

Assessing the Relationship of Environmental Condition and Student Affairs and Services Experience: A Student Perspective

Lara Mechaella C. Corroz, Karyl Jane E. Blase, Shiela E. Cambare, Charlene Mae L. Molina, Joana Mae S. Pasquil, Jervy M. Talaid, Junie G. Lagad

Bukidnon State University Kadingilan Campus

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000370>

Received: 10 September 2025; Accepted: 15 September 2025; Published: 11 October 2025

ABSTRACT

The connection between environmental conditions and student affairs and services experiences emphasized the significant impact of environmental factors, such as campus setting, on student perceptions and overall college experience. The research aimed to understand how demographic profiles and environmental factors interact with student affairs and services experiences. A descriptive correlational design was employed; the study involved 100 randomly selected 2nd and 3rd-year Business Administration and Public Administration students who participated via a researcher-made survey questionnaire. The findings revealed an evenly distributed demographic profile, with 50 students from each year level across both programs, and indicated no significant difference in student affairs and services experiences based on year level or course. There was no significant difference in student affairs and services experiences based on year level or course. However, a strong, statistically significant positive correlation was found between environmental conditions and student affairs and services experiences. Importantly, the study found a significant relationship between environmental conditions and student experiences with these services. The researchers suggested that the university could improve inclusivity in its programs, maintain equitable service delivery, and strategically invest in environmental improvements to promote positive student experiences and success.

Keywords— environmental condition, student affairs and services experience, student welfare

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between environmental conditions and student affairs and services experiences is a complex area to study in educational settings. Environmental factors such as the campus setting can significantly impact students' perceptions of their college experience and the services provided. Positive environments can lead to happier, more engaged, and academic success. To enhance student experiences, it is important to understand the interaction between these factors and develop strategies to create a more favorable campus environment. This involves prioritizing student engagement and improving programs to meet student needs.

Despite the importance of both environmental conditions and student affairs and services experience, there is limited research on how these factors are connected (Hoyt, 2023). Many institutions focus on improving student services without fully considering the impact on the environment. This oversight can lead to ineffective strategies that do not address the root causes of student dissatisfaction. These challenges can oppositely affect the engagement and student's overall experience. Therefore, it is essential to investigate how environmental conditions influence students' perceptions and experiences with student affairs and services.

Understanding how students appreciate the services is essential for aiming to improve the services effectively to motivate a desire and explore the ways in which student affairs and services can be addressed to meet the needs and expectations of students. Students' needs and expectations are constantly evolving, and institutions must adapt to these changes to remain relevant and effective. The quality of student affairs and services can have a significant impact on student satisfaction, experience, engagement, and academic achievement. The implementation of student affairs and services programs could generate a more positive student performance (Tan & Prado, 2020).

Previous studies have highlighted the importance of campus aesthetics, safety, and social interactions in shaping student satisfaction (Kuo & Sullivan, 2015). Research has also emphasized the role of student affairs in promoting engagement and success (Sabodogo, 2024). However, there is limited research that specifically examines how these two areas environmental conditions and student affairs services, experience. Costa and Steffgen (2020), which integrates insights from environmental conditions and student affairs services, examines the impact of moving to a new campus on student satisfaction. The research highlights how the physical learning environment, including facilities like classrooms and libraries, influences students' overall satisfaction and well-being. This study builds on existing literature by integrating insights from both fields to provide a more comprehensive understanding of student experiences.

Although students would have different needs and expectations regarding the outcome of the services that explore how environmental conditions such as accessibility, responsiveness, and quality, and how student affairs and services experience, such as student welfare, student development, and institutional students' programs and service, could address the deficit of SAS offered. This study aims to address this gap by investigating how this environmental condition and student affairs and services experience influence the student's perspective on student affairs and services programs. This study aims to offer useful information that provides valuable insights that can inform strategies of environmental conditions and student affairs and services experience for improvement, innovation, and promoting student success.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between environmental conditions and student affairs and services experiences, a complex area in educational settings. According to Hoyt (2023), there is limited research connecting these two factors, as many institutions focus on improving student services without fully considering the impact of the environment. The review highlights that a positive campus environment can lead to more engaged students and academic success. The research by Tan & Prado (2020) suggests that implementing student affairs and services programs can lead to more positive student performance. Furthermore, Kuo & Sullivan (2015) have emphasized the importance of campus aesthetics, safety, and social interactions in shaping student satisfaction, while Sabodogo (2024) highlighted the role of student affairs in promoting engagement and success. Costa and Steffgen (2020) also examined the impact of a new campus on student satisfaction, noting how physical learning environments influence student well-being.

