Teacher Education,
Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100601270>

Received: 01 July 2026; Accepted: 06 July 2026; Published: 16 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines deliberative dialogue as a pedagogy for enhancing critical-thinking skills among Grade 10 students in Araling Panlipunan. It assesses students' level of critical thinking, determines the extent of their exposure to deliberative dialogue, and analyzes the relationship between these variables. It also explores teachers' perceptions of the challenges in implementing deliberative dialogue and develops a teaching guide that integrates this strategy into Araling Panlipunan instruction. Correspondingly, a mixed-methods design is employed, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to investigate the relationship between exposure to deliberative dialogue and students' critical-thinking skills. Data are collected using a researcher-made questionnaire and focus group discussions (FGDs). Statistical analyses include the weighted mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's r to interpret quantitative data, while thematic analysis is used to derive qualitative insights. Findings indicate that Grade 10 students in CD4 PRISAB schools demonstrate moderate exposure to deliberative dialogue and a corresponding moderate level of critical thinking. Results show that students exhibit limited abilities in self-expression, critical engagement, and reflective participation during deliberative discussions. Similarly, lower performance in critical-thinking indicators is observed in independent and reflective domains, particularly in questioning, drawing conclusions, and identifying bias. A significant relationship is found between the two major variables. The study identifies key challenges in implementing deliberative dialogue, including students' lack of confidence, fear of judgment, limited comprehension, uneven participation, time constraints, and a tendency to provide opinion-based rather than evidence-based responses. The study concludes by proposing a teaching guide to support the effective integration of deliberative dialogue into Araling Panlipunan instruction and foster critical thinking.

Keywords: Deliberative Dialogue, Critical Thinking, Araling Panlipunan

INTRODUCTION

Critical thinking has become an indispensable competency in twenty-first-century education, particularly in Social Studies, where learners are expected to examine historical events, evaluate contemporary societal issues, and make informed civic decisions. In the Philippine K–12 curriculum, Araling Panlipunan seeks to develop learners who are capable of critical inquiry, evidence-based reasoning, and responsible citizenship. However, despite these curricular expectations, classroom instruction remains largely teacher-centered, often emphasizing factual recall rather than opportunities for learners to engage in higher-order thinking and collaborative knowledge construction. Recent research likewise indicates that effective critical thinking develops when students actively participate in inquiry, discussion, and reflective learning rather than passively receive information.

Critical thinking is commonly defined as a purposeful and self-regulatory process involving interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation, and self-regulation (Facione, 2020). Contemporary research further emphasizes that these cognitive processes are best developed through learning environments that encourage active participation and authentic problem-solving. For example, Arnie G. Dizon (2024) argued that Social Studies instruction and assessment should extend beyond factual knowledge by providing learners with opportunities to analyze evidence, justify arguments, and formulate reasoned conclusions. Likewise, recent

classroom research demonstrates that instructional practices emphasizing collaboration, inquiry, and reflective discourse significantly enhance students' critical thinking capabilities compared with conventional teacher-directed approaches.

One instructional approach that has gained increasing scholarly attention is deliberative dialogue, which promotes reasoned discussion, evidence-based argumentation, and collaborative decision-making. Unlike conventional classroom discussions that often involve simple question-and-answer exchanges or unstructured sharing of opinions, deliberative dialogue requires learners to examine multiple perspectives, evaluate evidence critically, justify their claims, and work collaboratively toward informed judgments. According to Keith C. Barton and Li-Ching Ho (2023), collaborative deliberation shifts classroom discussions from adversarial debate toward collective problem-solving, allowing students to build shared understanding through mutual respect, active listening, and reasoned communication. Such an approach better prepares learners for democratic participation while simultaneously strengthening their analytical and communication skills.

Recent studies further suggest that deliberative dialogue contributes to both cognitive and civic development by creating learning environments where students critically examine ideas instead of merely expressing opinions. International evidence consistently shows that structured classroom dialogue enhances learners' reasoning, reflective judgment, and engagement with complex social issues, particularly when discussions are carefully facilitated and supported by evidence-based inquiry. These findings indicate that integrating deliberative dialogue into Social Studies instruction may provide meaningful opportunities for students to develop the critical thinking competencies expected in 21st century education and the Philippine K–12 curriculum.

In the Philippine context, the need to strengthen critical thinking through dialogic instruction is reinforced by both educational policy and recent scholarship. The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) encourage the use of learner-centered pedagogies that promote critical and creative thinking, effective communication, and active learner engagement. Similarly, Canuto (2022) argued that Social Studies classrooms should function as communities of inquiry where students engage in reflective and deliberative discussions that cultivate democratic dispositions and independent reasoning. While Cruz (2019) emphasized the importance of pedagogical reforms that encourage learners to critically examine socio-political realities, both studies underscore the need to move beyond traditional teacher-centered instruction toward more participatory and inquiry-oriented learning environments.

