

UTILIZATION OF MICROSOFT TEAMS FOR ONLINE COMMUNICATION AMONG UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS

Rodel Mar V. Guban
Cavite State University - Naic Campus

Article History:

Received: Jan 7, 2026

Revised: Feb 3, 2026

Accepted: March 1, 2026

Keywords:

Microsoft Teams, Learning Management System, Online Communication, Undergraduate Research, Grounded Theory

DOI:

10.65141/sjter.v3i1n1



Copyright © 2026 by the author(s). This open-access article is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

Among the many options for a learning management system (LMS), Office 365 is one of the most popular among colleges and universities in the Philippines and abroad. While there are substantial studies conducted on the use of LMS for online communication in general, action research conducted for a specific higher education institution is still needed to produce immediate evidence that is readily applicable to a particular academic milieu. This study aims to generate a substantive grounded theory that can be applied immediately to the research writing courses in St. Jude College of Dasmariñas, Cavite (SJCDC). Twenty-two private conversations in Microsoft Teams (MS Teams) were selected and analyzed using a grounded theory approach. The results revealed that "routes of online communication," "functions of online communication," "the role of the research instructor," and "student feedback" constitute the dynamics of student-instructor online communication in MS Teams, which became the properties of the substantive grounded theory that is the R2F2 model. The model explains the direction of the online communication process, which takes place between the research instructor and the undergraduate research students, and how each route shifts the role of the instructor depending on the specific function of online communication initiated by the student. Therefore, consideration of the multiple aspects presented in the R2F2 model for online communication is necessary to achieve a greater understanding of the dynamics of students-to-instructor online communication in research. As such, continuous use of Microsoft Teams, faculty training emphasis on effective online communication using Office 365, and verificatory studies for other courses besides research are recommended for SJCDC.

INTRODUCTION

The use of a learning management system (LMS) has become the norm in many higher education institutions (HEIs) during the post-pandemic world. Though there may be initial resistance to online learning, as in the case of a university in Oman (Al-Farazi, 2023), it subsided later on because of the necessity caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. In many cases, the pandemic played a role in increasing the acceptance of online learning because of its restrictive effects on physical interactions. In view of this, MS Teams has become one of the most used and recognized online learning platforms during the period of the COVID-19 pandemic. As shown from the study of Barry and colleagues (2021), the online meeting feature of MS Teams is familiar news in the academe and is often used by educators to conduct their real-time classes. However, despite the inclusion of instructors from different levels (i.e., pre-kindergarten, third grade, fifth grade, and tertiary) as examples of how various distance education applications function, MS Teams was only presented to have been used by one university professor, which suggests its limitation in terms of usability, especially for learners below the tertiary education level. Support for the use of MS Teams is therefore concentrated in higher education. For example, college students of information and communication technology in India highly rated the usability of MS Teams through the Technology Acceptance Model and the System Usability Scale with no statistically significant difference (Pal & Vanijja, 2020). Further, in a systematic review of research literature on the perception of students conducted by Shetty and Gurav (2023), which covers studies that feature various online communication tools, including MS Teams, the presence of both positive and negative feedback can be observed. In the systematic review, it was found that learning through online platforms is highly recognized for its low cost, flexibility, and compatibility with independent learning. Nevertheless, online learning has also been criticized for a lack of interaction and vulnerability to technical issues, and threats to security and data privacy.

MS Teams has been used for different functions by educators. Delivering instructions and online communication are the most common usage as per Anđelković (2023) and Al-Fazari (2023). The popularity of MS Teams for online communication is especially consistent with its original function before it became a popular LMS during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, MS Teams is less popular for conducting assessments because of the limited types of questions that can be made through Microsoft Forms (Anđelković, 2023). Nevertheless, there are other learning activities where it has proven to be effective. In one case, MS Teams has been used to facilitate an asynchronous focus group discussion that has a lower dropout rate compared to a traditional face-to-face focus group discussion (Frey & Block, 2023). This suggests that while there is a consensus in previous studies that online learning cannot totally replace face-to-face learning based on the opinions of students, it is still an integral part of the learning experience in the post-COVID-19 pandemic world. The cited literature showed that MS Teams is an effective platform for delivering online communication in the academic context. Previous studies showed that the platform was a popular choice for delivering instructional services, but more so for its online communication features. Nevertheless, there is limited information on the features or dynamics of student-teacher communication using this platform. One reason for this is that not all higher education institutions (HEIs) are optimized to integrate online communication into their system. Contributing to the perpetuation of this situation among HEIs are the lack of information and communication technology infrastructures and resources.

