ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26feb150

Teaching Presence and Immediacy: Effects to Cognitive and Affective Learning of Social Studies Students in a State University

Irish E. Flores; Ella Mae G. Dagsaan; Jocelle Picar Devillas; Judy Ann Romualdo Abadilla; Joan Micah Lumibao Billena; Rico Pisco Mangohig

College of Teacher Education, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Philippines

Publication Date: 2026/02/12

Abstract: The transition from the interactive and familiar environment of traditional class settings to the virtual world appears to be difficult for both the facilitator and the student amid a pandemic. Thus, the present study determined the effects of teaching presence and immediacy to cognitive and affective learning of BSE-Social Studies students during online classes at the College of Teacher Education, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Campus. The study used descriptive quantitative research that aims to describe the demographic profiles of the respondents (age, sex, and year level) and determine the effects of teaching presence and immediacy on cognitive and affective learning in online classes. In collecting the data, the researchers used a survey questionnaire that identified the teaching presence and immediacy effects on the cognitive and affective learning of students. Based on the findings of the study, the researchers concluded that the students-respondents were typically young adults, female and mostly first year college students. In addition, online courses have been found out to boost students' cognitive learning. Moreover, there were no significant differences in age and sex in terms of teaching presence and teaching immediacy on both cognitive and affective learning. Furthermore, there was a significant difference in respondents' year level in terms of teaching presence on both cognitive and affective learning. But in terms of teaching immediacy, cognitive learning has a significant difference in the year level but not affective learning.

Keywords*: Cognitive, Affective Learning, Traditional Class, Virtual World, Teaching Presence, Teaching Immediacy.*

How to Cite: Irish E. Flores; Ella Mae G. Dagsaan; Jocelle Picar Devillas; Judy Ann Romualdo Abadilla; Joan Micah Lumibao Billena; Rico Pisco Mangohig (2026) Teaching Presence and Immediacy: Effects to Cognitive and Affective Learning of Social Studies Students in a State University. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(2), 303-308. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26feb150

I. INTRODUCTION

Advancements in educational technology have transformed online learning from a largely passive environment into a more interactive and engaging space. However, the shift from traditional face-to-face instruction to online learning continues to present challenges for both instructors and students, particularly in sustaining student participation and engagement. In online settings, instructors play a critical role in designing and facilitating learning experiences that promote meaningful interaction.

Teaching presence, defined as the instructor's visibility and involvement in course design, facilitation, and instruction, has been identified as a key factor in effective online learning [1]. Research indicates that teaching presence enhances student engagement and learning by providing structure and guidance in virtual classrooms. Nevertheless, traditional teacher immediacy behaviors—such as eye contact, gestures, humor, and personal recognition—are largely absent in online environments. Instead, these behaviors are conveyed through perceived teacher immediacy, supported by technological tools and instructional communication strategies [2].

Despite growing interest in teaching presence and teaching immediacy, limited research has examined their combined effects on students' cognitive and affective learning in online environments. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships among teaching presence, teaching immediacy, cognitive learning, and affective learning among BSE–Social Studies students. This paper contributes empirical evidence to online learning research and provides insights for improving student engagement and learning outcomes in virtual classrooms.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26feb150

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Profile of the Student-Respondents

Table 1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent
18	10	6.85
19	29	19.86
20	29	19.86
21	31	21.23
22	25	17.12
23	4	2.74
24	3	2.05
25	1	0.68
26	3	2.05
27	1	0.68
28	2	1.37
29	1	0.68
31	3	2.05
35	1	0.68
36	1	0.68
39	1	0.68
46	1	0.68
Total	**146**	**100.00**
Mean = 21.51		
Sex	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	49	33.56
Female	97	66.44
Total	**146**	**100.00**

Year Level	Frequency	Percent
1st year	33	22.60
2nd year	31	21.23
3rd year	30	20.55
4th year	31	21.23
EOP class	21	14.38
Total	**146**	**100.00**

Table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the student-respondents in terms of age, sex, and year level.

Age. Out of the 146 respondents, the largest group consisted of students aged 21 years (21.23%), followed by those aged 19 and 20 years (19.86% each). The computed mean age was 21.51 years, indicating that the respondents were generally young adults.

Sex. The majority of the respondents were female (66.44%), while males comprised 33.56% of the sample. This trend is consistent with previous findings showing higher female participation in teacher education programs [3].