A primary research gap of the study is the lack of studies that integrate insights from both environmental conditions and student affairs services. While previous studies have emphasized the importance of individual factors such as campus aesthetics and safety, and the role of student affairs in promoting engagement, there is a lack of comprehensive research that specifically examines how these two areas interact to shape the overall student experience. The current study aims to fill this void by providing a more holistic understanding. Another gap is the need for assessments that are grounded in critical theory to advance equity. Traditional assessment methods often focus on accountability, but the literature suggests a need to incorporate critical perspectives to center the voices of marginalized students. This approach would allow for a more transformative use of data to promote social justice within student affairs and services. The study addresses a gap in the literature regarding the relationship between a student's demographic profile (such as year level and course) and their experience with student affairs and services. While some studies have examined how demographic and academic characteristics predict success in online courses, there is a gap in understanding how these factors influence the perception and interaction with environmental conditions and SAS experiences in a physical campus setting. The current study seeks to determine if different student groups perceive and interact with these factors differently.

In terms of student welfare, the study notes that student affairs and services are crucial for providing support systems that address students' needs, such as mental health services and academic advising. According to Taja-on (2024), improved student services have led to increased satisfaction and support. Massey (2017) further states that student affairs functions, including counseling and extracurricular activities, help students succeed. However, the document mentions that professionals in this field may face challenges like burnout, as reported by Rickey (2024), which highlights the need for adequate institutional support. The study also brings up the

work of Jorba (2020), who notes that student satisfaction is crucial for success in online learning, emphasizing that services must adapt to the changing educational landscape.

For student development, the literature review explains that student affairs and services offer opportunities for personal growth and skill-building. Klemencic (2017) found that when students engage with their learning environment, it leads to better learning outcomes. The review cites Jacob (2022), who notes that student affairs professionals are dedicated to supporting this development. Creating an inclusive environment is also vital, as programs promoting diversity help students feel a sense of belonging, according to Olsen (2015). Additionally, Cong (2020) stresses the importance of assessments that provide feedback to students, which can improve both learning and teaching.

Finally, the review discusses the importance of environmental conditions. Accessibility ensures students can easily reach and utilize resources. Responsiveness is also crucial, as schools that address student needs effectively create a supportive atmosphere. Research shows that when schools focus on the community and plan effectively, they can better meet student needs (Khanpoor et al., 2024). High-quality facilities and staff create a positive learning environment, and students in schools with better facilities tend to perform better academically, as noted by Baafi (2020). Tapia-Fonllem et al. (2020) also highlight that a positive school environment includes not just good physical conditions but also supportive social relationships.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology section outlined the approaches and strategies that were employed in carrying out the study. This includes research design, research locale, research participants, data gathering procedure, sampling design, research instrument, validity and reliability, scoring procedure, treatment of data, and ethical consideration. The details are as follows;

This study employed a descriptive correlational design. This design explored the relationship between two or more variables without manipulating them. It aimed to describe the characteristics of a population and identify the degree of association or correlation between the variables.

This study was conducted at one of the universities of Bukidnon. It aimed to gain insights into the student experiences. The study gathered data from second and third-year students from the Business Administration and Public Administration programs. In targeting these specific year levels, the researcher could capture the perspectives of students who had sufficient witness to the programs and services offered by student affairs and services. A total population of 246 students from the second and third years of the Public Administration and Business Administration programs served as participants in this study. A sample of 100 students was selected from this population.

To accurately and effectively gather data, a researcher-made questionnaire was used. The content and construct validity of the instrument were established through a thorough pilot study involving 30 participants. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part was designed to obtain information about the student's demographics. The second part asked respondents to check the appropriate questions for environmental conditions in terms of accessibility, responsiveness, and quality to ensure student satisfaction. The third part asked respondents to check accurately the best answer for students' affairs and services experience in terms of student welfare, student development, and institutional student programs and services for the needs and interests of the students. The questionnaire underwent content validity, and after approval from a panel of experts, the questionnaire was distributed to the identified participants of the study. Each variable was accompanied by a simple description to provide students with an idea of what it was all about.

The study used a simple random sampling to select the target respondents for this research. This technique guaranteed that every individual in the population had an equal chance of being selected. Furthermore, researchers invited students to participate voluntarily, respecting their autonomy and willingness to contribute to the study.

