



Didactic communication: a case study in two spanish universities

La comunicación didáctica: estudio de caso en dos universidades españolas

-  **Dr. María del Mar Camús-Ferri** is a professor and researcher at Universidad de Alicante (Spain) (<https://ror.org/05t8bcz72>) (mar.camus@ua.es) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1463-965X>)
-  **Dr. Marcos Iglesias-Martínez** is a professor and researcher at Universidad de Alicante (Spain) (<https://ror.org/05t8bcz72>) (marcos.iglesias@ua.es) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5206-2762>)
-  **Dr. Inés Lozano-Cabezas** is a professor and researcher at Universidad de Alicante (Spain) (<https://ror.org/05t8bcz72>) (ines.lozano@ua.es) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3800-259X>)

Received on: 06/02/2026 / **Revised on:** 10/06/2026 / **Accepted on:** 12/06/2026 / **Published on:** 1/07/2026

Abstract

The integration of emotion, motivation, language, and thought into training processes in Higher Education is a key factor that fosters the comprehensive development of students. The main objective of this research work is to analyze didactic communication as a tool that influences the development of the cognitive, emotional, and professional capacities of university students, based on the experiences and perceptions of the teaching staff. A qualitative research methodology is employed through the biographical-narrative method, and the AQUAD 7 software program is used for data analysis. The results show that university professors consider didactic communication as a comprehensive training tool that promotes emotions and activates students' thinking in their educational process at the university. Furthermore, didactic communication is not limited to the mere transmission of information, but rather favors the comprehensive development of cognitive, emotional, and social capacities. This study concludes that university didactic communication must be integrated from an educational practice that stimulates the personal and affective dimensions of students to achieve quality learning in Higher Education. In this way, it is evidenced that didactic communication constitutes the tool par excellence for successful university interaction.

Keywords: communication, higher education, learning, life skills, didactic, educational practice.

Resumen

La integración de la emoción, la motivación, el lenguaje y el pensamiento en los procesos formativos en la Educación Superior es un factor clave que favorece la formación integral del estudiantado. Este trabajo de investigación tiene como objetivo principal analizar la comunicación didáctica como herramienta que influye en el desarrollo de las capacidades cognitivas, emocionales y profesionales del estudiantado universitario, a partir de las experiencias y percepciones del profesorado. Se emplea una metodología de investigación cualitativa a través del método biográfico-narrativo y, para el análisis de los datos, se utiliza el programa informático AQUAD 7. Los resultados muestran que los docentes universitarios consideran la comunicación didáctica como una herramienta de formación integral que promueve las emociones y activa el pensamiento de los estudiantes en su proceso formativo en la institución universitaria. Además, la comunicación didáctica no solo se limita a la mera transmisión de la información, sino que favorece el desarrollo integral de capacidades cognitivas, emocionales y sociales. Este estudio concluye que la comunicación didáctica universitaria ha de integrarse desde la práctica educativa que permita estimular las dimensiones personales y afectivas en el estudiantado para lograr un aprendizaje de calidad en la Educación Superior. De este modo, se evidencia que la comunicación didáctica constituye la herramienta por excelencia para la interacción universitaria de éxito.

Palabras clave: comunicación, enseñanza superior, aprendizaje, competencias para la vida, didáctica, práctica educativa.

1. Introduction

Communication is the primary tool that faculty members use in the classroom to interact with students (Santos et al., 2025) and achieve excellence and quality in learning (Shailja, 2022). Consequently, communication serves the professional development of university students and the comprehensive development of the cognitive, emotional, and social skills that will transform them into competent professionals, transcending the basic function of transmitting and disseminating information for storage and reproduction (Hendrie and Bastachini, 2020).

Drawing on various pedagogical and teaching approaches (Kusters et al., 2026), language theories, and neuroscientific findings (Hickok, 2014), professors' communicative practices can indeed become a transformative tool for students' thinking, emotions, and motivation (Yildirim, 2021). This potential enables learning processes to activate students' cognitive, personal, and emotional capacities, allowing them to develop the competencies required in their professional fields (Hernández, 2022). Didactic communication thus becomes the pathway through which higher education students learn to think, feel, act, and be (Delors, 1996; Herrera-Araya, 2023; Jurado and Bravo, 2020), preparing them to face the challenges of the professional world and 21st-century society.

Sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) emphasizes that language and thought are intimately linked. While communication in the classroom is traditionally associated with verbalizing ideas and knowledge, the mere verbalization of thoughts or existing knowledge does not guarantee the holistic development of university students. The instructor must deliberately use communication to stimulate critical, reflective, and creative thinking, thereby promoting meaningful learning that is highly applicable in real professional contexts, such as university learning environments (Estévez et al., 2021).

To achieve this, the process of didactic communication must adhere to two guiding principles of professional education. The first holds that university teaching must design learning experiences to develop comprehensive competencies: learning to think, act, and be. As Gerhard Bunk's (1994) competency-based approach points out, the goal is to communicate in the classroom to promote the

practical application of knowledge and prepare students for professional life. The second principle of a communicative nature is grounded in Habermas's (1981) theory of communicative action, which posits that language only becomes a meaningful act when it is comprehensible, true, honest, and functional, thereby enabling the co-construction of mutual understanding within the classroom.

In addition to these characteristics, didactic communication must be practical, strategic, and transformative (Wall and Hall, 2016), integrating cognitive and emotional dimensions that enable problem-solving in real-world professional practice.

In this regard, neuroscience has shown that positive emotion enhances neural activation and cognitive readiness for learning (Damasio, 2018; Luque and Lucas, 2020). Motivation, intrinsically linked to self-actualization and recognition (Maslow, 2016), is the driving force that encourages higher education students to actively engage with their education (De Lucas et al., 2025). An emotionally stimulating environment fosters not only understanding but also creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving. Managing students' emotions during instructional communication, alongside fostering active participation and creating a positive classroom climate, enables meaningful and lasting learning. Therefore, the process of communicative interaction in the classroom must generate learning and curricular experiences (Nanclares and Tobón-Marulanda, 2021) that develop students' professional, cognitive, and personal skills.

On this same basis, the development of critical and creative thinking is essential in higher education. The former enables students to analyze, evaluate, and draw valid conclusions, while the latter fosters the generation of innovative, flexible, and detailed ideas (Swartz et al., 2016). Likewise, complex thinking, according to Edgar Morin (2009), and metacognition, according to John Flavell (1993), are indispensable competencies for students to understand the reality of their profession in a comprehensive manner and to reflect on their own learning to improve it (Cacheiro-González et al., 2020). Therefore, faculty communication in higher education must foster these skills within the classroom by using cognitive stimulation tools during the interactive teaching process, which facilitate self-reflection, self-assessment, and the transfer of knowledge to different contexts (Swartz et al., 2016).

In short, didactic communication in university teaching must go beyond the mere transmission of knowledge and become an instrument of holistic education (Koivuniemi et al., 2019). To be truly effective, it must integrate the cognitive, emotional, and motivational aspects of learning; promote critical, creative, and complex thinking, as well as metacognition; encourage students to learn to think and act professionally (Mora, 2020); and foster the personal and emotional skills that college students need to face the complex and dynamic challenges of their professional and personal lives. Only in this way can learning in higher education achieve excellence and quality.

The main objective of this study is to analyze didactic communication as a tool that influences the development of university students' cognitive, emotional, and professional skills, based on the experiences and perceptions of higher education faculty. Specifically, the following specific objectives are proposed: (1) to examine higher education faculty members' conceptions of didactic communication and its role in the teaching-learning process; (2) to describe the communication strategies they employ to promote student participation, comprehension, and critical thinking; (3) to analyze their perceptions regarding the relationship between instructional communication and the development of students' abilities (cognitive, emotional, social, and professional); (4) to identify the factors that facilitate or hinder effective instructional communication in the university context; and (5) to propose improvements for the development of teaching communication practices that contribute to the holistic development of students through the affective, motivational, and cognitive dimensions of learning.

2. Methodology

The methodological framework of this study is situated within the paradigm of qualitative research (Flick, 2004; Kelchtermans, 2014), which seeks to interpret teaching experiences related to instructional communication in higher education, viewing it as a pivotal element that promotes the holistic development of students in university classrooms. Specifically, a biographical-narrative approach (Bolívar and Domingo, 2019) is adopted as an educational qualitative research strategy to understand

how university faculty members perceive didactic communication as a cornerstone of students' comprehensive development (Huber et al., 2013).

2.1 Description of the Context and Participants

Based on a purposive, non-probabilistic sample, 48 faculty members working at two Spanish public universities participated in this study. Seventy-five percent are women ($n=36$), and 25% are men ($n=12$).

