

# Students' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of In-Classroom Learning Factors in a Bachelor of Arts in Communication Program

Ramon Gian A. Bron  
rgabron@bicol-u.edu.ph

College of Arts and Letters  
Bicol University  
Legazpi City, Philippines

**Abstract**— The research evaluates the perceived effectiveness of the in-classroom learning factors as an instructional system in the Bachelor of Arts in Communication program of a state university in the Philippines. The study was based on the Constructivist Learning Theory, Media Richness Theory, Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge framework, supported by the Communication Accommodation Theory, and employed a mixed-methods approach of a structured five-point Likert scale survey of students in four year levels with two class blocks each, which were validated by the faculty members. Measures covered communication competencies, media production skills, teamwork, ethics and initiative, instructional delivery, learning climate, classroom adequacy, multimedia equipment, licensed software, multimedia exposure, and overall satisfaction. Cohort/block comparisons and weighted mean analysis revealed progressive improvement in perceived competencies with academic levels with fourth year students recording the highest scores and second year cohort recording lower scores as per developmental transition. The quality of teaching was also noted as a strong element in all cohorts, whereas the quality of the classroom setting, the quality of equipment, and the availability of software were the most consistent limitations. The results of these findings show that the program effectiveness of instruction is a multi-component system where the effective pedagogy is not sufficient to compensate the physical and technological constraints. The findings support actionable redesign of the system by means of specific facility enhancement, equipment modernization, software-access, planning and resource-based curriculum-alignment to enhance decision support, student satisfaction, and industry relevance.

**Keywords**— *communication education, instructional systems, learning environment, multimedia resources, systems engineering, higher education*

## I. INTRODUCTION

As a state university in the Philippines, the institution is expected to provide professional and technical training as well as advanced and specialized education in the fields of philosophy, science, literature, and the arts. Within this context, the Bachelor of Arts in Communication program is expected to produce graduates who are prepared for media, communication, and creative industries.

The completed BA Communication tracer study indicated training gaps, the lack of access to industry standard tools, and skills development opportunities. The current research was conducted to confirm the existence of similar concerns by the current students and to investigate the influence of program competencies, classroom resources, licensed software, and multimedia exposure on the in-classroom learning efficacy [1].

The paper is grounded in the Constructivist Learning Theory, Media Richness Theory, Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, and supported by the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT). These views combined consider learning as a process of interplay between pedagogy and media, technology and student experience: this is why BA Communication program can be evaluated with systems in mind [1].

The literature is also echoing this issue. Han [2] demonstrates that the perceptions that students hold regarding classroom communication technology is not only with regard to technology itself but also with regard to pedagogical training, formative feedback, question designing, and context related factors like reliability and affordability. The communication accommodation theory also explains the importance of perception of students on the behavior of instructors in the learning setting [3]. The recent classification of classroom practices based on CAT demonstrates the importance of accommodative or nonaccommodative communication by educators, teacher credibility, and satisfaction with communication to the effect of the classroom experience of students and their performance outcomes in learning [4]–[6]. The concept of CAT has been applied to mediated and online interaction as well, which demonstrates a wider significance of accommodation in the context of communicative constraints [3][7]. The previous research on ICT in classroom practice and digital transformation also reflect the fact that infrastructure and institutional digital capacity are prominent enabling factors of successful instruction [8][13]. Tracer studies also demonstrate the worth of coordinating academic curriculum with work expectations and the importance of the graduate evidence in improving the program [9]–[12].

The research thus aimed to determine perceived gaps in equipment and licensed software and multimedia influences; determine the impact of these in-classroom variables on skills and competencies; evaluate student satisfaction; and provide strategic recommendations on the improvement of the program. The final research was not comparative to other universities in any way, instead, the results compared against the available literature instead and an ability-based standard.

## II. METHODOLOGY

### A. Sources of Data

The research utilized a mixed-methods approach that integrated both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative source was a Likert-scaled five point questionnaire organized in a structured way where the students in the BA Communication program were used to respond to the questionnaire with two blocks of students in each year level.

The survey involved the perceived effectiveness of communication competencies, media production competence, teamwork, ethics and initiative, quality of teaching, learning climate, classroom adequacy, availability of multimedia equipment, access to licensed software, exposure to multimedia influences and overall satisfaction.

