# PREPARING FUTURE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS: THE ROLE OF LEARNING RESOURCES AND FACILITIES IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

**Lilybeth Claire M. Valde**
Negros Oriental State University, Negros Oriental, Philippines
Email: lilybeth.valde@norsu.edu.ph

***ABSTRACT:*** *This study examined the level of academic performance, satisfaction, and perceived contribution of institutional resources to the academic outcomes and professional preparation of Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNEd) students at Negros Oriental State University. Using a mixed-methods design, quantitative data were gathered from 70 students through a structured questionnaire covering learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, alongside students' overall satisfaction with the program. Academic performance was measured using grade point average (GPA), while qualitative data were obtained through open-ended questions to capture students' lived experiences. Descriptive statistics and Spearman rho correlation were employed for quantitative analysis, whereas thematic analysis was used for qualitative responses. Results indicated that most respondents achieved Very Good to Good academic performance. Students generally expressed satisfaction with learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, and perceived these institutional resources as positively contributing to their academic performance and preparation as future special education teachers. However, correlation analyses revealed no significant relationship between GPA and students' satisfaction levels, perceived contribution of institutional resources, or overall program satisfaction. Qualitative findings highlighted the library, online resources, instructional materials, and study spaces as key supports, while challenges included limited specialized resources, overcrowded and noisy study spaces, unstable internet connectivity, and insufficient assistive technologies. Overall, the findings suggest that while institutional resources and study spaces enhance learning experiences and professional preparedness, academic performance may be influenced by factors beyond students' perceptions of resource availability and satisfaction.*

**Keywords:** Learning Resources; Instructional Facilities; Academic Performance; Library Services; Study Spaces

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education has increasingly become a core priority of educational systems worldwide, emphasizing equitable access to quality learning opportunities for learners with diverse needs. As this commitment expands, higher education institutions offering Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNE or BSnEd) programs play a crucial role in preparing future special education teachers who are academically competent and professionally ready to support inclusive classrooms. Beyond curriculum design and instructional approaches, the availability, accessibility, and quality of institutional learning resources and facilities are fundamental in shaping students' learning experiences and academic performance.

A growing body of research highlights the importance of learning resources, instructional facilities, libraries, and study spaces in supporting students' academic achievement. Studies have consistently shown that well-equipped learning environments positively influence students' engagement, motivation, collaboration, and academic outcomes, while inadequacies in facilities and instructional materials hinder effective learning [1; 2]. In special education contexts, these challenges are often intensified due to the need for assistive tools, accessible infrastructure, and specialized instructional resources that address diverse learning needs [3].

In higher education, recent literature has underscored the complex relationship between physical learning spaces, resource availability, and student outcomes. Research on learning environments suggests that classrooms, libraries, and study spaces are not merely physical structures but integral components that influence students' academic focus, collaboration, and confidence [4]. However, access to resources alone does not guarantee improved academic performance. Harder [5] emphasized that while resource availability provides foundational support, meaningful academic gains are often contingent on students' perceptions, satisfaction, and effective utilization of these resources.

Within Special Needs Education programs, students' satisfaction with learning resources and instructional facilities is particularly significant, as these elements contribute not only to academic performance but also to professional preparation. Preservice special education teachers require adequate exposure to inclusive learning environments and institutional support systems to develop the competencies needed for future practice [6]. Empirical evidence from developing contexts further indicates that institutional resources substantially shape learners' academic outcomes, with resource availability accounting for a considerable proportion of variance in student performance [7]. Nevertheless, scholars caution that institutional support should be examined holistically, considering satisfaction, perceived contribution, and academic outcomes rather than resource presence alone [8].

Despite the breadth of studies on learning resources and facilities, limited research has specifically examined how students enrolled in BSNE or BSnEd programs perceive institutional resources and how these perceptions relate to their academic performance, as measured by Grade Point Average (GPA). Existing studies have predominantly focused on basic or secondary education settings or on general higher education populations, leaving a gap in understanding the unique experiences of future special education teachers. Moreover, there remains a need to integrate quantitative measures of satisfaction and GPA with qualitative insights that capture students' lived experiences, challenges, and recommendations.

In response to this gap, the present study investigates the level of satisfaction of BSNE or BSnEd students with learning resources and instructional facilities, the perceived

contribution of institutional resources including libraries and study spaces to their academic performance and preparation as future special education teachers, and the level of students' overall satisfaction with their learning experience in the program. Central to this inquiry is the examination of the relationship between these variables and students' academic performance, as measured by GPA. By combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, this study aims to provide empirical evidence that can inform institutional planning, resource allocation, and policy initiatives geared toward strengthening Special Needs Education programs and enhancing the academic success and professional readiness of future special education teachers.

Specifically, it purports to shed light to the following questions:

1. What is the level of academic performance (GPA) of BSNEd students?
2. What is the level of satisfaction of BSNEd students in terms of:
2.1 Learning Resources; and
2.2 Instructional Facilities?
3. What is the respondents' perception of the contribution of the institutional resources in terms of learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces to their academic performance?
4. What is the students' perception of the overall contribution of institutional resources to their academic performances?
5. What is the level of students' overall satisfaction with their BSNEd learning experience?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of satisfaction of BSNEd students and their GPA in terms of:
6.1 Learning resources; and
6.2 Instructional facilities?
7. Is there a significant relationship between students' GPA and their perception of the contribution of the institutional resources in terms of learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces to their academic performance?
8. Is there a significant relationship between students' GPA and their perception of the overall contribution of institutional resources to their academic performances?
9. Is there a significant relationship between students' overall satisfaction with the BSNEd program and their GPA?
10. What qualitative insights do BSNEd students provide regarding their experiences with learning resources and facilities in terms of:
10.1 Learning resources or facilities that most supported their academic performance;
10.2 Challenges encountered regarding learning resources or facilities;
10.3 How institutional resources helped prepare them as future special education teachers; and
10.4 Suggested improvements for the BSNE/BSnEd program?

## 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### Institutional Resources and Academic Performance

The relationship between institutional resources and students' academic performance has been widely examined across educational contexts. Empirical studies consistently demonstrated that the availability and adequacy of learning resources and instructional facilities contributed to improved academic outcomes, particularly when these resources were aligned with curricular demands and student needs. Studies conducted in basic, secondary, and higher education settings revealed that instructional materials, facilities, and supportive infrastructure enhanced teaching effectiveness and facilitated student learning [2; 9].

In higher education, learning environments comprising classrooms, teaching aids, and library resources were found to significantly predict students' academic achievement. Ramli and Mohd Zain [10] reported that teaching aids and library services were among the strongest contributors to students' academic performance in a university setting. Similarly, Baafi [1] established that students exposed to more conducive physical learning environments demonstrated higher academic achievement than those in poorly resourced settings. However, evidence from South Africa suggested that while educational resources exerted a statistically significant effect on achievement, their impact was comparatively modest when isolated from school management, accountability, and learner motivation [8]. This body of work underscored the importance of examining not only availability but also students' satisfaction with and perceived contribution of institutional resources.

