# School Facilities, Services, and Student Satisfaction in a Private Higher Education Institution

Dawn Mariah Sagmao[1]; Nieresse Jien R. Presbitero[2]; Zuriel Kenlee T. Francisco[3]; Xydelle L. Ariola[4]; Douglas Kent A. Casanos[5]; Lomyna Y. Morre[6]

[1,2,3,4,5,6]Student, Philippine College Foundation, Purok 6, Poblacion, Valencia City, Bukidnon, 8709, Philippines

**Abstract: This study measured student satisfaction with school facilities and services in a private higher education institution in Valencia City, Bukidnon. Guided by the Student Satisfaction Index by Temizer and Turkyilmaz (2012), it aimed to determine how facilities such as classrooms, computer laboratory, school library, and recreational areas, along with services including consultation, the registrar's office, and the clinic, influence student satisfaction. It also described respondents according to age, sex, year level, and course. The study employed a descriptive quantitative research design using a proportionate stratified random sampling method. A total of 348 students from the School of Business and Management served as respondents. Data were gathered using a researcher-developed questionnaire, rated on a 5-point Likert scale. The instrument was validated and tested for reliability, yielding a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.961, which indicates excellent internal consistency. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, were used to analyze the data. Findings revealed that students were generally satisfied with the school's facilities and services. The library and clinic received the highest satisfaction ratings, while recreational areas and internet connectivity showed the lowest. Demographic factors showed minimal effect on satisfaction levels. The study concludes that the Philippine College Foundation provides a conducive and supportive learning environment. However, continuous improvement in recreational spaces, facility maintenance, and internet reliability are needed.**

*Keywords: Student Satisfaction, School Facilities, School Services, Private Higher Education Institution.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Student satisfaction is an essential indicator of an educational institution's effectiveness, as students are its primary stakeholders and "customers." Student satisfaction refers to how students perceive and feel about their experiences, facilities, and services in their college or university. It is essential because it reflects whether the institution meets students' expectations, influences their engagement, motivation, and overall learning experience, and affects the institution's reputation and success. When students feel their needs are met, they are more likely to stay, participate actively, and value their education (Watermark Insights, 2024). However, many private higher education institutions face challenges in maintaining facilities and services that meet students' expectations, leading to dissatisfaction and a negative impact on the overall student experience.

At the global level, research shows that satisfaction with university facilities and services, such as classrooms, libraries, and support services, is strongly linked to overall student satisfaction in higher education (Bolatimi et al., 2025). At the national level in the Philippines, studies indicate that when private colleges provide good academic services, campus support, and efficient administrative services, many students report being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their education (Bartolo et al., 2024). Locally, in regions near Bukidnon, similar patterns emerge when institutions offer adequate support services and resources, students tend to have higher satisfaction, though shortcomings in facilities, guidance, and service delivery still surface, suggesting that

these issues could also exist for students in Bukidnon, including the study's context (Esoy et al., 2025).

Many studies on student satisfaction with school facilities and services in Philippine educational institutions have already been conducted. Still, there was a gap in understanding the status of Private Higher Education. As proof, a study at Bulacan State University was conducted to explore students' satisfaction with the environment, the cleanliness of campus facilities, communication systems, and the delivery of supplies from the campus store. Respondents were satisfied with the communication systems, but not the cleanliness of the comfort room or the timely delivery of supplies from the campus store (Estacio & Gopez, 2021). In addition, a study at a Philippine State University examined student satisfaction with frontline services, including the canteen and other frontline facilities, such as academic advising and counseling, library services, registration, and official academic records. The results showed that respondents were very satisfied with security management, the student affairs offices, and campus facilities (Ubat & Villalon, 2024). However, these studies failed to consider the specific context of private higher education institutions, and further research was needed to understand the significance of demographic variables such as age, sex, year level, and course on student satisfaction with campus facilities and services.

This study was conducted because many students want to know their level of satisfaction with the facilities and services they have experienced, and it is important to understand the actual levels of student satisfaction with the facilities and services offered by the private higher education institutions. This study aimed to measure students' satisfaction with school facilities and services and to identify strengths and areas for improvement. To measure student satisfaction with school facilities and services, the study surveyed students in the School of Business and Management, including those in the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Office Administration, and Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management programs. The study also aimed to provide recommendations to enhance the quality of learning and the student experience at the private higher education institution.

Independent and dependent variables are important for understanding student satisfaction because they help researchers clearly identify what affects it and how strong that effect is. Independent variables are the factors that may influence satisfaction, such as school facilities, service quality, safety, and learning resources. Dependent variables are the outcomes being measured, in this case, student satisfaction itself. By separating these two, researchers can identify which specific school factors improve or reduce satisfaction, make better decisions, and recommend changes. These help schools know where to focus their efforts to improve students' experiences and overall learning (Edu, 2019).

Measuring student satisfaction in a private higher education institution helps improve facilities and services. By identifying aspects that affect satisfaction, schools can

enhance facilities, streamline processes, and provide better support. Regular feedback monitoring promotes continuous improvement, addresses students' needs, and strengthens engagement, retention, and overall learning, while maintaining the institution's reputation and quality education.

## II. METHODOLOGY

➤ *Objectives of the Study*
The main objectives of this study are to measure student satisfaction with school facilities and services in a private higher education institution.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

- What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:

✓ Age;
✓ Sex;
✓ Year level; and
✓ Course?

- What is the level of student satisfaction with school facilities provided in a private higher education institution in terms of:

✓ Classrooms;
✓ Computer Laboratory;
✓ School Library; and
✓ Recreational areas?

