
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Challenges and Opportunities: Voices of Araling Panlipunan Teachers on Integrating Gamification into their Pedagogy

Beatriz Ann T. Simafranca

Researcher, Graduate Studies Department, University of Cebu- Main, Cebu City, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Beatriz Ann T. Simafranca **E-mail:** beatrizann.simafranca071@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

Gamification has emerged as a promising strategy to enhance student engagement, yet its specific application in the context of Philippine Social Studies (Araling Panlipunan) remains underexplored. This transcendental phenomenological study examined the lived experiences, challenges, and coping mechanisms of 10 Junior High School Araling Panlipunan teachers in the Toledo City Division (A.Y. 2024–2025). Data were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews and analyzed using thematic analysis. Findings reveal a dual narrative: while teachers reported positive outcomes such as increased student motivation, active participation, and improved lesson retention, they also encountered significant hurdles, including technological limitations, time constraints, and socio-emotional challenges among learners. To navigate these issues, teachers employed coping strategies focused on structured implementation, adaptability, and peer collaboration. The study concludes that while gamification is a potent pedagogical tool for Social Studies, its sustainable effectiveness relies heavily on strengthened institutional support, adequate technological infrastructure, and continuous professional development for teachers.

| KEYWORDS

Gamification, educational technology, teaching strategies, teacher experiences, araling panlipunan, game-based learning, social studies, qualitative

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 20 November 2024

PUBLISHED: 09 December 2025

DOI: 10.32996/jhsss.2025.7.12.3

Introduction

Araling Panlipunan, or Social Studies, holds a pivotal role in the Philippine educational curriculum as it encompasses a broad range of disciplines—history, geography, political science, economics, culture, and current national and global issues. Through these domains, the subject aims to deepen learners' understanding of the nation's heritage, promote civic responsibility, and cultivate informed, socially aware citizens. Despite its significance, Araling Panlipunan is often perceived by students as challenging and less engaging, which negatively affects their motivation and academic performance. This long-standing classroom concern continues to demand innovative pedagogical approaches that can sustain interest and enhance learning.

The shift to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic further highlighted the need for such innovation. Teachers were compelled to adopt digital tools and creative strategies to maintain student engagement in virtual environments. As schools returned to face-to-face instruction, educators were confronted with widened learning gaps, reduced student motivation, and a

resurgence of traditional instructional approaches that students often find disengaging (Ondras and Alvero, 2023). These conditions underscore the urgency of incorporating teaching strategies that actively foster participation and meaningful learning, particularly in subjects perceived as content-heavy or abstract.

National data echo these concerns. A Yale (2020) survey found that more than one-third of high school students frequently feel “tired,” “stressed,” or “bored” during class—emotions linked to lower engagement and poorer academic outcomes. Such disengagement is especially evident in subjects like Araling Panlipunan, where conventional lecture-based approaches make

complex topics are more difficult to grasp. In public secondary schools across Central Philippines, these issues are intensified by resource limitations and the persistence of traditional teaching methods, highlighting the need for more dynamic and motivating instructional strategies (Cruz & Olanda, 2023).

One promising approach is the integration of gamification into classroom instruction. Gamification enhances learning by incorporating elements of game design—points, badges, leaderboards, timed challenges, and interactive tasks—to foster motivation, participation, and a sense of achievement (Dabbagh et al., 2016). This strategy encourages active learning, creativity, collaboration, and improved knowledge retention. Today’s learners, who are highly familiar with digital technologies, respond positively to game-based elements, suggesting that gamification can make classroom experiences more engaging and enjoyable (Yang & Kang, 2020). Digital tools such as Raptivity, Kahoot, ClassDojo, and ClassPoint have already demonstrated their ability to captivate students’ interest and enrich instructional delivery.