Year Level. First-year students constituted the largest group (22.60%), followed closely by second-year and fourth-year students (21.23% each). Students enrolled in the Evening Opportunity Program (EOP) accounted for 14.38% of the respondents.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26feb150

B. Effects of Teaching Presence and Teaching Immediacy

➢ *Teaching Presence*

- *Cognitive Learning*

Table 2 Mean and Rating Scale on the Level of Effects of Teaching Presence on Cognitive Learning

Cognitive Learning	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Rating	Rank
1. I can easily answer the assessment if the teacher precisely discusses the lesson.	3.48	Strongly Agree	1
2. I am able to master the content of the lesson if the discussion is teacher-centered.	3.09	Agree	9
3. I am able to construct questions about the lesson during the discussion.	3.05	Agree	10
4. The teacher cultivates my knowledge during the teaching and learning process.	3.32	Strongly Agree	4.5
5. I am able to share my ideas if the teacher properly constructs the question about the lesson.	3.37	Strongly Agree	2
6. I am able to follow the instructions of teachers.	3.34	Strongly Agree	3
7. I have a lot of knowledge gained after the discussion.	3.25	Agree	7
8. The teacher develops my critical thinking.	3.30	Strongly Agree	6
9. I always get a passing score after the discussion.	3.24	Agree	8
10. The teacher expand my ideas during the discussion.	3.32	Strongly Agree	4.5
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.28**	**Strongly Agree**	

As shown in Table 2, the overall weighted mean for teaching presence on cognitive learning was 3.28, interpreted as Strongly Agree. The highest-rated indicator was the ability to answer assessments when lessons were clearly discussed (WM = 3.48), indicating that structured instruction enhanced students' cognitive engagement. These findings support earlier studies emphasizing the role of effective content delivery in promoting cognitive learning [4].

- *Affective Learning*

Table 3 Mean and Rating Scale on the Level of Effects of Teaching Presence on Affective Learning

Affective Learning	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Rating	Rank
1. I advance read if the syllabus is given.	3.03	Agree	8
2. I feel motivated when I receive positive comments from my teacher.	3.57	Strongly Agree	1
3. I am more engage in class when there's a sharing on thoughts base on experiences.	3.38	Strongly Agree	2.5
4. I am more confident in speaking if I use visual presentations.	3.27	Strongly Agree	5
5. I learn more from the teacher's comments.	3.38	Strongly Agree	2.5
6. I got nervous when the teacher asks me in front of synchronous class.	3.17	Agree	6
7. I am afraid whenever the teacher interrupted me when I am reciting.	2.95	Agree	9
8. I feel comfortable grouping with my distant classmates.	2.92	Agree	10
9. I get excited when the teacher encourages conversation.	3.32	Strongly Agree	4
10. I am confident when a teacher asks about an assignment, due dates, or discussion topics.	3.13	Agree	7
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.21**	**Agree**	

Table 3 shows an overall weighted mean of 3.21, with a qualitative rating of Agree. Students reported higher motivation when receiving positive feedback from instructors (WM = 3.57), highlighting the importance of teacher encouragement in affective learning. This result aligns with motivation theory, which underscores the role of positive reinforcement in sustaining engagement [5].

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26feb150

- *Summary of Teaching Presence*

Table 4 Summary on the Level of Effects of Teaching Presence

Effects of Teaching Presence	Overall Weighted Mean	Qualitative Rating	Rank
Cognitive Learning	3.28	Strongly Agree	1
Affective Learning	3.21	Agree	2
Grand Mean	**3.24**	**Agree**	

Cognitive learning ranked higher than affective learning, with a grand mean of 3.24, suggesting that teaching presence had a generally positive influence on students' online learning experiences.

➢ *Teaching Immediacy*

- *Cognitive Learning*

Table 5 Mean and Rating Scale on the Level of Effects of Teaching Immediacy on Cognitive Learning

Affective Learning	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Rating	Rank
1. I am able to participate in class and share my own ideas if the instructor is actively responding.	3.40	Strongly Agree	6
2. I raise questions when teacher cheerfully calling for a volunteer students.	3.01	Agree	10
3. I feel lively and eager to learn during class if the instructor address my name.	3.17	Agree	8.5
4. I confidently answer questions regarding the topic if the teacher ask nicely and in cheerful way.	3.25	Agree	7
5. I am proud and happy if the teacher compliment me about my answers.	3.41	Strongly Agree	5
6. It's easy to understand the topic if the teacher is in open camera.	3.17	Agree	8.5
7. It is very interesting to learn if the teacher is comprehensively explaining.	3.44	Strongly Agree	3.5
8. The lesson enlighten my way of thinking if the teacher uses humor to motivate us.	3.44	Strongly Agree	3.5
9. I feel very inspired in class when teacher makes us comfortable.	3.57	Strongly Agree	1
10. I feel motivated if the teacher used lively vocal tone while teaching.	3.48	Strongly Agree	2
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.33**	**Strongly Agree**	

Teaching immediacy demonstrated a strong effect on cognitive learning, with an overall weighted mean of 3.45. Clear speech, organized materials, and the use of concrete examples significantly enhanced students' understanding, consistent with prior research on instructional clarity and engagement [6], [7].