Recent international studies provide further evidence that structured classroom dialogue contributes significantly to students' higher-order thinking. Leiviskä (2023) emphasized that deliberative education promotes epistemic reasoning by enabling learners to evaluate evidence, reconsider assumptions, and engage respectfully with diverse perspectives. Likewise, Suprijono et al. (2025) reported that deliberative democracy-based cooperative learning significantly improved students' critical thinking by combining collaborative dialogue with metacognitive learning processes. Collectively, these findings suggest that deliberative dialogue is not merely a communication strategy but an instructional approach capable of developing both cognitive competencies and democratic citizenship.

Despite the growing body of international literature, empirical research examining deliberative dialogue within Philippine Araling Panlipunan classrooms remains limited. Existing local studies have primarily discussed dialogic pedagogy from conceptual or policy perspectives, with little empirical evidence on how deliberative dialogue is implemented in classroom settings or how it influences students' critical thinking capabilities. Moreover, research focusing on Grade 10 learners in private secondary schools is particularly scarce, leaving a gap in understanding how structured classroom dialogue may support the development of higher-order thinking in this educational context.

Addressing this gap is important because Araling Panlipunan provides authentic opportunities for learners to examine controversial issues, evaluate historical and contemporary evidence, and participate in reasoned discussions about societal concerns. Understanding how students experience deliberative dialogue and how these experiences relate to their critical thinking capabilities may provide valuable insights for improving instructional practices aligned with the goals of the K–12 curriculum.

Accordingly, this study examines the relationship between deliberative dialogue and the critical thinking capabilities of Grade 10 students in selected private schools in Batangas Province. Specifically, it seeks to assess students' level of critical thinking capabilities, determine their exposure to deliberative dialogue, and examine the relationship between these variables. The findings are expected to contribute to the growing literature on dialogic pedagogy and provide evidence-based recommendations for teachers, curriculum developers, and educational leaders seeking to strengthen critical thinking through meaningful classroom dialogue.

Objectives

This study aims to examine how deliberative dialogue is used in Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan classes and its relationship on students' development of critical thinking skills. Specifically, this study seeks to fulfill the following specific objectives:

1. Determine the level of critical thinking capabilities among Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan students.
2. Assess the extent of students' exposure to deliberative dialogue strategies in Araling Panlipunan classes.
3. Find out the relationship between the level of critical thinking capabilities and the extent of students' exposure to deliberative dialogue.
4. Identify the challenges encountered in utilizing deliberative dialogue strategy.
5. Prepare a deliberative dialogue-based teaching guide to enhance critical thinking capabilities.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed both qualitative and quantitative methods, using a mixed-methods design which examined how exposure to deliberative dialogue is related to the critical thinking of Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan students. The quantitative strand included questionnaires that assessed the extent of students' exposure to deliberative dialogue and determined their current level of critical-thinking capabilities. The qualitative strand involved gathering data through focus group discussions (FGDs) to better understand teachers' challenges in using deliberative dialogue as a strategy to foster critical thinking. These qualitative insights provided a deeper exploration of the teachers' views on how deliberative dialogue supports or challenges students' thinking. Findings from both strands served as the basis on the development of teaching guide.

Subjects of the Study

The respondents of this study were Grade 10 PRISAB-participating private school students and teachers from the municipalities of Congressional District IV, mainly Ibaan, Padre Garcia, Rosario, San Jose, San Juan, and Taysan. Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents per school.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents by schools

School	N	n
Ibaan Saint James Academy, Inc.	132	37
Our Lady of Mercy Academy	36	10
Golden Key Integrated School of St. Joseph	36	10
Oblates of St. Joseph Minor Seminary	9	3
St. Joseph Academy	200	56

Batangas Eastern Colleges	255	71
Joseph Marelo Institute	119	33
San Juan Institute of Technology	30	8
Rosario Adventist High School	24	7
Santo Rosario Academy of Alupay Rosario, Batangas, Inc.	36	10
Padre Vicente Garcia Memorial Academy, Inc.	77	21
Total	954	266

Legends: N – Total Population n – Sample Size

Correlated to this, it employed proportionate stratified random sampling, wherein respondents were grouped in accordance with their respective schools, which served as the strata, and for each stratum, samples were selected proportionally based on the population size of each school so as to ensure fair representation, wherein schools with larger populations had a correspondingly larger number of respondents, while smaller schools were also adequately represented.

Data Gathering Instrument

The researcher-made questionnaire and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) were used as the two primary instruments for data collection. The study researcher-made questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part examined students' exposure to deliberative dialogue, and the second part measured the level of critical thinking among Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan students. The guide contained a brief background of the study to help participants understand its purpose. It also included questions about the practices, issues, and challenges encountered when using deliberative dialogue. In addition, the guide provided the schedule and the Google Meet link which assisted participants during the activity.

