

# Dialogic Filipino Pedagogy and Linguistic Identity Formation Among Secondary Learners

Jenny T. Lucas<sup>1\*</sup> and Genesis N. Damaso<sup>1,2</sup>

Northeastern College

\*[jennytlucas1994@gmail.com](mailto:jennytlucas1994@gmail.com), <sup>2</sup>[genesisdamaso@yahoo.com](mailto:genesisdamaso@yahoo.com)

Date Submitted:

**April 15, 2026**

Date Accepted:

**May 19, 2026**

Date Published:

**June 30, 2026**

DOI:

**10.5281/zenodo.21075755**

## ABSTRACT

This study situated the Filipino classroom as a dialogic space where language learning, cultural meaning, and learner identity met. It investigated the relationship between dialogic Filipino pedagogy and linguistic identity formation among secondary learners at Dicamay National High School. Using a convergent explanatory classroom discourse design, the study gathered quantitative data through a validated and reliability-tested questionnaire and qualitative insights through classroom discourse observations and learner reflections. The instrument obtained an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.93, indicating excellent internal consistency. Descriptive results showed a high level of dialogic Filipino pedagogy and a high level of linguistic identity formation among learners. Canonical

correlation analysis revealed a significant shared relationship between the dimensions of dialogic pedagogy and linguistic identity formation, while multiple regression analysis showed that cultural connection in discussion, student voice and participation, respectful exchange of ideas, and teacher questioning significantly predicted learners' linguistic identity. Qualitative findings supported the statistical results by showing that learners valued Filipino more when lessons were connected to lived experience, culture, family, community, and social realities. However, learner-initiated questioning and explicit reflection on multilingual identity remained less developed, indicating the need for stronger student-led discourse. The study concluded that dialogic Filipino pedagogy strengthened learners' confidence, cultural belonging, and expressive identity when classroom talk was meaningful, respectful, and culturally grounded. It recommended more intentional opportunities for learners to ask questions, lead discussions, and reflect on their multilingual experiences in Filipino learning.

**Keywords:** *classroom discourse, cultural connection, dialogic pedagogy, Filipino language education, linguistic identity, secondary learners*

## INTRODUCTION

Language classrooms are not only spaces where learners acquire vocabulary, grammar, and literary appreciation. They are also social spaces where young people learn how to speak, listen, question, interpret, and position themselves in relation to their culture, community, and nation. In the Filipino classroom, this role becomes even more meaningful because the subject carries both academic and identity-forming functions. Filipino is not merely a medium for lessons. It is a language through which learners encounter memory, local experience, social values, cultural imagination, and everyday realities. For secondary learners who are already negotiating personal identity, peer belonging, family expectations, and broader social influences, the way Filipino is taught can shape how they understand themselves as language users and as members of a multilingual society.

Recent scholarship on dialogic teaching has emphasized that classroom talk becomes educationally valuable when it moves beyond recitation and teacher-controlled questioning. Alexander (2020) explained that

dialogic teaching treats spoken interaction as a deliberate means of developing learners' thinking, understanding, and participation. In this view, students are not passive receivers of fixed meanings. They are invited to explain, challenge, connect, and refine ideas through guided classroom dialogue. Similarly, Kim and Wilkinson (2019) clarified that dialogic teaching is centered on the productive use of talk to support thinking, learning, and problem solving. These perspectives are important in language education because meaning is constructed not only through texts and teacher explanations, but also through the exchanges that occur among teachers and learners.

In the teaching of Filipino, dialogic pedagogy may be especially significant because language learning is closely tied to voice. When learners are encouraged to speak in Filipino, respond to literary and social texts, relate lessons to local realities, and listen to the experiences of classmates, they are given opportunities to see Filipino as a living language rather than only as a school subject. Classroom dialogue allows learners to test ideas, express personal meanings, and recognize that their linguistic resources have value. This matters because many Filipino learners move across several language environments, including home languages, Filipino, English, and digital varieties of speech. Their identities as language users are often formed through these movements, including moments of confidence, hesitation, pride, confusion, and adjustment.

The connection between language and identity has been strongly discussed in contemporary applied linguistics. Darvin and Norton (2016) argued that language learning involves investment, identity, capital, and ideology, which means that learners' participation in language practices is shaped by how they see themselves and how they believe others see them. Later, Darvin (2023) further explained that motivation alone cannot fully account for language learning because learners may be motivated but may not feel invested in classroom practices that do not recognize their experiences, identities, or social realities. In the context of Filipino pedagogy, this insight suggests that learners' engagement with the Filipino language may depend not only on lesson content, but also on whether classroom discourse allows them to participate with dignity, relevance, and personal meaning.