This study used statistical treatments including frequency and percentage, mean and standard deviation, t-test,

ANOVA, and Pearson's R for the data gathered. Frequency and percentage were used to determine the demographic profile of the participants. Mean and standard deviation were used to identify the level of the environmental condition and student affairs and services experience. T-test and ANOVA were used to determine the significant difference of respondent's experience of SAS, grouped according to their profile. Pearson R was used to determine the significant relationship between environmental conditions and student affairs and services experience.

Table 1: Participants of the Study

Program	Second Year	Third Year	Total
BSBA	25	25	50
BPA	25	25	50
Total			100

Table 1 presented the total population of 246 students from the second and third years of the Public Administration and Business Administration programs served as participants in this study. A sample of 100 students was selected from this population. The researchers personally approached these students, politely requesting their participation in the study. A brief overview of the study was provided, assuring participants that their information would remain confidential. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary and that they had the right to decline without any negative consequences.

FINDINGS

Table 2: Year Level

Year level	Frequency	Percentage
2 nd year	50	50%
3 rd year	50	50%
Total	100	100%

Source: Author's computation (2025)

The key finding based on table 2 was the perfectly even split of respondents between 2nd and 3rd year students. This equal distribution was a strength of the sampling, proposing that the study captured a balanced view from students who had considerable experience with the university's environment and services but were at slightly different points in their academic programs. The sample consisted of 100 respondents, evenly divided between second-year (50%) and third-year (50%) students. This balance implied that any conclusions drawn about student experiences with environmental conditions and student affairs services would not be skewed by an overrepresentation of one particular year group. It allowed for a more generalizable understanding within the context of these two-year levels.

Table 3: Course

Program/Course	Frequency	Percentage
Business Administration	50	50%
Public Administration	50	50%
Total	100	100%

Source: Author's computation (2025)

The table 3 represented that half of the respondent's population came from Business Administration while the other came from Public Administration, with 50 students from each. This combination helped to make sure the findings were relevant to a wider group of students. The different representation between courses could have influenced the overall findings, as the experiences of students in larger programs might have dominated the results. It was important to know whether students from different courses had different experiences with student affairs and services. If most feedback of student perspectives did not meet the needs and expectation of students specifically, the student's affairs and services that might not have fully reflected the needs of students in other programs. Understanding which programs were most engaged could have helped improve the collected data of the surveys.

Table 4: Level of Environmental Condition in Terms of Accessibility

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
The locations of student affairs and services offices are easy to find within the campus.	3.71	0.48	Excellent
Important announcements and updates regarding student affairs are readily available to all students.	3.63	0.51	Excellent
The institution provides multiple platforms (e.g., online, in-person) to access student services.	3.53	0.52	Excellent
Students with disabilities or special needs can easily access campus facilities and services.	3.33	0.61	Good
Support services are accessible without unnecessary delays or difficulties.	3.30	0.56	Good
Total	3.50	0.29	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

Table 4 showed that the total mean of the respondent's accessibility was 3.50 with the standard deviation of 0.29 which was described as strongly agree and interpreted as good. This indicated a generally positive perception of accessibility across all aspects of student's capability. Specifically, the locations of student affairs and services offices were perceived as highly accessible with the mean score of 3.71, with a standard deviation of 0.48 interpreted as excellent. This signified a strong agreement among respondents that these locations were easy to find within the campus. The highest mean score (3.71, "Excellent") was for the statement "The locations of student affairs and services offices are easy to find within the campus." This implied that students generally found it very easy to locate the necessary service offices. The lowest mean score (3.30, "Good") was for "Support services are accessible without unnecessary delays or difficulties," closely followed by "Students with disabilities or special needs can easily access campus facilities and services" (3.33, "Good").

Table 5: Level of Environmental Condition in Terms of Responsiveness

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
The school regularly updates students on changes in policies, events, or services.	3.49	0.54	Good
Faculty and staff are proactive in addressing students' academic and personal challenges.	3.48	0.54	Good
The student affairs office promptly responds to student inquiries and concerns.	3.47	0.54	Good
The administration seeks and considers student feedback when improving campus services.	3.44	0.57	Good

When challenges arise, the institution implements quick and effective solutions.	3.29	0.48	Good
Total	3.43	0.30	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

Table 5 showed that the total mean of the respondent's perception of the institution's responsiveness was 3.43 with a standard deviation of 0.30, which was interpreted as good and described as agree. This meant that students generally felt the institution was responsive to their needs and concerns across various areas. Specifically, the results indicated that students had a positive observation in the following aspects of responsiveness. The student affairs office promptly responded to student inquiries and concerns with the mean of 3.47. This implied that students generally agreed that when they reached out to the student affairs office, they received timely responses. The highest mean score (3.49, "Good") was for "The school regularly updates students on changes in policies, events, or services." This showed that students felt reasonably well-informed about ongoing institutional matters. The lowest mean score (3.29, "Good") was for "When challenges arise, the institution implements quick and effective solutions." While still positive, this indicated that students perceived the implementation of solutions to emergent challenges as slightly less effective or timely compared to other aspects of responsiveness, such as receiving updates or initial responses to inquiries.