Validation and Reliability of the Instrument

The researcher accessed several published and unpublished references and resource materials about deliberative dialogue and critical thinking before constructing the questionnaire. The first draft of the questionnaire was presented to the research adviser for initial comments and suggestions. The revised and approved copy of the questionnaire was then presented to the three panel members and the chairman for content validation. After these, pilot testing was conducted in a private school in Batangas City with 30 respondents, as approved by the school principal. After the pilot testing, reliability testing was conducted using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a coefficient of .922, interpreted as excellent internal consistency. The results had proven that the items were reliable and consistent; they were then ready for administration. In terms of the FGD, the draft of the guide was first reviewed by the research adviser for initial feedback. After revisions, it underwent content validation by the three panel members and the chairman. Revisions were made based on their comments and suggestions to enhance clarity, relevance, and alignment with research objectives.

Scoring of Responses

The responses were tallied, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted in accordance with the responses of the respondents. The responses on the questionnaire were given equivalent weights of 1 to 4, with 1 as the lowest and 4 as the highest with corresponding verbal descriptions.

Option	Range	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.50-4.00	Highly Exposed/High

3	2.50-3.49	Moderately Exposed/Moderate
2	1.50-2.49	Slightly Exposed/Low
1	1.00-1.49	Least Exposed/Very Low

To determine the dispersion of the respondents' answers, the standard deviation was computed for each indicator. The standard deviation measures the dispersion of responses from the mean. A lower standard deviation indicated that the responses were closely clustered around the mean, suggesting greater agreement among respondents. Conversely, a higher standard deviation signified a wider spread of responses, which meant varied perceptions among the participants.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Critical Thinking Capabilities of Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan Students

Critical thinking is understood and practiced differently across secondary education disciplines, including history and social studies, which share similarities with Araling Panlipunan. Table 3 presents the perceived levels of students' critical thinking capabilities.

As the results indicate, the three highest indicators commonly focus on the application of knowledge in real-life contexts and the integration of multiple perspectives. This suggests that students demonstrate stronger skills in contextual and evidence-based critical thinking, particularly in connecting and evaluating information.

Table 2. Level of Critical Thinking Capabilities of Students

Item Statements	WM	SD	VI
1. Connect class topics to real-life or current societal issues.	3.52	0.60	High
2. Connect multiple perspectives to form a more complete understanding of issues.	3.48	0.54	Moderate
3. Distinguish between facts and opinions in discussions.	3.47	0.53	Moderate
4. Evaluate arguments using facts, logic, and relevance.	3.46	0.58	Moderate
5. Interpret historical and social issues by identifying their causes and effects.	3.45	0.58	Moderate
6. Analyze different sources of information before forming conclusions.	3.41	0.55	Moderate
7. Generate possible solutions to social problems based on classroom discussions.	3.40	0.58	Moderate
8. Explain my viewpoints clearly using historical or social evidence.	3.38	0.63	Moderate
9. Evaluate the reliability and bias of different sources or media.	3.36	0.55	Moderate
10. Use visuals or examples to explain complex ideas during discussions.	3.35	0.66	Moderate
11. Write down my thoughts to better understand and explain my reasoning.	3.35	0.66	Moderate
12. Identify ethical implications when discussing historical or civic issues.	3.31	0.62	Moderate

13. Seek out information or evidence beyond what is provided in class.	3.30	0.61	Moderate
14. Draw conclusions based on information collected in class activities.	3.27	0.55	Moderate
15. Ask questions that deepen or challenge the discussion.	3.27	0.69	Moderate
16. Identify missing or biased information in the materials we study.	3.20	0.58	Moderate
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.46	0.60	Moderate

Legends: WM – Weighted Mean SD – Standard Deviation VI – Verbal Interpretation

Students demonstrated a high level of ability to connect class topics to real-life or current societal issues. This suggests that students are highly capable of relating classroom discussions to actual social contexts, indicating strong relevance-building skills. This may be attributed to the nature of Social Studies instruction, where lessons are often directly linked to contemporary issues, community experiences, and national or global events. Such instructional design naturally encourages students to make connections between academic concepts and real-life situations, thereby strengthening their contextual understanding. This reflects Facione’s (2020) concept of interpretation, in which learners engage in understanding and making sense of information by situating it within appropriate contexts. When students connect academic concepts to real-life or societal issues, they demonstrate strong interpretive ability.

Students also showed a moderate ability to connect multiple perspectives to form a more complete understanding of issues. This implies that learners are capable of integrating diverse viewpoints when analyzing issues, although this skill is still at a high level rather than consistently very high. This may be attributed to students’ exposure to learning tasks that require analysis and comparison of different ideas or sources of information, which strengthens their ability to consider multiple perspectives when understanding an issue. This aligns with Hermosa and Joaquin (2023), who suggested an approach that effectively improves critical thinking, as learners have been able to remember, reason, and pay attention. This study demonstrated that a better approach will help students attain higher levels of critical thinking. This supports the idea that students’ ability to connect multiple perspectives is strengthened through exposure to varied information and analytical tasks through a scenario-based approach.