The qualitative source was faculty validation in the form of interviewing and /or focus group discussion with the selected faculty members teaching or teaching in the program. These were the inputs to contextualize and authenticate student perceptions.

### B. Processing

Survey data were tabulated by factor and broken down by year level and class blocks. Client satisfaction items were included in the study too and the students were requested to specify on what items they based their ratings on.

In compliance with the Philippine’s Data Privacy Act of 2012, the consent was obtained, responses were confidential, and data collection was regarded as sex-disaggregated and equal treatment in attitude to responses irrespective of gender, opinions, and affiliations.

### C. Analysis

Quantitative data was processed through weighted mean computation to determine the perceived effectiveness of each factor and to identify trends across cohorts. Comparative cohort and block analyses were used to detect performance patterns, variability, and system constraint points.

Qualitative responses from faculty validation were subjected to thematic interpretation to determine whether student observations were supported by classroom-level and institutional experience.

### D. Validation

Faculty inputs were used to validate the results of the student survey through triangulation. This move ascertained the presence of perceived problems in equipment, software access, classroom adequacy, and learning spaces among instructors as

well, thus being a manifestation of structural and not merely individual issues.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research relied on two sources of data. The student survey provided a measure of competency, teaching quality, learning climate, classroom adequacy, equipment, licensed software, multimedia exposure, and satisfaction which were evaluated by weighted means and cohort/block comparison. Faculty validation offered contextual insights of the limitations in equipment, software and learning spaces and was triangulated and interpreted.

### A. Summary of Data

The results showed that 66.1 percent of the respondents believed in verbal and written communication. On presentation delivery, 48.9 percent responded affirmatively, 38.3 percent responded neutrally and 12.8 percent responded negatively. With regards to satisfaction with instruction, 22.9% strongly agreed and 50.7% agreed with overall satisfaction with instruction.

TABLE I. STUDENT PERCEPTION ON SKILLS & INSTRUCTION

Indicator	Reported Result
Communication confidence	66.1% confident in verbal and written communication
Presentation delivery	48.9% affirmative, 38.3% neutral, 12.8% negative
Instructional satisfaction	22.9% strongly agreed, 50.7% agreed

There was also a cohort trend with the perceived competencies rising with the year level, with the fourth-year students reporting the highest levels and the second-year students reporting the lowest levels. Simultaneously, the resource shortage was also evident, with classroom adequacy, the quality of the learning environment, equipment availability, and software access being lower than instructional factors.

### B. Relevant Findings

The results indicate a gradual rise in perceived performance in learning with respect to academic levels. The best ratings of students were in fourth-year cohorts in communication skills, teamwork, ethics, and initiative, with the second-year cohorts having relatively lower scores, which reflects a transition period with rising cognitive and technical requirements.

One of the strengths of the program was instructional delivery. This tendency is supported by the weighted means: the knowledge of the subject matter of instructors received 4.04, the overall quality of instruction 3.96, verbal and written communication 3.81, the effect of software on skills and productivity 3.79, and constructive feedback 3.69, all in the Agree range. Faculty validation also favored the perception that instructors still remain adaptive to their strategies despite the constraint on resources.

Physical and technological factors, on the contrary, were weaker. The skill level in media production tools was 2.87, and it was considered to be Neutral. Other constraint indicators were also relatively lower: adequate equipment in classroom activities 3.22, adequate access to licensed software 3.37, and adequate number of classrooms to schedule classes 3.19 were all indicators of continued resource and facility constraints. This trend was strengthened by faculty validation that reported inadequate equipment and software provided by the school, workarounds, and learning spaces that were used in various ways as repairs and installations were being done.

The reported percentages and weighted means are heading in the same direction. Confidence in presentation delivery was 3.48, support of coursework and creative projects with equipment was 3.44, and accessibility of learning space was 3.54, all in the Agree range, though these scores were lower than the most powerful instructional indicators. The percentage responses also indicated that 66.1% of the respondents were confident in verbal and written communication with only 48.9% being affirmative in presentation delivery with 38.3% being neutral and 12.8% negative.