This was the critique recently given by Bazaeva et al. (2024) in their analysis of the features of the process of online communication between students and teachers. They argued that institutionalizing the use of digital platforms would require a comprehensive process of digitalization that would include the development of digital competencies for both students and teachers, as well as the creation of an educational ecosystem that would support the policy on the use of such platforms. Their analysis, however, is concentrated in a Russian academic context, which is quite different from the Philippine setting in terms of the education system and practices. Because of the significant difference between the academic settings of the two countries, the conduct of the present study is justified in order to generate a substantive grounded theory which may be readily applied in the Philippine context. Investigating patterns from the 22 conversation logs in MS Teams that were retrieved from a higher education institution in Cavite, this study employed the constant comparison method to connect and develop a model that would explain the dynamics of student-instructor online communication through MS Teams for the undergraduate course in research writing.

METHODS

Research Design

An action research design utilizing a grounded theory approach was used to inform the research procedure (Norton, 2009). The study also employed the constant comparative analysis of grounded theory research design following the protocol of Glaser and Strauss (1967), who are the proponents of grounded theory research. Glaser and Strauss (1967) mentioned that there are two types of theory that could be generated from this approach, namely, substantive and formal. The former refers to a grounded theory that can be substantiated by the immediate setting of the theoretical samples. The latter refers to a grounded theory that can be generalized analytically to other essentially similar contexts. The grounded theory that was developed in this study falls into the substantive category because of the action research paradigm, which requires the findings to be applied directly and immediately to the problems encountered in the immediate setting- in this case, the optimization of online communication between students and instructors of research at the undergraduate level in SJCDC.

Respondents and Locale of the Study

For this study, the researcher is also the instructor for the research writing course for the undergraduate research students. The college where this study took place offers bachelor's degree programs for nursing, psychology, business administration, accountancy, education, hospitality management, radiologic technology, and computer studies. Although at the time of this study, there were no students of research under the business administration and computer studies programs because of the schedule of their course offerings as prescribed by their respective curricula. The undergraduate research writing course in SJCDC requires each student to produce an original thesis, which makes the project extremely challenging because it has to be done individually. The modality of instruction for research at the time of this study is face-to-face, but the college retains the use of Office 365 as a learning management system for all of its courses.

Research Instrument

For a qualitative study such as this one, the researcher serves as the primary research instrument. As the research instructor for the research students involved in this study, the researcher's rapport facilitates the generation of communication logs from MS Teams that served as the theoretical samples for the present study.

Data Gathering Procedure and Analysis

Conversation logs from undergraduate research students were preserved in the history of chat conversations in MS Teams. It is normal for the instructor to receive around one hundred direct messages in MS Teams every semester. As a result, the selection of conversation logs that will be included in the pool of theoretical samples will depend on specific criteria. First, the conversation log should present a specific concern related to the research writing course. Second, the conversation log should be sent by a duly enrolled student in the research writing course for the first semester of the Academic Year 2023 to 2024. Third, the conversation log should also include the instructor's replies. Using these criteria, 22 conversation logs were selected, while the remaining were discarded due to missing at least one of the aforementioned criteria. The conversations were coded numerically to protect the data privacy rights of the students according to Republic Act No. 10173 or the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Data Privacy Act, 2012). The constant comparative analysis of grounded theory consists of four stages: (1) comparison of theoretical samples, (2) integrating categories and properties that emerged from the comparison of theoretical samples, (3) delimiting the theory by reviewing the generated categories and properties, and (4) writing the theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Ethical Considerations

To uphold the rights of the students involved in the present study, the researcher secured permission to study from the Director of Academic Affairs. Since the study is determined to be of low risk by the research department of the institution, the study proceeded on the condition that the personal information, particularly the names of the students, would be coded numerically or with the use of pseudonyms.