### Learning Spaces, Physical Environment, and Cognitive Outcomes

Beyond resource availability, the quality and design of learning spaces were shown to influence cognitive processes essential for academic performance. A systematic review by Makaremi *et al.* [11] demonstrated that classroom environments affected students' wellbeing through dimensions such as comfort, health, and social interaction, all of which indirectly supported academic engagement. Neuroarchitectural research further revealed that spatial characteristics including layout, enclosure, acoustics, lighting, and circulation influenced attention and memory, key cognitive functions underlying learning [12].

Empirical findings supported these conclusions. Nja *et al.* [13] found that classroom seating arrangement and acoustic quality significantly predicted academic grades, collaboration, and interest among secondary school students. Similarly, studies on innovative physical learning environments emphasized that learning spaces functioned within a psychosocial–physical system, wherein students' experiences and perceptions shaped how effectively spaces supported learning [14]. Reviews of higher education learning spaces highlighted the complexity of the relationship between physical space and academic outcomes, noting that meaningful effects emerged when learning environments were pedagogically aligned and intentionally used [4; 15].

### Learning Resources, Motivation, and Academic Engagement

Several studies suggested that institutional resources influenced academic performance indirectly through motivation and engagement. Usman and Lesmana [16] demonstrated that the availability of teaching materials, the use of appropriate learning methods, and learning stimuli significantly predicted students' learning motivation, which

in turn supported academic success. These findings aligned with Harder's [5] distinction between resource availability and resource usage, which revealed that academic achievement was more closely associated with how learners engaged with resources rather than mere possession. This perspective supported the inclusion of satisfaction and perceived contribution variables in examining relationships with GPA.

**Inclusive Education, Accessibility, and Special Education Context**

In Special Needs Education and inclusive settings, the role of institutional resources has been found to be particularly critical. Research from Kenya indicated that many educational facilities were physically inaccessible to learners with special needs, with toilets and classroom infrastructure cited as major barriers, thereby limiting participation and instructional effectiveness [17]. Similarly, qualitative evidence from the Philippine context revealed that SPED teachers faced challenges related to inadequate facilities, instructional materials, and learning environments, which hindered effective teaching and learner support [18].

Studies on inclusive early childhood education emphasized that infrastructure and learning facilities needed to be adapted according to the characteristics of learners with special needs. Azzahra et al. [3] concluded that modified facilities and flexible learning resources were essential to ensuring inclusive participation. At the higher education level, research in Ethiopia identified barriers such as lack of alternative-format learning materials, insufficient institutional policies, and the digital divide, all of which constrained access to educational resources for students with disabilities [19].

**Library Services, Study Spaces, and Academic Support**

Libraries and study spaces have been widely recognized as integral components of institutional learning support. Beyene et al. [19] emphasized the evolving role of libraries as learning and information commons that promote accessibility and academic skill development for students with disabilities. Complementary findings from Alomari *et al*. [20] showed that multimedia services and assistive technologies in libraries supported access for students with disabilities, although their effectiveness was limited by outdated technology and insufficient staff expertise.

Similarly, Fakunle [21] found that while library resources such as textbooks, encyclopedias, and digital materials were generally available, utilization was constrained by power supply issues, lack of locating tools, and limited professional support. These studies collectively reinforced the importance of assessing students' perceptions of library services and study spaces as contributors to academic performance.

**Facilities, Institutional Planning, and Student Satisfaction**

Institutional facilities were also conceptualized as products of planning, policy, and stakeholder engagement rather than merely physical assets. Oliveras-Ortiz [22] argued that intentional design and purposeful use of learning spaces were essential for supporting instructional models and equitable learning opportunities. Participatory approaches further demonstrated that incorporating student feedback into space design and improvement enhanced the relevance and effectiveness of institutional facilities [23].

Student satisfaction emerged as a critical indicator of the effectiveness of institutional resources. Research using validated instruments, such as the SCALE survey, showed that students' perceptions of learning environments and social context were reliably associated with educational outcomes [24]. In the context of Special Education, Alnahdi [6] found that preservice special education teachers generally expressed positive attitudes toward the field, yet some reported uncertainty about long-term commitment, suggesting that supportive learning environments and institutional resources were important for both academic success and professional preparation.

## 3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study are significant as they contribute empirical evidence to the growing body of literature on institutional resources, learning environments, and academic performance within the context of Special Needs Education in higher education. Specifically, the study provides insights into how students' satisfaction with learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces relates to academic performance as measured by grade point average (GPA), as well as to their preparation as future special education teachers. By integrating quantitative and qualitative data, the study offers a more comprehensive understanding of how institutional support structures influence both academic outcomes and professional readiness.

**Students in the Bachelor of Special Needs Education Program**

For BSNE or BSnEd students, the results of this study are valuable in articulating their experiences, perceptions, and challenges regarding institutional learning resources and facilities. The findings highlight which resources and facilities most effectively supported their academic performance, as well as the barriers that limited optimal use. By documenting students' voices through qualitative insights, the study empowers learners by translating their experiences into evidence that can inform institutional improvement. Moreover, understanding the relationship between satisfaction with resources and GPA enables students to better appreciate how learning environments contribute to their academic success and professional preparation.

**Teacher Education Institutions and Academic Administrators**

For higher education institutions offering Special Needs Education programs, the study provides evidence-based guidance for planning, allocation, and enhancement of learning resources and facilities. The demonstrated relationships between institutional resources, student satisfaction, and GPA underscore the importance of not only providing resources but also ensuring their quality, accessibility, and relevance to program objectives. Academic administrators and program heads may use the findings to prioritize investments in learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces that directly support student achievement and preparation for inclusive teaching practice.

**Faculty Members and Program Implementers**

For faculty members and program implementers, the study offers insights into how the learning environment complements instructional strategies in Special Needs Education. Understanding students' perceptions of resource contribution and satisfaction allows instructors to align pedagogical approaches with available facilities and materials. The findings may also inform faculty advocacy for improved resources and facilities that support inclusive instruction, differentiated learning, and competency development among future special education teachers.

**Policy Makers and Educational Planners**

For policy makers and educational planners, particularly those concerned with teacher education and inclusive education programs, this study provides empirical evidence supporting the role of institutional resources in academic performance and teacher preparation. The results may inform policy decisions related to infrastructure development, accessibility standards, library and learning space enhancement, and funding allocation for Special Needs Education programs. By linking institutional support to measurable academic outcomes, the study reinforces the need for sustained and equitable investment in teacher education institutions.

**Researchers and the Academic Community**

For researchers, the study contributes methodologically and conceptually to research on learning environments, student satisfaction, and academic performance. By examining satisfaction and perceived contribution alongside GPA, the study addresses gaps in prior research that often focused solely on resource availability. The mixed-methods approach further enriches the literature by combining statistical relationships with qualitative insights. Future researchers may build upon the findings to explore causal relationships, mediating variables such as motivation or engagement, and comparative analyses across teacher education programs.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

**Research Design**

The study employed a mixed-methods approach using a descriptive–correlational research design with a qualitative component. The quantitative phase described the level of academic performance of students as indicated by their Grade Point Average (GPA), their level of satisfaction with institutional learning resources and instructional facilities, their perceived contribution of institutional resources to academic performance and preparation as future special education teachers, and their overall satisfaction with the Bachelor of Special Needs Education program. Correlational analysis was conducted to determine the significant relationships between students' satisfaction and perceived contribution variables and GPA. The qualitative phase complemented the quantitative findings by capturing students' experiences, challenges, and recommendations regarding learning resources and facilities, thereby providing contextual depth and explanatory insight to the numerical results.