TABLE II. RANKED WEIGHTED MEAN RESULTS

Rank	Factor	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Instructors' knowledge of the subject matter	4.04	Agree
2	Overall quality of instruction	3.96	Agree
3	Verbal and written communication	3.81	Agree
4	Software enhances skills and productivity	3.79	Agree
5	Constructive feedback on performance and output	3.69	Agree
6	Learning spaces are accessible when needed	3.54	Agree
7	Presentation delivery confidence	3.48	Agree
8	Equipment supports coursework and creative projects	3.44	Agree
9	Adequate access to licensed software	3.37	Neutral
10	Sufficient equipment during class activities	3.22	Neutral
11	Enough classrooms for scheduled classes	3.19	Neutral
12	Proficiency in media production tools	2.87	Neutral

The confidence of communication, the knowledge of the instructor, and the overall quality of teaching are all in the Agree range, which implies that the students are likely to acknowledge the capabilities of the program to facilitate discursive, interpretive, and classroom-based learning activities. In comparison, the lowest indicator is the level of competence in media production tools, which is a dimension that relies more

directly on the recurring physical access to equipment, software, and usable learning spaces. This disparity implies that certain competencies may continue to be acquired in constrained conditions by lecture, discussion, feedback, and project guidance, but competencies that are more production-intensive are more vulnerable to resource bottlenecks. The results do not suggest a consistent weak learning environment, but it suggests dissimilar effectiveness of outcomes types, with the most gains in those areas that rely on teaching interaction and the least gains in those areas that rely on technological and spatial assistance.

The findings indicate that the program cannot be assessed only through classroom teaching. Rather, the interaction of pedagogy, physical facilities, equipment, software and media exposure determine the learning outcomes. This interpretation is in line with the literature that indicates that the perception of the students towards the effectiveness of the classroom is a result of the interaction between pedagogical decisions, communication habits, and facilitating technological conditions and not instruction.

TABLE III. SUMMARY OF INDICATORS

Category	Indicators	Evidence
Strongest instructional indicators	Instructors' knowledge, overall quality of instruction, constructive feedback	4.04, 3.96, 3.69
Strongest student outcome indicators	Verbal and written communication, presentation delivery confidence	3.81, 3.48
Technology/resource-related strengths	Software enhances skills and productivity, learning-space accessibility	3.79, 3.54
Key constraint indicators	Media production tools, enough classrooms, sufficient equipment, licensed software access	2.87, 3.19, 3.22, 3.37

The findings also resonate with cited literature. Han [2] discovered that the perceptions of the students regarding the use of technology in the classroom are conditioned by the instructional decisions and the situational factors like reliability and affordability, which is consistent with the current trend where the quality of teaching has stayed high, whereas the access to equipment and software has fallen behind. Recent studies based on CAT also indicate that instructor accommodation, non-accommodation, perceived similarity, credibility, and communication satisfaction influence classroom experience and learning-related outcomes [4]–[6]. Combined with the existing research on accommodation in mediated contexts [3][7] and on the digital capacity of schools [8] [13], the current results confirm the idea of considering instructional effectiveness as a result of the interaction between communication practices and institutional resources. The fact that the current study is a continuation of the previous tracer study also justifies the utilization of student and graduate

feedback as a curriculum and resource decision-making tool [1][9]–[12].

This overlap between the local results and the literature enhances the interpretation of the results. The current research does not assert any causal relationships, but the evidence is consistent to make a cautious conclusion that the quality of instruction and the adequacy of resources will work together and not separately. The fact that teaching scores are high does not eliminate the impact of poor infrastructure, but it could be the reason why the general satisfaction is still positive despite the evident facility and technology limitations.

That is, the program seems to be capable of maintaining positive learning perceptions in instructional competence even in the face of the students still experiencing impediments in technical performance and production preparedness. This is an important fact when considering program evaluation since the use of teaching-related indicators may give an overly positive image of readiness when they are not considered in conjunction with resource-dependent competencies.