Despite its promise, existing research on gamification yields mixed findings and highlights several gaps. Kalogiannakis et al. (2021) emphasize the need to examine contextual factors—such as subject area and instructional approach—that influence the effectiveness of gamification. Fernández et al. (2015) stress the importance of aligning gamified activities with diverse learner motivations, recommending more systematic investigations across educational settings. Lampropoulos & Sidiropoulos (2024) further demonstrate positive effects on student achievement and satisfaction but call for additional empirical studies that account for contextual variables.

As an Araling Panlipunan teacher, the researcher has directly experienced the challenges of sustaining learner engagement while navigating curriculum demands and resource constraints. This study aims to contribute to the limited Philippine literature on gamification by examining the lived experiences of Junior High School teachers who integrate gamification into their Araling Panlipunan classes. Specifically, the research seeks to identify the benefits, challenges, and coping mechanisms associated with gamification, thereby offering insights that can inform instructional practices and support improved learning outcomes in the Toledo City Division for A.Y. 2024–2025.

Literature Review

Gamification in education is grounded in three complementary theories: Constructivism, Behaviorism, and Flow Theory. Constructivism, rooted in Piaget’s (1971) view of learning as an active, inquiry-based process, emphasizes the role of learner-driven meaning-making facilitated through exploration and social interaction. Gamified environments mirror these principles by enabling students to solve problems, engage collaboratively, and construct understanding through interactive tasks (Werbach, 2014; Miltenoff et al., 2015). In Araling Panlipunan, where learners analyze historical and social issues, gamification supports deeper cognitive engagement and critical thinking.

Behaviorism, particularly Skinner’s (1953) operant conditioning, reinforces learning through rewards, feedback, and structured reinforcement. Gamification applies behaviorist mechanisms through points, badges, leaderboards, and immediate feedback that encourage participation and guide students toward desired academic behaviors (Kapp, 2012; Deterding et al., 2011). These reinforcements help sustain attention and performance, making behaviorist strategies particularly relevant in content-heavy subjects like Araling Panlipunan.

Flow Theory (Csikszentmihalyi, 2014) contributes a motivational dimension by describing optimal learning conditions where challenge, skill level, and feedback are balanced. Gamified activities enhance flow by offering progressive difficulty, autonomy, and clear learning goals, fostering high engagement and intrinsic motivation (Duncan & West, 2018; Hamari et al., 2016). These factors are crucial for sustaining learner interest in Araling Panlipunan, which students often perceive as reliant on memorization (Abao et al., 2024).

Within the Philippine context, Araling Panlipunan aims to develop civic competence, historical understanding, and social awareness (Serafico-Reyes et al., 2019). However, instruction is frequently challenged by limited resources, traditional lecture-oriented approaches, and students’ declining motivation (Mendoza, 2024; Jimenez, 2020). While pedagogical innovations such as storytelling, case-based learning, and collaborative activities have improved engagement (Discar & Dacena, 2023; Jalotjot & Fidelino, 2023; Yu, 2024), these methods are difficult to sustain in schools with insufficient digital tools or updated learning

materials (Tupas & Linas-Laguda, 2020; Celeste & Osias, 2024). These persistent challenges highlight the need for strategies that simultaneously support motivation and enhance instructional quality.

Gamification provides such potential by integrating game elements that make learning interactive, goal-oriented, and enjoyable. Studies show that points, badges, and rewards increase student participation and sense of accomplishment (Zichermann & Cunningham, 2011; Gibson et al., 2015). Leaderboards foster healthy competition that motivates improvement (Dichev & Dicheva, 2017), while narrative elements deepen contextual understanding and engagement (Deterding et al., 2011). Feedback loops—scores, progress bars, and corrective prompts—help students monitor performance and strengthen academic persistence (Hartt et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2023).