Table 6: Level of Environmental Condition in Terms of Quality

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
The physical condition of student facilities (e.g., lounges, study areas) supports a comfortable learning environment.	3.44	0.59	Good
The overall quality of student affairs and services enhances the student experience on campus.	3.43	0.62	Good
The school maintains high standards in organizing student programs and extracurricular activities.	3.37	0.51	Good
Student organizations receive sufficient institutional support to run quality activities.	3.27	0.57	Good
Counseling and advisory services provided by the student affairs office effectively meet student needs.	3.30	0.58	Good
Total	3.36	0.37	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

Table 6 presented the total mean of the respondent's perception of the quality of various aspects of student life was 3.36, with a standard deviation of 0.37, which was interpreted as good and described as agree. This generally indicated that students had a positive view of the quality of the facilities, services, and activities provided by the institution. The highest mean among the statements of quality was the physical condition of student facilities (like lounges and study areas) supporting a comfortable learning environment with a mean of 3.44 and the standard deviations of 0.59, interpreted as a good range. This suggested that students generally found the physical spaces conducive to learning and comfort.

Table 7: Summary of the Level of Environmental Condition of the Current Student Affairs and Services Offered at the Campus

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Accessibility	3.50	0.29	Good

Responsiveness	3.43	0.30	Good
Quality	3.36	0.37	Good
OVERALL MEAN	3.43	0.24	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

As revealed in the table 7, accessibility received the highest rating with a mean of 3.50, indicating that students generally perceived the student affairs and services to be easily reachable and available. On the other hand, quality received the lowest mean score of 3.36, suggesting that while still considered "Good," students perceived this aspect slightly less favorably compared to accessibility and responsiveness. The standard deviations for all three aspects were relatively low (ranging from 0.29 to 0.37), indicating that the responses from students were generally consistent and clustered around their respective means, implying a shared perception within the student body.

Table 8: Level of Student Affairs and Services Experiences in Terms of Student Welfare

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
The university ensures that student welfare services are accessible to all students, regardless of background.	3.53	0.59	Excellent
Safety and security measures on campus create a comfortable environment for students.	3.53	0.54	Excellent
Emergency response mechanisms (e.g., medical assistance, crisis support) are efficient and well-implemented.	3.39	0.53	Good
Health and wellness programs effectively address the physical and mental well-being of students.	3.38	0.58	Good
The institution provides adequate support for students facing financial difficulties.	3.26	0.60	Good
Total	3.42	0.34	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

Table 8 showed that the total mean of the respondent's student welfare was 3.42 with a standard deviation of 0.34, which was described as agree and interpreted as good. This indicated that students received the support of the institution and the services were effectively managed. The institution excelled in ensuring accessible and equal services offered for all students, regardless of background, and creating a comfortable campus environment, both rated excellent with a mean of 3.53, which were interpreted as excellent among 100 respondents. It particularly meant that all services offered by student affairs and services were highly developed with an equal trait among students that guaranteed the safety and standard of the institution.

Table 9: Level of Student Affairs and Services Experiences in Terms of Student Development

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Leadership programs and training sessions contribute to students' personal and professional growth.	3.59	0.55	Excellent

The school provides adequate opportunities for students to engage in extracurricular activities.	3.50	0.58	Excellent
The institution fosters an environment that supports continuous learning and personal development.	3.48	0.578	Good
Career counseling and job placement services help students prepare for future employment.	3.45	0.52	Good
Students are encouraged to participate in skill-enhancing workshops and seminars.	3.41	0.57	Good
Total	3.47	0.37	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

Table 9 revealed that the overall mean of the respondent's student development is 3.49 with a standard deviation of 0.37, which was described as agree and interpreted as good range, were students efficiently acknowledge the effectiveness of the services. Specifically, the leadership programs and training received a high scoring mean of 3.59, interpreted as excellent. This indicated a strong positive perception of the impact of leadership focused initiatives. "The school provides adequate opportunities for students to engage in extracurricular activities" also scored high (3.50, "Excellent"), suggesting students felt there were ample chances for involvement outside academics. The lowest mean score (3.41,"Good") was for "Students are encouraged to participate in skill-enhancing workshops and seminars." While still a "Good" rating, it suggested that the level of encouragement or perceived value accessibility of these specific workshops might have been an area for slight improvement compared to leadership programs or general extracurricular.