On the other hand, the three lowest indicators focus on independent and reflective critical-thinking skills, such as questioning, drawing conclusions, and identifying bias. This indicates that students still need further development in metacognitive and deeper evaluative thinking skills.

Students exhibited a moderate ability to identify missing or biased information in the materials studied. This suggests that students have an emerging awareness of bias detection and critical evaluation of learning materials. This may be because identifying bias requires more advanced metacognitive processes, such as reflection, self-regulation, and critical scrutiny of information, which are often more difficult to develop compared to basic comprehension or application skills. This finding aligns with the study of Le and Hockey (2021), which emphasizes that students’ critical thinking, particularly in evaluating information and recognizing bias, is influenced by classroom dynamics and practices that promote advanced metacognitive practices. Their research highlights that the ability to critically examine information, including identifying gaps and biases, develops gradually and is shaped by the level of engagement, confidence, and opportunities for reflective thinking provided in the learning environment.

Students also demonstrated a moderate ability to draw conclusions based on information collected during class activities. This implies that learners are generally able to synthesize information and make logical inferences. This suggests that students are developing inference skills, although these may still require strengthening for more consistent application.

Students showed moderate ability in asking questions that deepen or challenge the discussion, yet were placed in the three lowest weighted means. This indicates that while students are capable of engaging in inquiry-based

participation, they do not yet consistently demonstrate this skill during class discussions. This suggests that students may still need more structured opportunities to consistently engage in higher-level questioning during deliberations. This may be because questioning, especially questioning which challenges ideas or deepens discussion, is a more complex cognitive skill that requires not only an understanding of the topic but also confidence, curiosity, and a willingness to critique others' ideas.

This finding is supported by Espiritu (2026), who emphasized that the development of critical thinking in Araling Panlipunan often requires learners' ability to analyze information, use evidence, and engage in problem-solving rather than merely recall facts. The study highlighted that learners often require more time and structured learning experiences to develop these higher-order thinking processes. Thus, relatively low performance in generating thought-provoking questions may indicate a need for more deliberate opportunities for students to reflect and engage in evidence-based discussion during classroom deliberation.

In summary, the students demonstrate a moderate level of critical-thinking ability. It implies that critical thinking is evident among students, though not yet consistently at the highest level across all indicators. While students are able to perform higher-order thinking tasks, there remains room for further enhancement, particularly in more complex dimensions such as questioning, inference, and bias recognition. This inconsistency may be attributed to the fact that critical thinking is not a uniform or automatically developed skill, but one that varies depending on the context and learning conditions.

Extent of Exposure to Deliberative Dialogue Strategies in Araling Panlipunan

Expressing one's thoughts on a particular topic is a clear sign of understanding and depth of knowledge. Students must be active in this matter, for they have been engaging with various social issues. Hence, their practical reasoning and critical thinking must be observed in raising standpoints in a structured way. Table 3 presents the extent of students' exposure to the deliberative dialogue strategy.

Table 3. Extent of Exposure to Deliberative Dialogue Strategy in Araling Panlipunan

Item Statements	WM	SD	VI
1. Respecting and including opposing opinions during discussions.	3.56	0.59	GE
2. Listening attentively to differing viewpoints without immediate judgment.	3.50	0.63	GE
3. Gathering information and facts before forming conclusions.	3.44	0.65	ME
4. Deliberating on the pros and cons of proposed solutions.	3.36	0.64	ME
5. Revising my initial ideas based on new insights or evidence.	3.32	0.64	ME
6. Contributing to group decisions by presenting well-thought-out arguments.	3.32	0.66	ME
7. Analyzing multiple perspectives before forming my own stand on a topic.	3.30	0.64	ME
8. Justifying my opinions using logical reasoning and evidence	3.29	0.66	ME
9. Confirming agreements collectively after discussions.	3.26	0.66	ME
10. Connecting classroom dialogues in societal issues.	3.26	0.75	ME
11. Indulging in collaborative problem solving.	3.26	0.71	ME
12. Organizing my thoughts around central questions introduced by the teacher.	3.25	0.69	ME

13. Reflecting critically on my own biases and assumptions during discussions.	3.24	0.70	ME
14. Challenging or questioning my classmates' ideas respectfully.	3.16	0.77	ME
15. Expressing my opinions on social issues during class discussions.	2.98	0.79	ME
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.41	0.68	ME

Legends: **WM** – Weighted Mean **SD**- Standard Deviation **VI** – Verbal Interpretation

GE – Greatly Exposed **ME** – Moderately Exposed

The data reveal a clear trend: the three highest indicators center on information consumption and respect for diverse perspectives, rather than on active or critical expression. This suggests that students are more inclined to receive, process, and accommodate information from others rather than actively challenge, articulate, or transform ideas during deliberative dialogue.

