# LEARNING RESOURCES, STUDY SPACES, AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG PRE-SERVICE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

**Jonah Mavel M. Velez, Efreneth G. Alama, Gena P. Quibal, Auster C. Relasa, Jennifer Lyn V. Relasa, Marissa G. Samonte**
Negros Oriental State University, Negros Oriental, Philippines
Email: jonah.velez@norsu.edu.ph

***ABSTRACT:*** *This study examined the academic performance of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students and their perceptions of learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, as well as the relationship of these factors to students' grade point average (GPA). Employing a descriptive–correlational design with a convergent mixed-methods approach, data were collected from 185 BEED students of the College of Teacher Education, Negros Oriental State University. Quantitative data were gathered using a validated survey questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics and Spearman's rho correlation, while qualitative data were obtained through open-ended questions and analyzed thematically.*

*Results revealed that the majority of respondents demonstrated satisfactory to very good academic performance. Students reported high levels of satisfaction with learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, and strongly agreed that these institutional resources contributed positively to their academic learning and overall educational experience. However, correlation analyses showed no significant relationship between students' GPA and their perceptions of learning resources, instructional facilities, study spaces, institutional resource contributions, or overall program satisfaction.*

*Qualitative findings provided contextual depth, highlighting that library facilities, classrooms, digital resources, and quiet study environments were the most supportive of students' academic performance. Common challenges included overcrowded study spaces, limited learning materials, unstable internet connectivity, and insufficient functional classroom equipment. Students emphasized that campus facilities and study spaces supported focus, productivity, and collaboration, and suggested improvements related to infrastructure, technology integration, updated instructional materials, and increased hands-on teaching experiences.*

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

## 1 NTRODUCTION

The quality of teacher education is closely linked to the learning environments and institutional resources available to pre-service teachers during their training. As future frontliners of basic education, Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) students are expected to develop strong pedagogical competence, content mastery, and professional readiness. These outcomes are shaped not only by curriculum design and teaching strategies but also by the adequacy of learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces. Contemporary educational research increasingly emphasizes that learning does not occur in isolation. Rather, it is embedded within physical, social, and psychological environments that either support or constrain academic engagement and performance.

Learning resources and instructional facilities constitute foundational inputs in the teaching and learning process. Empirical studies have consistently demonstrated that the availability of educational resources such as instructional materials, laboratory facilities, and technological tools is positively associated with students' academic achievement and learning outcomes [1-3]. However, recent literature also highlights that availability alone is insufficient unless resources are effectively utilized and aligned with pedagogical goals [4; 5]. This distinction between resource availability and actual use is particularly important in teacher education, where pre-service teachers must not only benefit from resources but also learn how to creatively and pedagogically maximize them in future classroom contexts.

Beyond instructional materials, library services and study spaces play a critical role in shaping students' learning experiences. Libraries function as academic support systems that facilitate independent study, research engagement, and collaborative learning. Studies on library user satisfaction indicate that access to quality library facilities, services, and digital resources contributes to positive learning attitudes and academic support. At the same time, challenges related to awareness, accessibility, and comfort remain prevalent in many institutions [6-8]. Similarly, research on learning spaces underscores that the physical characteristics of classrooms and study areas, including seating arrangements, acoustics, accessibility, flexibility, and aesthetics, can significantly influence students' motivation, collaboration, engagement, and academic outcomes [9; 10].

Recent systematic reviews further affirm that learning spaces in higher education represent a complex and still under-theorized domain, where physical environments interact dynamically with pedagogical practices and psychosocial factors [11; 12]. Supportive and innovative learning environments have been shown to foster collaboration, creativity, and learner-centered pedagogies, whereas poorly designed or inadequately resourced spaces may hinder instructional effectiveness and student engagement [13; 14]. For pre-service teachers, these experiences are particularly consequential because they shape not only academic performance but also professional beliefs and preparedness for real classroom settings.

In the Philippine context, studies on pre-service teachers reveal persistent challenges related to learning environments, resource availability, and institutional support, which may influence both academic performance and readiness for teaching practice [15-17]. Despite the growing international literature on learning resources and learning spaces, there remains a need for localized and program-specific evidence

that examines how BEEd students perceive institutional resources and how these perceptions relate to measurable academic outcomes such as grade point average (GPA). Addressing this gap is essential for informing evidence-based improvements in teacher education programs and for ensuring that future elementary teachers are adequately prepared for the demands of contemporary classrooms.

In light of these considerations, this study investigates the level of satisfaction of BEEd students with learning resources and instructional facilities, their perceptions of the contribution of institutional resources including library services and study spaces to academic performance, and the relationships between these factors and students' GPA. By integrating quantitative and qualitative perspectives, the study aims to contribute empirical evidence to the discourse on learning environments in teacher education and to provide a sound basis for enhancing institutional support systems for pre-service elementary teachers.

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

1. What is the level of academic performance (GPA) of BEEd students?
2. What is the level of satisfaction of BEEd 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 BEEd learning experience?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of satisfaction of BEEd 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 BEEd program and their GPA?
10. What qualitative insights do BEEd 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 elementary education teachers; and
    10.4 Suggested improvements for the BEEd program?