- What is the level of student satisfaction with the school services provided in a private higher education institution in terms of:

✓ Consultation;
✓ Registrar's Office;
✓ Clinic; and

- What is the overall student satisfaction with school facilities and services?

## III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

➤ *Respondents*
The respondents of this study was 348 selected enrolled students across all year levels and programs from the School of Business and Management, which included the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Office Administration, and Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management during the first semester, thereby providing a wide variety of perspectives for the study on school facilities and services.

➤ *Research Design*
This study used a descriptive quantitative research design to determine students' satisfaction with the facilities and services at a Private Higher Education Institution. A

descriptive research design is a type of quantitative study that aims to provide an accurate and clear picture of the current situation, characteristics, and opinions of a specific group of people. It does not look for reasons why things happen or the relationships between factors; instead, it shows "what is" based on real data collected from respondents. This design is often used when researchers want to identify trends, measure opinions, or summarize experiences in a clear and organized way. In this study, the descriptive design was well-suited because it enabled the researchers to measure and describe students' satisfaction with classrooms, libraries, laboratories, administrative services, and other school facilities. By using this method, the study provided information about how students currently perceive and experience the school, which can guide improvements and decisions in the institution.

➢ *Instrument*

The research instrument was a researcher-developed survey questionnaire used to measure students' satisfaction with the facilities and services offered by a Private Higher Education Institution. The questionnaire's usability yielded three data sets. The first part of the questionnaire gathered the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of their age, sex, year level, and course background to determine if any of these demographic variables affected student satisfaction. The second part of the questionnaire studied the students' level of satisfaction with the school's facilities and services, including classrooms, computer laboratory, school library, recreational areas, consultation, registrar's office, and clinic. In the third part, students were asked to assess their overall satisfaction with the school's facilities and services using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). All statements were written positively, so a higher level of agreement indicated greater satisfaction. The survey questionnaire was prepared in clear, simple, and concise language to elicit precise feedback from respondents. A pilot study was conducted at Valencia Colleges Inc., with a total student population of 45, before disseminating the questionnaire to respondents to test its clarity and feasibility. The information produced from the data collection helped support school facilities and services.

➢ *Sampling Procedure*

The researchers used proportionate stratified random sampling to make sure that students from every program and year level in the School of Business and Management, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA), Bachelor of Science in Office Administration (BSOA), and Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) were fairly represented. It was a technique in which a population was divided into homogeneous subgroups (strata), and a sample was drawn from each stratum in proportion to its size in the population. The total population of School of Business and Management students was 2,653, as per the official enrollment list provided by the Registrar's Office. To determine the overall sample size, the researchers used Slovin's formula (Slovin, E. 1960), which divides the total population by 1 plus the product of the population and the square of the desired margin of error. Using a five-percent margin of error, this produced a total sample of 348 respondents. The 348 respondents were then allocated to each program in proportion to its share of the total population.

Table 1 Distribution of Respondents by Program

| Respondents | Total Population | Proportionate allocation each program |
|---|---|---|
| BSBA | 1, 073 students | 141 respondents |
| BSOA | 769 students | 101 respondents |
| BSHM | 811 students | 106 respondents |

Table 2 Distribution of Respondents by Year Level

| Program | Total Population | First Year | Second Year | Third Year | Fourth Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BSBA | 141 students | 65 respondents | 38 respondents | 16 respondents | 22 respondents |
| BSOA | 101 students | 43 respondents | 27 respondents | 11 respondents | 20 respondents |
| BSHM | 106 students | 49 respondents | 33 respondents | 13 respondents | 11 respondents |
| Total | 348 | 157 | 98 | 40 | 53 |

➢ *Scoring Procedure*

The study used a five-point Likert scale to determine the school facilities, services, and student satisfaction in a Private Higher Education Institution.

Table 3 The Scoring Guide on the Level of Student Satisfaction on Facilities and Services

| Numerical Rating | Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4.51-5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 4 | 3.51-4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 3 | 2.51-3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2 | 1.51-2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1 | 1.00-1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at all |

Table 4 The Scoring Guide on the Overall Students' Satisfaction

| Numerical Rating | Range | Verbal Description | QualitativeInterpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4.51-5.00 | Strongly Agree | High Satisfied |
| 4 | 3.51-4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 3 | 2.51-3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2 | 1.51-2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1 | 1.00-1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at all |

➤ *Statistical Treatment*

This study employed descriptive statistical methods to summarize, organize, and interpret the data. Descriptive statistics presented the findings in a clear and meaningful way that reflected the level of student satisfaction with school facilities and services at the Philippine College Foundation.

For Problem Number 1, which described the demographic profile of respondents in terms of age, sex, year level, and course, frequency counts and percentages were used to show the distribution.

For Problem Number 2, which measured satisfaction with school facilities such as classrooms, computer laboratories, libraries, and recreational areas, the mean and standard deviation were applied. The mean represented the average satisfaction level, while the standard deviation showed response consistency.

For Problem Number 3, which measured satisfaction with services such as consultation, the registrar's office, and the clinic, the same tools were used to analyze satisfaction levels and response variation.

For Problem Number 4, which measured overall satisfaction with school facilities and services, the mean and standard deviation summarized the general trend in student satisfaction. These statistical tools provided accurate interpretations of the data and helped determine which areas needed improvement.

**IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents the data, analysis, and interpretation of the findings. The data are presented in tables organized by the problems they address. The interpretation of the findings follows each table that is presented.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics on the Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age

| Age | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 17-25 years old | 329 | 94.5 |
| 26-35 years old | 18 | 5.2 |
| 36-45 years old | 1 | 0.3 |
| 45 and above | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **348** | **100.0** |

From Table 5, most respondents are between 17 and 25 years old, comprising 94.5% of the total population (329 respondents). This finding reveals that many respondents belong to the adjudged universal student age bracket. This bracket represents those people undertaking undergraduate studies. The results suggest that the respondents are at a stage of life focused on academic and personal development. It also implies that their youth and active engagement influence their experiences and satisfaction with school facilities and learning services.