Empirical findings in the Philippines echo these global trends. Gamification has been shown to boost motivation, engagement, and participation among learners in Science, Social Studies, and language subjects (Cabello et al., 2021; Bangcaya et al., 2021; Castro, 2020; Tomines et al., 2021). Gamified tasks also enhance collaboration and peer interaction, contributing to positive classroom climates (Reyes-Cabrera, 2022; Caballero et al., 2022). However, evidence on academic achievement is mixed. Derasin (2024) reported improvements in motivation but not significant gains in mathematics performance, suggesting the need for careful design alignment between game elements and learning outcomes.

Despite its promise, gamification faces challenges. Teachers require training, design skills, and time to integrate game mechanics effectively (Gómez-Carrasco et al., 2020). Access to technology remains uneven, particularly in public schools (Esteban Jr. & Cruz, 2021). Additionally, some students may be distracted by gameplay or may not respond positively to competitive elements (Filgona et al., 2020; Kwon & Özpolat, 2020). These issues underscore the importance of thoughtful implementation and adequate institutional support.

Overall, the literature suggests that gamification anchored in constructivist, behaviorist, and flow-based principles has strong potential to enhance engagement and improve instructional delivery in Araling Panlipunan. Yet its effectiveness depends on contextual factors such as teacher readiness, resource availability, and alignment with curriculum objectives. These considerations justify examining teachers' experiences to better understand how gamification can be meaningfully applied in Philippine Araling Panlipunan classrooms.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative transcendental phenomenological design to explore the lived experiences of Junior High School Araling Panlipunan teachers in integrating gamification. The research was conducted in selected public secondary schools in the Toledo City Division. Ten teachers served as participants, purposively chosen based on the following criteria: holders of a BSED major in Araling Panlipunan, with at least three years of teaching experience, and actively implementing gamification in their classes.

Data were gathered through semi-structured one-on-one interviews using a validated interview guide. Permissions were secured from the Schools Division Superintendent and school heads, and participants signed informed consent forms outlining confidentiality and voluntary participation. All interviews were audio-recorded with permission.

To ensure the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the interview questions with the study objectives, the interview guide underwent expert validation. Two research specialists with expertise in qualitative inquiry reviewed the instrument and provided feedback on content accuracy and question structure. Minor revisions were implemented based on their suggestions, and a pilot test with one non-participant teacher was conducted to confirm the comprehensibility of the questions. This process strengthened the credibility and trustworthiness of the instrument.

Interview transcripts were subjected to thematic analysis. Significant statements were coded, clustered, and synthesized to generate emergent and overarching themes describing teachers' experiences, challenges, and coping mechanisms. Bracketing and reflexive notes were employed to reduce researcher bias and strengthen analytic rigor.

Ethical considerations—including beneficence, nonmaleficence, justice, and autonomy—were strictly observed. Confidentiality of participants and research sites was maintained throughout the study.

Results

This section details the findings from the semi-structured interviews with 10 Araling Panlipunan teachers. Following the thematic analysis, the data revealed 16 emergent themes categorized into three major clusters: (1) Positive Experiences, (2) Negative

Experiences/Challenges Encountered, and (3) Coping Mechanisms. These themes reflect the participants' lived experiences in integrating gamification into their instruction.

Table 1 (*Positive Experiences of Teachers in Integrating Gamification*)

Emergent Theme	Best Illustrative Quote
1. Increased Student Participation	IDI 3: <i>"The benefits I've noticed are that students get excited knowing that in our class, we will be using a gamification app. It is not always that they get to see their teachers use these, so they get curious, excited, and at the same time, motivated to participate and learn."</i>
2. Positive Classroom Behavior	IDI 7: <i>"Since incorporating gamification into my lessons, I observed a significant improvement in classroom behavior. Students are more focused and less likely to get distracted because they are eager to complete challenges or earn rewards."</i>
3. Enhanced Retention of the Lesson	IDI 4: <i>"First, it helps them remember the lessons more. Second, it makes them feel more engaged and active. Third, because of its merit system, students are motivated to study. Fourth, it removes boredom away. Lastly, they become more involved in the learning process."</i>
4. Engaging Teaching-Learning Strategy	IDI 1: <i>"For example, in economics, by using Minecraft Education, we can not only deliver the lesson but also let students experience how transactions happen on a daily basis. They see firsthand how product limitations affect prices by building their own market with classmates."</i>
5. Increased Student Motivation	IDI 8: <i>"Students become more curious about the subject, asking more questions and even doing extra research on their own because the games make them feel connected to the lesson in a fun and interactive way."</i>