## 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### Learning Resources and Academic Performance

Learning resources are widely recognized as critical inputs that influence students' academic achievement and learning experiences. Educational resources include instructional materials, textbooks, technological tools, laboratory equipment, and other learning aids that support curriculum delivery. Several empirical studies have established a significant relationship between the availability of learning resources and students' academic performance. Ramli and Mohd Zain [1] found that learning environment components such as teaching aids, library facilities, and e learning systems significantly predicted students' academic achievement, explaining more than half of the variance in performance outcomes. Similarly, Abidoye *et al.* [2] reported that the availability of laboratory facilities had a significant influence on students' academic performance, highlighting the importance of adequate instructional resources in improving learning outcomes.

Studies conducted in African and Asian contexts further reinforce these findings. Mulatya *et al*. [3] demonstrated that learning resource availability accounted for a substantial proportion of variation in learner outcomes, emphasizing that access to quality materials forms the backbone of an effective educational system. Festiyed *et al*. [18] also reported that the lack of diverse learning resources beyond textbooks limited enrichment learning opportunities, underscoring the need for ICT based and self directed learning materials. However, other scholars caution that resources alone do not automatically translate into higher achievement. Adebayo *et al.* [4], using TIMSS data, concluded that while educational resources significantly affected academic performance, their impact was smaller compared to factors such as school management, accountability, and learner self determination.

### Resource Availability, Utilization, and Learning Motivation

Beyond academic performance, learning resources have been shown to influence students' motivation and engagement. Usman and Lesmana [19] found that the availability of teaching materials, combined with appropriate learning methods and learning stimuli, had a significant effect on students' learning motivation. In a similar vein, Nurmayani et al. [20] emphasized that the availability of concrete, visual, and digital educational tools enhanced students' attention, comprehension, and motivation, particularly in primary education contexts. These findings suggest that learning resources play both cognitive and affective roles in the learning process.

More recent theoretical work draws an important distinction between resource availability and resource usage. Harder [5] argued that possessing resources does not necessarily lead to improved learning outcomes unless these resources are actively and effectively utilized. Her findings indicated that resource usage was more strongly associated with self-regulation and learning strategies, while resource availability contributed to students' sense of security and well being. This distinction is particularly relevant in teacher education programs, where pre service teachers must learn not only to access resources but also to integrate them meaningfully into instructional practice.

**Library Services and Learning Support**

Library services constitute a vital component of institutional learning resources, supporting independent study, research skills, and collaborative learning. Studies on student attitudes toward library facilities consistently report positive perceptions, although gaps in accessibility and awareness persist. Alokluk [6] found that students generally demonstrated positive attitudes toward library use, primarily for study space, internet access, and academic materials, but expressed dissatisfaction with the availability of comfortable study spaces and awareness of specific services. Amarasekara and Marasinghe [7] similarly reported that users were generally satisfied with library facilities, resources, and staff services, although improvements were needed in information literacy programs and digital access.

Research focusing on utilization patterns highlights that availability does not guarantee effective use. Fakunle [8] observed that while core library materials such as textbooks and reference books were readily available, constraints such as inadequate staffing, limited ICT infrastructure, and low user awareness restricted optimal utilization. These findings reinforce the importance of examining both satisfaction and perceived contribution of library services when evaluating their role in academic performance.

**Study Spaces, Learning Environments, and Educational Outcomes**

The physical learning environment, including classrooms and study spaces, has emerged as a significant determinant of students' academic engagement and outcomes. Empirical studies demonstrate that classroom features such as seating arrangement and acoustics significantly predict academic grades, collaboration, and student interest [9]. Baafi [21] similarly established that students in schools with pleasant and conducive physical environments performed better academically than those in less supportive settings.

Recent studies extend this discussion by emphasizing the relational nature of learning spaces. Baars et al. [13] argued that physical learning environments interact with psychosocial and pedagogical factors, and that alignment between space design and instructional practices is crucial for effective learning. Coelho et al. [14] further highlighted the value of participatory approaches in assessing student perceptions of school spaces, emphasizing that student feedback can inform inclusive and pedagogically meaningful space design.

Systematic reviews provide broader perspectives on this growing field. Leijon et al. [11] noted that research on formal learning spaces in higher education remains fragmented and under theorized, despite increasing recognition of the role of physical environments in learning. Papaioannou *et al*. [12] likewise emphasized the transition from traditional classrooms to innovative, hybrid, and technology enhanced learning spaces, noting their potential to enhance collaboration, creativity, and engagement when adequately supported.

**Pre Service Teachers, Institutional Resources, and Teacher Preparation**

For pre service teachers, institutional resources and learning environments are not only academic supports but also formative experiences that shape professional readiness. Studies in the Philippine context identify recurring challenges related to learning resources, classroom space, and institutional support. Ymana [15] reported that pre service BEEd students encountered difficulties related to unavailability of learning resources and classroom space, which affected their pedagogical development. Napanoy et al. [16] similarly found that learning environment and facility related challenges contributed to the difficulties experienced by pre service teachers during training. Rudio *et al*. [17] observed that while student teaching programs were generally well perceived, continuous improvement of facilities and support services remained necessary to strengthen teacher preparation.