Additionally, the lowest frequency is found in the 45 years and above age range, with no respondents. The findings show that no older students were present during the study period. The 36 to 45 age range follows; only one respondent, or 0.3%, indicated that middle-aged students comprise a tiny part of the total. This finding varies, as most students enrolled at a private higher education institution are young. It also reflects that few adults pursue college education later in life,

possibly due to work, family responsibilities, or other priorities.

According to Li et al. (2024), younger students tend to report higher satisfaction with their learning experiences than older students. The results of this study indicate that individuals aged 17 to 25 accounted for 94.5% of respondents and were generally more satisfied with the facilities and services within their school. People in this age range are expected to be at an earlier stage of their education (undergraduate) and to be more adaptable, engaged, and willing to participate in campus social activities than older individuals. The results imply that older students, who make up a smaller percentage of the total study population, are also experiencing different forms of distress and/or change, such as job and family obligations, which are likely to affect their level of satisfaction negatively. The study results further support the conclusion that younger students have the most positive perspective regarding the school's environment.

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics on the Demographic Profile of the respondents in terms of Sex

| Sex | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 151 | 43.4 |
| Female | 197 | 56.6 |
| **Total** | **348** | **100.0** |

The table shows that most respondents are female, accounting for 56.6% of the total population, while 43.4% are male. The results indicate that slightly more female students are participating in the study than male students. This result suggests that the number of women enrolled in the SBM department is higher, which may indicate that the broader trend in higher education was for female participation to be greater. Yet the difference between males and females is small, which, in fact, still yields a relatively balanced distribution of respondents. This balance is essential because it enables the study to gather views from both males and females on their school facilities and services, resulting in a more accurate and fair assessment of student satisfaction.

The greater number of female respondents means that most of the answers in this study reflect women's opinions. Female students express their feedback and concern more aggressively towards school facilities and services. But as male respondents are also present in high numbers, the result remains balanced. According to the study, female students are more concerned about cleanliness, tidiness, and comfort of their school environment, and male students are concerned with more functional and convenient aspects. This study aligns with current findings in that the high number of female respondents may be affecting the overall student rating.

The study by Mandoñahan et al. (2023) on "Satisfaction on the Student Personnel Services of UM Digos College: Basis for a Service Enhancement Program" supports the present findings that female students tend to show higher engagement and satisfaction with school services. Their study revealed that female respondents rated student personnel services more positively than male respondents. This study aligns with the findings of a higher number of female participants, suggesting that women are more active in providing feedback on school facilities and services. The consistent trend across studies indicates that gender plays a role in shaping satisfaction levels in educational settings.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics on the Demographic Profile of the respondents in terms of Year Level

| Year Level | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 1st Year | 156 | 44.8 |
| 2nd Year | 99 | 28.4 |
| 3rd Year | 40 | 11.5 |
| 4th Year | 53 | 15.2 |
| **Total** | **348** | **100.0** |

Table 7 shows that the highest frequency was among first-year students, with 156 or 44.8%. The result suggests that most respondents are new to their academic programs and are adjusting to college life. Their high participation indicates that the respondents are interested in educational activities and giving input that will help improve school services and the learning environment.

The third-year respondents had the lowest number, with only 40 or 11.5%. This small number may imply that they were working on their major topics or practices more than the survey itself and hence had lower survey participation. It may also imply that these respondents were more burdened by schoolwork or academic pressure and could not participate in the research.

These results are supported by the findings of Suprianto et al. (2025), who found that learning facilities and academic services positively affect students' satisfaction levels, especially among first-year college entrants. This study confirms that first-year college students are more observant and attentive about the college's facilities and services. The results suggest that well-maintained and accessible facilities can enhance students' overall academic experience and satisfaction.

Table 8 Descriptive Statistics on the Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of the Course

| Course | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| BSBA | 141 | 40.5 |
| BSOA | 101 | 29.0 |
| BSHM | 106 | 30.5 |
| **Total** | **348** | **100.0** |

Table 8 results show that the BSBA program has the highest number of respondents, with 141 students, or 40.5% of the total population. The results indicate that the BSBA program has the largest student enrollment among the School of Business and Management's programs. The high participation of BSBA students suggests strong engagement and interest in activities and surveys related to their academic environment. It also reflects the program's popularity among students who aim to develop management and financial skills for business careers.

Additionally, the BSOA program recorded the lowest number of respondents, with 101 students or 29.0% of the total population. The results indicate that fewer students are enrolled in this program compared to BSBA and BSHM. The smaller number of respondents may indicate limited class sections or lower enrollment trends in office administration courses. Despite this, BSOA students' participation continues to yield valuable insights that contribute to the study's overall findings.

Differences in students' academic programs can influence how they view satisfaction with school facilities and services. Programs with more practical activities, such as hospitality management, usually require specialized equipment and laboratories, while office and business courses depend on classrooms and technology-based spaces (Manogura et al., 2021). This idea supports the current findings, as each course in the study likely rated satisfaction based on the type of facilities they use most.