- *Affective Learning*

Table 6 Effects of Teaching Immediacy on Affective Learning

Effects of Teaching Immediacy	Overall Weighted Mean	Qualitative Rating	Rank
Cognitive Learning	3.45	Strongly Agree	1
Affective Learning	3.33	Strongly Agree	2
Grand Mean	**3.39**	**Strongly Agree**	

The overall weighted mean of 3.33 indicates that teaching immediacy strongly influenced affective learning. Students felt more motivated and inspired when instructors used humor, addressed them by name, and created a comfortable learning environment, supporting the importance of instructor–student rapport [8].

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26feb150

- *Summary of Teaching Immediacy*

Table 7 Summary on the Level of Effects of Teaching Immediacy

Profile Variables	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Sig.	Interpretation
Age	Between Groups	2.96	16	0.19	0.13	Do not reject H_O Not Significant
	Within Groups	16.39	129	0.13		
	Total	19.35	145			
Sex	Between Groups	0.13	1	0.13	0.32	Do not reject H_O Not Significant
	Within Groups	19.22	144	0.13		
	Total	19.35	145			
Year Level	Between Groups	1.74	4	0.44	0.01	H_O is rejected Significant

Cognitive learning ranked first, followed by affective learning, with a grand mean of 3.39, indicating that teaching immediacy significantly enhanced students' learning experiences.

C. Analysis of Variance on Teaching Presence and Teaching Immediacy

➢ *Teaching Presence*

Table 8 Difference on the Effects of Teaching Presence on Cognitive Learning

Profile Variables	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Sig.	Interpretation
Age	Between Groups	2.82	16	0.18	0.30	Do not reject Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	19.48	129	0.15		
	Total	22.30	145			
Sex	Between Groups	0.03	1	0.03	0.69	Do not reject Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	22.28	144	0.16		
	Total	22.30	145			
Year Level	Between Groups	0.92	4	0.23	0.20	Do not reject Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	21.39	141	0.15		
	Total	22.30	145			

No significant differences were found across age and sex. However, a significant difference was observed across year level ($p < 0.05$), suggesting that academic level influenced students' perceptions of teaching presence.

➢ *Teaching Immediacy*

Similarly, no significant differences were observed across age and sex. A significant difference emerged only in cognitive learning when grouped by year level, indicating varying instructional needs across academic levels.

III. CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that the respondents were predominantly young adults, female, and first-year students. Teaching presence positively influenced both cognitive and affective learning, while teaching immediacy exerted a stronger effect on these learning domains. No significant differences were observed across age and sex; however, year level significantly influenced perceptions of teaching presence and cognitive learning in teaching immediacy. These results underscore the importance of instructional presence and immediacy in enhancing online learning outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the students who willingly participated in the study and the faculty members who provided valuable support during the data-gathering process.

REFERENCES

[1]. Caskurlu, S., Yukiko, I., & Richardson, J. C. (2020). *Teaching presence in online learning: Research developments and future directions*. Educational Technology Research and Development, 68(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09756-4

[2]. Campbell, J. (2014). *Instructor immediacy behaviors in online learning environments.* Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 13(3), 1–15.

[3]. Chakraborty, M. (2017). *Gender differences in participation and engagement in higher education*. International Journal of Educational Development, 55, 109–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.06.003

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26feb150

[4]. Muganga, L., & Ssenkusu, P. (2019). *Teacher-centered versus student-centered learning: Implications for cognitive engagement*. Journal of Education and Practice, 10(12), 16–25.
[5]. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2015). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020
[6]. Rawson, K. A., Dunlosky, J., & Sciartelli, S. M. (2015). *The power of examples in learning and instruction*. Educational Psychology Review, 27(4), 559–590. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9317-6
[7]. Chen, Y., & Chang, C. (2017). *Instructor immediacy and student engagement in online learning environments*. Computers & Education, 114, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.06.015
[8]. Myers, S. A., & Claus, C. J. (2012). *The relationship between instructor immediacy and students' affective learning*. Communication Education, 61(4), 319–331. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.69793