**3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

This study is significant in several important ways, as it contributes to theory, practice, and policy in teacher education, particularly within the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program.

For BEEd students, the findings provide empirical evidence on how learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces influence their academic performance and overall learning experience. By identifying which institutional resources most strongly support learning, the study helps students become more aware of how to maximize available resources to enhance their academic success and professional preparation as future elementary teachers.

For teacher education institutions and administrators, the study offers data driven insights that can guide institutional planning, resource allocation, and facilities development. Understanding students' levels of satisfaction and perceptions of the contribution of institutional resources allows administrators to identify strengths and areas for improvement in learning environments. This evidence can support informed decision making related to upgrading instructional facilities, improving library services, and enhancing study spaces to better support pre service teachers' academic needs.

For teacher educators and faculty members, the study provides a clearer picture of how institutional resources intersect with teaching and learning processes. The results may inform instructional planning and encourage faculty to integrate available resources more effectively into their teaching practices. In doing so, teacher educators can help pre service teachers develop resourcefulness and pedagogical competence that are essential for effective classroom practice.

For curriculum developers and policymakers, the findings contribute to the growing body of evidence emphasizing the role of learning environments and institutional resources in academic performance. The results may serve as a basis for reviewing teacher education curricula and policies to ensure alignment between program objectives, available resources, and desired learning outcomes.

For future researchers, this study adds to the limited local literature on learning resources, study spaces, and academic performance among pre service elementary teachers. It provides a framework and empirical baseline for further investigations that may explore similar variables across other teacher education programs, institutions, or methodological approaches.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study adopted a descriptive correlational research design to determine the level of satisfaction and perceptions of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) students regarding institutional resources and to examine the relationship between these variables and their academic performance. The design was deemed appropriate because the study focused on describing existing conditions and determining the degree of association among variables without manipulating them. Specifically, the design allowed for the examination of relationships between students' satisfaction with learning resources and instructional facilities, their perceptions of the contribution of institutional resources including library services and study spaces, and their grade point average (GPA).

### Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study consisted of 185 Bachelor of Elementary Education students from the College of Teacher Education of Negros Oriental State University. These respondents were officially enrolled during the conduct of the study and represented various year levels within the BEEd program. A total enumeration approach was employed to ensure adequate representation of the target population and to strengthen the generalizability of the findings within the institutional context.

### Research Instrument

Data were collected using a researcher developed questionnaire designed to measure students' satisfaction and perceptions of institutional resources and their learning experience. The instrument included sections that elicited information on respondents' academic performance in terms of GPA, satisfaction with learning resources, satisfaction with instructional facilities, perceptions of the contribution of institutional resources including learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces to academic performance, and overall satisfaction with the BEEd learning experience. The questionnaire utilized a Likert type scale to quantify responses. Content validation was conducted by experts in teacher education and educational research to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives, while reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha was performed to establish the internal consistency of the instrument.

### Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, the necessary permissions were secured from the university and relevant academic units. The purpose and objectives of the study were clearly explained to the respondents, and informed consent was obtained. Respondents were assured that participation was voluntary and that their responses would be treated with strict confidentiality. The questionnaires were administered personally by the researcher and retrieved after completion to ensure completeness and a high retrieval rate.

### Statistical Treatment of Data

The data gathered from the questionnaires were encoded, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to describe the respondents' academic performance and levels of satisfaction and perception. Inferential statistics were applied to determine the significance of relationships between students' GPA and their satisfaction and perception of institutional resources. Correlation analysis was employed to examine the degree and direction of relationships among the variables at a specified level of significance.

### Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles were strictly observed throughout the conduct of the study. Respondents were informed of the nature and purpose of the research, their right to withdraw at any stage, and the confidentiality of the information they provided. No personally identifying information was collected, and all data obtained were used solely for academic and research purposes in accordance with institutional research ethics guidelines.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1.1 Respondents GPA**

| Grade | GPA | |
|---|---|---|
| | f | % |
| 95 & above Excellent (E) | 0 | 0.00 |
| 92-94 Very Good (VG) | 44 | 23.78 |
| 90-91 Good (G) | 82 | 44.32 |
| 88-89 Very Satisfactory (VS) | 54 | 29.19 |
| 85-87 Satisfactory (S) | 5 | 2.70 |
| Total | 185 | 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 shows the distribution of the academic performance of the 185 Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) student respondents based on their Grade Point Average (GPA). The findings reveal that the respondents generally demonstrated favorable academic performance, with the majority clustered in the middle to upper GPA categories.

Most of the respondents obtained a GPA classified as Good (90–91), accounting for 82 students or 44.32% of the total sample. This was followed by those in the Very Satisfactory (88–89) category, comprising 54 respondents or 29.19%, and the Very Good (92–94) category with 44 respondents or 23.78%. Only a small proportion of students, representing 2.70%, fell under the Satisfactory (85–87) category. Notably, none of the respondents achieved a GPA of 95 and above (Excellent).