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Student Satisfaction on School Facilities in Terms of Classrooms

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 3.84 | 0.86 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 4.01 | 0.72 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 3.53 | 0.91 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 3.72 | 0.88 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 3.86 | 0.79 | Agree | Satisfied |
| **Overall** | **3.79** | **0.61** | **Agree** | **Satisfied** |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

As shown in Table 9, the overall mean of 3.79 (SD = 0.61) indicates that students are satisfied with their classroom facilities. The results suggest that students generally perceive their classrooms as comfortable, orderly, and conducive to learning, which promotes focus, engagement, and active participation. Well-maintained classrooms reduce distractions, lessen stress, and foster a sense of safety and belonging among students. Supporting this, Miri et al. (2025) emphasized that proper classroom maintenance, lighting, and ventilation are significantly associated with students' satisfaction and academic performance, as a well-organized learning environment positively influences motivation and overall learning outcomes.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.01, is: "I find the classroom whiteboards, projectors, and other equipment are functional and sufficient." The study suggests that students highly value having operational instructional tools that support teaching and learning. Functional equipment allows for interactive lessons, improves comprehension, and helps students retain information more effectively. When teaching tools are reliable and complete, classroom activities run smoothly, enhancing learning efficiency. These results are supported by Cutillas et al. (2023), who found that classrooms equipped with adequate and properly functioning learning tools and technological resources significantly improve student participation, engagement, and perceived learning outcomes, highlighting the importance of operational instructional equipment in achieving high-quality learning experiences.

The lowest-rated indicator, with a mean of 3.53, is: "I find that the noise levels in and around the classrooms are well-managed to prevent disruptions." Although still within the "Satisfied" range, this indicates that students occasionally experience noise disturbances that may affect concentration and learning performance. Noise management is, therefore, an area that needs improvement, as excessive noise can reduce attention, comprehension, and memory retention. Azmy (2024) supports these results, reporting that higher classroom noise levels negatively impact students' comfort, focus, and learning efficiency. Effective management of acoustics and environmental noise is crucial for maintaining a conducive learning environment and enhancing overall student satisfaction.

Table 10 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Student Satisfaction on School Facilities in Terms of Computer Laboratory

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 3.84 | 0.80 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 4.03 | 0.79 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 3.74 | 0.84 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 3.84 | 0.86 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 3.95 | 0.77 | Agree | Satisfied |
| **Overall** | **3.88** | **0.63** | **Agree** | **Satisfied** |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |

| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
|---|---|---|
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

Laboratories are essential for hands-on learning, providing students with access to technology and educational resources. Table 10 shows that students are satisfied with the computer laboratory overall, with a mean of 3.88 (SD = 0.63), which falls within the "Satisfied" range. This mean represents responses to questions regarding general cleanliness, equipment maintenance, organization, and the lab's usability. The result suggests that well-maintained and organized laboratories promote concentration, engagement, and productivity, which contribute to improved academic performance. Supporting this, Libres and Dalman (2021) emphasized that modern, accessible, and well-maintained laboratory facilities enhance student motivation and satisfaction. In contrast, outdated or insufficient equipment can reduce learning efficiency and student satisfaction.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.03, is "I find the computer laboratory clean and well-maintained." The results indicate that students highly value a clean, organized, and well-maintained computer lab, which enables them to concentrate better and use technology effectively. Proper maintenance prevents equipment malfunction, ensures a safe environment, and encourages responsible use of facilities. Supporting the results, Gloria et al. (2025) emphasized that higher education students report higher satisfaction and better academic performance when institutional infrastructure, including computer laboratories, is clean, functional, and well-maintained.

The lowest-rated indicator, with a mean of 3.74, is Q3: "I am satisfied with the reliability of the internet connection in the computer lab." While students are generally satisfied, this suggests that connectivity remains an area for improvement. A strong and consistent internet connection is essential for research, online learning, and timely submission of digital assignments, and instability can disrupt academic progress and lower satisfaction. These findings are supported by Diana and Kurniah (2024), who reported that although students were generally satisfied with computer laboratories, unstable internet access negatively affected their learning experience, underscoring the need for reliable technological infrastructure in higher education institutions.

Their findings confirm that clean, functional, and well-equipped facilities enhance both learning engagement and academic performance. These studies support the findings of the present research, reinforcing the importance of maintaining cleanliness, ensuring equipment functionality, and improving technological reliability to achieve sustained student satisfaction.

Table 11 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Student Satisfaction with School Facilities in Terms of the School Library

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 4.09 | 0.84 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 4.20 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 4.22 | 0.75 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 4.31 | 0.73 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 3.97 | 0.88 | Agree | Satisfied |
| **Overall** | **4.16** | **0.62** | **Agree** | **Satisfied** |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

Table 11 shows that students are satisfied with library services, with an overall mean of 4.02, which falls within the "Satisfied" range. This overall represents responses to questions regarding staff assistance, accessibility, and adequacy of resources, digital services, and responsiveness of library services. The result suggests that the quality of library services directly influences students' satisfaction and their ability to meet academic and information needs. Supporting this, Sumalinog et al. (2025) found a statistically significant association between library service quality, resource use, and students' satisfaction with information needs, highlighting that well-managed services and resources positively impact learning outcomes and academic engagement.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.31, is Q4: "I find the library clean and well-maintained." The results indicate that students highly value cleanliness and maintenance, as it allows them to study comfortably and remain focused. A neat and orderly library promotes a calm and productive atmosphere, enhancing engagement and concentration. Fagyan et al. (2023) support the findings by emphasizing that library cleanliness and proper upkeep positively affect student satisfaction, motivation, and overall learning experiences, thereby supporting the idea that well-maintained facilities contribute significantly to academic success.