RESULTS

Results of the grounded theory analysis performed on the 22 conversation logs generated four main categories that describe the dynamics of student-teacher online communication in MS Teams for undergraduate research writing courses in SJCDC. These categories are the routes of online communication in MS Teams, its functions, the role of the research instructor as a giver, and student feedback. Each of these categories constitutes the dynamics in which undergraduate research students utilize MS Teams for online communication with their research instructor.

Routes of Online Communication

This category presents two main directions in which conversation between research students and the research instructor may lead. The first route begins with an awareness of the

ambiguities in various aspects of the research writing course. In taking this route, the research student acknowledges that there is a lack of understanding on his/her part pertaining to certain aspects of the course. These aspects include given directions in particular assignments, modes, and the schedule of classes, and joining a class in MS Teams. Table 1 presents some examples of messages from the conversation logs of undergraduate research students in MS Teams.

Table 1. Examples of Extracts Pertaining to the Ambiguities in Research Writing Course

Assignment Directions	Modes and Schedule of Classes	Joining a Class in MS Teams
"Good morning, sir. This is Remi from BSP 3. I would just want to clarify the instructions for the assignment in Week 3 pertaining to the research proposal. According to the instructions posted in the assignment tab, our topics could either be qualitative or quantitative, but during our Thursday class, you mentioned that our topics should be qualitative. I wonder which one we should follow?"	"Good morning, sir. I'm Michaela, a 3rd-year BSRT student in research. May I know if we're going to have a face-to-face class tomorrow? Thank you."	"Good morning, sir. This is Michaela from the 3 rd -year BSRT. May I request to be added as a member in our Teams for the Introduction to Research? Thank you."
"Hello, sir! Good afternoon. I just want to ask if we really need to answer all the assigned forms in Research here in Teams, like the Week 1 Tracker, for example. Thank you."	"Hello and good day, sir! Are we going to have a face-to-face class tomorrow for the Introduction to Research, 7 AM-10 AM, Thursday?"	"Hello and good morning, sir. I request to be added to the Teams for our class in Introduction to Research. Thanks."

The second route is taken by research students who anticipate their inability to comply with the assigned research tasks within the given period of time. There is a recognition of one's limitations when it comes to one's own capacity to complete the assignments, which are often followed by excuses that the student deemed to be valid. Research students express their intention to go with this route by confessing their inability, coupled with an explanation as to why they would not be able to comply with the requirement. They would say, for example, "I only recently got my proposed topic approved, which is why I'm one of those who would be submitting the introduction part late," or "I was not able to submit [the requirement] personally because of a fever."

Functions of Online Communication

Four main functions serve as the properties for this second category. These are "confirming information," "seeking guidance," "sharing reports on updates," and "requesting consideration." The first three connect to the first route of online communication, namely, "perceived ambiguities in the research writing course." Confirming information happens when the student is not sure about his/her interpretation of the given instructions in a particular assignment in MS Teams. For example, Riley messaged the research instructor, "Good evening, sir. I just want to clarify if I got the instructions right. Do we just have to turn in the assignment in Teams and submit the printed copy on Monday?"

Another function of online communication in MS Teams for undergraduate research students is to seek specific guidance from their instructor regarding a particular research writing concern. The research instructor is then expected to provide clear directions on what to do in certain research scenarios encountered by the research students. These scenarios may include submission procedures for assignments, how to write certain parts of a research paper, and obtaining updates on the results of major research activities, such as approval of research topics. In such cases, research students seek active guidance from their research instructor as to how to proceed to the next phase of their research writing. As a response, the research instructor provides detailed directions when there are no available ones to be seen in official posts or in the assignment instructions. For example, when asked to comment on the plausibility of some topics for the research proposal, the conversation between James and the Research Instructor goes like this:

Good morning, sir! I was just wondering if you can comment on these topics for my proposal: (1) Exploring the social impact on student nurse in health care setting; (2) A qualitative inquiry into student nurse challenges with prioritization management; (3) Exploring the factors influencing the attention span challenges among student nurse; (4) Discovering the unspoken struggle of self-depreciation among student nurse; (5) Understanding the impact of poor communication skills among student nurse. Thank you. (James, Third Year Nursing Student, SJCDC)

Try not to limit your topics to the mental struggle of nursing students. In my opinion, that topic is already saturated. Among the topics you presented, Topic 1 seems to be the most plausible, but you need to clarify the aspect of social impact that you want to explore and remove 'healthcare setting' since it is already pretty obvious that that is the context of your study with the mention of 'student nurse.' (Research Instructor)

Detailed response from the research instructor, like in the conversation above, is common when the research instructor performs his role as a giver of guidance. However, when the source of information on which the concern of the guidance-seeking student rested was already available elsewhere, the research instructor only needed to direct the student to where he/she could find the answers to his/her questions. This is evident in the following conversation:

If ever, can I propose a topic about nurse-patient communication since it seems to fit the research agenda for my program? (Angel, Third Year Nursing Student, SJCDC)

Yes, you may try to propose it to the dean. Also, please follow the indicated instructions in our Teams when consulting him about your topics. Thanks! (Research Instructor)

The third function of online communication is that of sharing updates on the resolution of student concerns. Unlike the two previous functions, which are usually initiated by the research students, this one is initiated by the instructor. The difference lies in who will message whom first, but at the core of this arrangement is the instructor's initiative to establish a quick update rule for his research classes. Thus, when the instructor commits to giving updates to a

certain student pertaining to the status of his/her research topic proposal. It was the instructor who messaged the student first using the MS Teams chat feature. On the other hand, when the research student was instructed by the research instructor to give him updates on the development of a concern, it was the student who messaged the research instructor to report. This was illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2. Two Examples of Update-Sharing Between Students and Instructor

Student to Instructor	Instructor to Student
Friya: Good day, sir. I'm sending you an image of my approved topic, signed by the dean. Research Instructor: Okay, this is noted	Research Instructor: I already corrected the spelling of your name in the spreadsheet. Zia: Thank you, sir.

The fourth function pertains to the request for consideration. This function is exclusive for research students who take the second route of online communication in MS Teams, that is, the inability to comply with the requirements within a given time period. The process of requesting consideration involves the giving of excuses regardless of their perceived validity, the appeal to the instructor's pity, and the waiting time for the instructor's verdict.

The Role of the Research Instructor as a Giver

The third category of the dynamics in online communication between the research students and the research instructor is that of the giving role of the research instructor. This category directly connects to the second category, as the means by which the intended functions are achieved by the research students. In responding to the online messages of research students, the research instructor plays the role of either an information-giver, an instruction-giver, or a consideration-giver. As an information-giver, the function of the instructor is to provide students with the requested information by either sharing updates, reminders, and/or confirming the students' degree of understanding of the given task. The giving of information fulfills two of the functions indicated in the second category, namely, "confirming information" and "sharing updates." When the research instructor takes up the information-giver role, the dynamics of the student-instructor communication become strictly informative in nature. The consent of information given by the research instructor varies depending on the requested information, as in the following excerpts of replies by the research instructor to four different concerns:

Proceed to the director for academic affairs for consultation and observe the indicated instructions in our most recent announcement in Teams.

You may also request a reassignment of approved topics from students who have more than one approved topic; just follow the instructions in the recent assignment.

Make sure that you have completed all submissions in the proper MS Teams class for section 2.

Check the updates of the topic proposal status to see if the topic you proposed can be classified as experimental.

On the other hand, being an instruction-giver pertains to that role of the researcher instructor in which clear directions are provided to the students either before they communicate online through MS Teams or after it. Instances in which instructions are given before the student initiates online communication are seen in the assigning of tasks through MS Teams and when the research instructor redirects the student to the proper locus of answers to their questions. Statements like, "Kindly check our recent post in Teams," "Please proceed to the dean for consultation and observe the indicated instructions in our recent post," and "Kindly check the indicated instructions in the assigned tasks in Teams" reflect this instructive pattern on the part of the research instructor.