Overall, the results indicate that more than 97% of the respondents attained GPAs within the Good to Very Good range, suggesting that BEEd students possess a generally strong academic foundation. This level of performance reflects adequate mastery of course requirements and aligns

with expectations for pre-service teachers undergoing professional preparation.

The absence of students in the Excellent category, however, implies potential constraints that may limit the attainment of outstanding academic performance. Prior studies have emphasized that while academic achievement is influenced by students' abilities and motivation, it is also shaped by the availability and quality of learning resources, instructional facilities, and supportive study spaces [1; 21; 2]. Moreover, research has shown that the effective use of resources, rather than mere availability, plays a crucial role in enhancing learning outcomes [4; 5].

In teacher education programs, GPA serves as an important indicator of students' preparedness for professional practice, as academic competence is closely linked to pedagogical effectiveness and readiness for classroom responsibilities [15; 16]. Thus, the GPA distribution presented in Table 1.1 provides a meaningful baseline for examining how students' satisfaction with learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces may be associated with their academic performance in the subsequent analyses of this study.

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

| Learning Resources | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Required instructional materials for my courses are available. | 4.09 | 0.89 | Agree |
| Reference materials related to Elementary Education are sufficient. | 3.90 | 0.91 | Agree |
| Digital learning resources are accessible when needed. | 4.05 | 0.93 | Agree |
| Learning materials support my understanding of course topics. | 4.23 | 0.91 | Strongly Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 4.09 | | Agree |

Table 2.1 presents the level of satisfaction of BEEd students with respect to learning resources. The composite mean of 4.09, interpreted as Agree, indicates that students generally perceive the learning resources available in the program as adequate and supportive of their academic needs.

Specifically, students agreed that required instructional materials for their courses are available (M = 4.09, SD = 0.89) and that reference materials related to Elementary Education and allied fields are sufficient (M = 3.90, SD = 0.91). These findings suggest that core learning materials are accessible to students, providing essential academic support for coursework and requirements. The result aligns with prior studies emphasizing that the availability of instructional and reference materials contributes to a positive learning experience and fosters academic engagement among pre-service teachers [6; 7].

The respondents also expressed agreement that digital learning resources are accessible when needed (M = 4.05, SD = 0.93). This reflects the growing importance of technology-enhanced learning in teacher education, where access to online materials, learning management systems, and digital references supports flexible and independent learning. The finding is consistent with literature highlighting that digital resource availability enhances students' ability to complete academic tasks and engage in self-directed learning, particularly in higher education contexts [22].

Notably, the highest-rated item indicates that learning materials support students' understanding of course topics (M = 4.23, SD = 0.91), interpreted as Strongly Agree. This suggests that beyond mere availability, the quality and relevance of learning materials are perceived to be effective in facilitating comprehension and conceptual understanding. Such a finding underscores the pedagogical value of well-aligned instructional resources in supporting learning outcomes, even when direct links to GPA may not be evident.

Overall, the results imply that BEEd students are largely satisfied with the learning resources provided by the institution. Consistent with existing studies, these resources appear to function as critical enabling conditions that support comprehension, engagement, and academic preparedness rather than as direct predictors of academic performance [13]; [23]. In teacher education programs, adequate learning resources thus play a vital role in shaping students' learning experiences and professional readiness, reinforcing their importance in program quality assurance and continuous improvement.

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

| Instructional Facilities | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Classrooms provide adequate space for learning activities. | 4.11 | 0.90 | Agree |
| Classroom layouts support effective teaching–learning activities. | 4.11 | 0.88 | Agree |
| Learning spaces are free from unnecessary distractions. | 3.96 | 0.91 | Agree |
| Instructional buildings are physically accessible. | 4.00 | 0.90 | Agree |
| Facilities allow independent movement within campus. | 4.04 | 0.87 | Agree |
| Facilities are well-maintained and conducive to learning. | 4.12 | 0.91 | Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 4.06 | | Agree |

Table 2.2 presents the level of satisfaction of BEEd students with respect to instructional facilities. The composite mean of 4.06, interpreted as Agree, indicates that students generally perceive the institution's physical learning facilities as adequate, accessible, and supportive of their academic activities.

The findings show that students agree that classrooms provide adequate space for learning activities (M = 4.11, SD = 0.90) and that classroom layouts support effective teaching–learning processes (M = 4.11, SD = 0.88). These results suggest that the physical configuration of classrooms facilitates interaction, participation, and engagement, which are essential in pre-service teacher education where collaborative and activity-based learning is emphasized. This aligns with studies indicating that well-designed classroom environments contribute positively to students' engagement and perceived learning effectiveness [21; 13].

Students also agreed that learning spaces are generally free from unnecessary distractions (M = 3.96, SD = 0.91). While

still rated positively, this item obtained the lowest mean in the table, suggesting that distractions remain a moderate concern in some learning environments. Similar observations have been reported in the literature, where noise, congestion, and shared-use spaces were identified as common challenges affecting concentration and sustained academic focus [9; 12].