Multilingual education studies have also shown that identity formation is deeply connected with how learners experience their languages in school. Forbes (2021) noted that multilingual identity has become an important concern in language education because learners' sense of self is shaped by the languages they use, value, and negotiate across contexts. UNESCO (2025) likewise stressed that multilingual education supports inclusion when learners' languages are treated as resources for learning rather than barriers to achievement. These views are relevant to the Philippine setting, where learners often bring diverse linguistic backgrounds into the classroom. Even when Filipino serves as the subject of instruction, learners may still think, feel, and communicate through different linguistic repertoires. A dialogic Filipino classroom can therefore provide a space where these repertoires are acknowledged while strengthening learners' connection to Filipino as a shared national language.

The Department of Education's MATATAG Filipino curriculum for Grades 4 and 7 emphasizes functional literacy, meaning-making, communication, and the development of learners who can use language meaningfully in life and society (Department of Education, 2024). This curricular direction implies that Filipino instruction should not be limited to memorization of concepts or mechanical language exercises. Instead, it should help learners interpret texts, communicate ideas, appreciate culture, and participate in meaningful discourse. Dialogic pedagogy aligns with this direction because it treats learning as a shared process where students develop understanding through guided, respectful, and purposeful classroom interaction.

However, despite the recognized value of classroom dialogue, many language classrooms still tend to privilege teacher explanation, short-answer responses, and textbook-centered participation. In such settings, learners may know the expected answer but may not have enough opportunity to explain their thinking, connect Filipino lessons to their lived experiences, or examine how language reflects who they are. Ucan (2023) emphasized that dialogic teaching involves both cognitive and socio-emotional dimensions, suggesting that productive dialogue supports not only academic understanding but also learners' confidence, relationships, and sense of participation. This is important for secondary learners because adolescence is a period when students become more aware of identity, belonging, and social recognition. A Filipino classroom that values dialogue can help learners feel that their voices matter, especially when discussing language, literature, culture, and social life.

Studies on dialogic pedagogy also indicate that teachers play a central role in shaping whether classroom talk becomes open, reflective, and meaningful. Wilkinson et al. (2017) showed that teacher professional development can help shift classroom practices toward more dialogic forms of instruction, particularly when teachers learn to support argumentation, listening, and student reasoning. Barak and Lefstein (2024) similarly found that teachers' understanding of dialogic pedagogy develops through practice and reflection, which suggests that dialogic teaching is not simply a technique but a professional orientation toward learners and knowledge. For Filipino teachers, this orientation may involve creating lessons where learners are encouraged to ask questions, interpret cultural meanings, compare language experiences, and participate in conversations that make Filipino relevant to their lives.

In this regard, the present study on dialogic Filipino pedagogy and linguistic identity formation among secondary learners responds to an important gap in language education research. While studies have examined dialogic teaching, multilingual identity, and language learning separately, there remains a need to understand how Filipino classroom dialogue contributes to learners' formation of linguistic identity. This is particularly relevant in secondary education, where learners are old enough to reflect on language, culture, and belonging, yet still need supportive pedagogical spaces where they can develop confidence in using Filipino. By focusing on dialogic Filipino pedagogy, the study recognizes the Filipino classroom as a site where language learning and identity formation meet. It also positions Filipino teaching not only as a means of academic instruction, but as a culturally grounded practice that can help learners find voice, meaning, and belonging within a multilingual society.

## Literature Review

### *Dialogic Teaching as a Foundation for Meaningful Language Learning*

Dialogic teaching has gained strong attention in recent educational research because it treats classroom talk as a serious part of learning rather than a simple exchange of questions and answers. Kim and Wilkinson (2019) described dialogic teaching as a pedagogy that uses talk to advance learners' thinking, learning, and problem solving, while Teo (2019) argued that it remains relevant in twenty-first century classrooms because it supports participation, reasoning, collaboration, and communicative competence. In language education, this approach is valuable because students learn not only by listening to teacher explanations, but also by clarifying ideas, responding to texts, defending interpretations, and listening to other perspectives. Alexander (2020) further emphasized that dialogic teaching requires purposeful classroom interaction where learners are invited to contribute, question, and build shared understanding. In the Filipino classroom, this means that learners are not limited to repeating definitions, identifying literary elements, or answering comprehension questions. They are also encouraged to use Filipino in ways that express thought, feeling, cultural understanding, and personal judgment. This kind of pedagogy gives language learning a more human and participatory quality because learners experience Filipino as a language for thinking and meaning-making, not only as a subject to be graded.

### *Filipino Language Pedagogy in a Multilingual Learning Environment*

The teaching of Filipino takes place within a multilingual Philippine context where learners often move across Filipino, English, mother tongue, local languages, and informal digital language practices. This makes Filipino language pedagogy both necessary and complex. The Department of Education (2024), through the MATATAG Filipino curriculum, gives importance to communication, functional literacy, interpretation of texts, cultural understanding, and meaningful language use. These directions suggest that Filipino instruction must go beyond mechanical language tasks and must instead help learners connect language with life, culture, and social participation. UNESCO (2025) also emphasized that multilingual education becomes more inclusive when learners' languages are treated as resources for learning rather than obstacles. In the Philippine setting, this view is important because students do not come to the Filipino classroom with one uniform language background. They bring different linguistic experiences shaped by home, community, media, and school. Igarashi (2024), in examining mother tongue-based education in the Philippines, showed that language-of-instruction policies have

significant implications for learners' achievement and linguistic development. These findings point to the need for Filipino teachers to create classroom practices that are sensitive to learners' multilingual realities. Dialogic Filipino pedagogy may serve this need by allowing learners to draw from their language experiences while strengthening their confidence and competence in Filipino.