The lowest-rated indicator, with a mean of 3.97, is Q5: "I find that the library has enough computers and good

internet." Although this still falls within the "Satisfied" range, this result suggests that many students perceive limitations in digital resources, such as insufficient computers or unreliable internet connectivity, which can hinder research, online learning, and overall academic productivity. The results align with those of Ayu & Mahliati (2024), who found that reliable internet access significantly influences students' ability to participate in online learning. That limited internet access leads to lower student participation and satisfaction.

Table 12 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Student Satisfaction with School Facilities in Terms of Recreational Areas

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 3.94 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 3.89 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 3.83 | 0.88 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 3.89 | 0.94 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 3.50 | 1.17 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| **Overall** | **3.81** | **0.75** | **Agree** | **Satisfied** |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

Table 12 shows that students are satisfied with the recreational areas, with an overall mean of 3.81 (SD = 0.75), which falls within the "Satisfied" range. Overall mean represents responses to all indicators, including supervision in sports areas (Q1), condition of equipment (Q2), availability of green spaces (Q3), safety and security (Q4), and cleanliness and comfort of lounge areas (Q5). The result suggests that well-maintained and accessible recreational areas contribute to students' physical well-being, relaxation, and social interaction, thus positively impacting overall student satisfaction. Supporting this, Shukor et al. (2025) found that the quality of campus facilities, including recreational and green spaces, significantly affects students' satisfaction, motivation, and engagement, highlighting the importance of safe and comfortable recreational environments.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean of 3.94, is Q1: "I find the supervision in sports and fitness areas effective in preventing accidents." The results show that students value adequate supervision during physical activities, as it reduces the risk of injury and encourages active engagement. Proper supervision ensures a safe and secure environment, which promotes confidence in using sports and recreational facilities. Nie et al. (2024) emphasized that safe and well-monitored recreational spaces enhance students' physical health, reduce stress, and foster a sense of community, supporting the finding that supervision positively contributes to overall student satisfaction.

The lowest-rated indicator, with a mean of 3.50, is Q5: "I find that the lounge areas and common spaces are clean and comfortable for students to study." Although this is moderately satisfied, it suggests that students perceive these spaces as applicable but not consistently maintained, which may limit their effectiveness for relaxation. The results align with Zhang et al. (2024), who reported that access to clean, comfortable, and secure recreational and lounge areas contributes to students' mental well-being, and sense of belonging, and overall satisfaction. Enhancing the maintenance and comfort of these spaces can further improve student engagement and support academic and social balance.

Overall, students are satisfied with the recreational areas regarding supervision and safety in sports and fitness areas. However, the lounge and common areas need improvements in cleanliness and comfort to support students' relaxation and study needs fully.

Table 13 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Student Satisfaction with School Services in Terms of Consultation

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 4.02 | 0.74 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 4.09 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 4.03 | 0.76 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 4.05 | 0.79 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 4.04 | 0.80 | Agree | Satisfied |
| **Overall** | **4.05** | **0.63** | **Agree** | **Satisfied** |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

The results in Table 13 show that students are satisfied with consultation services, with an overall mean of 4.05 (SD = 0.63), interpreted as "Satisfied." This overall mean represents responses to all indicators, including ease of consulting instructors (Q1), helpfulness of consultations (Q2), feedback and guidance (Q3), professionalism of consultations (Q4), and sufficiency of consultation time (Q5). The result suggests that well-organized consultation services positively influence students' learning, academic confidence, and satisfaction with the institution. A study by Ismail et al. (2021) found that academic advising and consultation services significantly impact on student satisfaction, particularly when instructors are approachable and provide clear guidance, emphasizing the importance of structured support systems in higher education.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.09, is Q2: "I feel that consultations are helpful for my academic concerns." The results suggest that students highly value consultations that provide practical guidance, clarify lessons, and help improve performance. Professional and supportive consultations encourage students to seek help, foster confidence, and enhance learning outcomes. Al-Aqeel and Alhumaid (2024) emphasized that mentoring and consultation programs that offer constructive feedback increase students' academic confidence and sense of belonging, supporting the finding that helpful consultations are critical to student satisfaction and engagement. The results also imply that institutions that prioritize training instructors in effective consultation and feedback techniques are likely to see higher overall student engagement and academic achievement.

The lowest indicator, with a mean of 4.02, concerns students' ability to consult with instructors when needed, specifically "I can easily consult with my instructors when needed". Although the result still falls under "Satisfied," it suggests there may be barriers, such as scheduling conflicts or limited instructor availability during busy periods. Accessibility is a key factor in ensuring that students receive timely support, as it helps prevent academic stress and promotes continuous learning. Enhancing consultation systems by setting flexible office hours or digital consultation options can improve accessibility and satisfaction. This result aligns with the study by Wong and Chapman (2022), which found that frequent and open communication between students and instructors significantly boosts satisfaction and engagement in higher education. Their research highlighted that interactive academic relationships help students feel valued and supported, leading to higher motivation and better learning outcomes.

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Student Satisfaction on School Services in Terms of the Registrars' Office

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 4.13 | 0.77 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 4.08 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 4.09 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 4.02 | 0.83 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 4.11 | 0.77 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Overall | 4.05 | 0.63 | Agree | Satisfied |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

Students are satisfied with the registrar's office services in Table 14, with an overall mean of 4.05 (SD = 0.63), interpreted as "Satisfied." This overall mean represents responses to all indicators, including staff courtesy and respect (Q1), clarity and accuracy of information (Q2), accessibility during office hours (Q3), resolution of concerns (Q4), and overall service satisfaction (Q5). The result implies that students perceive the registrar's office as professional, reliable, and supportive, contributing to smoother administrative processes and a positive academic experience. Supporting this, Ramirez (2025) found that staff empathy, effective communication, and friendly service strongly influence student satisfaction with registrar services, while efficiency and responsiveness further enhance perceived support and value.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.13, is Q1: "I am treated with courtesy and respect by the registrar's staff." The results suggest that students highly value polite and professional interactions, which create a welcoming and supportive environment. Respectful communication fosters trust and positive perceptions of administrative services, encouraging students to seek assistance confidently. The results also indicate that positive interpersonal interactions with staff can enhance students' overall perception of the institution's efficiency and commitment to supporting their academic needs. Gonzalez et al. (2020) highlighted that offices like the registrar significantly influence student satisfaction, emphasizing that courteous and approachable staff are essential for ensuring a positive campus experience.