In terms of accessibility, respondents agreed that instructional buildings are physically accessible (M = 4.00, SD = 0.90) and that facilities allow independent movement within the campus (M = 4.04, SD = 0.87). These findings are particularly relevant in teacher education contexts, as inclusive and accessible environments support diverse learner needs and model inclusive practices that future teachers are expected to adopt in their professional practice. Prior studies emphasize that accessibility and ease of movement within learning environments contribute to students' comfort, autonomy, and overall satisfaction with institutional facilities [14; 11].

Moreover, students agreed that facilities are well-maintained and conducive to learning (M = 4.12, SD = 0.91), indicating that the physical condition and upkeep of instructional spaces positively influence their learning experience. This supports existing evidence that the maintenance and physical quality of facilities play a crucial role in shaping students' perceptions of institutional support and learning readiness [4]. Overall, the results indicate that BEEd students hold a favorable perception of instructional facilities, viewing them as functional, accessible, and generally supportive of academic engagement. Consistent with earlier research, these facilities appear to contribute more to students' satisfaction and learning experience rather than directly predicting academic performance as reflected in GPA [23; 13]. As such, instructional facilities remain a vital component of a supportive learning environment that fosters engagement, comfort, and preparedness among future elementary educators..

**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 Elementary Education concepts. | 4.29 | 0.69 | Strongly Agree |
| Learning resources support my completion of academic requirements. | 4.27 | 0.70 | Strongly Agree |
| Instructional facilities help me focus during academic activities. | 4.22 | 0.71 | Strongly Agree |
| Facilities support my independent academic work. | 4.15 | 0.73 | Agree |
| Library resources support my coursework. | 4.11 | 0.74 | Agree |
| The library provides a conducive environment for studying. | 4.22 | 0.71 | Strongly Agree |
| Library services help me prepare for academic assessments. | 4.12 | 0.72 | Agree |
| Campus study spaces help me concentrate on academic tasks. | 4.02 | 0.75 | Agree |
| Quiet study areas support my independent learning. | 4.37 | 0.66 | Strongly Agree |
| Group study spaces support collaboration for academic tasks. | 4.26 | 0.70 | Strongly Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 4.19 | | Strongly Agree |

Table 3.1 presents the respondents' perception of how institutional resources, specifically learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, contribute to their academic performance. The findings show a highly positive perception, as reflected in the composite mean of 4.19, interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that students strongly recognize the role of institutional resources in supporting their academic success.

Among the indicators, "Quiet study areas support my independent learning" registered the highest mean score of 4.37 with a standard deviation of 0.66, interpreted as Strongly Agree. This result underscores the critical importance of quiet and dedicated study spaces in fostering concentration and independent learning. Previous studies have consistently emphasized that well designed and low distraction study environments enhance focus, self regulation, and academic outcomes among higher education students [21; 9; 11].

Learning resources were also perceived as highly contributory to academic performance. The items "Learning resources help me understand Elementary Education concepts" and "Learning resources support my completion of academic requirements" obtained mean scores of 4.29 and 4.27, respectively, both interpreted as Strongly Agree. These findings align with earlier research which highlights that access to relevant and sufficient instructional materials improves conceptual understanding, task completion, and overall academic achievement [2; 4; 5].

Instructional facilities likewise received strong affirmation from respondents. The statement "Instructional facilities help me focus during academic activities" yielded a mean of 4.22, interpreted as Strongly Agree, suggesting that the physical learning environment plays a significant role in sustaining attention and engagement. This supports existing literature that links conducive instructional facilities, including classroom design and physical comfort, with improved focus and learning efficiency [1; 13].

Library related indicators also demonstrated positive perceptions. Respondents strongly agreed that the library provides a conducive environment for studying with a mean of 4.22, while agreement was also evident in the perceived contribution of library resources and services to coursework and assessment preparation. These results echo findings from library use and satisfaction studies which emphasize the role of libraries as essential academic support systems that promote effective study habits and academic preparedness [6-[8].

Finally, group oriented learning spaces were perceived as supportive of collaborative academic activities, as indicated by the mean score of 4.26 for group study spaces. This result supports research highlighting the importance of flexible

learning spaces that accommodate collaboration, discussion, and peer learning as part of contemporary educational practices [23; 12].

**Table 4.1 Perceived Overall Contribution of Institutional Resources to Students' Academic Performance and Preparation as Elementary 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. | 4.19 | 0.88 | Agree |
| Facilities, library, and study spaces support my academic success. | 4.29 | 0.88 | Strongly Agree |
| Library services and study spaces help improve my academic outcomes. | 4.22 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | 4.23 | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |

Table 4.1 presents the perceived overall contribution of institutional resources namely campus learning resources and facilities, library services, and study spaces to BEEd students' academic performance and preparation as future elementary education teachers. The results yield a composite mean of 4.23 (SD = 0.85), interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that students generally perceive institutional resources as highly contributory to their academic success and professional preparation.

Specifically, the item "Campus learning resources contribute positively to my academic performance" obtained a mean of 4.19 (SD = 0.88), interpreted as Agree. This suggests that students recognize the importance of instructional materials, facilities, and campus-based resources in supporting their learning tasks, comprehension of course content, and completion of academic requirements. This finding is consistent with prior studies which emphasize that the availability and accessibility of learning resources create enabling conditions for effective learning, even if such resources do not always manifest as direct predictors of GPA [4; 22].