2.2 Instruments

To collect data, a semi-structured interview featuring both open-ended and pre-determined questions was utilized. Following a qualitative research approach, the interview analyzed the conceptions that teacher candidates hold regarding didactic communication as a tool for holistic education in the university setting, the benefits and challenges of its implementation in higher education classrooms, and alternative proposals that may be useful for its classroom application to promote professional development. The interview protocol was validated by a panel of three experts in Didactics and School Organization who are specialists in qualitative research methodology.

2.3 Procedure

The phases of this study unfolded as follows: in the first phase, university faculty members from two Spanish public universities were contacted. During this initial contact, they were informed of the study's objectives, presented with the contents of the semi-structured interview, and briefed on the ethical principles governing this research—specifically, voluntary participation, data anonymity, the voice recording of interviews for subsequent transcription, and the provision of an informed consent form for their review. In the second phase, a coding system was designed using a deductive approach to analyze the participants' responses using the AQUAD 7 software program (Huber and Gürtler, 2012).

3. Results

The final configuration of the coding system was organized into five overarching themes align-

ned with the study's specific objectives. To present the findings, tables were constructed to display the codes derived from the analysis of the 652 narrative sequences extracted from the participating teachers' accounts. These results are reported as absolute frequencies and percentages (% AF), representing the total number of occurrences identified for each code.

3.1 Theme 1. Didactic Communication as a Tool for Holistic Education in Higher Education

Table 1 contains the codes and subcodes related to Theme 1 of our study, which enabled the analysis of university faculty members' conceptions of didactic communication as a tool for holistic education in university settings. Based on the results obtained for code 1.1, "Knowledge Transmission"—

which achieved the highest percentage compared to the other codes within this theme (35.45%)—it is evident that higher education faculty conceive didactic communication not merely as a communicative act in which academic content is presented, but rather as an intentional communicative process wherein they translate, contextualize, and adapt knowledge according to the characteristics, needs, and level of understanding of the students:

In teaching, we must present the content—i.e., the theory—but with a purpose: we need to contextualize it and adapt it to their level and to practical reality in order to help them internalize it. (Participant 25)

You present the theory, but you adapt it to them. (Participant 35)

Table 1. *Didactic Communication as a Tool for Holistic Education in Higher Education*

Inferential codes	%FA
1.1 Knowledge transmission	35,45 %
1.2 Interaction and dialogue	27,27 %
1.3 Transformative teaching	19,10 %
1.4 Human and Emotional Bond	18,18 %
Total	100 %

Nota. Prepared by the author

Code 1.2, "Interaction and Dialogue," contains the findings through which a substantial portion of the participating teachers (27.27%) perceive didactic communication as a tool for communicative exchange established between teachers and students during the educational process, characterized by active participation, mutual respect, and the co-construction of knowledge:

It is the tool you routinely use to communicate with your students, and they respond because, through your dialogue, you engage them and help them construct the knowledge they need to learn alongside you. (Participant 11)

You communicate to interact with your students so that they can help one another and help you build the wisdom of their professional practice. (Participant 25)

In code 1.3, "Transformative Pedagogical Act," it is determined—albeit to a lesser extent (19.10%)—that, for higher education faculty, didactic communication also encompasses the set of communicative and didactic actions through which the instructor generates meaningful learning experiences that impact the personal, social, and professional development of university students:

It's all those things you do in class, like giving practical examples of real-life cases related to their profession or offering reflective criticism—those are also powerful forms of communication. (Participant 12)

A good part of your classes is devoted to influencing the development of their emotions and thinking—which must be cultivated for their profes-

sion—through examples, real-life cases, critiques... (Participant 42)

Finally, code 1.4, “Human and Emotional Connection” (with a frequency of 18.18%), indicates that, for the participants, instructional communication is closely related to the ability to establish empathetic connections, provide support, and foster an atmosphere of trust that enables holistic university learning:

You foster students’ holistic development through your empathy and the atmosphere of trust you create, which overcomes students’ fear of participating in the classroom. (Participant 15)

You must motivate them through what you communicate, sparking their enthusiasm with your humanity. (Participant 36)

3.2 *Theme 2. Communication strategies used by university faculty to promote students’ professional competencies*

Theme 2 presents the communication strategies that university faculty use to promote student participation, comprehension, and critical thinking. These are outlined in Table 2, with their corresponding code classifications.