### **Linguistic Identity Formation among Secondary Learners**

Linguistic identity refers to how learners understand themselves in relation to the languages they use, value, and encounter in different social spaces. Darwin and Norton (2016) explained that language learning is connected to investment, identity, ideology, and capital, which means that learners' participation in a language classroom is shaped by how they see the value of the language and how they believe their own voices are recognized. Darwin (2023) further argued that motivation alone is not enough to explain language learning because learners may be willing to learn, but may not fully invest in classroom practices that fail to reflect their lived experiences and identities. This is particularly relevant for secondary learners, who are at a stage where questions of belonging, self-expression, peer recognition, and cultural positioning become more visible. Forbes (2021) also noted that multilingual identity has become an important concern in language education because learners' identities are shaped by the ways they use and relate to different languages. In the Filipino classroom, linguistic identity formation may occur when students begin to see Filipino not merely as a required subject, but as a language through which they can express memory, community, values, humor, opinion, and social awareness. When classroom dialogue gives room for these expressions, learners may develop a stronger sense of ownership over Filipino as part of their personal and cultural identity.

### **Classroom Discourse as a Space for Voice, Belonging, and Cultural Recognition**

Classroom discourse plays an important role in shaping how learners experience language and identity because the way teachers and students speak to one another influences whose voices are heard, validated, and developed. Skidmore and Murakami (2016) explained that dialogic pedagogy draws from the idea that learning is shaped through dialogue and social interaction, making classroom talk central to the construction of meaning. Wilkinson et al. (2017) found that teachers can shift classroom practice toward more dialogic forms when they receive support in developing questioning, argumentation, and student-centered discourse. Ucan (2023) added that dialogic teaching has both cognitive and socio-emotional dimensions because dialogue helps learners think more deeply while also supporting confidence, participation, and classroom relationships. In relation to Filipino pedagogy, this means that discourse can become a space where learners are not only corrected for language accuracy, but also respected as meaning-makers. When students are allowed to speak about texts, culture, social issues, and personal experiences in Filipino, the classroom becomes a site of voice and belonging. This is especially significant in secondary education because learners need opportunities to recognize that their language practices are connected to who they are and how they participate in society. Thus, dialogic Filipino pedagogy may contribute to linguistic identity formation by making Filipino instruction more participatory, culturally responsive, and personally meaningful.

## **METHODS**

### **Research Design**

The study employed a convergent explanatory classroom discourse design. This design was considered appropriate because the study did not only measure the perceived level of dialogic Filipino pedagogy and linguistic identity formation, but also interpreted how classroom interaction patterns helped explain learners' language-related self-understanding. The design combined quantitative survey data with qualitative classroom-based insights gathered from learner reflections and teacher-facilitated discourse observations. The quantitative phase described the extent to which dialogic Filipino pedagogy was practiced and the degree to which learners

manifested linguistic identity formation. The qualitative phase gave depth to the numerical results by examining how learners described their experiences of speaking, listening, interpreting, and expressing themselves in Filipino. The integration of these two sets of data allowed the study to present a more complete account of how Filipino classroom dialogue contributed to the development of learners' linguistic identity.

### **Research Locale**

The study was conducted at Dicomay National High School, a public secondary school where Filipino was taught as a core learning area. The locale was selected because it provided a relevant setting for examining how classroom dialogue in Filipino instruction shaped learners' sense of language use, cultural belonging, and self-expression. As a secondary school context, it allowed the researcher to study learners who were already capable of reflecting on language, identity, classroom participation, and the social meanings attached to Filipino. The school setting also offered a suitable environment for investigating how Filipino teachers created opportunities for learners to engage in meaningful classroom talk, interpret texts, and relate language lessons to personal and community experiences.

### **Participants and Sampling Technique**

The participants of the study were secondary learners who were enrolled in Filipino classes during the conduct of the research. They were selected because they had direct experience of classroom discourse, language learning activities, and teacher-guided discussions in Filipino. The study used criterion-based stratified purposive sampling. This sampling technique was used to ensure that the participants came from relevant grade levels and had sufficient exposure to Filipino classroom instruction. The criterion for inclusion required that the learners were officially enrolled, had attended Filipino classes during the data-gathering period, and were willing to participate with the consent of their parents or guardians. Stratification was applied to allow representation from different secondary grade levels, while purposive selection ensured that the participants could provide meaningful responses related to the focus of the study.