In some cases, the research instructor may also provide fresh instructions as a response to the online message of the student, if no prior indicated instructions have been provided pertaining to the student's concern. For instance, in the following exchange between the research instructor and the student, Kate reveals how the former provides additional instructions to the student as to how to proceed with her conceptual framework for mixed-method research.

Good evening, sir. I apologize for this late message. I just want to ask how to proceed with my theoretical or conceptual framework for my topic about workforce issues in the nursing profession if I use a mixed-method research design (Kate, Third year nursing student, SJCDC).

In the conceptual framework, you should just focus on the variables of your study. In the diagram, try to present the relationship of the variables. There is not much distinction in the framework, even if you're planning to use a mixed-method design for your study (Research instructor).

By successfully performing this instructive role, the research instructor is contributing to the fulfillment of the MS Teams communication function of seeking guidance from the research instructor.

Student Feedback

The student feedback can be observed in the closing part of the student-instructor online communication in MS Teams. Based on the 22 conversation logs covered in this study, student feedback in online communication through MS Teams is predominantly positive, as reflected through the recognition of shortcomings, expressed gratitude, and commitment to the research tasks by the research student. Recognition of shortcomings is articulated in phrases such as "I'm sorry for not submitting my manuscript draft," and "my apologies as I'm confused on how to proceed with the review of literature." Expressed gratitude is observed regardless of the taken route of online communication, as indicated by the transcendental quality of this feedback in the dynamics of online student-instructor communication in MS Teams. This property of student feedback is usually observed in the closing part of the conversation between the instructor and the student. As such, expressed gratitude functions both as a way to communicate the student's appreciation of the research instructor's help and also to formally end the conversation. Expressed gratitude is briefly stated in words such as "thank you, sir," "thank you po," "no worries," "no problem," or simply by giving the thank-you message a heart or like reaction.

Finally, "commitment to research tasks" is expressed by the student as a response to the instructor's directions. This feedback is exclusive to the function of seeking guidance and

the role of the instructor in providing instructions to the student. These were brief responses like "noted," "thank you," or "will do." It is noteworthy to mention that the word "thank you," which is also used as an expression of gratitude, is also used here as an expression of resolve to commit to the research tasks after receiving help from the research instructor in the form of additional information, further instruction, or consideration.

The categories and properties indicated above became the basis for a proposed conceptual model of online communication dynamics among undergraduate research students and instructors called R2F2 Online Communication Dynamics. "R2F2" is a mnemonic device to recall all of the dynamics of the generated substantive grounded theory. R2 refers to the first letter of two theoretical categories of online communication dynamics, namely, "routes of online communication" and "role of the research instructor." F2, on the other hand, refers to the remaining two categories, which are the "functions of online communication" and the "feedback from students."

Figure 1. The R2F2 Dynamics of Online Communication for Students and Instructors of Research



DISCUSSION

This section presents the discussion of the properties of the categories of the R2F2 model. The discussion focuses on key observations, including the state of understanding of students of research in their given research tasks, the characteristics of the function of online communication which emerged in the study, the role of the research instructor, and the absence of negative feedback from the students.

Initial Understanding Validated by the Research Instructor

While online communication seeking confirmation of information from the research instructor may give the impression that the student may not have any understanding of what to do in a given research task, the findings in this study suggest that the research student already has an initial understanding of what the instruction is telling him/her to do, as evidenced by their inclusion of paraphrased assignment instructions in their messages. For example, "When selecting topics for a proposal, do we just have to relate the topics to the research agenda of allied health sciences, or do we need to just link the topics exclusively to nursing?" This lack of certainty over one's understanding is mitigated by a confirmation that the student may receive from the research instructor. Often, research students will ask brief clarificatory questions such as "Can I do quantitative research for this topic?" or "Can I propose this topic for approval?" These questions are intended to generate a clear and brief categorical response from the research instructor (i.e., "Yes" or "No"). Consequently, this observation implies that the popularity of MS Teams for online communication, as indicated by Anđelković (2023), may be related to how the validation of initial understanding on a given research task is easily achieved by using it.