The first cluster highlights the beneficial impact of gamification on the teaching-learning process. Most participants emphasized that game-based elements significantly boosted student morale and interaction. As detailed in Table 1, the analysis identified five themes, including *Increased Student Participation* and *Positive Classroom Behavior*. Teachers consistently observed that students became more eager to engage in class activities, leading to better lesson retention and a more dynamic classroom atmosphere.

Table 2 (*Negative Experiences and Challenges Encountered*)

Emergent Theme	Best Illustrative Quote
1. Technical and Resource Limitations	IDI 3: <i>"The challenges I encountered in using gamification are that it is heavily reliant on an internet connection and data/load. In areas with a weak signal, this becomes a significant factor. Additionally, using gamification apps requires a teacher to be tech-savvy."</i>
2. Pedagogical and Time Management Challenges	IDI 4: <i>"Yes, gamification engages students, but it is too time-consuming. At times, the objectives of the day are not met because students become more focused on the games than on the content itself."</i>
3. Technological and Infrastructural Barriers	IDI 3: <i>"In my class, we were supposed to do an activity using gamification. However, some students didn't have their own gadgets, while others had gadgets but no load... only a few students had the necessary resources."</i>
4. Socio-Emotional Challenges	IDI 9: <i>"I tried using a leaderboard system. For some students, it motivated them to perform and participate even more. However, for students at the bottom, it was discouraging. Instead of motivating them, it made them feel defeated, and they stopped trying to improve."</i>
5. Disruption of Classroom Dynamics	IDI 3: <i>"There is too much noise and rowdiness when students are being competitive with one another. They become too focused on the game rather than the lesson."</i>
6. Overemphasis on Competition and Rewards	IDI 6: <i>"Overemphasis on rewards, points, and leaderboards can shift students' focus from learning to just earning points, which undermines the educational goals of the activity."</i>

Despite the reported pedagogical benefits, the participants also encountered significant hurdles in implementation. The thematic analysis identified six emergent themes primarily revolving around infrastructural deficits and behavioral dynamics. As shown in Table 2, the most pressing issues were *Technical and Resource Limitations* and *Technological Barriers*, where unstable internet connections and a lack of devices frequently disrupted lessons. Furthermore, teachers noted *Pedagogical Challenges*, explaining

Challenges and Opportunities: Voices of Araling Panlipunan Teachers on Integrating Gamification into their Pedagogy

that gamification consumed excessive time and occasionally caused *Disruption of Classroom Dynamics* due to noise and over-competitiveness among students.

Table 3 (*Coping Mechanisms Used by Teachers*)

Emergent Theme	Best Illustrative Quote
1. Structured Implementation and Inclusivity	IDI 2: "I set clear rules, balance rewards with intrinsic motivation, and provide support to struggling students. Additionally, I alternate gamified activities with other strategies to maintain variety and inclusivity."
2. Adaptability and Continuous Improvement	IDI 9: "I learned to adapt the level of competition. Instead of a single leaderboard, I use small group leaderboards or focus on collective goals so that students compete with their previous scores instead of constantly comparing themselves to others."
3. Institutional Support and Resources	IDI 5: "I request additional resources, such as portable charging stations or an improved Wi-Fi connection, to mitigate power and internet issues during game-based lessons."
4. Collaborative Learning and Peer Support	IDI 3: "I encourage students to form diverse groups that include both tech-savvy students and those who are struggling. This way, they help each other, and no one feels left out because of a lack of technical knowledge."
5. Differentiated Instruction and Personalized Support	IDI 7: "I implement differentiated activities, such as providing simpler tasks for beginners and more complex challenges for advanced learners. This ensures that every student finds value in the gamified lesson, regardless of their skill level."