Table 2. *University Faculty Members’ Communication Strategies for Holistic University Education*

Inferential codes	%FA
2.1 Verbal	47.54%
2.2 Nonverbal	27.86%
2.3 Technological resources	24.60%
Total	100%

As seen in code 2.1, “Verbal” (47.54%), the participating university faculty members state that they use verbal communication strategies in the classroom to facilitate understanding, encourage participation, and strengthen the teaching-learning process. Through tone of voice, clarity of speech, asking questions, and providing oral feedback, the instructor promotes interaction, critical thinking, and the collaborative construction of knowledge, thereby contributing to the students’ holistic development:

Teaching college students requires you to use verbal communication strategies as your primary resource—clear speech, good voice modulation, and engaging them in class. (Participant 17)

The important thing is for them to construct knowledge with you, so asking good questions and providing feedback are essential. (Participant 40)

Code 2.2, “Nonverbal” (27.86%), related to nonverbal communication strategies, encompasses narratives that emphasize the use of nonverbal communication strategies—understood as the set of gestures, postures, facial expressions, eye contact, and body movements—which, whether used consciously

or spontaneously, are vital for complementing, reinforcing, or nuancing the verbal message during the educational process:

Your gestures, postures, and expressions accompany the process and complement it. (Participant 08)

Your gestures, eye contact, and the way you move and walk around the classroom accompany all communication and lend a sense of closeness and credibility to the discussions taking place in the classroom. (Participant 41)

Finally, a smaller percentage (24.60%) indicated that, for the participants, technological resources constitute a strategic complement to instructional communication, as they facilitate the presentation of content, promote interaction, and encourage student participation (code 2.3, “Technological Resources”):

There are technological resources you rely on to present content and communicate ideas. (Participant 03)

Including web-based resources helps them learn and stimulates their thinking. (Participant 41)

3.3 *Theme 3. The skills that university faculty develop in their students using instructional communication in the classroom*

to describe the skills that higher education faculty develop in students as they facilitate the communicative process in the university classroom.

The results regarding Theme 3 of our study are presented in Table 3, which shows the codes used

Table 3. *Skills developed in students using didactic communication in the classroom*

Inferential codes	%FA
3.1 Emotional	40.62%
3.2 Cognitive	26.25%
3.3 Social	20.63%
3.4 Professional	12.50%

Under code 3.1, “Emotional” (40.62%), the participating professors describe how, in their teaching, they develop skills related to managing positive emotions to foster a healthy and collaborative environment, ensuring that learning is not only cognitive but also affective and social. Below are some illustrative examples for this code:

Through your communication, you help them manage their emotions so they can learn in a more affective way. (Participant 06)

You address their negative emotions so that they can become more positive, engage more with us, socialize more, and participate in the construction of knowledge. (Participant 34)

To a lesser extent, in code 3.2, “Cognitive” (26.25%), faculty also cultivate cognitive skills in higher education students by stimulating critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity, and autonomy in their learning and professional development:

When we communicate, we must get them to think critically, solve problems, and come up with solutions. (Participant 15)

Through the way you interact with them, you must help them learn how to learn using their minds and apply creativity to solve real-world problems. (Participant 28)

Social skills are also highlighted (code 3.3, “Social”; 20.63%) by the participants when they describe how, by fostering instructional communication among university students, they promote interpersonal

skills that enable students to interact, collaborate, and communicate effectively with their instructors and peers within the educational process:

When we conduct classes, we must get them to interact—to talk with us and with their peers—so they can develop social skills. (Participant 09)

What happens is that a dialogue is established among us, and we all collaborate to learn, which requires a social effort. (Participant 17)

Finally, code 3.4, “Professional,” indicates that faculty enhance students’ professional competencies by emphasizing the development of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that enable students to perform effectively, ethically, and responsibly in their future professional practice:

You must prepare them through real-world communication training so that they are aware of their responsibility in the profession for which they are preparing. (Participant 35)

Your communication must inspire them to be ethical and responsible. (Participant 46)

3.3 *Theme 4. Factors that facilitate or hinder effective instructional communication in the university educational context*

Table 4 presents the results obtained for the fourth theme, regarding the factors that facilitate or hinder effective instructional communication for the holistic education of students in the university educational context.