**Research Locale**

The study was conducted at Negros Oriental State University, Philippines. The research specifically involved 70 students enrolled in the Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNE/BSnEd) program. The university was selected as the research locale because it offers a formal undergraduate program in Special Needs Education and provides an appropriate institutional context for examining how learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces support academic performance and professional preparation for future special education teachers.

**Research Participants**

The respondents of the study were 70 undergraduate students officially enrolled in the BSNE or BSnEd program during the period of data collection. These students were considered appropriate participants as they had direct and sustained exposure to the institutional resources and facilities being examined. A purposive sampling technique was employed to ensure that only students who had completed at least one academic term in the program were included, allowing respondents to provide informed assessments based on actual experience within the learning environment.

**Research Instruments**

Data were gathered using a researcher-developed questionnaire designed in alignment with the Statement of the Problem and the study variables. The instrument included sections that measured students' academic performance in terms of GPA, their level of satisfaction with learning resources and instructional facilities, their perceived contribution of institutional resources including learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces to academic performance, and their overall satisfaction with the BSNEd program. Responses to the closed-ended items were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. To capture qualitative insights, open-ended questions were incorporated to elicit students' perspectives on resources and facilities that most supported their academic performance, challenges encountered, how institutional resources contributed to their preparation as future special education teachers, and suggested improvements for the program.

**Validity and Reliability of the Instrument**

The validity of the research instrument was established through content validation by experts in teacher education and educational research who examined the questionnaire for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the research objectives. Suggestions provided by the validators were incorporated to improve item formulation and coherence. Reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach's alpha coefficient to assess internal consistency, and the resulting reliability indices indicated that the instrument was acceptable for use in the study.

**Data Gathering Procedure**

Prior to data collection, permission to conduct the study was obtained from the appropriate university authorities. The questionnaire was administered to eligible BSNE or BSnEd students through an agreed mode of distribution. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study and were assured that participation was voluntary. Confidentiality and

anonymity were emphasized, and informed consent was secured. Completed questionnaires were collected, screened for completeness, and organized for analysis.

**Data Analysis**

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to determine the levels of academic performance, satisfaction, and perceived contribution of institutional resources. To address the correlational objectives of the study, correlation analysis was applied to determine the significant relationships between students' satisfaction and perceived contribution variables and GPA. Qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questions were subjected to thematic analysis, wherein responses were coded and categorized into themes reflecting common experiences, challenges, and recommendations. The qualitative findings were used to enrich and contextualize the quantitative results.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical standards were strictly observed throughout the conduct of the study. Participants were informed of the purpose of the research and were assured that their responses would be treated with confidentiality and used solely for academic purposes. Informed consent was obtained, anonymity was maintained, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1.1 Respondents GPA**

| Grade | GPA | |
|---|---|---|
| | f | % |
| 95 & above Excellent (E) | 0 | 0.00 |
| 92-94 Very Good (VG) | 33 | 47.14 |
| 90-91 Good (G) | 31 | 44.29 |
| 88-89 Very Satisfactory (VS) | 5 | 7.14 |
| 85-87 Satisfactory (S) | 1 | 1.43 |
| Total | 70 | 100.00 |

Legend:
95 & above Excellent (E)
92-94 Very Good (VG)
90-91 Good (G)
88-89 Very Satisfactory (VS)
85-87 Satisfactory (S)
83-84 Fairly Satisfactory (FS)

Table 1.1 presents the distribution of respondents' Grade Point Average (GPA). The results indicate that the academic performance of the BSNE or BSnEd students was generally high. Nearly half of the respondents (47.14%) obtained a GPA classified as Very Good (92–94), while 44.29% were in the Good category (90–91). Only a small proportion of students fell into the Very Satisfactory (7.14%) and Satisfactory (1.43%) categories, and none of the respondents achieved a GPA classified as Excellent (95 and above).

Overall, the data suggest that the majority of the students demonstrated strong academic performance, with more than 90% of the respondents attaining GPAs within the Good to Very Good range. This pattern reflects a generally favorable academic standing among students enrolled in the Bachelor of Special Needs Education program. Similar findings have been reported in studies on teacher education and higher education contexts, where students' academic performance tended to cluster within higher GPA ranges when supported by adequate learning environments and institutional resources [1; 10].

The absence of respondents in the Excellent category may indicate that while students performed well overall, reaching the highest level of academic distinction remains a challenge. Previous research suggests that high academic performance is not solely determined by individual ability but is also influenced by the quality and usability of learning resources, instructional facilities, and broader institutional support systems [8; 5]. In this context, the GPA distribution underscores the relevance of examining how satisfaction with and perceived contribution of institutional resources relate to academic outcomes, as explored in the succeeding analyses of this study.

Furthermore, the predominance of Very Good and Good GPAs aligns with literature emphasizing those conducive learning environments, accessible instructional resources, and supportive facilities contribute to stable and above-average academic achievement rather than extreme performance outcomes [11; 14]. Thus, the GPA profile presented in Table 1.1 provides an important baseline for understanding students' academic performance and for interpreting subsequent findings on the relationship between GPA and satisfaction with institutional learning resources and facilities.

**Table 2.1 Level of Satisfaction of BSNED Students in Terms of Learning Resources**

| Learning Resources | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Required instructional materials for my courses are available. | 3.69 | 0.93 | Agree |
| Reference materials related to Special Needs Education are sufficient. | 3.63 | 0.92 | Agree |
| Digital learning resources are accessible when needed. | 3.74 | 0.90 | Agree |
| General instructional tools are available for academic use. | 3.76 | 0.81 | Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 3.71 | | Agree |

Table 2.1 presents the level of satisfaction of BSNE or BSnEd students in terms of learning resources. Overall, the respondents expressed a positive level of satisfaction, as reflected by a composite mean of 3.71, which falls within the interpretation of Agree. This finding indicates that, on average, students perceived the learning resources provided by the institution as adequate and supportive of their academic needs.

Specifically, students agreed that general instructional tools were available for academic use (M = 3.76, SD = 0.81) and that digital learning resources were accessible when needed (M = 3.74, SD = 0.90). These results suggest that both traditional and digital resources played a meaningful role in supporting students' learning experiences. This aligns with earlier studies which emphasized that access to instructional tools and digital resources enhances students' engagement and facilitates effective learning, particularly in higher education contexts [10; 7].

The respondents also agreed that required instructional materials for their courses were available (M = 3.69, SD = 0.93) and that reference materials related to Special Needs Education were sufficient (M = 3.63, SD = 0.92). Although these items received slightly lower mean scores compared with other indicators, they still reflected a favorable perception. These findings are consistent with research indicating that the adequacy of course-related materials and discipline-specific references contributes to stable academic performance and supports students' mastery of content, particularly in specialized programs such as Special Needs Education [17; 18].