The item "Facilities, library, and study spaces support my academic success" registered a higher mean of 4.29 (SD = 0.88), interpreted as Strongly Agree, highlighting the central role of physical and academic support environments in fostering sustained student engagement and achievement. Learning spaces that are conducive, accessible, and well-maintained have been shown to enhance concentration, independent learning, and collaborative activities, all of which are essential competencies for pre-service teachers [12; 9].

Similarly, "Library services and study spaces help improve my academic outcomes" yielded a mean of 4.22 (SD = 0.87), also interpreted as Strongly Agree. This finding reinforces the critical role of libraries and designated study spaces as hubs for academic support, information access, and self-directed learning. Empirical evidence suggests that students who perceive library services and study environments as supportive tend to demonstrate higher academic confidence, better study habits, and improved preparedness for assessments [6]; [7].

Overall, the findings indicate that BEEd students strongly acknowledge the contribution of institutional resources to their academic performance and preparation as future elementary educators. While subsequent correlational analyses reveal no significant statistical relationship between these perceptions and GPA, the results align with contemporary literature asserting that institutional resources primarily function as qualitative enhancers of the learning experience, influencing motivation, satisfaction, and readiness for professional practice rather than serving as sole determinants of academic grades [23; 13]. This underscores the importance of sustaining well-integrated learning resources and environments in teacher education programs to support holistic student development..

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

| Learning Resources, Instructional Facilities, Library Services, and Study Spaces | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am satisfied with my learning experience in the BEEd program. | 4.27 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| The program supports my academic development. | 4.30 | 0.86 | Strongly Agree |
| I would recommend the BEEd program to prospective students. | 4.34 | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| **Composite Mean** | **4.31** | | Strongly Agree |

Table 5.1 presents the level of students' overall satisfaction with their BEEd learning experience in terms of learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces. The composite mean of 4.31, interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicates a very high level of overall satisfaction among BEEd students, suggesting that institutional support systems holistically contribute to a positive academic experience.

The item "I am satisfied with my learning experience in the BEEd program" obtained a mean of 4.27 (SD = 0.87), reflecting strong affirmation of students' general learning conditions and academic environment. This finding suggests that students perceive coherence between instructional delivery, available resources, and institutional facilities, which collectively foster meaningful learning experiences.

Students also strongly agreed that the program supports their academic development (M = 4.30, SD = 0.86). This result underscores the role of adequate learning resources, instructional facilities, and supportive study spaces in facilitating cognitive growth, skill acquisition, and professional readiness among pre-service teachers. Prior research emphasizes that supportive academic environments strengthen students' motivation, engagement, and perceived competence, even when such factors do not always directly translate into higher GPA outcomes [20]; [3].

The highest-rated item, "I would recommend the BEEd program to prospective students" (M = 4.34, SD = 0.89), indicates a strong endorsement of the program by its current students. This finding implies that students' satisfaction

extends beyond personal experience to broader perceptions of program credibility and institutional effectiveness. Studies in higher education consistently highlight that students' willingness to recommend a program is a robust indicator of overall satisfaction and perceived institutional quality [6; 7].

Overall, the results suggest that while learning resources, facilities, library services, and study spaces may not show a statistically significant relationship with GPA, they play a critical role in shaping students' academic satisfaction and perceived developmental support. This aligns with the literature asserting that institutional resources primarily function as enabling conditions that enhance learning engagement, well-being, and preparedness for professional practice, rather than as direct predictors of academic performance [23; 13]. Consequently, the high level of satisfaction among BEEd students reflects the institution's effectiveness in providing a supportive and conducive learning environment for future elementary educators.

**Table 6 Relationship Between the Perceived Quality of Study Spaces and the Academic Performance of BEED Students**

| GPA | Spearman Rho | Degree of Relationship | p-value | decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learning resources | -0.082 | Negative Negligible | 0.268 | Non-Significant, Fail to Reject the Null |
| Instructional facilities | -0.068 | Negative Negligible | 0.358 | 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 presents the results of the Spearman rank correlation analysis examining the relationship between students' academic performance, measured through GPA, and their perceived quality of learning resources and instructional facilities. The analysis was conducted using Spearman rho due to the ordinal nature of perception data and non normal distribution of GPA scores.

The results indicate a negative negligible relationship between GPA and perceived quality of learning resources, with a Spearman rho value of –0.082 and a corresponding p value of 0.268. Since the computed p value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the relationship is not statistically significant, leading to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis. This finding suggests that variations in students' GPA are not significantly associated with their perceived quality of learning resources.

Similarly, the relationship between GPA and perceived quality of instructional facilities yielded a Spearman rho value of –0.068, also classified as a negative negligible relationship, with a p value of 0.358. As this value likewise exceeds the 0.05 significance threshold, the result indicates no significant relationship between instructional facilities and academic performance, resulting again in a failure to reject the null hypothesis.