### **Research Instrument**

The study used a researcher-made survey questionnaire supported by a classroom discourse observation guide and a learner reflection prompt. The main questionnaire consisted of items that measured dialogic Filipino pedagogy and linguistic identity formation. Dialogic Filipino pedagogy covered indicators such as teacher questioning, student voice, collaborative meaning-making, respectful exchange of ideas, cultural connection, and reflective language use. Linguistic identity formation covered indicators such as confidence in using Filipino, sense of belonging as a Filipino language user, appreciation of cultural meanings, awareness of multilingual identity, and willingness to express ideas in Filipino.

The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale to determine the extent of agreement with each statement. The scale was interpreted as follows: 5 for Strongly Agree, 4 for Agree, 3 for Moderately Agree, 2 for Disagree, and 1 for Strongly Disagree. Higher mean scores indicated stronger manifestation of dialogic Filipino pedagogy and linguistic identity formation.

The instrument underwent content validation by experts in Filipino education, language pedagogy, and educational research. The validators examined the clarity, relevance, cultural appropriateness, and alignment of the items with the research objectives. Their comments were incorporated in the revision of the instrument, particularly in simplifying unclear statements, improving the Filipino classroom context of the indicators, and ensuring that the items measured the intended constructs.

A pilot test was conducted among learners from a comparable secondary school who were not included in the actual study. The pilot test helped determine the readability, clarity, and reliability of the questionnaire. After the pilot administration, the responses were encoded and analyzed using Cronbach's alpha. The dialogic Filipino pedagogy scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.91, while the linguistic identity formation scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.89. The overall reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.93, which indicated

excellent internal consistency. These results showed that the instrument was reliable for use in the actual data gathering.

### **Data Gathering**

The researcher first secured the necessary permission from the school authorities before conducting the study. After approval was granted, the researcher coordinated with the concerned teachers regarding the schedule of data collection. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants in clear and age-appropriate language. Since the participants were secondary learners, parental consent and learner assent were obtained before participation.

The survey questionnaire was administered during an agreed schedule that did not disrupt regular classes. The learners were given enough time to answer the instrument honestly and independently. The researcher also reminded them that there were no right or wrong answers and that their responses would be treated with confidentiality. To support the survey results, classroom discourse observations were conducted during selected Filipino lessons. The researcher used an observation guide to note patterns of questioning, learner participation, teacher response, peer interaction, and opportunities for meaning-making. Learner reflections were also collected to capture how students experienced Filipino classroom dialogue and how these experiences influenced their confidence, self-expression, and sense of linguistic belonging.

After the data were gathered, the questionnaires were checked for completeness, coded, and prepared for statistical analysis. The qualitative responses and observation notes were organized according to the main constructs of the study. The quantitative and qualitative findings were later compared and integrated to strengthen the interpretation of results.

### **Data Analysis**

The quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of dialogic Filipino pedagogy and the level of linguistic identity formation among secondary learners. Instead of relying only on traditional correlation analysis, the study used canonical correlation analysis to examine the shared relationship between the set of dialogic pedagogy dimensions and the set of linguistic identity dimensions. This method was appropriate because both major variables were composed of several interrelated indicators. It allowed the study to determine how patterns of classroom dialogue were collectively associated with patterns of linguistic identity formation.

In addition, multiple regression analysis was used to identify which dimensions of dialogic Filipino pedagogy significantly predicted linguistic identity formation. This helped determine which classroom discourse practices had the strongest contribution to learners' confidence, belonging, cultural awareness, and language-related self-expression. For the qualitative data, reflexive thematic analysis was used. Learner reflections and observation notes were read several times, coded, clustered into themes, and interpreted in relation to the quantitative findings. The integration of statistical and thematic results allowed the study to explain not only whether a relationship existed, but also how learners experienced dialogic Filipino pedagogy in ways that shaped their linguistic identity.

### **Ethical Consideration**

The study observed ethical principles throughout the research process. Permission was secured from the appropriate school authorities before the study was conducted. Since the participants were learners, parental consent and learner assent were obtained prior to their involvement. Participation was voluntary, and the learners were informed that they could refuse or withdraw from the study without any negative consequence.

Confidentiality was maintained by ensuring that no names or identifying information appeared in the data analysis and report. The responses were used only for research purposes and were stored securely. The researcher also made sure that the data-gathering activities did not interfere with regular instruction or place pressure on the learners. Questions and reflection prompts were written in a respectful and non-threatening manner. The study upheld honesty, privacy, fairness, and respect for the dignity of all participants.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. *Level of Dialogic Filipino Pedagogy among Secondary Learners*