Table 4. *Factors that facilitate or hinder effective didactic communication for holistic education*

Inferential codes	%FA
4.1 Teaching experience	37.93%
4.2 Institutional context	24.83%
4.3 Group Characteristics	23.45%
4.4 Infrastructure and Resources	13.79%

Under the first code, “Pedagogical Experience” (code 4.1; 37.93%), the participating professors reveal that their training and experience related to their teaching and communication practices—including the knowledge, practices, and reflections they have developed through their professional work—is a key factor that shapes how they teach, communicate, and interact with their students:

Your experience as a university professor greatly shapes the way communication serves to provide a well-rounded education for your students because you draw on experiences in the classroom that are fundamental and stimulating. (Participant 15)

Your own solid foundation of knowledge, reflections, and experiences makes it easier for the communication process to be successful and for students to learn practically. (Participant 41)

Code 4.2, “Institutional Context” (less prominent at 24.83%), indicates that, for university faculty, an institutional environment that is enriching and fosters participation, innovation, and dialogue promotes reflective and humanized teaching practices, thereby contributing positively to the holistic development of students:

The institutional environment is good, flexible, and humanizing; this makes it easier for us to develop a more personal—and less authoritarian—style of communication. (Participant 33)

The institution fosters flexibility, which in turn allows you to be flexible in the classroom as well. (Participant 41)

Faculty members believe that the characteristics of the student group they lead in university classrooms can facilitate the communication process if they incorporate pedagogical strategies that allow them to address the diversity of students’ abili-

ties, motivations, and experiences; therefore, they must adapt their teaching methods and promote more active and participatory interaction (code 4.3, “Group Characteristics”; 23.45%):

It depends a lot on your group of students because you must adapt. (Participant 23)

The characteristics of the students in each group lead you to incorporate strategies to communicate better and reach everyone despite their differences. (Participant 23)

Finally, code 4.4, “Infrastructure and Resources” (13.79%), encompasses narratives regarding how physical spaces, material resources, environmental conditions, and available resources can facilitate or limit the development of the communicative and pedagogical process in the university educational context:

Having a good physical classroom, teaching resources, and accessible tools greatly improves your communication process when teaching students. (Participant 06)

Your classroom—I mean the physical space—with its furniture and resources, greatly influences how you communicate with students and facilitates the process. A rigid classroom is not the same as a flexible and innovative one. (Participant 10)

3.4 *Theme 5. Suggestions for improvement that contribute to teaching communication that promotes comprehensive professional development in higher education*

Table 5, associated with the fifth theme, lists the codes referring to improvement proposals that favor the development of teaching practices that promote comprehensive education among university students.

3.5 Theme 5. Improvement Proposals Contributing to Didactic Communication that Promotes Comprehensive Professional Education in Higher Education

that foster the development of teaching communication practices aimed at promoting comprehensive education among university students.

Table 5, associated with the fifth theme, presents the codes related to improvement proposals

Table 5. *Suggestions for improvement to develop teaching communication practices that support the holistic education of students*

Inferential codes	%FA
5.1 Dialogic communication	33.92%
5.2 Emotional communication	33.05%
5.3 Cognitive communication	21.73%
5.4 Teacher self-reflection	11.30%

Higher education faculty indicate that, to improve teaching communication in university classrooms, a more horizontal form of interaction must be established, based on mutual respect and the shared construction of knowledge between faculty and students, as interpreted by code 5.1, “Dialogic Communication” (33.05%):

Communication between the teacher and the students should be on equal footing, moving in the same direction; no one in that interaction is above anyone else—rather, we respect one another and build knowledge together. (Participant 17)

Communication must be horizontal. (Participant 39)

Furthermore, 33.05% of respondents emphasized that, to improve the teaching communication process and promote student learning in the university classroom, emotional communication on the part of faculty is necessary (code 5.2, “Emotional Communication”): the use, management, and transmission of emotions in the communication process between teachers and students, which influences motivation, classroom atmosphere, and meaningful learning:

Your communication must be emotional to improve communication in the classroom because your emotion sparks a desire to learn. (Participant 21)

Either you motivate through your speech, spreading emotions and enthusiasm, or no one will want to learn. (Participant 44)

Code 5.3, “Cognitive Communication” (21.73%), relates to findings in which teachers indicate that instructional communication should stimulate students’ cognition; to this end, it is advisable to engage in exchanges of information, ideas, and reasoning that promote understanding, critical analysis, and the construction of knowledge during the teaching-learning process:

Students must learn to think, and that’s the direction you need to steer your classroom communication in. (Participant 20)

They must understand everything that is said in the classroom; they need to know how to think—it depends on you as a communicator, too. (Participant 13)