To navigate the identified challenges, teachers developed adaptive strategies to ensure that gamification remained an effective instructional tool. The data revealed five key coping mechanisms focused on flexibility and peer support. As presented in Table 3, the most prominent approach was *Structured Implementation and Inclusivity*, where teachers established clear rules to manage behavior. Participants also emphasized *Adaptability*, modifying game mechanics to suit technical constraints, and utilized *Collaborative Learning* to address the digital divide. Finally, teachers actively sought *Institutional Support* to mitigate systemic resource gaps.

Discussion

The findings reveal a dichotomy in the implementation of gamification: while it serves as a potent pedagogical enhancer, it is simultaneously constrained by logistical friction.

The Dual Nature of Gamification: Positive Experiences vs. Challenges

Pedagogical Benefits: Engagement, Flow, and Retention. The most consistent positive finding was the surge in *Student Participation and Motivation*. Participants described a shift from passive reception to active inquiry, observing that gamified elements (rewards, leaderboards, quizzes) sparked curiosity and encouraged self-directed research. This aligns with Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) *Flow Theory*, where the balance of challenge and skill in gamified tasks allows students to enter a state of deep immersion and enjoyment.

This heightened engagement translated into *Positive Classroom Behavior*. Teachers noted that students were less distracted and more cooperative, as the structure of the games provided clear goals and immediate feedback. Consistent with Skinner's (1938) behaviorism, the external motivators (points/badges) acted as reinforcements that conditioned students toward on-task behavior and collaboration. Furthermore, the immersive nature of these activities contributed to *Enhanced Lesson Retention*. By transforming abstract economic or historical concepts into interactive simulations (e.g., Minecraft Education, role-playing), students moved beyond rote memorization to a deep, constructivist understanding. As noted by Domínguez et al. (2013), this active "learning by doing" strengthens cognitive anchors, leading to better long-term recall.

Barriers to Implementation: The Digital Divide and Behavioral Risks. Despite the pedagogical gains, the study identified critical hurdles. The most pervasive were *Technological and Infrastructural Barriers*. Participants frequently cited unstable internet, power outages, and a lack of devices as major disruptors that excluded students without personal gadgets. These resource limitations disrupted the "flow" of lessons, causing frustration and inequity. This echoes the findings of Lester et al. (2023), who noted that contextual constraints often hamper the adoption of game-based learning despite its potential.

Pedagogically, teachers faced *Time Management Challenges* and *Socio-Emotional Risks*. The preparation required for gamified lessons was described as demanding, often competing with the need to cover the curriculum. Furthermore, an *Overemphasis on Competition* sometimes backfired. While leaderboards motivated high achievers, they demotivated struggling students, leading to

feelings of defeat or exclusion. This supports Hanus and Fox (2015), who warned that excessive focus on extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation and shift focus from learning content to simply "winning" the game.

Navigating the Gamified Classroom: Coping Mechanisms

To mitigate these challenges, teachers employed adaptive strategies that ensured gamification remained an effective instructional tool.

Strategic Structuring and Inclusivity. Teachers emphasized the need for *Structured Implementation*. By establishing clear rules and managing expectations, they prevented the chaotic environments that excessive competition can breed. A key coping strategy was *Inclusivity and Differentiation*; to address the digital divide, teachers utilized "offline" gamification alternatives and mixed-ability grouping. This ensures that students without devices are not marginalized. This approach aligns with Piaget's *Constructivism*, where the teacher facilitates an environment that allows all learners to construct knowledge through social interaction and accessible experiences.