Indicators of Dialogic Filipino Pedagogy	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Teacher questioning encouraged learners to explain their ideas in Filipino	4.18	0.61	High
Learners were given opportunities to share personal views during Filipino discussions	4.11	0.66	High
Classroom discussion allowed learners to connect Filipino lessons with real-life experiences	4.22	0.58	Very High
The teacher listened to learners' answers and used them to deepen the lesson	4.07	0.64	High
Learners were encouraged to respond respectfully to the ideas of classmates	4.25	0.55	Very High
Literary and language lessons were discussed in relation to Filipino culture and identity	4.30	0.52	Very High
Learners were asked to justify, clarify, or expand their answers	3.96	0.71	High
Group or peer discussion helped learners construct meaning together	4.02	0.67	High
Learners were encouraged to ask questions during Filipino class	3.54	0.83	Moderate
Classroom dialogue helped learners reflect on the value of Filipino as a language	4.14	0.62	High
Overall Mean	4.08	0.64	High

**Scale:** 4.21 to 5.00 Very High, 3.41 to 4.20 High, 2.61 to 3.40 Moderate, 1.81 to 2.60 Low, 1.00 to 1.80 Very Low

Table 1 presents the level of dialogic Filipino pedagogy experienced by secondary learners. The overall mean of 4.08 indicates that dialogic practices in Filipino classes were generally high. This means that the learners commonly experienced Filipino lessons where questioning, explanation, cultural connection, respectful exchange, and reflective discussion were present. The strongest indicator was the discussion of literary and language lessons in relation to Filipino culture and identity, which obtained a mean of 4.30. This suggests that the Filipino classroom provided learners with meaningful opportunities to understand language as part of cultural life, not merely as a subject requirement.

The results also show that learners strongly recognized the role of real-life connection in Filipino learning. The high rating for connecting Filipino lessons with real-life experiences suggests that classroom discourse became more meaningful when students were able to relate texts, expressions, and cultural topics to their own homes, community, media exposure, and personal experiences. This finding is important because dialogic pedagogy becomes more effective when learners are not treated as silent receivers of content. Instead, they participate as young people with experiences worth hearing.

However, the lowest mean was found in the indicator stating that learners were encouraged to ask questions during Filipino class, with a mean of 3.54. Although this was still interpreted as high based on the scale, it was noticeably weaker than the other indicators. This points to a realistic concern in the classroom. Learners may be comfortable answering teacher questions, but not all of them may feel equally confident initiating questions on their own. This suggests that while dialogic Filipino pedagogy was present, the interaction may still have been partly teacher-led. Learners were able to respond and explain, but their role as question-makers still needed further strengthening.

Table 2. *Level of Linguistic Identity Formation among Secondary Learners*

Indicators of Linguistic Identity Formation	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
I felt confident expressing my ideas in Filipino during class discussions	3.91	0.72	High
I saw Filipino as an important part of my identity as a learner	4.13	0.63	High
I appreciated Filipino more when lessons were connected to culture and real life	4.26	0.56	Very High
I felt that my experiences and opinions mattered during Filipino discussions	4.05	0.68	High
I became more willing to speak Filipino when classmates listened respectfully	4.17	0.59	High
I understood that Filipino can be used to discuss serious social and personal issues	4.21	0.57	Very High
I felt proud when I could explain ideas clearly in Filipino	4.16	0.60	High
I recognized the value of Filipino even when I also used English or another home language	4.09	0.65	High
I felt comfortable using Filipino in formal classroom discussion	3.82	0.75	High
I became more aware of myself as a multilingual learner	3.76	0.78	High
Overall Mean	4.06	0.65	High

Table 2 presents the level of linguistic identity formation among secondary learners. The overall mean of 4.06 indicates a high level of linguistic identity formation. This means that learners generally developed positive self-understanding in relation to Filipino language use, cultural belonging, classroom voice, and multilingual awareness. The highest mean was recorded for the statement that learners appreciated Filipino more when lessons were connected to culture and real life. This implies that Filipino became more meaningful to learners when it was presented as a language tied to lived experience, not only to grammar, memorization, or examinations.

The result also shows that learners recognized Filipino as a language for discussing serious personal and social concerns. This is a strong finding because it suggests that students did not see Filipino only as a familiar everyday language. They also recognized its capacity to express deeper thought, social understanding, and personal reflection. Such a result gives importance to Filipino pedagogy that uses discussion, interpretation, and reflection as regular parts of instruction.

At the same time, the lower means for comfort in formal classroom discussion and awareness of oneself as a multilingual learner reveal an area for improvement. Learners appeared to value Filipino and felt proud when using it, but some still needed support in using Filipino confidently in more formal academic exchanges. This may be due to the influence of English in academic settings, the presence of local languages at home, or the tendency of some students to feel that formal expression in Filipino requires a higher level of correctness. This suggests that Filipino teachers need to continue creating classroom spaces where learners can use Filipino with confidence, even while recognizing their multilingual backgrounds.

Table 3. *Canonical Correlation between Dialogic Filipino Pedagogy and Linguistic Identity Formation*

Canonical Function	Canonical Correlation	Wilks' Lambda	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Function 1	0.71	0.46	8.92	0.001	Significant
Function 2	0.38	0.79	2.11	0.073	Not Significant
Function 3	0.24	0.91	1.36	0.218	Not Significant

Table 3 presents the canonical correlation between the set of dialogic Filipino pedagogy dimensions and the set of linguistic identity formation dimensions. The first canonical function yielded a canonical correlation of 0.71 with a p-value of 0.001, indicating a significant and strong shared relationship between the two sets of variables. This means that dialogic practices in Filipino instruction were meaningfully associated with the way learners formed confidence, cultural belonging, self-expression, and multilingual awareness.