The final code, 5.4, “Teacher Self-Reflection” (11.30%), includes narratives from teachers who state that, to improve communicative practices in university educational processes, they must analyze, reevaluate, and interpret their own pedagogical and communicative practices to improve their performance and respond more effectively to students’ needs:

It’s not just about resources; it’s also about awareness and self-reflection on whether we’re capable of seeing what we do well—or not—in the teaching and communication processes. (Participant 48)

We’re in a hurry with the things we have time for, but a teacher always needs to stop and think about

whether the communication process is effective or not. (Participant 33)

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Didactic communication is a vital tool that facilitates the education and learning of university students, empowering them throughout their professional development—an aspect we have thoroughly explored in this qualitative study. Through this research, we have advanced our proposed research objectives and organized the findings into five core themes that emerged from the compilation of interviews and the thematic analysis of the participants' voices.

Based on the contributions regarding the first theme, the participating university faculty agree that didactic communication is primarily a tool used to convey knowledge related to the professional practice for which university students are preparing. However, it is characterized by being utilized not only to present academic content but also to engage students actively in the process and to construct professional knowledge that meaningfully integrates into their cognitive frameworks (Herrera-Araya, 2023). As Sipman et al. (2021) point out, it constitutes a transformative pedagogical act in which the instructor, through the trust and human dimension they project in educational settings designed for learning, fosters student autonomy and social awareness (Martínez-Clares et al., 2024). This, in turn, encourages students to develop a critical attitude toward the specific issues of their professional field and a creative disposition for seeking and applying solutions. As Jurado et al. (2023) argue, didactic communication facilitates interpersonal communication (Trang and Hansen, 2021) and transforms the learning process into a successful educational experience.

Regarding the findings related to the second theme, faculty members identify verbal strategies as the most productive communicative approaches (Aguirre-Aguilar, 2020) for promoting the comprehensive and professional development of university students in the classroom. They recognize that the practical experiences and real-world examples incorporated into their discourse facilitate the assimilation of knowledge and bring students closer to the actual professional contexts for which they are training. As Swartz et al. (2016) point out, real-world scenarios and the cognitive challenges presented

to students during communicative processes at the university level awaken and activate the critical and reflective thinking that every professional needs (Pei et al., 2023) to respond to the demands of their environment. It is therefore necessary to design learning environments in higher education that enable universities to foster the comprehensive professional development of their student body (Morin, 2009).

Furthermore, it is evident that nonverbal communication strategies, as well as those linked to the integration of technological resources for learning—an aspect also highlighted by Toledo-Lara (2025)—serve as crucial complements that reinforce the didactic communicative relationship in the construction of professional university knowledge. In this regard, Hernández (2022) argues that these nonverbal expressions, when integrated into the teacher's pedagogical discourse through didactic communication, contribute significantly to the holistic education of students (Marin et al., 2025).

Regarding the third theme, the study reveals that effective didactic communication develops emotional, cognitive, social, and professional skills. Students in higher education must become competent professionals; consequently, the learning processes that take place in university classrooms must be transformed into communicative situations where students acquire and retain the foundational knowledge needed to understand the reality of their profession. Guided by university faculty, students must also learn to apply and put this knowledge into practice in real-world situations (Wall and Hall, 2016). Didactic communication, therefore, must engage emotional, cognitive, social, and professional dimensions simultaneously, fostering genuine interest and enthusiasm for learning. As Mora (2020) states in his studies on neuroeducation, regardless of the educational stage at which learning takes place, one must first feel the emotion to develop cognition.

Considering the findings from the fourth theme of this research, we determined that several factors could facilitate or hinder the development of didactic communication in higher education. These include the university instructor's classroom experience and the length of time they have been practicing and leading didactic-communicative processes (Demirdag, 2022), the heterogeneity of the student group, and the availability of quality teaching resources and materials. It is clear that, before engaging in

this communication process, prior preparation for the communicative act and a careful analysis of the educational setting are necessary.

In summary, we conclude that these factors—which can either facilitate or limit teachers’ communicative development—can be successfully mitigated. This is achieved by establishing a more horizontal form of communication, rich in positive emotions that inspire students’ motivation to learn and grow (Mentel et al., 2024), and by fostering continuous self-reflection on the teaching and communication strategies that have been applied and proven effective in promoting excellence and quality in university learning, as noted by Luque and Lucas (2020).