The relatively low standard deviation values across all indicators indicate a moderate consistency in students' responses, suggesting that perceptions of learning resources were generally shared among respondents. However, the absence of "strongly agree" interpretations may imply that while resources were viewed as adequate, there remains room for enhancement in terms of quantity, accessibility, or relevance. Previous literature supports this interpretation, noting that satisfaction with learning resources often reflects adequacy rather than optimal provision, and that continuous improvement is necessary to meet evolving academic and professional demands [8; 5].

**Table 2.2 Level of Satisfaction of BSNED Students in Instructional Facilities**

| Instructional Facilities | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Classrooms provide adequate space for learning activities. | 3.69 | 0.91 | Agree |
| Classroom layouts support inclusive instruction. | 3.64 | 0.92 | Agree |
| Learning spaces are free from unnecessary distractions. | 3.29 | 0.85 | Neutral |
| Instructional buildings are physically accessible. | 3.70 | 0.82 | Agree |
| Facilities allow independent movement within campus. | 3.56 | 0.83 | Agree |
| Specialized facilities for Special Needs Education courses are available. | 3.14 | 1.23 | Neutral |
| **Composite Mean** | 3.50 | | Agree |

Table 2.2 shows the level of satisfaction of BSNE or BSnEd students in terms of instructional facilities. The overall composite mean of 3.50, interpreted as Agree, indicates that students were generally satisfied with the instructional facilities provided by the institution. This suggests that the physical learning environment was perceived as supportive of students' academic activities and inclusive learning needs, although certain areas required further improvement.

Among the indicators, students agreed that instructional buildings were physically accessible (M = 3.70, SD = 0.82) and that classrooms provided adequate space for learning activities (M = 3.69, SD = 0.91). These findings imply that the basic physical infrastructure of the institution met acceptable standards for accommodating learning activities and promoting accessibility. Similar conclusions have been reported in studies emphasizing that adequate space and physical accessibility contribute to a positive educational climate and facilitate student learning [1; 10].

The respondents also agreed that classroom layouts supported inclusive instruction (M = 3.64, SD = 0.92) and that facilities allowed independent movement within the campus (M = 3.56, SD = 0.83). These results are particularly significant for students enrolled in a Special Needs Education program, as inclusive classroom layouts and campus mobility are central to modeling inclusive practices and preparing future special education teachers. Prior research in inclusive and special education contexts has highlighted that inclusive infrastructure and accessible facilities play a crucial role in supporting learning and fostering independence [3; 17].

However, two indicators were interpreted as Neutral. Students expressed neutrality regarding whether learning spaces were free from unnecessary distractions (M = 3.29, SD = 0.85) and whether specialized facilities for Special Needs Education courses were available (M = 3.14, SD = 1.23). These findings suggest areas of concern, particularly in relation to the availability of specialized facilities that are essential for hands-on training and authentic exposure to special education practices. Similar issues have been documented in previous studies, which reported that the absence of inadequacy of specialized facilities and conducive learning environments may limit the effectiveness of instruction and professional preparation in Special Needs Education programs [18; 25].

**Table 3.1 Respondents' Perception of the Contribution of the Institutional Resources in Terms of Learning Resources, Instructional Facilities, Library Services, and Study Spaces to their Academic Performance**

| Learning Resources, Instructional Facilities, Library Services, and Study Spaces | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Learning resources help me understand Special Needs Education concepts. | 4.09 | 0.78 | Agree |
| Learning resources support my completion of academic requirements. | 4.09 | 0.76 | Agree |
| Instructional facilities help me focus during academic activities. | 3.81 | 0.83 | Agree |
| Facilities support my independent academic work. | 3.69 | 0.89 | Agree |
| Library resources support my coursework in Special Needs Education. | 3.73 | 0.86 | Agree |
| The library provides a conducive environment for studying. | 3.93 | 0.81 | Agree |
| Campus study spaces help me concentrate on academic tasks. | 3.59 | 0.92 | Agree |
| Group study spaces help me collaborate on academic work. | 3.94 | 0.88 | Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 3.86 | | Agree |

The relatively higher standard deviation observed for specialized facilities indicates greater variability in students' perceptions, suggesting unequal experiences or inconsistent access to such facilities. This observation aligns with research emphasizing that resource availability and facility quality

may vary across programs or academic units, influencing students' satisfaction and perceived preparedness [8; 5].

Table 3.1 presents the BSNE or BSnEd students' perceived contribution of institutional resources to their academic performance, covering learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces. The composite mean of 3.86, interpreted as Agree, indicates that students generally perceived institutional resources as playing a positive and meaningful role in supporting their academic performance in Special Needs Education.

Among the indicators, students most strongly agreed that learning resources helped them understand Special Needs Education concepts (M = 4.09, SD = 0.78) and supported the completion of academic requirements (M = 4.09, SD = 0.76). These findings emphasize the central role of adequate and relevant instructional materials in facilitating conceptual understanding and academic task completion. Prior studies have consistently shown that the availability and effective utilization of learning resources significantly enhance students' academic outcomes by supporting comprehension, retention, and task performance [7; 16]. This is particularly critical in Special Needs Education, where learning materials often need to be adapted to address diverse learner needs and professional competencies.

Students also agreed that instructional facilities helped them focus during academic activities (M = 3.81, SD = 0.83) and supported independent academic work (M = 3.69, SD = 0.89). These results suggest that the physical learning environment contributed to students' ability to sustain attention and work independently, which are essential skills in higher education. Similar findings have been reported in studies highlighting the influence of well-designed and accessible learning spaces on students' concentration, engagement, and academic productivity [1; 13].

In terms of library services, students agreed that library resources supported their coursework (M = 3.73, SD = 0.86) and that the library provided a conducive environment for studying (M = 3.93, SD = 0.81). These results align with research demonstrating that libraries remain vital academic support structures, offering both information resources and quiet, structured environments that enhance learning effectiveness and academic performance [21; 23]. For students in Special Needs Education, access to specialized reference materials and inclusive library spaces further strengthens academic preparation.

With respect to study spaces, students perceived that campus study spaces helped them concentrate on academic tasks (M = 3.59, SD = 0.92), while group study spaces supported collaboration (M = 3.94, SD = 0.88). These findings underscore the dual importance of individual and collaborative learning environments in higher education. Research on learning spaces has emphasized that flexible and well-designed study areas promote both focused individual learning and collaborative knowledge construction, thereby contributing to improved educational outcomes [4; 15].

Overall, the results in Table 3.1 indicate that BSNE or BSnEd students recognized institutional resources as substantial contributors to their academic performance. Consistent with Harder [5], the findings suggest that not only the availability but also the functional use of resources shapes students' learning experiences and outcomes. These results provide empirical support for examining the relationship between students' GPA and their perceived contribution of institutional resources, as outlined in the study's Statement of the Problem, and highlight the importance of sustained investment in learning resources, facilities, libraries, and study spaces to support academic success and professional preparation in Special Needs Education.