The negative yet negligible correlations imply that while students generally report positive perceptions of learning resources and facilities, these perceptions do not directly translate into measurable differences in GPA. This finding aligns with previous studies which argue that academic performance is shaped by multiple interacting factors beyond physical and instructional resources, including individual motivation, self regulation, teaching strategies, assessment practices, and socio academic variables [4; 5].

Furthermore, this result supports the view that resource availability or perceived quality alone may not be sufficient to predict academic achievement, particularly in teacher education programs where performance outcomes are influenced by practicum experiences, cognitive engagement, and pedagogical competence [1; 13]. Harder [5] likewise emphasized that the effective use of resources, rather than their mere availability, is a stronger predictor of learning and achievement outcomes.

Despite the lack of statistical significance, the findings do not diminish the importance of learning resources and instructional facilities in the educational process. Instead, they suggest that while such resources contribute to students' satisfaction, engagement, and learning experience, their impact on GPA may be indirect or mediated by other academic and psychosocial factors. This highlights the need for a more holistic understanding of academic performance that integrates both environmental supports and learner centered variables.

**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 | -0.008 | Negative Negligible | 0.915 | 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 presents the result of the Spearman rank correlation analysis examining the relationship between students' academic performance, as measured by GPA, and their perception of the contribution of institutional resources, including learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, to their academic performance. The use of Spearman rho was deemed appropriate due to the ordinal nature of perception data and the distribution characteristics of GPA.

The analysis yielded a Spearman rho coefficient of –0.008, which indicates a negative negligible relationship between

students' GPA and their perception of the contribution of institutional resources. This correlation value is very close to zero, suggesting virtually no association between the two variables. Furthermore, the computed p value of 0.915 exceeds the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that the relationship is not statistically significant. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

These findings suggest that students' academic performance, as reflected in their GPA, is not significantly related to how strongly they perceive institutional resources to contribute to their academic performance. This result implies that students across different GPA levels tend to hold similar perceptions regarding the usefulness and contribution of learning resources, facilities, library services, and study spaces.

The absence of a significant relationship aligns with previous research suggesting that academic achievement is influenced by a complex interplay of factors beyond environmental supports alone. While institutional resources are essential in facilitating learning, their direct influence on GPA may be mediated by individual learner characteristics such as motivation, self regulation, study habits, and instructional quality [4; 1]. Harder [5] further emphasized that resource utilization, rather than perceived availability or contribution, is a more critical determinant of learning outcomes and academic achievement.

Moreover, in teacher education programs, GPA may be influenced by assessment structures, field based experiences, and performance tasks that extend beyond the immediate impact of physical and academic resources [15; 16]. Thus, even though students strongly acknowledge the value of institutional resources, this appreciation does not necessarily translate into higher GPA outcomes.

**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 | 0.004 | Negligible | 0.961 | 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 result of the Spearman rank correlation analysis examining the relationship between students' Grade Point Average (GPA) and their perception of the overall contribution of institutional resources to their academic performance. Institutional resources in this context include learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces taken collectively. Spearman rho was employed due to the ordinal nature of perception data and the distribution characteristics of GPA.

The analysis yielded a Spearman rho coefficient of 0.004, which indicates a negligible relationship between students' GPA and their perception of the overall contribution of institutional resources. The correlation value is extremely close to zero, signifying an almost total absence of association between the two variables. Furthermore, the computed p value of 0.961 is substantially greater than the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that the relationship is not statistically significant. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

These results suggest that students' academic performance, as measured by GPA, is independent of how they perceive the overall contribution of institutional resources to their academic success. Regardless of whether students have higher or lower GPAs, their perceptions of the value and contribution of institutional resources remain largely similar.

This finding is consistent with earlier results in Tables 6 and 7, which likewise revealed non significant and negligible relationships between GPA and both specific and overall perceptions of institutional resources. Collectively, these results support the assertion that while institutional resources are essential components of the learning environment, their perceived contribution does not directly predict academic performance outcomes in terms of GPA. Prior studies have emphasized that academic achievement is influenced by a constellation of factors, including learner motivation, self regulation, instructional strategies, assessment practices, and individual differences, rather than environmental resources alone [4; 1].

Moreover, Harder [5] argued that the mere availability or perceived contribution of resources may be insufficient to affect academic outcomes unless these resources are actively and strategically utilized by students. In teacher education contexts, GPA is also shaped by practicum based assessments, pedagogical competencies, and performance tasks that may not be directly linked to perceptions of physical or academic resources [15; 16].

**Table 9 Relationship Between Students' Overall Satisfaction with the BEEd Program and Their GPA**

| GPA | Spearman Rho | Degree of Relationship | p-value | decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Satisfaction with the BEEd Program | -0.052 | Negative Negligible | 0.485 | 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 presents the relationship between students' overall satisfaction with the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program and their academic performance as reflected by GPA. The Spearman rho coefficient of −0.052 indicates a negative negligible relationship, while the computed p-value of 0.485 exceeds the 0.05 level of significance. This result leads to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis, signifying that students' overall satisfaction with the BEEd program is not significantly associated with their academic performance.