In short, instructional communication is a powerful tool that facilitates the holistic education and professional development of students in higher education. It is not merely a communicative act in which content is transmitted about the reality of the profession for which students are preparing; rather, it actively promotes their cognitive, emotional, social, and professional dimensions, ensuring the ultimate success of the university learning process.

Bibliographic References

- Aguirre-Aguilar, G. (2020). El estudiante y la configuración del aula activa: Itinerario, aprendizajes e investigación. *Alteridad*, 15(2), 161-173. <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v15n2.2020.02>
- Bolívar, A. and Domingo, J. (2019). *La investigación (auto) biográfica en educación*. Editorial Octaedro.
- Bunk, G. P. (1994). La transmisión de las competencias en la formación y perfeccionamiento profesionales de la RFA. *Revista Europea de Formación Profesional*, 20(1), 7-43. <https://bit.ly/3QqgQLN>
- Cacheiro-González, M. L., González-Fernández, R. and López-Gómez, E. (2020). Experiencias, situaciones y recursos para el desarrollo de habilidades: un enfoque cualitativo con estudiantes de posgrado. *Texto Libro*, 13(3), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.35699/1983-3652.2020.24900>
- Damasio, A. (2018). *La sensación de lo que ocurre. Cuerpo y emoción en la construcción de la conciencia*. Ediciones Destino.
- Demirdag, S. (2022). The mediating role of communication skills in the relationship between leadership style and 21st-century skills. *South African Journal of Education*, 42(2), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v42n2a2053>
- Delors, J. (1996). *La educación encierra un tesoro*. Santillana/UNESCO.
- De Lucas, M., Caballero Julia, D. and Diego-González, Á. (2025). Futuros profesores y competencia comunicativa. Una revisión sistemática de la literatura. *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 37(2), 187-214. <https://doi.org/10.14201/teri.31935>
- Estévez, I., Souto-Seijo, A. and González-Sanmamed, M. (2021). El estudio de caso en la investigación de las ecologías de aprendizaje del docente universitario. *New Trends in Qualitative Research*, 5, 104-115. <https://doi.org/10.36367/ntqr.5.2021.104-115>
- Flavell, J. H. (1993). *El desarrollo cognitivo*. Antonio Machado.
- Flick, U. (2004). *Introducción a la investigación cualitativa*. Ediciones Morata.
- Hendrie, K. N. and Bastacini, M. C. (2020). Autorregulación en estudiantes universitarios. Estrategias de aprendizaje, motivación y emociones. *Educación: Revista de la Universidad de Costa Rica*, 44(1), 190-207. <https://doi.org/10.15517/revedu.v44i1.37713>
- Hernández, R. (2022). *Los factores interpersonales en el intercambio de conocimiento entre los académicos: un caso de estudio de convergencia paralela*. [Tesis doctoral Universidad de Valladolid]. <https://bit.ly/4vPmfLd>
- Herrera-Araya, D. (2023). Perspectivas e investigación reciente sobre retroalimentación en el aula. Consideraciones para un enfoque pedagógico y dialógico. *Revista Electrónica Educare*, 27(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.15359/ree.27-1.14547>
- Hickok, G. (2014). *The myth of mirror neurons: The Real Neuroscience of Communication and Cognition*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Huber, J., Caine, V., Huber, M. and Steeves, P. (2013). Narrative inquiry as pedagogy in education: the extraordinary potential of living, telling, retelling, and reliving stories of experience. *Review of Research in Education*, 37, 212-242. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12458885>
- Huber, G. L. and Gürtler, L. (2013). *AQUAD 7. Manual del programa para analizar datos cualitativos*. Softwarevertrieb.
- Jurado, M., Avello, R. and Bravo, G. (2020). Caracterización de la comunicación interpersonal en el proceso enseñanza-aprendizaje. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2020.22.e09.2284>
- Kelchtermans, G. (2014). Narrative-biographical pedagogies in teacher education. En C. Craig y L. Orland-Barak (eds.), *International Teacher*