The lowest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.02, is Q4: "I feel that my concerns are resolved quickly and professionally." Although still within the "Satisfied" range, this suggests that some students may experience occasional delays in document processing or responses to inquiries. Efficient and responsive service is crucial for maintaining smooth academic operations and preventing student frustration. Improving responsiveness not only enhances

satisfaction but also reinforces students' trust in the institution's administrative efficiency and reliability. Vega (2019) found that moderate satisfaction with registrar services was often due to limited information accessibility and slower responsiveness, suggesting that improving communication and timeliness could increase overall student satisfaction.

Table 15 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Student Satisfaction on School Services in Terms of Clinic

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 4.44 | 0.73 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 4.36 | 0.75 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 4.32 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 4.45 | 0.73 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 4.38 | 0.75 | Agree | Satisfied |
| **Overall** | **4.39** | **0.64** | **Agree** | **Satisfied** |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

The results in Table 15 show that students are satisfied with the school clinic services, with an overall mean of 4.39 (SD = 0.64), indicating "Satisfied." The results reflect students' positive perceptions of clinic professionalism, accessibility, medical equipment, cleanliness, and overall service quality. The finding implies that the school clinic provides a supportive environment for student health, helping them feel safe, cared for, and focused on their academic tasks. This result is supported by Olowolafe et al. (2020), who found that secondary school students in Oyo State, Nigeria, reported higher satisfaction when school clinics provided essential health services, contributing to better health management, reduced absenteeism, and improved readiness for learning. Similarly, Gaitan et al. (2022) emphasized that professionalism, access, and quality care are primary drivers of student satisfaction in school health services.

A mean of 4.45 is the highest indicator, Q4: "I find the clinic clean and properly maintained." This result shows that students place great importance on the overall sanitation and organization of the clinic, as these factors significantly influence their comfort and willingness to seek medical attention. A clean environment creates a sense of safety, reduces anxiety, and reassures students that proper hygiene

practices are consistently followed. Maintaining cleanliness also reflects the institution's commitment to providing quality healthcare services, thereby strengthening students' confidence in the facility. Mnculwane (2021) supports the findings by emphasizing that well-maintained and hygienic clinics contribute to higher levels of trust among students, ultimately improving their satisfaction with health services. This study implies that cleanliness is not only a physical requirement but also a psychological factor that enhances positive perceptions of the clinic.

The lowest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.32, is Q3: "I believe the clinic has the necessary medical equipment and supplies." Although satisfactory, this suggests some students perceive limitations in the availability or functionality of medical tools. Adequate equipment is essential for effective treatment, particularly in emergencies, and insufficient supplies can reduce students' confidence in the clinic's responsiveness. Adejumo et al. (2019) found that, while students were satisfied with treatment effectiveness and communication, consultation time and equipment adequacy were rated lower, suggesting that improvements in clinical resources and medical tools could further enhance satisfaction and trust in school healthcare services.

Table 16 Descriptive Statistics on the Overall Student Satisfaction on School Facilities and Services

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q1 | 4.17 | 0.77 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q2 | 4.20 | 0.78 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q3 | 4.16 | 0.75 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q4 | 4.17 | 0.80 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q5 | 4.08 | 0.77 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q6 | 4.08 | 0.79 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q7 | 4.14 | 0.77 | Agree | Satisfied |
| Q8 | 4.08 | 0.75 | Agree | Satisfied |

| Q9 | 3.97 | 0.98 | Agree | Satisfied |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q10 | 4.20 | 0.82 | Agree | Satisfied |
| **Overall** | **4.12** | **0.58** | **Agree** | **Satisfied** |

Legend:

| Range | Verbal Description | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.51–5.00 | Strongly Agree | Highly Satisfied |
| 3.51–4.50 | Agree | Satisfied |
| 2.51–3.50 | Moderately Agree | Moderately Satisfied |
| 1.51–2.50 | Disagree | Less Satisfied |
| 1.00–1.50 | Strongly Disagree | Not Satisfied at All |

Table 16 shows that students are satisfied with the overall school facilities and services, with a mean of 4.12 (SD = 0.58), indicating "Satisfied." The results suggest that the institution provides a supportive environment that meets students' academic and non-academic needs. Students' general satisfaction reflects positively on the school's ability to deliver functional facilities, professional services, and responsive support systems, thereby enhancing learning experiences and fostering student engagement. Suprianto et al. (2025) supported the results that quality learning facilities and academic services significantly influence student satisfaction, motivation, and commitment, highlighting the importance of well-maintained and functional resources in promoting both performance and trust in the institution.

The highest-rated indicators, with a mean of 4.20, are Q2: "The school facilities support my academic success" and Q10: "I would recommend this school to others because of its facilities and services." These results suggest that students recognize the tangible benefits of well-equipped and accessible facilities, which enhance their learning efficiency, engagement, and academic confidence. Positive experiences with facilities and services also translate into loyalty and willingness to recommend the school, reinforcing its credibility and reputation. The result is supported by Suprianto et al. (2025), who found that adequate facilities and supportive academic services increase student satisfaction, motivation, and institutional loyalty.