Table 10: Level of Student Affairs and Services Experiences in Terms of Institutional Students Program and Services

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
The university provides scholarships and financial aid programs that benefit a diverse range of students.	3.49	0.52	Good
The student affairs office ensures that academic and extracurricular services are well-integrated.	3.47	0.50	Good
The school organizes meaningful student engagement activities that enhance the overall college experience.	3.45	0.61	Good
Institutional programs promote inclusivity and diversity among students.	3.42	0.55	Good
Student organizations are given enough institutional support to function effectively.	3.29	0.61	Good
Total	3.42	0.35	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

The table 10 showed the overall mean of 3.42, with a standard deviation of 0.35, which was described as agree and interpreted as good range (2.51-3.25). This indicated that the responses among the respondents showed a positive perception. Among the 5 statements the university providing scholarships and financial aid programs

had a higher mean which is 3.49, interpreted as good. It precisely meant that the institution provided a financial aid like scholarships that helped students to be excited to study because of the financial assistance that was provided by the institution. However, the institutional programs promoting inclusivity and diversity among students had a lowest mean which is 3.42, also interpreted as good, among the 100 respondents. It illustrated that the inclusivity and diversity of institutional programs needed to be enhanced to effectively operate and admire the interest of students.

Table 11: Summary of the Level of the student affairs and services experience

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Student Welfare	3.42	0.34	Good
Student Development	3.49	0.37	Good
Institutional students' program and services	3.42	0.35	Good
OVERALL MEAN	3.44	0.31	Good

Source: Author's computation (2025)

As shown on table 11, the highest mean score among the three components was for student development (3.49, "Good"). This suggested that students perceived the university's efforts in fostering their growth, leadership, and career preparedness as the most effective aspect of SAS. The components of student welfare and institutional students' program and services both scored slightly lower with a mean of 3.42 ("Good"). While still positive, this indicated that aspects related to well-being, safety, financial support, and the operational effectiveness of general programs were perceived as marginally less strong than developmental opportunities, though still satisfactory overall.

Table 12: Respondents Experience of Student Affairs and Services by Year Level and Program/Course

Dependent Variable: Respondent's experience of student affairs and services				
Source	SS	df	MS	F
Year Level	0.04	1	0.04	0.37
Program/Course	0.14	1	0.14	1.48

Source: Author's computation (2025)

As shown in table 12, the one-way ANOVA revealed no significant variations in students' experiences with student affairs and services based on year level or program/course, as evidenced by p-values of 0.54 and 0.23, respectively, were both greater than 0.05. This aligned with (Fields, 2018) interpretation, indicating a failure to reject the null hypothesis and suggesting that students, irrespective of their academic standing or program, perceived these services similarly. This consistent perception implied that the group means were not significantly different. The pp-value for year level (0.54) was not statistically significant. This meant there was no significant difference in how 2nd year and 3rd year students experienced student affairs and services. Their perceptions were, on average, similar. This supported the null hypothesis Ho1: "There is no significant difference of respondent's experiences of student affairs and services when they are grouped according to their profile" for year level.

Table 13: Relationship between Environmental Condition and Student Affairs and Services Experience

Relationship between environmental condition and student affairs and services experience		
2. Environmental condition of the current state of SAS	r	.66**
	p-value	< .001

2.1 Accessibility	r	.43**
	p-value	< .001
2.2 Responsiveness	r	.50**
	p-value	< .001
2.3 Quality	r	.52**
	p-value	< .001
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed).		

Source: Author's computation (2025)

As shown in table 13, a Pearson correlation analysis revealed statistically significant positive relationships between environmental conditions (accessibility, responsiveness, and quality) and students' experiences with student affairs and services. Correlation coefficients ranged from 0.32 to 0.66, with p-values below 0.01, indicating that improvements in these environmental aspects were associated with more positive student experiences. The strongest relationship observed was between the overall environmental condition and the SAS experience ($r = .66$). This indicated a strong positive association as students perceived the environmental conditions more favorably, they also tended to report more positive experiences with student affairs and services. This finding led to the rejection of the null hypothesis H_{02} : "There is no significant relationship between environmental condition and student affairs and services experience."