Adaptability and Collaborative Support. Participants highlighted *Adaptability* as a crucial skill, often modifying game mechanics in real-time to suit classroom energy or technical constraints. This flexibility was often bolstered by *Collaborative Learning and Peer Support*. Teachers created communities of practice, sharing resources, templates, and troubleshooting tips with colleagues. Figg and Jaipal-Jamani (2018) support this, finding that peer collaboration significantly reduces the burden of preparation and fosters a culture of innovation.

Institutional Reliance. Finally, the data underscores the necessity of *Institutional Support*. Teachers who received training and adequate resources reported higher success rates. As noted by Dichev and Dicheva (2017), sustainable gamification requires more than individual teacher effort; it demands systemic backing in the form of infrastructure and professional development to bridge the gap between theoretical potential and classroom reality.

Conclusion

Overall, the findings affirm that gamification holds substantial pedagogical value when aligned with clear objectives, differentiated approaches, and supportive learning environments. However, its effectiveness depends heavily on adequate infrastructure, capacity building, and thoughtful design that balances engagement with equity. The study contributes to the limited literature on gamification in the Philippine Social Studies context by providing an empirical account of teachers' everyday realities, highlighting how they navigate both opportunities and barriers in the classroom.

These insights carry important implications. At the classroom level, teachers benefit from structured implementation, balanced competitive-collaborative elements, and reflective practices that deepen conceptual understanding. At the institutional level, successful adoption requires sustained professional development, technological provision, and communities of practice that encourage innovation. At the policy level, national support for digital infrastructure, research funding, and standards for technology integration is essential to ensure equitable access and effective pedagogical use.