The lowest-rated indicator, with a mean of 3.97, concerns Q9: "The efforts to maintain cleanliness and order are consistent." Although satisfactory, this suggests that some areas of the campus may require more frequent cleaning or organization to meet students' expectations. Clean, well-maintained environments are crucial for comfort, safety, and focus, and they signal that the administration values student welfare. These findings, supported by Gloria et al. (2025), highlighted that proper infrastructure maintenance and orderly surroundings directly influence student satisfaction.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that students in a Private Higher Education Institution are generally satisfied with the school's facilities and services. Results showed that the classrooms, computer laboratories, libraries, and recreational areas are well-maintained, clean, and conducive to learning. Similarly, the services offered by the consultation, registrar's office, and clinic are efficient and helpful in addressing students' needs.

These findings indicate that the institution provides a comfortable and supportive learning environment that meets students' academic and personal expectations.

However, despite the overall positive results, some areas still need improvement. The school should continue enhancing its internet connectivity, classroom noise control, and the quality and availability of recreational spaces. Continuous maintenance and regular evaluation of school facilities and services are essential to sustain and increase student satisfaction. By addressing these minor issues, the Private Higher Education Institution can further strengthen its reputation as a student-centered institution.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are presented to improve school facilities and services:

- School Administration may maintain cleanliness, safety, and organization of all facilities while addressing lower-rated areas such as internet connectivity, classroom noise, and recreational spaces. Regular inspections and semester-based feedback can help identify students' changing needs. Collaboration with teachers and staff ensures practical improvements and enhanced student satisfaction.
- Students are encouraged to use and care for school facilities responsibly, ensuring that resources remain available and in good condition for everyone. They may also provide honest and constructive feedback to help the administration identify areas needing improvement. By actively participating in school activities, clubs, and events and maintaining open communication with teachers and staff, students help create a positive, safe, and supportive learning environment that enhances engagement and overall satisfaction.
- Teachers and Staff are encouraged to help maintain classroom order and support students in using school facilities responsibly. By addressing students' concerns and providing feedback to the administration, they play an essential role in improving services. Their active involvement in guiding and assisting students strengthens the learning environment, promotes a positive and supportive atmosphere, and contributes to higher student satisfaction, better academic performance, and overall personal development.

- Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other departments, schools, or higher education institutions to compare students' satisfaction levels across different settings. They may include additional factors, such as faculty performance, canteen services, transportation, or security management, to provide a fuller understanding of what affects satisfaction. Examining these areas can help future studies offer a broader perspective on how school facilities, services, and support systems impact students' overall learning experience and satisfaction.

## REFERENCES

[1]. Adejumo, O. A., Abolarin, O. S., Akinbodewa, A. A., Enikuomehin, O. C., & Lawal, O. M. (2019). Assessment of students' satisfaction with university health care services in a medical university in southern Nigeria. Research Journal of Health Sciences, 7(1), 48–56. Https://doi.org/10.4314/rejhs.v7i1

[2]. Al-Aqeel, S., & Alhumaid, H. K. (2024). Undergraduate university students mentoring program: experiences of mentors and mentees. Frontiers in Education, 9. Https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1486398

[3]. Ayu Raihani, & Mahliati. (2024). The Influence of Internet Access Availability on Student Participation in Online Learning in Aceh Province. International Journal Education and Computer Studies (IJECS), 4(3), 108–118. Https://doi.org/10.35870/ijecs.v4i3.2655

[4]. Azmy, N. Y. (2024). Evaluating the impact of classroom design and orientation on the indoor environment quality in Egyptian schools. JES. Journal of Engineering Sciences, 0(0). Https://doi.org/10.21608/jesaun.2024.305777.1353

[5]. Bolatimi, Folarin Emmanuel Bolatimi, Oladagba Stephen Bolatimi, & Folarin Emmanuel Bolatimi. (2025). Student satisfaction with university facilities and services and its impact on academic performance at Koforidua Technical University Ghana. Discover Education, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00913-9

[6]. Cutillas, M. A., Lagumbay, D. G., Ancajas, V. M., & Linox, D. (2023, September 3). Enhancing student learning through classroom design exploring the influence of environment on academic... Researchgate; unknown. Https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373640279_enhancing_student_learning_through_classroom_design_exploring_the_influence_of_environment_on_academic_performance

[7]. Diana, E., & Kurniah, R. (2024). Analysis of Student Satisfaction Levels with Computer Laboratory Services with a Fuzzy Service Quality Approach. Ojs.uma.ac.id. Https://doi.org/10.31289/jite.v8i1.10762

[8]. Edu, E. (2019, July 5). Instructional quality and academic satisfaction of university students. Researchgate; unknown. Https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334387680_instructional_quality_and_academic_satisfaction_of_university_students

[9]. Esoy, J. L., Bual, N., Carbonero, L., Buno, M., Añana, M., & Alonsabe, O. (2025). Assessing Senior High School Learners' Satisfaction with Facility Service Quality at Senior High School, San Fernando, Bukidnon. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14609777

[10]. Estacio, D., & Gopez, Ma. T. (2021). Satisfaction Survey: Use of Facilities, Buildings and Grounds Cleanliness, Communication System and Delivery of Supply in Bulacan State University, Malolos, Bulacan. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 2(8), 677–688. Https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.08.06

[11]. Fagyan, C., Macalingay, M., Abellada, A., Munar, B., Depnag, M., Bheal, A., & Kitani, M. (2023). The Impact of Library Use Frequency on Student Satisfaction: An Evaluation of Resources, Services, and Facilities. IRE Journals |, 7. Https://www.irejournals.com/formatedpaper/1704885.pdf