### C. Faculty Insights on Student Responses

Faculty insights suggest that the faculty complement of the program is its core strength, which reflects student observations, indicating that instructors are perceived as knowledgeable, capable of delivering quality instruction, and able to provide constructive feedback, even when students face limitations in other aspects of the learning environment. This indicates to a faculty body that can support learning among students due to subject mastery and adaptability in teaching. Essentially, the instructional power of the program seems to serve as a stabilizer, in that way it assists to stabilize positive student perception of learning despite circumstances that are not quite conducive.

Simultaneously, the faculty members acknowledge the continual discrepancy between the program as it is supposed to be developed and the resources that are available to facilitate that development. The less desirable outcomes in media production competencies, equipment adequacy, and software availability, as well as classroom adequacy, indicate that instructors are operating under the restraints that directly influence the provision of production-based and industry-aligned learning. In this sense, it is not merely that there is insufficiency of resources, but rather the shortage is one that constrains the extent to which effective teaching can be converted to enhanced technical skills. Effective teaching still exists, but it does not act under circumstances that could allow it to fully affect learning outcomes.

The faculty validation is particularly essential in this case as it takes the discourse beyond the student opinion. The faculty view provides clarity to understand the reasons why certain indicators are not higher than mediocre even in a case where the students are still positive about instruction. Faculty members cited inadequate school-supplies, lack of software, as well as use of workarounds, establishing the ground-level terms and conditions under which teaching in the program is being practiced. It implies that the decreasing ratings on production readiness cannot be viewed as single student dissatisfaction. They indicate a systemic problem in the learning system: the learning expectations in communication/multimedia course are

growing in terms of material support that is not necessarily provided at the level required by the curriculum.

The alignment between student and faculty views therefore increases confidence that the constraints identified in the study are program-level concerns with direct implications for planning and budgeting.

TABLE IV. FACULTY-VALIDATED CONSTRAINTS

Constraint Area	Student-Side Evidence	Faculty Insight
Equipment	Low rating for sufficient equipment during class activities (3.22)	Insufficient school-provided equipment
Software	Neutral rating for adequate access to licensed software (3.37)	Limited software access and reliance on workarounds
Learning spaces	Neutral rating for enough classrooms (3.19); moderate rating for accessibility of spaces (3.54)	Learning spaces used for multiple purposes during repairs/installations
Production readiness	Lowest rating in proficiency in media production tools (2.87)	Resource conditions limit full technical development

As far as student development is concerned, faculty members mentioned a transitional period during the second year of the program. According to the curriculum, second year courses, including Introduction to Film and Video, Production Processes, and Digital Sound Production, facilitate student transition in the aspect of class requirements. Learning curve is associated with introduction of technical concepts. This and the results of the survey indicate that the shift to more challenging technical and applied coursework may be the place where the strain becomes most apparent.

This presupposes that faculty are possibly experiencing a phase of the program where students require additional assistance, since expectations are increasing quicker than facilities, software and equipment. In this light, the faculty viewpoint emphasizes one fact that the problem of the program is not fundamental instructional feebleness, but the necessity to match the demands of learning with the institutional capacities that should be provided to respond to these demands.

The second-year pattern is also worth discussing more in detail since it is the stage at which the program starts transitioning into a more technically-focused learning of communication rather than a base of it. At the present grade, students are no longer evaluated primarily based on general classroom activity and written or spoken expression; they start to be exposed to processes of production, tasks involving tools and more elaborate performance demands. This level of low rating can thus be interpreted as developmental bottleneck but not as an indicator of decline of overall quality in the program.

The point is that the difficulty of the curriculum seems to increase at the same level when resource pressure is more

significant. This explanation aligns with the faculty perspective that middle years are in need of more support. It also explains why a specific intervention at this stage is a logical reaction: enhanced access, timing, scaffolding, and technical assistance in the transition years can lead to larger benefits than general, but not specific resource changes at all levels of the year.

In general, the discussion identifies an instructional system where faculty strength is both needed and not enough. The program shows the ability to develop communication-focused competencies, maintain student satisfaction, and develop students through a progressively more demanding set of expectations. The same evidence, however, suggests that multimedia and production work preparation that is geared towards the industry is more exposed to institutional constraints. This difference is important since BA Communication results are a combination of conceptual, expressive, collaborative, and technical skills.