Future research should examine the long-term effects of gamification on learning outcomes, compare various game-based strategies, and explore diverse learner groups and classroom settings. Including student perspectives, studying specific game mechanics, and evaluating professional development models would further enrich understanding and guide evidence-based improvements. Collectively, these directions can strengthen the informed and sustainable integration of gamification within Araling Panlipunan and across the broader educational landscape.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the affiliated organization, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1] Abao, J., Taganas, W. & Comon, J. (2024). Factors affecting academic performance in Araling Panlipunan among junior high school learners of Gingoog City. *European Modern Studies Journal*, 8(4), 1-25. [https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8\(4\).2024.1](https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8(4).2024.1)
- [2] Bailey, C. (2018). *A guide to qualitative field research*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071909614>
- [3] Bangcaya, H. O., Olvis, P. R., Disca, B. Y., Comoda, J. T., & Taborada, J. H. (2021). Play as you learn: Gamification and its effect on the learning outcomes and motivation of students in science. *PAPSI International 3-Day Research Conference Proceedings*, 2(1), 1-1.
- [4] Caballero, L., Ferrer, M. & Tiria, R. (2022). The role of gamification in the academic performance of junior high school students in language subject. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Multidisciplinary Studies*, 8(3), 1-4.
- [5] Cabello, C. A., Abadianob, M. N., Mabitad, A., Hipe, A. & Pulma, D. (2021). Gamification in education: The motivation-exploration-implementation theory. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(7). 2356-2369.
- [6] Castro, A. M. S. (2020). Simulation games techniques and lecture method in teaching Araling Panlipunan. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(2).
- [7] Celeste, R. J. & Osias, N. (2024). Challenges and implementation of technology integration: Basis for enhanced instructional program. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 3(2), 106-130. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i2.2656>
- [8] Cruz, B. D. T. & Olanda, L. R. Q. (2023). Causes of students' boredom in Social Studies discussions. *Universal International Journal of Research (UIJR)*, 4(5). <https://doi-ds.org/doilink/10.2023-44367552/UIJR>
- [9] Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.
- [10] Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2014). Learning, flow, and happiness. In *The best within us: Positive psychology perspectives on eudaimonia*. Springer.
- [11] Dabbagh, N., Benson, A. D., Denham, A., Joseph, R., Al-Freih, M., Zgheib, G., Fake, H., & Guo, Z. (2016). *Learning technologies and globalization: Pedagogical frameworks and applications*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22963-8>
- [12] Derasin, L. M. (2024). The impact of digital gamification and traditional-based learning on students' mathematics achievement: Evidence from the Philippines. *Journal of Data Acquisition and Processing*, 38(1), 2108-2116. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.778108>
- [13] Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R. & Nacke, L. (2011). From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining gamification. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments* (pp. 9-15). ACM.
- [14] Dichev, D. & Dicheva, D. (2017). Gamifying education: What is known, what is believed and what remains uncertain: A critical review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0042-5>
- [15] Discar, R. F. & Decena, A. (2023). Development of Araling Panlipunan competencies among the grade ten learners of Sayao National High School using a flipped classroom approach. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 9(2), 222-240. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7976101>
- [16] Domínguez, A., Saenz-de-Navarrete, J., de-Marcos, L., Fernández-Sanz, L. Pagés, C. & Martínez-Herráiz, J.J. (2013). Gamifying learning experiences: Practical implications and outcomes. *Computers & Education*, 63, 380-392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.12.020>
- [17] Duncan, J. & West, R. E. (2018). Conceptualizing group flow: A framework. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 13(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2017.3313>
- [18] Esteban Jr, A. M. & Cruz, M. J. P. (2021). Digital divide in times of pandemic among teacher education students. *Open Access Library Journal*, 8(4), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107323>
- [19] Fernández, C., Massey, G. & Dornbusch, S. (2015). High school students' perceptions of social studies. *The Social Studies*, 67(1), 51-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1943.11019455>
- [20] Figg, C. & Jaipal-Jamani, K. (2018). Developing teacher knowledge about gamification as an instructional strategy. In *Teacher training and professional development: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications* (pp. 1215-1243). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5631-2.ch056>
- [21] Filgona, J., Sakiyo, J., Gwany, D. M. & Okoronka, A. U. (2020). Motivation in learning. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 10(4), 16-37. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2020/v10i430273>
- [22] Gibson, D., Ostashewski, N., Flintoff, K., Grant, S. & Knight, E. (2015). Digital badges in education. *Educ Inf Technol*, 20(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-013-9291-7>
- [23] Gómez-Carrasco, C. J., Monteagudo-Fernández, J., Moreno-Vera, J. R. & Sainz-Gómez, M. (2020). Evaluation of a gamification and flipped-classroom program used in teacher training: Perception of learning and outcome. *PloS One*, 15(7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236083>
- [24] Hamari, J., Shernoff, D. J., Rowe, E., Coller, B., Asbell-Clarke, J. & Edwards, T. (2016). Challenging games help students learn: An empirical study on engagement, flow and immersion in game-based learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 54, 170-179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.045>
- [25] Hanus, M. D. & Fox, J. (2015). Assessing the effects of gamification in the classroom: A longitudinal study on intrinsic motivation, social comparison, satisfaction, effort, and academic performance. *Computers & Education*, 80, 152-161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.08.019>
- [26] Hartt, M., Hosseini, H. & Mostafapour, M. (2020). Game on: Exploring the effectiveness of game-based learning. *Planning Practice & Research*, 35(5), 589-604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2020.1778859>
- [27] Jalotjot, L. & Fidelino, R. (2023). Contextualized and localized modules in Araling Panlipunan 9 for secondary schools in the division of Marinduque: A validation. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 11(10), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8229460>
- [28] Jimenez, E. (2020). Motivating factors of teachers in developing supplementary learning materials (SLMs). *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 8, 108-113. <https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/10912>
- [29] Kalogiannakis, M., Papadakis, S. & Zourmpakis, A.-I. (2021). Gamification in science education: A systematic review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, 11(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11010022>
- [30] Kapp, K. M. (2012). *The gamification of learning and instruction: Game-based methods and strategies for training and education*. Pfeiffer. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119200079>