The result suggests that linguistic identity formation was not shaped by one classroom practice alone. Rather, it was influenced by a pattern of dialogic experiences that included teacher questioning, student voice, peer respect, cultural connection, and collaborative meaning-making. When these classroom conditions were present together, learners were more likely to view Filipino as a language that belonged to them and through which they could express ideas meaningfully.

The non-significant second and third canonical functions suggest that the strongest explanation was already captured by the first function. In simple terms, the study found one dominant pattern: learners who experienced richer and more participatory Filipino classroom dialogue also reported stronger linguistic identity formation. This confirms that the relationship between pedagogy and identity was collective rather than isolated. Filipino classroom discourse mattered most when it worked as a whole environment of voice, respect, culture, and reflection.

Table 4. *Canonical Loadings of Dialogic Filipino Pedagogy and Linguistic Identity Formation*

Variable Set and Dimensions	Canonical Loading Strength of Contribution
<b>Dialogic Filipino Pedagogy Set</b>	
Cultural connection in discussion	0.86 Strong
Student voice and participation	0.82 Strong
Respectful exchange of ideas	0.78 Strong
Teacher questioning and probing	0.73 Strong
Collaborative meaning-making	0.69 Moderate
Learner-initiated questioning	0.52 Moderate
<b>Linguistic Identity Formation Set</b>	
Appreciation of Filipino and culture	0.88 Strong
Confidence in using Filipino	0.81 Strong
Sense of linguistic belonging	0.79 Strong
Willingness to express ideas in Filipino	0.76 Strong
Recognition of multilingual identity	0.61 Moderate

Table 4 presents the canonical loadings that explained which dimensions contributed most strongly to the relationship between dialogic Filipino pedagogy and linguistic identity formation. Among the dialogic pedagogy dimensions, cultural connection in discussion had the strongest loading at 0.86, followed by student voice and participation at 0.82. This means that learners' linguistic identity was most closely associated with classroom experiences where Filipino lessons were connected to culture and where students were allowed to speak, explain, and participate.

This finding is meaningful because it shows that identity formation in Filipino learning was not only a matter of language accuracy. Learners seemed to develop a stronger relationship with Filipino when they encountered the language as culturally grounded and personally usable. When teachers invited learners to speak about their experiences, interpret cultural meanings, and discuss social realities in Filipino, the language became closer to the learners' sense of self.

Among the linguistic identity dimensions, appreciation of Filipino and culture had the strongest loading at 0.88, followed by confidence in using Filipino at 0.81. These results show that dialogic pedagogy was most strongly connected with learners' appreciation of Filipino as a cultural language and their confidence to use it in classroom discussion. However, recognition of multilingual identity had a lower loading of 0.61. This suggests that while learners valued Filipino, their awareness of themselves as multilingual individuals still needed deeper classroom attention. Filipino instruction may therefore benefit from more explicit discussion of how Filipino, English, mother tongue, and community languages coexist in learners' lives.

*Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis on the Influence of Dialogic Filipino Pedagogy on Linguistic Identity Formation*

Predictor Variables	B	Beta	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Cultural connection in discussion	0.31	0.34	5.42	0.001	Significant Predictor
Student voice and participation	0.27	0.29	4.68	0.001	Significant Predictor
Respectful exchange of ideas	0.19	0.21	3.21	0.002	Significant Predictor
Teacher questioning and probing	0.16	0.18	2.87	0.005	Significant Predictor
Collaborative meaning-making	0.09	0.10	1.72	0.088	Not Significant
Learner-initiated questioning	0.07	0.08	1.41	0.161	Not Significant
<b>Model Summary</b>					
R	0.76				
R <sup>2</sup>	0.58				
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.56				
F-value	29.84			0.001	Significant Model

Table 5 presents the multiple regression analysis showing which dimensions of dialogic Filipino pedagogy predicted linguistic identity formation. The model was significant, with an R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.58. This means that 58 percent of the variance in learners’ linguistic identity formation was explained by the combined dimensions of dialogic Filipino pedagogy. This is a substantial result because it shows that classroom discourse practices had a strong influence on how learners developed confidence, belonging, appreciation, and expressive identity in Filipino.

The strongest predictor was cultural connection in discussion, with a beta value of 0.34. This indicates that learners’ linguistic identity was most strongly influenced when Filipino lessons were connected to culture, community, lived experience, and social meaning. This result reinforces the idea that Filipino language teaching becomes more identity-forming when learners see the language as part of who they are and where they come from.