**Table 4.1 Perceived Overall Contribution of Institutional Resources to Students' Academic Performance and Preparation as Future Special Education Teachers in Terms of Campus Learning Resources and Facilities, Library, and Study Spaces**

| Learning Resources, Instructional Facilities, Library Services, and Study Spaces | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Campus learning resources contribute positively to my academic performance. | 3.83 | 0.79 | Agree |
| Facilities, library, and study spaces support my academic success. | 3.96 | 0.74 | Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 3.90 | | Agree |

Table 4.1 presents the BSNE or BSnEd students' perceptions of the overall contribution of institutional resources to their academic performance and preparation as future special education teachers, focusing on campus learning resources as well as facilities, library services, and study spaces. The composite mean of 3.90, interpreted as Agree, indicates a generally positive evaluation of how institutional resources support both academic success and professional preparation in Special Needs Education.

Students agreed that campus learning resources contribute positively to their academic performance (M = 3.83, SD = 0.79). This finding suggests that the availability and relevance of instructional and learning materials play a crucial role in facilitating students' mastery of Special Needs Education concepts and competencies. Prior research has emphasized that access to appropriate learning resources strengthens academic engagement and performance, particularly in programs that require specialized knowledge and pedagogical skills, such as special education [7; 16]. The result also supports the argument that learning resources are foundational to developing both theoretical understanding and applied competencies needed in professional practice.

Similarly, students agreed that facilities, library services, and study spaces support their academic success (M = 3.96, SD = 0.74), reflecting an even stronger perception of the value of the physical and academic support environment. This finding is consistent with studies highlighting the significant influence of well-designed learning spaces, accessible facilities, and functional libraries on students' learning effectiveness, motivation, and academic achievement [1; 23; 4]. Libraries and study spaces, in particular, have been shown to provide both academic resources and conducive environments that enhance concentration, independent study, and collaborative learning, which are essential in higher education contexts.

From a professional preparation perspective, these results indicate that institutional resources extend beyond immediate academic support and contribute to students' readiness as future special education teachers. Papaioannou et al. [15] and Harder [5] emphasized that comprehensive learning environments, which integrate resources, facilities, and supportive spaces, foster not only academic achievement but also skill development, confidence, and professional identity formation. For BSNE or BSnEd students, such environments are especially important, as they mirror inclusive and resource-rich settings that they are expected to design and manage in their future teaching careers.

**Table 5.1 Level of Students' Overall Satisfaction with their BSNEd Learning Experience**

| Learning Resources, Instructional Facilities, Library Services, and Study Spaces | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am satisfied with my learning experience in the BSNE program. | 3.94 | 0.76 | Agree |
| The program supports my academic development. | 4.10 | 0.72 | Agree |
| I would recommend the program to prospective students. | 4.30 | 0.68 | Strongly Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 4.11 | | Agree |

Table 5.1 presents the level of students' overall satisfaction with their BSNEd learning experience, encompassing satisfaction with the program, perceived academic support, and willingness to recommend the program to others. The composite mean of 4.11, interpreted as Agree, indicates a high level of overall satisfaction among BSNEd students regarding their learning experience and institutional support.

Students expressed agreement with the statement "I am satisfied with my learning experience in the BSNE program" (M = 3.94, SD = 0.76), suggesting that the program generally meets their expectations in terms of instruction, curriculum delivery, and learning support. This finding aligns with studies emphasizing that student satisfaction is closely associated with the adequacy of learning resources, instructional quality, and supportive learning environments in higher education [1; 15]. In special education programs, satisfaction is particularly important as it reflects how well institutions address diverse learning needs and prepare students for inclusive professional practice [25].

The highest agreement among the first two indicators was observed in perceived support for academic development (M = 4.10, SD = 0.72). This result indicates that students recognize the program's role in enhancing their academic skills, knowledge, and readiness for professional responsibilities. Consistent with Mulatya *et al.* [7], institutional support systems, including access to learning resources, facilities, and structured academic guidance, significantly contribute to students' academic growth and confidence. In the context of Special Needs Education, such support is critical, as students require both theoretical grounding and practical competencies to function effectively as future teachers.

Notably, students reported strong agreement with the statement "I would recommend the program to prospective students" (M = 4.30, SD = 0.68), which reflects a very positive overall appraisal of the BSNEd program. Willingness to recommend a program is widely regarded as a robust indicator of student satisfaction and perceived program quality [5]. This finding suggests that students view their learning experience as valuable, relevant, and beneficial, reinforcing the program's credibility and effectiveness in preparing future special education teachers.

Overall, the findings in Table 5.1 indicate that BSNEd students are highly satisfied with their learning experience, perceive strong academic support, and demonstrate strong program endorsement. These results are consistent with literature asserting that positive learning environments, adequate institutional resources, and inclusive instructional practices foster student satisfaction, motivation, and academic success [4; 23]. Moreover, the high level of satisfaction provides a strong basis for examining its relationship with students' GPA, as outlined in the study's Statement of the Problem, and underscores the role of student satisfaction as a meaningful outcome of effective institutional support and resource provision.

**Table 6 Relationship between the Perceived Quality of Study Spaces and the Academic Performance of BSNEd Students**

| GPA | Spearman Rho | Degree of Relationship | p-value | decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learning resources | -0.013 | Negative Negligible | 0.915 | Non-Significant, Fail to Reject the Null |
| Instructional facilities | -0.140 | Negative Negligible | 0.248 | Non-Significant, Fail to Reject the Null |

*Adapted from Calmorin
An r ± 0.00 denotes zero correlation.
An r from 0.01 to ± 0.20 deals on negligible correlation
An r from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 denotes low or slight relationship.
An r from ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 indicates marked or moderate correlation.
An r from ± 0.71 to ± 0.90 shows high relationship.
An r from ± 0.91 to ± 0.99 denotes very high correlation.
An r ±1.0 indicates perfect relationship.

Table 6 examines the relationship between the perceived quality of study spaces and the academic performance (GPA) of BSNEd students using Spearman's rho. The findings reveal negative negligible and statistically non-significant relationships between GPA and students' perceptions of learning resources ($\rho = -0.013$, $p = 0.915$) and instructional facilities ($\rho = -0.140$, $p = 0.248$). Given that both p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypotheses are retained, indicating that students' GPA is not significantly associated with how they perceive the quality of their study spaces.

These results are consistent with contemporary literature emphasizing that the relationship between physical learning environments and academic outcomes is complex, indirect, and often mediated by psychosocial and pedagogical factors rather than operating as a direct predictor of grades. In their systematic review of formal learning spaces in higher education, Leijon et al. [4] underscored that while learning spaces shape engagement, collaboration, and learning

processes, empirical evidence directly linking physical spaces to measurable academic performance such as GPA remains fragmented and under-theorized. Similarly, the state-of-the-art review by Papaioannou *et al*. [15] highlighted that innovative and well-designed learning spaces primarily enhance student engagement, collaboration, and creativity, rather than producing immediate gains in traditional achievement indicators.

Moreover, although studies have demonstrated that learning spaces can influence educational outcomes through physical, social, and psychological mediators, these influences do not always manifest in academic grades. For instance, Nja et al. [13] found that seating arrangements and acoustics significantly predicted collaboration, interest, and academic outcomes among science students; however, such effects were mediated by motivation, self-efficacy, and social interaction. This helps explain why, in the present study, positive perceptions of learning resources and facilities may enrich the learning experience without exerting a measurable impact on GPA.