Differences in Characteristics Across the Functions of Online Communication in MS Teams

The findings show differences among the characteristics of the three functions of online communication from the R2F2 model. The three functions: confirming information, seeking guidance, and requesting consideration, are all initiated by the students. That is, the students are the ones who contact the research instructor first to present their concerns, thus launching the student-instructor online communication in MS Teams. However, whereas confirming information is characterized by the limited replies of the research instructor who only needed to answer in either affirmative or negative terms, seeking guidance requires longer replies from the research instructor because of its didactic nature. Since the students require a more detailed set of instructions to proceed to the given research tasks, the function, seeking guidance, most of the conversation is composed of the instructor's responses, which are characterized by instructions for the student to follow. These two functions belong to the first route of online communication in MS Teams- the perceived ambiguities in research writing. Because the students were confronted by the lack of clarity while working on specific research tasks, this route is often the direction of online communication between the students and the instructor. Taking this route leads the student to achieve their purpose of either

validating their initial understanding or receiving clear instructions to follow to make progress in their research project. On the other hand, the function “request for consideration” takes the second route, which is the perceived inability to comply with the research requirements. Unlike the previous functions, this function does not oblige the research instructor to comply. Instead, a request for consideration appeals to the instructor’s pity rather than an objective verdict. This function always constitutes the excuse given by the student, no matter its perceived validity. These findings explain as to why previous studies state that online learning lacks interaction (Shetty & Gurav, 2023) since the dynamics of online communication in this study are limited to four functions, which effectively fixed the students and the research instructor to their respective positions- the students on the receiving end, and the research instructor as the one who always does the giving. Because of this, online communication between the research students and the instructor is linear and lacks the complexity that is characteristic of face-to-face human interactions.

The Act of Giving Characterizes the Role of the Research Instructor

Another important finding in this study is the role of the research instructor, which is confined to the act of giving. In the scheme of the dynamics of online communication in MS Teams between the students and the research instructor, the latter always gives something to the former to satisfy the function of the conversation. As mentioned by Bazaeva et al. (2024), the process of institutionalizing the use of digital platforms in HEIs would require a holistic approach that includes developing the digital competencies of both students and teachers. The present study helps identify which aspects of digital competencies should be prioritized. Based on the findings regarding the role of the research instructor, digital competencies should target the areas of information-, instruction-, and consideration-giving. While the former two can be combined into the technical dimension of digital competencies, the latter (i.e., consideration-giving) should represent the attitudinal dimension that involves the instructor’s compassion for the learners. This would potentially foster a more compassionate dynamic of online communication between the students and the research instructor.

The Absence of Negative Student Feedback

Interestingly, there is no observed negative student feedback in the theoretical samples used for the present study. All conversation logs end on a positive note as the feedback consists of either a recognition of shortcomings, an expression of gratitude, or an expression of commitment to the task. Even though Shetty and Gurav (2023) identified negative feedback, such as a lack of interaction, technical issues, and threats to security and data privacy, this was absent in the present study. This could be explained by the difference in scope, as, unlike in the literature presented in the systematic review by Shetty and Gurav (2023), the scope of online learning that is represented by this study is limited to one undergraduate research writing course. In SJCDC, the setting of this study, most of the courses that are being taken by the same students who were enrolled in the research writing course seldom use MS Teams in the delivery of essential learning activities, including communication. Thus, while MS Teams is

frequently used for online communication in their research writing course, most communication between instructors and students in other courses is done face-to-face or with other more accessible digital platforms like Messenger.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

The present study is limited to its application by virtue of its action research framework and grounded theory design. As an action research project, the intended application of the R2F2 model is to improve the online communication in the research writing course of SJCDC, which uses Office 365 as its primary learning management system. In particular, since the conversation logs that comprised the theoretical samples of the study were retrieved from MS Teams, other online communication activities done in alternative digital platforms, like Messenger, were not included. Because MS Teams is more optimized for laptops or personal computers, online communication using mobile-based applications may demonstrate different dynamics than what has been presented in the R2F2 model. Moreover, member-checking was not employed to ascertain the accuracy of the interpretation. Instead, the author relied on the iterative method of reading and re-reading, which aligns with the constant comparison method of grounded theory research for documentary evidence.