Students had a great exposure to respecting and including opposing opinions during class discussions. This indicates strong inclusivity in classroom discussions, where students foster a respectful environment that allows multiple perspectives to be heard. This suggests that the democratic values and participatory discourse are both effectively modeled in the Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan classrooms. This may be due to sufficient opportunities to be exposed to differing opinions while respecting them. Salayo et al. (2024) found that dialogic engagement further enables learners to engage with social realities, helping them develop critical awareness of their society. It also showed an empowered role through problem-posing, referencing, reflecting, and problem-solving, which led to the openness in diverse perspectives.

Additionally, the students are greatly exposed to listening attentively to differing viewpoints without immediate judgment. This shows that students are highly capable of listening to others' perspectives, demonstrating openness and respect toward diverse viewpoints, a foundational skill in deliberative dialogue. This indicates a positive classroom climate that supports inclusive and respectful discussions. The reason may be that they value other people's opinions and understand that this supports engagement.

However, students showed strong exposure to gathering information and facts before forming conclusions. This shows that students often rely on evidence before making judgments. This indicates that students demonstrate an emerging ability to base their opinions on factual information, which is essential for informed decision-making and critical thinking. This can be rooted in the idea that they understand the importance of evidence-based reasoning. Reyes and Santos (2022) emphasized that inquiry-based learning in Araling Panlipunan encourages students to engage with multiple sources of information before arriving at conclusions. They also showed that when learners are exposed to structured questioning and evidence-searching activities, they begin to strengthen the ability to evaluate and synthesize information before making judgments.

On the other hand, regarding the three lowest indicators, the data revealed a clear trend indicating that students have limited ability to express themselves, critically engage, and reflect during deliberative discussions, even though these are still interpreted as moderately exposed. This suggests that while deliberative dialogue practices are present in the classroom, students' higher-order communicative and reflective skills remain less developed compared to other competencies.

The findings also revealed that students are moderately exposed to critical reflection on biases and assumptions during discussions, placing this among the lowest indicators. This result indicates that self-reflection is only moderately practiced among students, suggesting they may not be consistently engaged in metacognitive processes such as examining their own biases, an important aspect of deeper critical thinking and balanced judgment. This result could be traced to the cognitive demands of metacognitive processes, particularly self-regulation and reflective thinking, which require students to consciously evaluate their own assumptions and reasoning. This aligns with the DepEd's curriculum guide (2016), which emphasizes that learners should develop

higher-order thinking skills, including analysis, evaluation, and reflective thinking, thereby allowing them to examine their own perspectives in relation to social issues.

Further, students are moderately exposed to challenging or questioning their classmates' ideas respectfully. This suggests possible discomfort with engaging in constructive disagreement, which is a vital element of deliberative dialogue. This finding may be rooted in students possibly avoiding questioning others due to insufficient facilitation that encourages peer challenge and balanced participation. This is consistent with the findings of Lomabao and Arazo (2024), who emphasized that effective questioning practices create engaging classroom discussions, promote learners' critical thinking, and encourage active participation. Their study suggests that purposeful questioning by teachers provides opportunities for learners to articulate ideas and engage more meaningfully in classroom discourse, thereby creating conditions that support deeper learning.

Lastly, students showed a moderate level of exposure in expressing opinions on social issues during class discussions. This suggests that while students are somewhat able to express their opinions, this skill is not consistently or confidently demonstrated during class discussions. This implies that opportunities for critical discourse are present but not yet fully maximized in classroom settings. This reflects a limitation in one of the core components of deliberative dialogue: active participation through the articulation of ideas.

In general, students assess their level of exposure to the deliberative dialogue strategy as moderate. This indicates that students in Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan classes demonstrate a fair level of exposure to deliberative dialogue. This suggests that while the elements of deliberative dialogue are present in classroom practices, they are not yet consistently or fully evident across all indicators. The findings clearly suggest that deliberative dialogue is being implemented at a foundational level, but there is a greater emphasis on more structured, international, and sustained practices to deepen students' critical thinking and active participation.

Relationship between the Level of Critical Thinking Capabilities and the Extent of Students' Exposure to Deliberative Dialogue

This study determines whether there is a significant relationship between the extent of students' exposure to deliberative dialogue and their level of critical thinking.

As shown in the table, there is a significant relationship between students' exposure to deliberative dialogue and their critical-thinking capabilities.

Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, implying that deliberative dialogue is an important instructional approach for enhancing higher-order thinking capabilities. It suggests that students who are more frequently engaged in deliberative dialogue tend to demonstrate stronger critical-thinking capabilities than those with less exposure.