From a resource perspective, Mulatya *et a*l. [7] reported a strong and significant relationship between the availability of learning resources and student outcomes in basic education contexts, with resource availability explaining a substantial proportion of variance in learner outcomes. The contrast with the present findings may be attributed to contextual differences: GPA in higher education reflects cumulative performance influenced by prior knowledge, assessment design, learner autonomy, and individual study habits, reducing the direct explanatory power of perceived institutional resources alone. In line with this, Usman and Lesmana [16] emphasized that teaching materials, learning methods, and learning stimuli affect motivation more strongly than achievement itself, suggesting that institutional resources may act indirectly by fostering motivation and engagement rather than directly determining grades.

Taken together, the results in Table 6 suggest that for BSNEd students, perceived quality of study spaces, learning resources, and instructional facilities functions more as a supportive condition for learning and professional preparation rather than a direct determinant of academic performance as measured by GPA. This finding reinforces growing evidence in higher education research that GPA should not be treated as the sole indicator of educational effectiveness, particularly in practice-oriented programs such as Special Needs Education, where professional competence, applied skills, and readiness for inclusive teaching environments may be better captured through qualitative outcomes and performance-based indicators rather than grades alone.

**Table 7 Relationship between Students' GPA and their Perception of the Contribution of the Institutional Resources in Terms of Learning Resources, Instructional Facilities, Library Services, and Study Spaces to their Academic Performance**

| GPA | Spearman Rho | Degree of Relationship | p-value | decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of the Contribution of the Institutional Resources | -0.037 | Negative Negligible | 0.761 | Non-Significant, Fail to Reject the Null |

*Adapted from Calmorin

An r ± 0.00 denotes zero correlation.
An r from 0.01 to ± 0.20 deals on negligible correlation
An r from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 denotes low or slight relationship.
An r from ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 indicates marked or moderate correlation.
An r from ± 0.71 to ± 0.90 shows high relationship.
An r from ± 0.91 to ± 0.99 denotes very high correlation.
An r ±1.0 indicates perfect relationship.

Table 7 shows the relationship between students' GPA and their perception of the contribution of institutional resources (learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces) to their academic performance using Spearman rho. The obtained correlation coefficient ($\rho = -0.037$, $p = 0.761$) indicates a negative negligible and non-significant relationship, leading to the failure to reject the null hypothesis. This result suggests that students' academic performance, as reflected by GPA, is not statistically associated with how they perceive the contribution of institutional resources to their learning.

The negligible correlation implies that while students generally acknowledge and value the role of institutional resources in supporting their academic tasks, such perceptions do not directly correspond to variations in GPA. This finding is consistent with prior studies emphasizing that academic performance is multifactorial, and grades are often shaped more strongly by individual learner characteristics such as prior knowledge, learning strategies, motivation, and self-regulation than by contextual factors alone [8]. Harder [5] likewise underscored that resource availability and perceived support may contribute more to learners' sense of security, well-being, and engagement rather than producing immediate or direct effects on measurable achievement indicators like GPA.

Moreover, research on learning environments has highlighted that the influence of physical and institutional resources on achievement is often indirect and mediated by teaching practices and student engagement [14; 4]. Papaioannou *et al*. [15] argued that innovative and well-designed learning spaces enhance collaboration, interest, and engagement, yet these benefits may not automatically translate into higher grades, particularly in higher education contexts where students develop adaptive learning strategies regardless of environmental constraints. Similarly, Baafi [1] noted that although a conducive physical environment supports learning, its effect on achievement may be less pronounced when students already demonstrate relatively high academic performance.

In the context of Special Needs Education and related programs, this result may indicate that students maintain consistent academic outcomes despite differing perceptions of institutional support. Access to and satisfaction with resources may enhance learning experiences, professional preparation, and confidence, which are critical outcomes for future special education teachers, but these gains may not be fully captured by GPA alone [25; 23]. Thus, GPA may function as a limited indicator of educational quality when examined independently of affective, experiential, and professional readiness variables.

**Table 8 Relationship Between Students' GPA and Their Perception of The Overall Contribution of Institutional Resources to Their Academic Performances**

| GPA | Spearman Rho | Degree of Relationship | p-value | decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of the Overall Contribution of Institutional Resources | -0.184 | Negative Negligible | 0.128 | Non-Significant, Fail to Reject the Null |

*Adapted from Calmorin
An r ± 0.00 denotes zero correlation.
An r from 0.01 to ± 0.20 deals on negligible correlation
An r from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 denotes low or slight relationship.
An r from ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 indicates marked or moderate correlation.
An r from ± 0.71 to ± 0.90 shows high relationship.
An r from ± 0.91 to ± 0.99 denotes very high correlation.
An r ±1.0 indicates perfect relationship.

Table 8 presents the relationship between students' GPA and their perception of the overall contribution of institutional resources to their academic performance, analyzed using Spearman rho. The computed correlation coefficient ($\rho = -0.184$, $p = 0.128$) indicates a negative negligible and statistically non-significant relationship, resulting in the failure to reject the null hypothesis. This finding implies that students' GPA is not significantly associated with how strongly they perceive the overall contribution of institutional resources such as campus learning resources, facilities, library services, and study spaces to their academic performance.

Although the correlation coefficient is slightly higher than those reported in earlier tables, it still falls within the negligible range based on Calm Orin's interpretation guidelines, and the p-value exceeds the 0.05 level of significance. This suggests that any observed tendency for students with higher or lower GPAs to perceive institutional resources differently is weak and likely attributable to random variation rather than a meaningful relationship.

This result aligns with a growing body of literature emphasizing that academic performance in higher education is not solely determined by environmental or institutional factors. Adebayo, Nzimande, and Ngema [8] found that while educational resources significantly affect student performance, their impact is often smaller compared to factors such as school management, accountability mechanisms, and learner self-determination. Similarly, Harder [5] demonstrated that resource availability tends to be more strongly associated with subjective well-being and perceived security rather than with direct academic achievement outcomes.

Studies on learning spaces further support this interpretation. Leijon et al. [4] and Papaioannou *et al*. [15] argued that physical and institutional learning environments primarily influence engagement, collaboration, and learning processes, with academic achievement outcomes being mediated by instructional practices and student agency. Baars *et al*. [14] likewise noted that innovative physical learning environments support pedagogical change but do not automatically result in higher grades unless aligned with teaching strategies and learner needs.

In the context of Special Needs Education, this finding is particularly relevant. Research suggests that institutional resources play a crucial role in professional preparation, confidence building, and inclusive practice, which may not be fully reflected in GPA [25]; [23]. Students may recognize and value the contribution of institutional resources to their training as future special education teachers, even when such perceptions do not translate into measurable differences in academic grades.

**Table 9 Relationship Between Students' Overall Satisfaction with the BSNE/Bsned Program and Their GPA**

| GPA | Spearman Rho | Degree of Relationship | p-value | decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Satisfaction with the BSNEd Program | -0.096 | Negative Negligible | 0.428 | Non-Significant, Fail to Reject the Null |

*Adapted from Calmorin
An r ± 0.00 denotes zero correlation.
An r from 0.01 to ± 0.20 deals on negligible correlation
An r from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 denotes low or slight relationship.
An r from ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 indicates marked or moderate correlation.
An r from ± 0.71 to ± 0.90 shows high relationship.
An r from ± 0.91 to ± 0.99 denotes very high correlation.
An r ±1.0 indicates perfect relationship.