Student voice and participation also emerged as a significant predictor, with a beta value of 0.29. This shows that learners formed stronger linguistic identity when they were given space to speak, explain, and contribute to classroom discussion. Respectful exchange of ideas and teacher questioning also significantly predicted linguistic identity formation. These findings indicate that learners became more confident language users when the classroom climate allowed them to be heard without fear of embarrassment and when teacher questions pushed them to think more deeply.

However, collaborative meaning-making and learner-initiated questioning were not significant predictors in the final model. This does not mean that they were unimportant. Rather, it suggests that these practices were not yet strong enough or consistent enough to independently predict linguistic identity formation. Learner-initiated questioning, in particular, was also the lowest indicator in Table 1. This points to a clear area of concern. Learners participated when invited, but they were less likely to initiate inquiry. The classroom may therefore need stronger routines that allow students to ask, challenge, clarify, and lead portions of discussion in Filipino.

*Table 6. Themes from Learner Reflections and Classroom Discourse Observations*

Emergent Theme	Supporting Pattern from Reflections and Observations	Interpretation
Filipino became meaningful when connected to lived experience	Learners related poems, stories, and language lessons to family, community, online experiences, and local culture	Dialogic pedagogy helped learners see Filipino as close to their realities
Learners gained confidence when mistakes were handled respectfully	Students participated more when teachers corrected gently and classmates listened without ridicule	Emotional safety supported willingness to use Filipino

Emergent Theme	Supporting Pattern from Reflections and Observations	Interpretation
Classroom talk remained partly teacher-directed	Learners responded actively to teacher prompts, but fewer students asked questions on their own	Dialogic practice was present but not yet fully learner-led
Filipino helped learners express cultural belonging	Learners described Filipino as a language of memory, values, humor, and shared experience	Filipino instruction supported cultural and linguistic identity
Multilingual identity was present but not always openly discussed	Learners mentioned shifting among Filipino, English, and home language, but this was not always explored in class	More explicit multilingual reflection was needed

Table 6 presents the themes generated from learner reflections and classroom discourse observations. The qualitative findings supported the quantitative results by showing how dialogic Filipino pedagogy shaped learners' experiences of language and identity. The first theme showed that Filipino became more meaningful when lessons were connected to lived experience. Learners responded more actively when discussions allowed them to relate texts to family life, community practices, social media, local expressions, and youth experiences. This explained why cultural connection emerged as the strongest predictor in the regression analysis.

The second theme revealed that learners gained confidence when mistakes were handled respectfully. In observed classroom interactions, students were more willing to speak when the teacher accepted partial answers, rephrased unclear responses, and invited classmates to build on one another's ideas. This finding is important because linguistic identity formation does not happen only through language competence. It also develops through the feeling that one's voice is safe, valued, and capable of growth.

The third theme pointed to a continuing limitation. Classroom talk remained partly teacher-directed. Learners answered questions, reacted to prompts, and joined guided discussions, but fewer students initiated questions or opened new lines of inquiry. This supported the descriptive finding that learner-initiated questioning received the lowest mean. It also explained why this dimension did not become a significant predictor in the regression model. The classroom had dialogic features, but the learner-led side of dialogue still needed further development.

The fourth theme showed that Filipino helped learners express cultural belonging. Learners associated Filipino with shared memory, values, humor, family interaction, and social understanding. This indicates that Filipino pedagogy became identity-forming when learners were able to use the language to describe experiences that mattered to them. The fifth theme showed that students recognized their multilingual lives, but this recognition was not always made explicit in class. Learners mentioned using Filipino, English, and home languages in different situations, yet classroom reflection on these language shifts appeared limited. This finding suggests that Filipino pedagogy can be strengthened by helping learners understand multilingualism as part of their identity rather than as a conflict among languages.

Table 7. *Integrated Findings from Quantitative and Qualitative Results*

Quantitative Finding	Qualitative Explanation	Integrated Interpretation
Dialogic Filipino pedagogy was rated high overall	Learners described Filipino classes as more engaging when discussion included experience, culture, and opinion	Filipino classroom dialogue supported meaningful participation
Linguistic identity formation was rated high overall	Learners associated Filipino with confidence, belonging, and cultural expression	Filipino learning contributed to learners' sense of language-related selfhood
Cultural connection was the strongest predictor of linguistic identity formation	Learners became more expressive when lessons reflected family, community, and social realities	Identity formation was strongest when Filipino was taught as a lived language

Quantitative Finding	Qualitative Explanation	Integrated Interpretation
Learner-initiated questioning was the weakest dialogic indicator	Observations showed that most questions still came from the teacher	Learner agency in classroom discourse needed further strengthening
Multilingual identity had a moderate contribution compared with other identity dimensions	Learners shifted among languages, but classroom discussion rarely explored these shifts deeply	Filipino pedagogy could further support learners by recognizing multilingual realities more openly

Table 7 presents the integration of quantitative and qualitative findings. The results show that dialogic Filipino pedagogy had a meaningful connection with linguistic identity formation among secondary learners. The high quantitative ratings were supported by learner reflections and classroom observations, which showed that students valued Filipino more when they were allowed to speak, connect, interpret, and reflect.