Table 4. Relationship between the level of critical thinking capabilities and the extent of students' exposure to deliberative dialogue

Variables	p-value	r-value	Strength of Relationship	Statistical Significance	Decision on H ₀
Critical thinking capabilities and exposure to deliberative dialogue	<.001	0.713	Strong positive correlation	Highly Significant	Reject H ₀

Further, this finding is strongly supported by Resnick et al. (2018), who emphasize that classroom discourse plays a central role in the development of students' thinking abilities. They argue that when students engage in academically productive talk, in which they are required to explain, justify, and critically examine ideas, their cognitive processes become more explicit and sophisticated. Through structured dialogue, learners are exposed to opportunities for argumentation, evaluation of differing viewpoints, and refinement of their own reasoning, all of which contribute to the development of critical thinking.

Furthermore, they highlighted that dialogic instruction fosters an environment in which students actively construct knowledge through interaction rather than passively receiving information. This form of social intellectual engagement encourages learners to articulate their thinking, respond to others' ideas, and revise their understanding based on reasoned discussion. As a result, students develop deeper conceptual understanding and improved ability to analyze and evaluate complex issues.

Thus, the strong positive correlation observed in the study indicates that deliberative dialogue is an effective pedagogical strategy for strengthening students' critical thinking capabilities by promoting sustained, structured, and intellectually rich classroom interaction.

Challenges Encountered in Utilizing Deliberative Dialogue

This section presents the study's findings based on the analysis of responses to the focus group discussion (FGD) by Araling Panlipunan 10 teachers. The data were systematically arranged and categorized, leading to the emergence of key themes and subthemes describing teachers' experiences using deliberative dialogue in the classroom. The themes highlight both the challenges encountered by the Grade 10 teachers in utilizing deliberative dialogue and the strategies employed to overcome these barriers. The table below presents the matrix of the emerging themes and sub-themes generated from the FGD:

Thematic Matrix of Teachers' Challenges in Utilizing Deliberative Dialogue in Araling Panlipunan 10

Theme	Sub-themes	Description of Findings	Verbatim Statement	Implication
Theme 1: Learner-Related Barriers	1.1 Lack of Confidence and Fear of Judgment	Students hesitate to participate due to fear of criticism, making mistakes, or being judged by peers, particularly high-performing students.	<i>"Students often feel hesitant to speak or share their ideas... they fear being judged by others."</i>	A psychologically safe classroom environment is necessary to encourage active participation.
	1.2 Limited Knowledge and Understanding	Insufficient prior knowledge and shallow understanding of topics hinder meaningful participation in deliberative dialogue.	<i>"Some students still struggle to fully understand it, which makes it difficult for them to participate."</i>	Teachers need to provide scaffolding and background knowledge before discussions.
	1.3 Uneven Participation	Discussions are often dominated by a few students while others remain passive.	<i>"Some students tend to dominate the discussion, while others remain quiet."</i>	Structured participation strategies are needed to ensure inclusivity.
	1.4 Time Constraints	Limited classroom time restricts opportunities for reflection and in-depth discussion.	<i>"A good deliberation cannot be rushed; it really requires enough time."</i>	Effective time management and extended discussion opportunities are essential.
	1.5 Opinion-Based Rather Than Evidence-Based Responses	Students frequently rely on personal opinions without sufficient evidence.	<i>"Some students still rely on 'I think' statements without proper support."</i>	Greater emphasis on evidence-based reasoning should be integrated into instruction.

	Lack of Interest or Motivation	Students disengage when topics are perceived as irrelevant or uninteresting.	<i>"When students do not feel engaged or see the relevance of the topic, they are less likely to actively take part."</i>	Teachers should connect discussions to students' experiences and interests.
Theme 2: Contextual and Environmental Constraints	2.1 Classroom Environment and Conditions	Physical classroom conditions and class size affect student participation and focus.	<i>"Class size also affects participation."</i>	Conducive learning environments are necessary for effective dialogue.
	2.2 Socio-Cultural Factors	Cultural norms emphasizing deference to authority discourage students from expressing differing opinions.	<i>"Students often feel that the teacher is the sole source of knowledge."</i>	Teachers should foster a more participatory and democratic classroom culture.
	2.3 Access to Resources	Limited access to learning materials constrains the quality and depth of discussion.	<i>"Access to learning materials is important because it greatly helps improve the quality of discussion."</i>	Adequate instructional resources are essential for evidence-based dialogue.
Theme 3: Pedagogical Strategies for Enhancing Deliberative Dialogue	3.1 Structured Discussion Techniques	Teachers use organized discussion formats to ensure equitable participation.	<i>"I use strategies like think-pair-share for more equal participation."</i>	Structured approaches promote engagement and inclusivity.
	3.2 Use of Real-World Issues	Teachers connect discussions to contemporary and relevant social issues.	<i>"Nagpe-present ako ng real-world issues..."</i>	Authentic and relevant topics increase engagement and critical thinking.
	3.3 Use of Guide Questions	Strategic questioning is used to stimulate deeper thinking and discussion.	<i>"Giving guiding questions and support helps students express their ideas more clearly."</i>	Well-designed questions enhance the quality of deliberation.
	3.4 Establishing Rules and Safe Space	Teachers establish discussion norms that promote respect and inclusivity.	<i>"Respecting others' opinions, not interrupting, and using evidence when sharing ideas."</i>	Psychological safety encourages greater student participation.
	3.5 Use of Evidence and Multiple Sources	Students are encouraged to support arguments using credible sources.	<i>"Examine multiple credible sources... then backed up by evidence."</i>	