The utilization of MS Teams for online communication between undergraduate research students and the research instructor is shaped by four categories of its dynamics, consisting of the routes of online communication for research students, its functions, the role of the research instructor, and student feedback. Understanding how MS Teams are utilized by undergraduate research students requires the consideration of all the dynamics as they relate to one another through the types, processes, and conditions under which each of them operates. The absence of one of the dynamics may result in the collapse of a potentially successful online communication between the students and the research instructor. The R2F2 model characterizes the student-instructor communication using MS Teams as a process by which the students can receive help from the research instructor in the form of information, guidance, or consideration. The model describes the beginning and the end of the online communication between students and the research instructor. Thus, it can be used as a basis to develop an algorithm that will address key research writing issues encountered by the students.

Based on the conclusion, it is recommended that future faculty development training should focus on effective communication of information and instruction using online media such as MS Teams. In addition, ensuring that online communication with research students will emphasize giving clear guidance to encourage commitment to the research task may contribute greatly to the positive outcomes of research students. Continuous use of MS Teams for online communication in the research writing course is encouraged to provide a quick resolution to the concerns of the research students. Furthermore, the potential application of the generated model of online communication dynamics should be explored and verified in other undergraduate courses utilizing a diverse learning management system.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher recognized the contribution of St. Jude College - Dasmarinas, Cavite, for allowing this study to be conducted among their students. This will not be possible without

the support of the management, especially Mr. Reymart B. Bolagao, the Director for Academic Affairs. In addition, the researcher would like to thank the research students whose conversations generated the insights in this study.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The researcher declares no conflict of interest for this study.

DECLARATION OF AI USE

The researcher declares that no AI technology was used to generate the texts or to develop the ideas presented in this study.

REFERENCE

- Al-Fazari, H. (2023). Delivery of Online and Blended-Learning Higher Education Programs in the Arab world—A Case Study from Sohar University in Oman. *Higher Education in the Arab World: E-Learning and Distance Education*, 99-109.
- Anđelković, J. (2023, December). Testing, assessment and evaluation in an online environment: a case study of tertiary ESP courses. In the *International Scientific Conference on Economy, Management and Information Technologies 1*(1), 329-334.
- Barry, D. M., Kanematsu, H., Ogawa, N., & McGrath, P. (2021). Technologies for teaching during a pandemic. *Procedia Computer Science*, 192, 1583-1590.
- Bazaeva, F. U., Emelyanova, I. E., & Zhdanova, S. N. (2024). Features of the process of online communication in the "student-teacher" system in higher education. *КУЛЬТУРЫ, ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ*, 101.
- Data Privacy Act of 2012, R. A. No. 10173. (2012).
<https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2012/08/15/republic-act-no-10173/>
- Frey, T. K., & Bloch, B. S. (2023). Using Microsoft Teams to Facilitate Asynchronous Online Focus Groups. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1-15.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231211251>
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. AldineTransaction.
- Norton, L. S. (2009). *Action Research in Teaching and Learning: A practical guide to conducting pedagogical research in universities*. Routledge.
- Pal, D., & Vanijja, V. (2020). Perceived usability evaluation of Microsoft Teams as an online learning platform during COVID-19 using the System Usability Scale and the Technology Acceptance Model in India. *Children and youth services review*, 119, 105535.
- Shetty, D., & Gurav, V. S. (2023). Opinion of Students Pursuing Higher Education on Online Learning During COVID-19 Pandemic: Review of Literature and a Sample Survey. *Handbook of Evidence-Based Management Practices in Business*, 640-650.