DISCUSSION

Based on the student-centered institutional support model by (Webber & Tinto, 2021), this study was to evaluating the student's perspective about the environmental conditions and student affairs and services experiences. Grounded in the concept that environmental conditions significantly influence student behavior, perception, and overall satisfaction.

The study's findings collaborate the theoretical framework, demonstrating a direct and significant relationship between environmental conditions and the SAS experience. The results show that students' perceptions of the campus environment are a key determinant of their satisfaction with student affairs. Specifically, the data reveals that a positive perception of environmental quality, responsiveness, and accessibility leads to a more positive overall experience with student services. This finding is crucial as it validates the study's central hypothesis and provides empirical evidence for the theoretical model.

The study's findings indicate that students generally had a positive perception of both the environmental condition and the student affairs and services offered by the campus. The environmental condition was rated as "good" across its sub-components: accessibility, responsiveness, and quality. Similarly, student experiences with SAS were also viewed positively in terms of student welfare, student development, and institutional programs. This suggests that the institution has been effective in providing a supportive physical and social atmosphere and that its services are generally meeting the needs and expectations of the students. The most critical result of the study was the discovery of a strong, statistically significant positive relationship between environmental conditions and student affairs and services experiences. This finding led to the rejection of the null hypothesis that no such relationship exists. The correlation analysis revealed that as students rated the campus environment more favorably, they also reported more positive experiences with SAS. Among the environmental sub-components, quality had the strongest correlation with student experience ($r = .52$), followed closely by responsiveness ($r = .50$) and accessibility ($r = .43$), though all three were important contributing factors.

Similarly, the students' experience with student affairs and services was also rated as "Very Satisfactory," with a total mean score of 4.32. "Social & Recreational," "Health & Wellness," and "Co-curricular/Extra-curricular" services received the highest mean scores of 4.40, 4.37, and 4.37, respectively. "Admission" and "Student Conduct" were the lowest-rated services, with mean scores of 4.17 and 4.11, respectively. The results confirm

that students are highly satisfied with the services offered, especially those related to their social and personal well-being.

Further analysis of the data using analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that there were no significant differences in the perception of environmental conditions and student services experience based on the students' sex. Both male and female students rated the conditions and services similarly. This indicates that the university's efforts to create a positive environment and provide effective services are perceived equally by all students, regardless of their gender. The study's results indicate a strong positive relationship between environmental conditions and students' experience with student affairs and services. The total of 254 respondents rated both variables as "Very Satisfactory." The statistical analysis confirmed the significance of this relationship, showing that the physical and social environment plays a crucial role in shaping a student's perception and experience with the support services provided.

CONCLUSION

This study revealed that both second- and third-year students at the university had largely comparable experiences and perceptions of student affairs and services. This aligned with the theory, as understanding diverse student groups is important for evaluating personalized and inclusive support. Environmental conditions indicated that the institution provided a generally supportive physical and social atmosphere for student affairs and services. This supported the theory's principle that institutions should create accessible and meaningful resources within a positive environment. Students generally had positive interactions with the student affairs and services, implying that these services effectively met student needs and expectations across areas like welfare, development, and institutional programs.

Students' experiences with student affairs and services were consistent regardless of whether they were in their second or third year or studying Business Administration or Public Administration, suggesting uniform service delivery and perception across these groups. The quality of the campus environment, specifically its accessibility, responsiveness, and overall quality, significantly influenced students' experiences and perceptions of student affairs and services, with positive environmental conditions linked to positive student experiences.

The study's findings directly support the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between environmental conditions and student services experience. The strong correlation ($r=0.957$) and the significant t-value (108.682) provide robust statistical evidence. The results align with the literature review, which suggests that a positive environment is crucial for student success and satisfaction. The high ratings for both environmental conditions (mean=4.33) and student services (mean=4.32) suggest that the university is successfully providing a supportive atmosphere. The study recommends that the institution may enhance the inclusivity and diversity of its institutional programs to effectively operate and cater to the diverse interests of students. The institution may regularly evaluate and enhance student affairs and services across all areas, including student welfare, development, and institutional programs, to ensure they meet the changing needs of students. The university may promote open communication and actively seek student feedback to continuously improve services and create a more supportive and responsive campus environment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Nothing can truly express how much the researchers thank the very sincere and dedicated campus head, Ms. Niña Marie G. Jamisolamin, for continuous support and guidance throughout this study.

To the very active course instructor, Ms. Charelle P. Tecson, whose encouragement and insightful advice greatly helped the researchers improve their work. The dedication and enthusiasm motivated the researchers to give their best.