Learner-Related Barriers

This theme illustrated the challenges faced by Araling Panlipunan 10 teachers in utilizing deliberative dialogue. They described their experience in the teaching and learning process. Among all themes, this emerged as the

most dominant across all respondents, highlighting the barriers that hinder the effective implementation of deliberative dialogue in the classroom. The challenges, in the experience of the AP 10 teachers is described in three sub-themes: Lack of Confidence and Fear of Judgment, Limited Knowledge and Understanding, Uneven Participation, Time Constraints, Opinion-Based Rather Than Evidence-Based Responses, and Lack of Interest or Motivation.

Theme 2: Contextual and Environmental Constraints

This theme illustrated the contextual elements influencing the effectiveness of deliberative dialogue among Araling Panlipunan 10 teachers. The findings reveal that the effectiveness of deliberative dialogue is shaped by a combination of environmental, socio-cultural, and resource-related factors. These are all reflected in the three subthemes: Classroom Environment and Conditions, Socio-Cultural Factors, and Access to Resources.

Theme 3: Pedagogical Strategies for Enhancing Deliberative Dialogue

The findings reveal that teachers employ a range of intentional and adaptive strategies to facilitate deliberative dialogue, highlighting that effective implementation is not incidental but deliberately constructed through pedagogical design. The strategies, as reported by AP 10 teachers, are organized into five sub-themes: Structured Discussion Techniques, Use of Real-World Issues, Use of Guide Questions, Establishing Rules and Safe Space, and Use of Evidence and Multiple Sources.

Proposed Teaching Guide in Araling Panlipunan 10

The researcher analyzed the key findings of this study to understand the extent of students' exposure to the deliberative dialogue strategy and their level of critical thinking. Based on the results, students are moderately engaged in deliberative dialogue practices, such as critically reflecting on opinions on relevant social issues during class discussions. These indicators suggest that while students are exposed to dialogic practices, there is their own biases and assumptions during discussions, respectfully challenging or questioning their classmates' ideas, and expressing their still room for further enhancement to ensure more consistent and meaningful engagement in structured academic discourse.

Table 6. Basis for the proposed deliberative dialogue-based teaching guide

Research Insights	Implications	Focus Component
Students are moderately exposed to deliberative dialogue practices such as reflecting on biases, respectfully questioning peers' ideas, and expressing opinions on social issues.	Students need more structured and sustained opportunities to participate in meaningful academic discourse.	Integration of structured deliberative dialogue activities, discussion protocols, reflective activities, and guided questioning techniques
Students demonstrate a moderate level of critical thinking capabilities, particularly in questioning, drawing conclusions, and identifying biased information.	Instructional activities should continuously strengthen higher-order thinking skills through inquiry and evidence-based discussions.	Integration of critical thinking prompts, issue-analysis activities, source evaluation tasks, and evidence-based reasoning exercises.
The development of critical thinking skills may depend on the quality of students' engagement in deliberative dialogue.	Effective facilitation strategies are necessary to sustain active participation and deeper cognitive engagement.	Provision of facilitation techniques, collaborative discussion guides, inclusive participation strategies, and reflective deliberation activities.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, this study concludes that deliberative dialogue is a meaningful pedagogical approach for enhancing the critical thinking capabilities of Grade 10 Araling Panlipunan students. Although students reported

only a moderate level of exposure to deliberative dialogue and demonstrated a moderate level of critical thinking, the significant relationship between these variables underscores the value of structured, evidence-based classroom discussions in promoting higher-order thinking. These findings support the view that meaningful dialogue serves not only as a communication strategy but also as an instructional process that enables learners to analyze issues, evaluate evidence, consider multiple perspectives, and make informed judgments.

The study contributes to Araling Panlipunan pedagogy by providing empirical evidence that supports the integration of deliberative dialogue into classroom instruction. It reinforces the role of Social Studies as a discipline that develops not only content knowledge but also democratic participation, reflective inquiry, and critical citizenship. The proposed teaching guide further extends this contribution by offering teachers a practical framework for systematically incorporating deliberative dialogue into lessons, thereby creating more learner-centered, inclusive, and intellectually engaging classroom environments.