When the technical component grows at a slower rate than the instructional component, students will graduate with excellent communication building blocks and an imbalanced production preparedness. The usefulness of the current findings thus is not just in the demonstration that students are generally satisfied, but also in the determination of the elements of the learning system that are always good and those that need to be reinforced consciously.

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The finished research demonstrates that the BA Communication program is sound and advanced in the creation of soft skills and communication-based competencies, and the faculty members are viewed as good communicators of instruction. The program however, has institutional limitations in the aspect of physical facilities, access to classrooms, availability of equipment and access to licensed software which curtails the full realization of production based and industrial based learning outcomes.

The results confirm a number of suggestions already mentioned in the tracer report [1]: Modernization and repair of the equipment and facilities; purchase or acquisition of industry-standard software and its implementation into the relevant subjects; conduct of a curriculum review to align the learning outcomes with the available resources; early intervention of students in the middle years to develop their technical skills; and use of the findings to review the curriculum, AACUP documentation, budget decision and partnership development.

Collectively, these suggestions translate the findings into decision support. Systemically, they refer to redesign of the instructional set-up as opposed to mere reinforcement of classroom instruction.

Future work aims additional research on the particular challenges and issues that were faced in the intermediate years of the program and specifically the second year when the lowest ratings were noted.

Since the study carried out has been restricted to one institution, further research ought to compare the findings with

the existing literature and where possible with other universities with varying access to the facilities, equipment and software. This kind of comparison would allow identifying whether the patterns observed are particular to the school or are indicative of more general developments in the way students perceive things over time.

Future research can also be used to aid curriculum changes, lab planning, software licensing, and subsequent research on in-demand communication and multimedia skills determined in the previous tracer study.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express his sincerest gratitude to the people who contributed and assisted in the completion of this study, specifically to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, college personnel, and the faculty and staff under the Communication Department.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. G. Bron, "Alumni Employment Outcomes as a Basis for Curriculum Evaluation in a State University's Bachelor of Arts in Communication Program," unpublished.
- [2] J. H. Han, "Unpacking and repacking the factors affecting students' perceptions of the use of classroom communication systems (CCS) technology," *Computers & Education*, vol. 79, pp. 159–176, 2014.
- [3] H. Giles, A. L. Edwards, and J. B. Walther, "Communication accommodation theory: Past accomplishments, current trends, and future prospects," *Language Sciences*, vol. 99, p. 101571, 2023.
- [4] D. Ji, H. Giles, and W. Hu, "The role of students' perceptions of educators' communication accommodative behaviors in classrooms in China," *Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. 560, 2025.
- [5] T. K. Frey and D. R. Lane, "CAT in the classroom: A multilevel analysis of students' experiences with instructor nonaccommodation," *Communication Education*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 223–246, 2021.
- [6] A. Allard and A. J. Holmstrom, "Students' perception of an instructor: The effects of instructor accommodation to student swearing," *Language Sciences*, vol. 99, p. 101562, 2023.
- [7] L. Vincze, J. Gasiorek, and M. Dragojevic, "Little chance for divergence: The role of interlocutor language constraint in online bilingual accommodation," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 27, pp. 608–620, 2017.
- [8] C. Lomos, J. W. Luyten, and S. Tieck, "Implementing ICT in classroom practice: what else matters besides the ICT infrastructure?," *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 1, 2023.
- [9] A. B. Aquino, B. A. Anania, and L. R. del Rosario, "A Teacher Education Graduate Tracer Study from 2010 to 2014 at a State University in Batangas, Philippines," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 101–112, 2015.
- [10] M. P. C. Ginés, "Tracer Study of PNU Graduates," unpublished manuscript, Pamantasan ng Normal ng Universidad (PNU), 2014.
- [11] M. J. Millington, "Graduate tracer studies: a review of their methodological challenges," *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 289–305, 2001.
- [12] E. B. Rico and E. S. Lleva, "Tracer Study of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) Pre-School Graduates of a State University in the Philippines from SY 2012-2015," *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 7, pp. 102–111, 2017.
- [13] S. Timotheou, O. Miliou, Y. Dimitriadis et al., "Impacts of digital technologies on education and factors influencing schools' digital capacity and transformation: A literature review," *Education and Information Technologies*, vol. 28, pp. 6695–6726