[12]. Gaitan, E., Leanne, M., Laganhon, A., & Laganhon, M. (2022). Satisfaction of student services in selected state universities and colleges (suc). Https://doi.org/10.46360/globus.edu.220221005

[13]. Gloria, D. S., Thrina, E., & Castro, R. D. (2025). The role of infrastructure and student satisfaction in higher education: inputs for campus development plan. Problems of education in the 21st century, 83(4), 501–524. Https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/25.83.501

[14]. Gonzales, R. D., Lumanta, C. N., & Vingua, P. D. (2020). Customers' Satisfaction on Campus Related Delivery Services. International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences, 5(3), 823–828. Https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.53.38

[15]. Ismail, A., Roslan, L., Ismail, H. B., & Mohd Salleh, N. A. (2021). Students' Satisfaction towards Academic Advising Service. Asian Journal of University Education, 17(3), 291. Https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i3.14497

[16]. Li, I. W., Jackson, D., & Koshy, P. (2024). Student's reported satisfaction at University: the role of personal characteristics and secondary school background. Higher Education, 89(6), 1513–1531. Https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01286-y

[17]. Libres, A. C., & Dalman, J. T. (2021). Assessment of the Adequacy and Quality of Laboratory Facilities: It's Impact to Students' Academic Achievements. Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research, 17(1). Https://doi.org/10.7828/ljher.v17i1.1532

[18]. Mandoñahan, G. M., Manocdoc, A. J., Mortillero, R., & Cruz, M. (2023). Satisfaction on the Student Personnel Services of UM Digos College: Basis for a Service Enhancement Program. Business and Organization Studies E-Journal, 1(3), 77–105. Https://ieesjournals.com/index.php/bosej/article/view/158

[19]. Manogura, A., Cabalida, E., Leo, Naparota, C., Lovina, R., Caw-It, A., & Leo. (2021). Students' Satisfaction on the Quality of Service of Andres

Bonifacio College of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0). International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (IJTSRD) International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 4, 602–625. Https://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd42331.pdf

[20]. Miri, M., Faubel, C., Alban, U. D., & Martinez-Molina, A. (2025). Impact of Indoor Environmental Quality on Students' Attention and Relaxation Levels During Lecture-Based Instruction. Buildings, 15(16), 2813–2813. Https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15162813

[21]. Mnculwane, M. R. (2021). The perception of students towards administration of health services at the Durban University of Technology's Durban campus clinic. Https://doi.org/10.51415/10321/3706

[22]. Nie, X., Wang, Y., Zhang, C., Zhao, Y., & Kirkwood, N. (2024). The varied restorative values of campus landscapes to students' well-being: evidence from a Chinese University. BMC Public Health, 24(1). Https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-17952-w

[23]. Olowolafe, A. S., Olowo, B. F., Ogunsanwo, M. A., & Oladele, O. P. (2020). Assessing Impacts of the School Clinic on Academic Performance in Selected Secondary Schools in Oyo State. International Journal of Innovative Approaches in Education, 4(3), 108–120. Https://doi.org/10.29329/ijiape.2020.271.4

[24]. Ramirez, R. B. (2025). The Service Quality of the Registrar's Office and the Stakeholders' Satisfaction in Olivarez College Tagaytay. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, VIII(XIV), 455–465. Https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.814mg0038

[25]. Shukor, S. A. M., Dzulkalnine, N., Anwar, N. A., Munir, Z. A., & Rahman, M. J. A. (2025). Assessing students' well-being by campus facilities. Information Management and Business Review, 17(3(I)), 668–678. Https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v17i3(i).4713

[26]. Slovin, E. (1960). "Slovin: Slovin's Formula for Sampling Technique." https://sciencing.com/slovinsformula-sampling-techniques-5475547.html. (n.d.). Www.sciepub.com. https://www.sciepub.com/reference/405928

[27]. Sumalinog, L. C., Redondo, R. P., & Tagarda, E. P. (2025). Use and Quality of Library Services: Implications on the Satisfaction of Students' Information Needs. British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies, 6(1), 1–12. Https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.04228

[28]. Suprianto, Nur Ahyani, & Kesumawati, N. (2025). The Relationship between the Quality of Academic Services and Learning Facilities and Students' Satisfaction. PPSDP International Journal of Education, 4(2), 392–406. Https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v4i2.422

[29]. Temizer, L., & Turkyilmaz, A. (2012). Implementation of Student Satisfaction Index Model in Higher Education Institutions. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46, 3802–3806. Https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.150

[30]. Ubat, J., & Villalon, G. (2024). Student Satisfaction with Frontline Services at a Philippine State University. 2(11). Https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0486

[31]. Vega, Engr. Ma. T. C. (2019). Students' Level of Satisfaction on the Program and Services Offered by the NEUST, San Isidro Campus. International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management and Science, 5(3), 180–188. Https://doi.org/10.22161/ijaems.5.3.4

[32]. Watermarkinsights. (2024, September 25). 9 tips to improve student satisfaction in higher education - Watermark Insights. Watermark Insights. Https://www.watermarkinsights.com/resources/blog/9-tips-to-improve-student-satisfaction-in-higher-education/

[33]. Wong, W. H., & Chapman, E. (2022). Student satisfaction and interaction in higher education. Higher Education, 85(5), 957–978. Https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00874-0

[34]. Zhang, Z., Hao, M., Mao, Y., & Chen, S. (2024). The Role of Campus Green Space for Residents: Based on Supply–Demand of Recreation Services. Sustainability, 16(16), 6997. Https://doi.org/10.3390/su16166997