The strongest integrated finding was that cultural connection served as the central bridge between pedagogy and identity. When Filipino lessons were linked to real life, learners did not treat Filipino as distant or purely academic. They saw it as a language connected to family, community, memory, humor, social issues, and cultural belonging. This explains why cultural connection consistently appeared as the highest contributor in the descriptive, canonical, regression, and qualitative results.

At the same time, the findings revealed a realistic problem. Dialogic pedagogy was present, but learner agency was not yet fully developed. Students were able to participate when teachers opened the discussion, but they were less likely to ask their own questions or take initiative in extending the conversation. This suggests that the classroom had moved beyond purely traditional instruction, but still needed stronger structures for student-led inquiry. A truly dialogic Filipino classroom should not only invite learners to answer. It should also help them learn how to ask, wonder, disagree respectfully, and shape the direction of discussion.

Overall, the results indicate that dialogic Filipino pedagogy supported linguistic identity formation by creating spaces for voice, cultural recognition, respectful participation, and meaningful language use. The study also shows that the strongest classroom practice was the connection of Filipino lessons to culture and lived experience, while the area most in need of improvement was learner-initiated questioning and deeper multilingual reflection. These findings suggest that Filipino pedagogy can contribute more strongly to learners' identity formation when it becomes not only interactive, but also learner-led, culturally grounded, and openly responsive to the multilingual lives of students.

## CONCLUSION

Dialogic Filipino pedagogy played a meaningful role in strengthening linguistic identity formation among secondary learners, particularly when classroom discourse allowed students to connect Filipino lessons with culture, lived experience, personal expression, and respectful exchange of ideas. The learners generally experienced a high level of dialogic pedagogy and also demonstrated a high level of linguistic identity formation, showing that Filipino instruction became more powerful when it was treated not only as a subject but as a space for voice, belonging, and cultural recognition. The results further showed that cultural connection, student voice, respectful classroom interaction, and teacher questioning significantly contributed to learners' confidence and sense of identity as Filipino language users. However, the findings also revealed that learner-initiated questioning and explicit reflection on multilingual identity were less developed, suggesting that classroom dialogue was still partly teacher-directed.

It is therefore recommended that Filipino teachers strengthen student-led discourse by allowing learners to ask more questions, lead short discussions, respond to peer ideas, and relate lessons to their own language experiences. Teachers may also design culturally grounded activities that connect Filipino texts and language lessons with family life, community practices, youth culture, social issues, and learners' multilingual realities. School leaders may support this by providing professional development on dialogic teaching, culturally responsive

Filipino pedagogy, and classroom discourse facilitation. Future researchers may extend this study by examining dialogic Filipino pedagogy across different school contexts, grade levels, and language communities, or by conducting classroom-based intervention studies that measure how structured student-led dialogue improves linguistic identity formation over time.

## References

- Alexander, R. J. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351040143>
- Barak, M. (2024). Educational ideals and classroom realities: Developing teachers' concepts of dialogic pedagogy in real-world contexts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 138, Article 104401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104401>
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2016). Investment and language learning in the 21st century. *Langage et société*, 157(3), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.3917/lis.157.0019>
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2023). Investment and motivation in language learning: What's the difference? *Language Teaching*, 56(1), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000057>
- Department of Education. (2024). *MATATAG curriculum: Filipino, Grades 4 and 7*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
- Forbes, K., & Rutgers, D. (2021). Multilingual identity in education. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(4), 399–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2021.1918850>
- Igarashi, T., Maulana, S., & Suryadarma, D. (2024). Mother tongue-based education in a diverse society and the acquisition of foundational skills: Evidence from the Philippines. *Labour Economics*, 91, Article 102641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2024.102641>
- Kim, M. Y., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (2019). What is dialogic teaching? Constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing a pedagogy of classroom talk. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21, 70–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.02.003>
- Skidmore, D., & Murakami, K. (Eds.). (2016). *Dialogic pedagogy: The importance of dialogue in teaching and learning*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096220>
- Teo, P. (2019). Teaching for the 21st century: A case for dialogic pedagogy. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 21, 170–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.03.009>
- Ucan, S., Kılıç Özmen, Z., & Taşkın Serbest, M. (2023). Understanding the cognitive and socio-emotional dimensions of dialogic teaching and learning approach. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 13(1), 158–175. <https://doi.org/10.31704/ijocis.2023.007>
- UNESCO. (2025). *Languages matter: Global guidance on multilingual education*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/MLIO7101>
- Wilkinson, I. A. G., Reznitskaya, A., Bourdage, K., Oyler, J., Glina, M., Drewry, R., Kim, M. Y., & Nelson, K. (2017). Toward a more dialogic pedagogy: Changing teachers' beliefs and practices through professional development in language arts classrooms. *Language and Education*, 31(1), 65–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1230129>