Table 9 shows the relationship between students' overall satisfaction with the BSNE/BSnEd program and their GPA, analyzed using Spearman rho. The obtained correlation coefficient ($\rho = -0.096$) indicates a negative negligible relationship, and the associated p-value ($p = 0.428$) is far above the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the result is non-significant, leading to the failure to reject the null hypothesis. This finding suggests that students' level of satisfaction with the BSNE/BSnEd program is not statistically related to their academic performance as measured by GPA.

The negligible and non-significant association implies that students with higher GPAs are not necessarily more satisfied with the program, nor are students with lower GPAs necessarily less satisfied. This reinforces the idea that academic performance and student satisfaction represent distinct dimensions of the learning experience. GPA largely reflects cognitive achievement and assessment outcomes, whereas overall satisfaction captures broader perceptions of program quality, academic support, learning experiences, and institutional climate.

This result is consistent with prior studies emphasizing that satisfaction is influenced by environmental, psychosocial, and institutional factors that may not directly translate into higher grades. For instance, Ramli and Zain [10] and Baafi [1] reported that facilities, learning environments, and institutional support contribute positively to students' learning experiences and perceptions but do not always show a direct or strong link with academic achievement indicators. Similarly, Adebayo *et al*. [8] found that while educational resources and institutional conditions are significant, their isolated effects on academic performance are often modest compared with learner-related factors such as motivation, self-determination, and study behaviors.

In higher education contexts, learning space and institutional resource studies have likewise shown that student satisfaction is more strongly associated with engagement, comfort, support, and well-being rather than with grades alone [4; 15]. Harder [5] further demonstrated that resource availability and positive perceptions of the learning environment tend to support subjective well-being and a sense of security, whereas academic achievement depends more on how students regulate and enact their learning.

Within Special Needs Education, this distinction is particularly salient. Satisfaction with a BSNE/BSnEd program may reflect students' appreciation of inclusive practices, accessibility, professional preparation, and alignment with future teaching roles rather than purely academic metrics [25; 23]. Students may therefore express high satisfaction with the program even when GPA differences are minimal or unrelated.

**Qualitative Findings**

**Learning Resources and Facilities Supporting Academic Performance**

The qualitative responses reveal that students in the Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNED) program identified the library, online learning platforms, instructional materials, and classroom-based resources as the most significant contributors to their academic performance. The university library emerged as the most frequently cited resource, valued for providing access to reference books, journals, quiet study spaces, and a conducive environment for examination preparation and independent learning. Students also emphasized the importance of digital resources, including online tutorials, recorded lectures, educational websites, and learning management systems, which allowed flexible review of lessons and deeper understanding of complex special education concepts. Additionally, instructor-provided materials, guided discussions, visual aids, videos, and classroom demonstrations were highlighted as essential in clarifying lessons and supporting diverse learning preferences, particularly for visual and auditory learners. Together, these resources facilitated comprehension, timely completion of academic tasks, and overall academic engagement.

**Challenges Encountered in Learning Resources and Facilities**

Despite the positive contributions of available resources, students reported several challenges that constrained their learning experiences. Common issues included the limited availability and outdated nature of specialized special education materials, particularly assistive technologies such as Braille tools, adaptive devices, and assessment materials. Overcrowded facilities, especially the library and shared classrooms, were frequently cited, resulting in distractions from noise, lack of space, poor ventilation, and difficulty maintaining concentration during peak periods such as examinations. Technical concerns such as unstable internet connectivity, nonfunctional classroom equipment including televisions and audiovisual tools, and limited access to digital platforms further hindered effective learning. Financial constraints were also noted, as some students were required to purchase essential learning materials independently. These challenges collectively reduced opportunities for hands-on practice and limited students' exposure to authentic special education teaching contexts.

**Preparation as Future Special Education Teachers**

Students consistently expressed that institutional resources played a crucial role in preparing them as future special education teachers. Through coursework, seminars, workshops, and guided practice, students developed foundational knowledge of inclusive education, learner diversity, individualized education plans, and adaptive teaching strategies. Exposure to instructional demonstrations, teaching aids, and practicum-related activities enhanced their confidence, patience, and adaptability when working with learners with special needs. Faculty guidance and mentorship were particularly valued, as instructors modeled professional practices and shared real-world experiences from the field. Although some students, especially those in the lower year levels, reported limited direct engagement with learners with disabilities, they acknowledged that the program had begun shaping their professional identity and readiness through structured learning experiences and values formation aligned with the demands of special education.

**Suggested Improvements for the BSNED Program**

Participants proposed several improvements to strengthen the Bachelor of Special Needs Education program. A dominant recommendation was the expansion of hands-on training and earlier, more intensive field exposure in authentic special education settings to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Students advocated for increased access to updated instructional materials and assistive technologies, including resources for Braille literacy, sign language training, adaptive learning tools, and inclusive classroom simulations. Enhancing physical facilities such as dedicated special education laboratories, inclusive classrooms, and additional study spaces was also suggested to address overcrowding and improve learning conditions. Moreover, students recommended hiring more faculty members with specialization in special needs education, strengthening partnerships with special education schools and centers, and offering continuous professional development seminars. These improvements were viewed as essential in ensuring that BSNED graduates are well-equipped, confident, and competent to meet the diverse needs of learners with disabilities.

## CONCLUSION

This study examined the academic performance, satisfaction, and perceptions of institutional resources among Bachelor of Special Needs Education students at Negros Oriental State University. Overall, the findings indicate that the respondents demonstrated strong academic standing, with the majority attaining Good to Very Good GPA classifications. Students likewise reported generally positive levels of satisfaction with learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, and they perceived these institutional resources as meaningful contributors to their academic performance and professional preparation as future special education teachers.

Despite these favorable perceptions, correlational analyses revealed no statistically significant relationships between students' GPA and their satisfaction with learning resources and instructional facilities, nor between GPA and their perceived contribution of institutional resources or overall program satisfaction. These results suggest that while institutional resources and learning environments are valued and perceived as supportive, academic performance as measured by GPA may be influenced more strongly by other factors beyond perceived resource quality alone. This finding aligns with the view that academic achievement is multifactorial and cannot be explained solely by environmental or institutional inputs.

Qualitative findings provided important contextual depth to the quantitative results. Students consistently identified libraries, digital learning resources, instructor guidance, and available study spaces as key supports for learning. At the same time, they highlighted persistent challenges related to limited and outdated special education materials, insufficient assistive technologies, overcrowded and noisy learning spaces, and inconsistent internet connectivity. Importantly, students emphasized that institutional resources contributed substantially to their professional formation by strengthening foundational knowledge in inclusive education, enhancing practical skills through training and seminars, and fostering confidence in working with learners with diverse needs.