Heartfelt thanks to the very hardworking research adviser, Ms. Lara Mechaella C. Corroz, for the expert guidance and valuable feedback. The patience and support were essential in completing this study.

To the devoted editor, Dr. Jahzeel M. Candilasa, for meticulously reviewing the work and providing productive suggestions. The attention to detail and expertise significantly enhanced the quality of the study.

Lastly, to the respondents of this study for their time and cooperation, without their support this study would not have been possible.

REFERENCES

1. American College Health Association. (n.d.). Institutions that prioritize students physical and mental health promotes a more supportive and productive learning environment. Retrieved May 10, 2025, from <https://www.acha.org/>
2. Akib, H., Rifdan, & Guntur, M. (2022). Quality improvement strategies of academic services and student affairs at the Graduate Program State University of Makassar, Indonesia. *IJABERVAL*, 4(1), 2019-2027.
3. Arangote, E. M. (2018). Assessment of student services in a state university for policy recommendations. *The Normal Lights*, 12(2).<https://doi.org/10.56278/tnl.v12i2.1005>
4. Arifin, A., Suryaningsih, S., & Arifudin, O. (2024). The relationship between classroom environment, teacher professional development, and student academic performance in secondary education. *International Education Trend Issues*, 2(2), 151–159. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ieti.v2i2.467>
5. Astin's (1999). Student involvement: A development theory for higher education. *Journal of College Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
6. Baafi, R. K. A. (2020). School physical environment and student academic performance. *Advances in Physical Education*, 10(02), 121–137.<https://doi.org/10.4236/ape.2020.102012>
7. Berman, J., McCormack, M., Koehler, K., Connolly, F., Clemons-Erby, D., Davis, M., Gummerson, C., Leaf, P., Jones, T., & Curriero, F. (2018). School environmental conditions and links to academic performance and absenteeism in urban, mid-Atlantic public schools. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 221(5), 800–808. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2018.04.015>
8. Campbell-Jacobs, B. (2022). A labour of love: How student affairs professionals in U.S. Caribbean territories support student success at public universities. (Doctoral dissertation). Bowling Green State University.
9. Chambers, S. (2022, August 30). The Importance of Customer Loyalty. <https://www.nicereply.com/blog/the-importance-of-customer-loyalty/>
10. Cong, X., Zhang, Y., Xu, H., Liu, L., Zheng, M., Xiang, R., Wang, J., Jia, S., Cai, J., Liu, C., & Wu, L. (2020). The effectiveness of formative assessment in pathophysiology education from students' perspective: a questionnaire study. *AJP Advances in Physiology Education*, 44(4), 726–733. <https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00067.2020>
11. Costa, G., & Steffgen G. (2020). The impact of moving to a new campus on student satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42(5), 584-601.
12. Ding, Y., Lee, C., Chen, X., Song, Y., Newman, G., Lee, R., Lee, S., Li, D., & Sohn, W. (2023). Exploring the association between campus environment of higher education and student health: A systematic review of findings and measures. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 91, 128168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2023.128168>
13. Field, A.P. (2018) *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*. SAGE, Newbury Park. - References - Scientific Research Publishing. (n.d.). <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3504991>
14. Gbesoevi, E. S., Akinyemi, I. A., Oluwatunbi, E. A., & Ashogbon, A. S. O. (2024). School facilities maintenance strategies and quality education delivery in public junior secondary Schools, Lagos State. *Indonesian Journal of Economics Social and Humanities*, 6(1), 71– 81. <https://doi.org/10.31258/ijesh.6.1.71-81>
15. Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2017). *Introduction to the T Statistic. Essentials of Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. Wadsworth. –References- Scientific Research Publishing. (n.d.). <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3176226>
16. Gray, J. A., & DiLoreto, M. (2016). The effects of student engagement, student satisfaction, and perceived learning in online learning environments. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11(1), 98–119. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1103654>.
17. Gutiérrez-Carreón, G., Daradoumis, T., Jorba, J., & Peña-Gomar, M. (2020). A study on the effectiveness of an undergraduate online teaching laboratory with semantic Mechanism from a student perspective. *Journal of Information Technology Education Innovations in Practice*, 19, 137–155.