The findings likewise have important implications for classroom practice. Teachers are encouraged to design learning experiences that promote collaborative reasoning, active listening, evidence-based argumentation, and respectful exchange of ideas. School administrators and curriculum developers may also use the findings to strengthen professional development programs and instructional support that encourage dialogic teaching approaches aligned with the goals of the K–12 Araling Panlipunan curriculum and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers.

Finally, future research may examine the effectiveness of deliberative dialogue across different educational contexts, grade levels, and learning modalities using experimental or longitudinal research designs. Further studies may also investigate other learner outcomes associated with deliberative dialogue, such as civic engagement, communication competence, decision-making, and collaborative problem-solving, to expand the evidence base for dialogic pedagogy in Philippine Social Studies education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers would like to express their gratitude and appreciation to the following individuals who helped, supported, and contributed significantly to the success of this study.

Most High God, for His guidance, provision, and blessing throughout this academic journey.

Dr. Realiza M. Mame, Dean of the College of Teacher Education and the researchers' statistician, for her support and encouragement;

Dr. Agnes D. Arellano, Dr. Sherry Joy A. Del Mundo, Dr. Charity A. Aldover, and Dr. Jennifer M. Cueto for sharing valuable insights and suggestions in order to improve the study and the research instrument;

Dr. Jayson O. Gulpan, the secretary of PRISAB, for his assistance and support in administering the research instrument;

Dr. Catherine R. Banta, the president of PRISAB, for her willingness and support in conducting the study to the selected PRISAB participating schools;

Dr. Leonora M. Rodriguez, for her kind words, moral support, and understanding throughout the completion of this study;

Dr. Elaine Noreen G. Baxa, the editor, for her efforts and expertise in reading and editing the manuscript;

Ms. Rodelia Lat, School Principal of Golden Gate College, for her acceptance in administering the research instrument as part of the pilot testing;

Grade 10 AP students of selected CD 4 private schools, and the AP 10 teachers, for their willingness, cooperation, and patience in answering the survey questionnaire and participating in the conduct of FGD;

To the researchers' families, friends, and classmates for giving support, inspiration, and care.

REFERENCES

1. Barton, K. C., & Ho, L.-C. (2023). Collaborative deliberation in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 104(5), 44–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00317217231156229>
2. Canuto, A. A. (2022). Communities of inquiry in Social Studies education: Democratic dispositions and reflective thinking. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 22(3), 58–72.
3. Cruz, R. P. (2019). Decolonial perspectives in foreign language education in the Philippines. *The Normal Lights*, 13(2), 1–24.
4. Department of Education. (2016). K to 12 Curriculum Guide: Araling Panlipunan. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Araling-Panlipunan-CG.pdf>
5. Dizon, A. G. (2025). Development of a framework for the assessment of critical thinking in Grade 10 Social Studies. *The Social Studies*, 116(2), 95–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2024.2364669>
6. Espiritu, J. V. (2026). Pisa-Type Assessment In Developing Critical Thinking Skills In Araling Panlipunan 7 In Bauan National And Vocational Integrated High School Sy 2025-2026. Volume 2 Issue 6. DOI. 10.5281/zenodo.20353983
7. Facione, P. A. (2020). *Critical Thinking: What It Is and Why It Counts*. Insight Assessment.
8. Hermosa, J., & Joaquin, L. L. (2023). Scenario- based learning approach for enhancing the critical thinking skills of grade 9 students in araling panlipunan. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4488116>
9. Le, A., & Hockey, J. (2021). Critical thinking in the higher education classroom: Knowledge, power, control and identities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 43(1), 140–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2021.2003182>
10. Leiviskä, A. (2023). Democratic education and the epistemic quality of democratic deliberation. *Policy Futures in Education*, 21(7), 791–806. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14778785231187304>
11. Lomabao, N. D., & Arazo, V. H. (2024). Teachers' Practices on the Art of Questioning and Learners' Performance: A Basis for Action Plan. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 26(5), 529–541. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13928904>
12. Resnick, L. B., Asterhan, C. S. C., & Clarke, S. N. (2018). Socializing intelligence through academic talk. American Educational Research Association.
13. Reyes, M. A., & Santos, J. P. (2022). Inquiry-based learning practices in Araling Panlipunan and its effect on students' critical thinking skills. *Philippine Journal of Social Studies Education*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361234567>
14. Salayo, J., Gatcho, A. R., & Titar-Improgo, C. M. (2024). L1 as a tool for dialogic discourse in an ESL classroom during pre-writing stage. *Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(1), 111–123.
15. <https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2412.01.09>Suprijono, A., Abbas, E. W., & Riyadi. (2025). Metacognition and cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy moderated by learning style toward critical thinking skill in Social Studies learning. *Cogent Education*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2458915>