Taken together, the results suggest that institutional resources play a critical developmental and preparatory role in special education training, even when their influence on measurable academic outcomes such as GPA is not direct or statistically significant. The convergence of high satisfaction, positive perceived contributions, and non-significant GPA relationships underscores the importance of viewing institutional resources not only as predictors of grades, but as essential supports for holistic learning, professional readiness, and inclusive teacher preparation in special education contexts.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that the Bachelor of Special Needs Education program at Negros Oriental State University further strengthen the availability, quality, and accessibility of learning resources and facilities to better support students' academic development and professional preparation. Although institutional resources were not found to have a significant statistical relationship with GPA, students consistently perceived these resources as essential to their learning experiences and readiness to become future special education teachers. Thus, program improvement initiatives should prioritize developmental and competency-based outcomes alongside academic performance indicators.

Specifically, the university may consider expanding and updating Special Needs Education–specific instructional materials, including reference books, digital resources, and assessment tools, to ensure alignment with current inclusive education practices. Increased investment in assistive technologies such as Braille materials, sign language resources, adaptive devices, and multimedia instructional tools is likewise recommended, as these were repeatedly identified as insufficient yet essential for authentic special education training. Enhancing internet connectivity and the functionality of instructional equipment across classrooms and learning spaces would also improve students' access to digital learning materials and blended instructional approaches.

In terms of facilities, it is recommended that the institution address issues related to overcrowding, noise, and limited study spaces, particularly in libraries and shared classrooms. Establishing more dedicated and inclusive learning environments, such as specialized laboratories or simulated special education classrooms, may provide students with opportunities to translate theory into practice more effectively. Improving ventilation, classroom conditions, and accessibility features would further support inclusive and focused learning experiences.

## REFERENCES

[1] Baafi, R. K. A. (2020). School physical environment and student academic performance. Advances in Physical Education, 10, 121–137. https://doi.org/10.4236/ape.2020.102012

[2] Abidoye, F. O., Adebisi, A. M., Rihanat, A. A., & Aliyu, Z. M. (2022). Availability of laboratory facilities on students' performance in upper basic schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. International Journal of Educational Research Review, 7(4), 262–270. https://www.ijere.com

[3] Azzahra, I. M., Diana, R. R., Nirwana, E. S., Wiranata, R. R. S., & Andriani, K. M. (2023). Learning facilities and infrastructure based on the characteristics of children with special needs in inclusive education. Journal of Inclusive Education Studies, 5(1), 1–12.

[4] Leijon, M., Nordmo, I., Tieva, Å., & Troelsen, R. (2024). Formal learning spaces in higher education: A systematic review. Teaching in Higher Education, 29(6), 1460–1481. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2066469

[5] Harder, B. (2025). Differential effects of resource availability and usage on learning, achievement, and subjective well-being. Cogent Education, 12(1), Article 2501440. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2501440

[6] Alnahdi, G. H. (2020). Factors influencing the decision to major in special education in Saudi Arabia. South African Journal of Education, 40(2), Article 1742. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v40n2a1742

[7] Mulatya, F., Muna, W., & Kipchumba, H. (2024). Exploring the effect of learning resource availability on student outcomes in Makueni County: An in-depth analysis. Journal of Popular Education in Africa, 8(8), 5–24.

[8] Adebayo, K. A., Nzimande, N., & Ngema, Z. G. (2020). Availability of educational resources and student academic performances in South Africa. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(8), 3768–3781. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080858

[9] Mbeya, A., Kasiita, M., & Muwoya, D. W. (2024). Resource availability and students' achievement in practical lessons in secondary schools in Iganga

Municipal Council. Journal of Research in Inclusive Education, 8(4), 521–530.

[10] Ramli, A., & Mohd Zain, R. (2018). The impact of facilities on students' academic achievement. Science International (Lahore), 30(2), 299–311.

[11] Makaremi, N., Yildirim, S., Morgan, G. T., Touchie, M. F., Jakubiec, J. A., & Robinson, J. B. (2024). Impact of classroom environment on student wellbeing in higher education: Review and future directions. Building and Environment, 265, Article 111958. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2024.111958

[12] Llorens-Gámez, M., Higuera-Trujillo, J. L., Sentieri Omarrementeria, C., & Llinares, C. (2021). The impact of the design of learning spaces on attention and memory from a neuroarchitectural approach: A systematic review. Frontiers of Architectural Research, 11, 542–560. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2021.12.002

[13] Nja, C. O., Anari, M. I., Erim, C. M., Idiege, K. J., Ilhami, A., Ukah, J. U., Eneyo, O. E., & Uwe, U. E. (2023). Learning space, students' collaboration, educational outcomes, and interest: Exploring the physical, social, and psychological mediators. International Journal of Educational Research, 118, 102150.

[14] Baars, S., Schellings, G. L. M., Joore, J. P., & van Wesemael, P. J. V. (2023). Physical learning environments' supportiveness to innovative pedagogies: Students' and teachers' experiences. Learning Environments Research, 26, 617–659. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-022-09433-x

[15] Papaioannou, G., Volakaki, M.-G., Kokolakis, S., & Vouyioukas, D. (2023). Learning spaces in higher education: A state-of-the-art review. Education Sciences, 13(9), 879.

[16] Usman, O., & Lesmana, I. (2020). The effect of availability of teaching materials, the use of the learning method and the learning stimulus on learning motivation. Journal of Education and Learning, 9(3), 98–106.

[17] Long'ore, P. L., Cheloti, S. K., & Mwanza, R. (2023). Influence of physical facilities and instructional materials on the teaching of special needs learners in public primary schools in Kenya. Strategic Journal of Education, 10(1), 523–532.

[18] Allam, F. C., & Martin, M. M. (2021). Issues and challenges in special education: A qualitative analysis from teachers' perspective. Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal, 10(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.37134/saecj.vol10.1.4.2021

[19] Beyene, W. M., Mekonnen, A. T., & Giannoumis, G. A. (2023). Inclusion, access, and accessibility of educational resources in higher education institutions: Exploring the Ethiopian context. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 27(1), 18–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1817580

[20] Alomari, M. A., Daradkah, S. A., Abu Al Rub, M. O., Alqsaireen, E. M., & Khasawneh, M. A. (2023). Utilization of multimedia services in libraries for students with disabilities. Information Sciences Letters, 12(7), 2891–2897. https://doi.org/10.18576/isl/120717

[21] Fakunle, S. M. (2023). Availability and utilisation of school library resources for learning activeness by students in selected secondary schools in Isokan Local Government, Osun State, Nigeria. Library Philosophy and Practice, Article 7784. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7784

[22] Oliveras-Ortiz, Y. (2023). Facilities beyond physical spaces: A case for the intentional design and use of learning space. Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 26(3), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/15554589231171858

[23] Coelho, C., Cordeiro, A., Alcoforado, L., & Moniz, G. C. (2022). Survey on student school spaces: An inclusive design tool for a better school. Buildings, 12(4), Article 392. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12040392

[24] Walker, J. D., & Baepler, P. (2017). Measuring social relations in new classroom spaces: Development and validation of the Social Context and Learning Environments (SCALE) survey. Journal of Learning Spaces, 6(3), 25–40.

[25] Francisco, M. P. B., Hartman, M., & Wang, Y. (2020). Inclusion and special education. Education Sciences, 10(9), Article 238. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10090238