- [31] Kwon, H. Y. & Özpolat, K. (2020). The dark side of narrow gamification: Negative impact of assessment gamification on student perceptions and content knowledge. *INFORMS Transactions on Education*, 20(3), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ited.2019.0227>
- [32] Lampropoulos, G. & Sidiropoulos, A. (2024). Impact of gamification on students' learning outcomes and academic performance: A longitudinal study comparing online, traditional, and gamified learning. *Education Sciences*, 14(4), 367. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14040367>
- [33] Lester, D., Skulmoski, G. J., Fisher, D. P., Mehrotra, V., Lim, I., Lang, A. & Keogh, J. W. L. (2023). Drivers and barriers to the utilisation of gamification and game-based learning in universities: A systematic review of educators' perspectives. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 54(6), 1748–1770. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13311>
- [34] Mendoza, J. C. C. (2024). Extent of implementation and issues encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in the student-centered learning approach. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research (IJMCER)*, 6(3), 730-783.
- [35] Miltenoff, P., Martinova, G. & Todorova, R. (2015). *Gaming and gamification in academic and library settings*.
- [36] Ondras, L. & Alvero, J. (2023). Post-pandemic challenges in addressing learning gaps: Experiences of teachers in public elementary and secondary schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 47(4), 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2023/v47i41032>
- [37] Piaget, J. (1971). The theory of stages in cognitive development. In J. Piaget (Ed.), *Theories of cognitive development: From Piaget to today* (pp. 11-23). Routledge.
- [38] Reyes-Cabrera, W. (2022). Gamification and collaborative online learning: An analysis of strategies in a Mexican university. *ALTERIDAD. Revista de Educación*, 17(1), 24-35. <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v17n1.2022.02>
- [39] Serafico-Reyes, N. M. A., Sjamsuddin, H., Wiriaatmadja, R. & Hasan, S. H. (2019). *Araling Panlipunan (Social Studies) in the Philippine Makabayan learning area: Problems and prospects in articulating social studies as a discipline*. In Proceedings of the 3rd Asian Education Symposium (AES 2018) (pp. 138–143).
- [40] Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms: An experimental analysis*. Appleton-Century.
- [41] Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Macmillan.
- [42] Tomines, E. M. M., Tipolo, A. A. P. & Pantao, J. G. (2021). Ap-Dama design: Effectiveness on test performance of the pupils in Araling Panlipunan. *ASEAN Journal of Basic and Higher Education*, 5(1), 41-64.
- [43] Tupas, F. P. & Linas-Laguda, M. (2020). Blended learning – An approach in Philippine basic education curriculum in new normal: A review of current literature. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(11), 5505–5512. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081154>
- [44] Werbach, K. (2014). (Re)defining gamification: A process approach. In A. Spagnolli, L. Chittaro, & L. Gamberini (Eds.), *Persuasive technology* (Vol. 8462, pp. 266-272). Springer-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-07127-5_23
- [45] Yale News. (2020, January 30). National survey: Students' feelings about high school are mostly negative. *Yale News*.
- [46] Yang, K. C. C. & Kang, Y. (2020). The effectiveness of gamification on student engagement, learning outcomes, and learning experiences. In D. Ifenthaler & D. K. Mah (Eds.), *Handbook of research on creating meaningful experiences in online courses* (pp. 375–395). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-0115-3.ch017>
- [47] Yang, S., Azari Noughabi, M., Botes, E. & Dewaele, J. M. (2023). Let's get positive: How foreign language teaching enjoyment can create a positive feedback loop. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(1), 17-38. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.32358>
- [48] Yu, A. (2024). Cooperative learning strategies in teaching araling panlipunan and the level of learning competencies of Grade 10 students *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 19(2), 176-185.
- [49] Zichermann, G. & Cunningham, C. (2011). *Gamification by design: Implementing game mechanics in web and mobile apps*. O'Reilly Media.