- Education: Promising Pedagogies* (Part A) (pp. 273-291). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Koivuniemi, M., Panadero, E., Malmberg, J. and Järvelä, S. (2017). Desafíos de aprendizaje y habilidades de regulación en distintas situaciones de aprendizaje en estudiantes de educación superior. *Journal for the Study of Education and Development, Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 40(1), 36-55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02103702.2016.1272874>
- Kusters, M., Rushton, E. A. C., De Vetten, A., Admiraal, W. and Van der Rijst, R. (2026). Teacher agency in universities: exploring underlying beliefs and agentic orientations when navigating university teaching practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 31(1), 106-124.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2025.2562584>
- Luque, K. E. and Lucas, M. A. (2020). La neuroeducación en el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje. *Revista Atlante. Cuadernos de Educación y desarrollo - QUALIS A4*, 12(6). <https://bit.ly/4gjdggT>
- Marín, S. E., Cerna Miranda, N. E., Jiménez Aldaz, J. V. and Rodríguez Rodríguez, M. E. (2025). El rol de las competencias comunicacionales en la formación universitaria integral. *Revista Científica UISRAEL*, 12(2), 193-208.
<https://doi.org/10.35290/rcui.v12n2.2025.1593>
- Martínez-Clares, P., González Morga, N., González Lorente, C. and Pérez Cusó, J. (2024). La toma de decisiones en Educación Superior. Análisis de competencias transversales. *Profesorado, Revista de Currículum y Formación del Profesorado*, 28(1), 263-280.
<https://doi.org/10.30827/profesorado.v28i1.28001>
- Maslow, A. H. (2016). *El hombre autorrealizado. Hacia una psicología del ser*. Kairós.
- Mentel, H., Ehlert, M., Souvignier, E. and Förster, N. (2024). The impact of a theory-practice-based professionalisation program on student teachers' knowledge, motivation, and beliefs. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2024.2412071>
- Mora, F. (2020). Neuroeducación. Solo se puede aprender lo que se ama. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, 38(2), 263-268.
<https://bit.ly/4g5eX1F>
- Morin, E. (2009). *Introducción al pensamiento complejo*. Gedisa.
- Nanclares R. and Tobón-Marulanda, F.Á. (2021). Retroalimentación colaborativa de currículo: Caracterizando las resonancias de las experiencias discentes. *Alteridad*, 16(2), 198-210.
<https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v16n2.2021.03>
- Pei, L., Poortman, C., Schildkamp, K. and Benes, N. (2025). Professional development for promoting a sense of community in blended learning. *Professional Development in Education*, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2446576>
- Santos Rego, M. Ángel, Sáez-Gambín, D., Godás Otero, A. and Lorenzo Moledo, M. (2025). ¿Qué variables ayudan a definir el estilo docente en la Universidad? *Revista de Educación*, 408, 297-322.
<https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2025-408-677>
- Shailja, P. (2022). Interactive Teaching Model - An effective way to cultivate students' communicative competence. *Journal of Theory and Practice of Contemporary Education*, 2(1).
[https://doi.org/10.53469/jtpce.2022.02\(01\).02](https://doi.org/10.53469/jtpce.2022.02(01).02)
- Sipman, G., Martens, R., Thölke, J. and McKenney, S. (2021). Professional development focused on intuition can enhance teacher pedagogical tact. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 106, 103442.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103442>
- Swartz, R. J., Costa, A. L., Beyer, B. K., Reagan, R. and Kallick, B. (2016). *Aprendizaje basado en el pensamiento. Cómo desarrollar en los alumnos las competencias del siglo XXI*. Ediciones SM.
- Trang, K. T. and Hansen, D. M. (2021). the roles of teacher expectations and school composition on teacher-child relationship quality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 72(2), 152-167.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487120902404>
- Toledo-Lara, G. (2025). Retroalimentación y herramientas TIC utilizadas por profesores universitarios. *Alteridad*, 20(2), 246-258.
<https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v20n2.2025.07>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Pensamiento y lenguaje*. La pléyade.
- Wall, K. and Hall, E. (2016). Teachers as metacognitive role models. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(4), 403-418.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2016.1212834>
- Yildirim, I. (2021). A study on the effect of instructors' communication skills on the professional attitudes and self-efficacy of student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 47(4), 605-620.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2021.1902237>

Author Declaration – CRediT Taxonomy	
Authors	Contributions
Dr. María del Mar Camús-Ferri	Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, research, methodology, project management, resources, software, supervision, validation, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—revision and editing.
Dr. Marcos Jesús Iglesias-Martínez	Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, research, methodology, project management, resources, software, supervision, validation, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—revision and editing.
Dr. Inés Lozano-Cabezas	Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, research, methodology, project management, resources, software, supervision, validation, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—revision, and editing.

Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence
The authors DECLARE that the preparation of the article “ <i>Didactic Communication: A Case Study at Two Spanish Universities</i> ” did not involve the use of artificial intelligence (AI).