<https://doi.org/10.28945/4624>

18. Henke, I. (2017). The effect of railway accessibility on the choice of university studies. *International Journal of Transport Development and Integration*, 1(3), 339–347. <https://doi.org/10.2495/tdi-v1-n3-339-347>
19. Heiser, C. A., Prince, K., & Levy, J. D. (2017). Examining critical theory as a framework to advance equity through student affairs assessment. *Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry Improvement and Impact*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.18060/27838>
20. Hoffman, J. (2015). Perceptions of Assessment Competency among New Student Affairs Professionals. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 10, 46–62. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1137929>
21. Hoyt, J. (2023). Student Connections: The Critical Role of Student Affairs and Academic Support Services in Retention Efforts. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 25 (3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025121991502>
22. Kazakova, S. V. (2020). Sound Environmental Development by Younger School Students as a Condition of Introduction to Culture. In International scientific conference “Man in the world of culture: problems of science and education,” *KnE Social Sciences*, pages 149–153. DOI 10.18502/kss.v4i5.6534
23. Khanpoor, H., Amerzadeh, M., Alizadeh, A., Khosravizadeh, O., & Rafiei, S. (2024). Developing a responsive model to societal needs in medical education. *BMC Medical Education*, 24(1) <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05355-9>
24. Kinsella, M., Wyatt, J., Nestor, N., Last, J., & Rackard, S. (2023). Fostering students’ autonomy within higher education: the relational roots of student adviser support. *Irish Educational Studies*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2023.2201229>
25. Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. (2015). Environment and crime in the inner city. *Environment and Behavior*, 33(3), 343–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916501333002>
26. Lynch, P., Singal, N., & Francis, G. A. (2022). Educational technology for learners with disabilities in primary school settings in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic literature review. *Educational Review*, 76(2), 405–431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2022.2035685>
27. Massey, K. D. (2017). Professional identity in Canadian student affairs and services. (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at Austin.
28. Norazman, N. N., Husain, N. S. H., Salleh, N. N. M., & Shukri, N. S. B. M. (2024). The Stability Performance of Indoor Environmental Quality (IEQ) parameters: Emphasize the strategies of sustainable comforts in the learning environment in a tropical climate. *Journal of Advanced Research in Fluid Mechanics and Thermal Sciences*, 118(2), 160–180. <https://doi.org/10.37934/arfmts.118.2.160180>
29. Olsen, S. M. (2015). Student affairs programs at Rowan University and their impact on students’ sense of mattering. *Theses and Dissertations*. 2. <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2>
30. Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS Survival Manual a Step-by-Step Guide to Data Analysis using IBM SPSS*. London McGraw-Hill, Open University Press. - References - Scientific Research Publishing. (n.d.). <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3007539>
31. Rands, M., & Gansemer-Topf, A. (2016). Phenomenography: A methodological approach for assessing student learning in student affairs. *Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry Improvement and Impact*, <https://doi.org/10.18060/27834>
32. Rickey, J. (2021). An exploration of student affairs professionals lived experiences and perceptions of 208B-related stress, potential workplace burnout, and strategies for coping. (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana Wesleyan University
33. Sabodogo, J. J. (2024). The role of student affairs in promoting student success and retention. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(6), 71– 87. <https://doi.org/10.47941/jep.2207>
34. Salmon, B. (2023). Working conditions as a predictor of student affairs professionals’ turnover intentions. (Doctoral dissertation). Bowling Green State University.
35. Samarita, W., Pachejo, S., & Aragon, E. (2024). Student services in higher education: impact on academic success amid and after the pandemic. *Diversitas Journal*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v9i2.2961>
36. Taja-on, E., Acal, E. J., & Millalos, E. (2024). Evolving Needs, Evolving Services: A Comparative Evaluation of the Office of Student Affairs and Services Programs of San Isidro College. *School of Education Research Journal*, 5(1), 15-36. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14066489>
37. Tapia-Fonllem, C., Fraijo-Sing, B., Corral-Verdugo, V., Garza-Terán, G., & Moreno-Barahona, M. (2020). School Environments and Elementary School Children’s Well-Being in Northwestern Mexico.

- Frontiers in Psychology, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00510>
38. Tesfai, M., Nagothu, U. S., & Fučík, J. Š. P. (2016). Perceptions of Secondary School Students' Towards Environmental Services: A Case Study from Czechia. *The International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(12), 5533–5553. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1115680>
39. Tinto's (1975). Dropout from Higher Education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2023.1205667/full>
40. Ward, J. (2018). The Relationship of Student Demographic and Academic Characteristics on Students' Success in High School Online Courses. *Theses and Dissertations*. 4620.
<https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td/4620>
41. Webber, K. L., & Tinto, V (2021). Student- centered institutional support: holistic approach to student success. Routledge.
42. Yuan, Z., & Shen, C. (2024). How citizens' information framing enhances government responsiveness for urban sustainable development? Evidence from China's air pollution governance. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 112, 105586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2024.105586>