This finding suggests that although students reported high levels of satisfaction with learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces, such satisfaction did not directly translate into higher GPA outcomes. Similar results have been documented in prior studies indicating that students' perceptions of institutional support and learning environments do not always correspond with measurable academic performance indicators [6; 7]. Satisfaction often reflects affective and experiential dimensions of learning, whereas GPA is influenced by a complex interaction of cognitive ability, prior academic preparation, assessment rigor, and individual learning strategies.

The present result is also consistent with studies emphasizing that learning resources and facilities, while essential for creating supportive educational environments, function more as enabling conditions rather than direct determinants of academic achievement [4; 22]. In teacher education contexts, adequate facilities and positive learning environments may enhance engagement, motivation, and persistence without necessarily producing immediate gains in grades. Usman and Lesmana [19] further explain that factors such as learning motivation and instructional methods may mediate the relationship between resources and academic outcomes, suggesting that satisfaction alone is insufficient to predict performance.

Moreover, research on learning spaces highlights that their contribution to academic success is often indirect, operating through improved concentration, reduced stress, and enhanced learning experiences rather than through direct effects on grades [13; 23]. This perspective aligns with the current findings, where BEEd students expressed strong overall satisfaction, yet GPA remained statistically independent of such perceptions..

**Learning Resources and Facilities That Most Supported Academic Performance**

**Theme 1: The library as the primary academic support space**

Across responses, the library emerged as the most frequently cited learning facility supporting students' academic performance. Students described the library as central to completing academic tasks, preparing for examinations, and locating references needed for coursework and research outputs. The value of the library was commonly framed in terms of both access to academic resources such as books and references and favorable learning conditions such as quietness and focus. For many students, the library functioned as a structured environment that enabled sustained concentration and independent study.

**Theme 2: Digital tools and online resources as academic enablers**

A second prominent theme highlighted the role of digital tools and online learning resources, including internet searching, online platforms, modules, and educational videos, in supporting academic performance. Students reported that these resources enhanced access to information, supported lesson review, and facilitated the completion of academic requirements. Online platforms were also viewed as extending learning opportunities beyond printed materials. However, reliance on digital resources was often conditional on the availability of stable internet access, which became a recurring concern in the discussion of challenges.

**Theme 3: Classrooms and instructional facilities as supportive learning environments**

Classrooms and instructional facilities were also identified as supportive learning spaces, particularly when teaching and learning processes were reinforced by clear explanations and adequate instructional materials. Students indicated that well-managed classroom environments contributed to improved comprehension and engagement. Some respondents emphasized the importance of audio-visual equipment, such as televisions and projectors, in supporting effective presentations and enhancing understanding of lesson content.

**Theme 4: Instructional and teacher support as part of academic resources**

Although the questions focused on facilities, students frequently associated academic support with teacher guidance and instructional support. Supportive teachers who motivate learners, explain lessons clearly, and guide academic development were perceived as integral components of the learning environment. This suggests that students conceptualized learning resources broadly, encompassing both physical facilities and human instructional support.

**Challenges Encountered Regarding Learning Resources and Facilities**

**Theme 1: Internet connectivity constraints**

The most frequently cited challenge involved unstable or slow internet connectivity. Students reported that limited access to reliable internet hindered their ability to search for information, use online platforms, and complete academic tasks efficiently. Connectivity issues were particularly problematic when academic requirements depended heavily on digital submissions and online research, resulting in delays and additional effort to locate accessible connections.

**Theme 2: Overcrowding and noise in shared learning spaces**

Students frequently mentioned overcrowding and noise, especially in the library, as barriers to effective studying. Difficulty in finding available seating during peak hours and disturbances caused by noise or improper use of shared spaces were commonly reported. These concerns indicate that the presence of facilities alone does not guarantee their effectiveness if the learning environment is not adequately managed.

**Theme 3: Limited and outdated learning materials**

Another recurring challenge related to the limited availability and outdated nature of learning materials. Students noted shortages in books, instructional materials, and subject-specific references, particularly for education-related courses.

In some cases, students were compelled to purchase personal copies to compensate for institutional shortages, which created additional financial burden.

**Theme 4: Infrastructure and equipment limitations**

Students also raised concerns about infrastructure and equipment deficiencies, such as non-functional presentation equipment, inadequate ventilation, insufficient cooling devices, and limited instructional technology. Poor physical conditions were described as distracting and uncomfortable, especially during longer class sessions, thereby affecting students' focus and engagement.

**Theme 5: Academic workload and time-related constraints**

Some students cited time management challenges, heavy academic workload, and financial limitations that interacted with resource constraints. These factors limited their ability to maximize available learning facilities and intensified the impact of existing resource limitations.

**4.3 How Campus Facilities and Study Spaces Supported Students' Studies**

**Theme 1: Promotion of focus and reduced distractions**

Campus facilities and study spaces were widely recognized as providing environments conducive to focused and productive learning. Students highlighted the importance of quiet spaces, particularly the library and designated study areas, in reducing distractions and supporting sustained academic concentration. These environments were viewed as essential for reviewing lessons, completing assignments, and preparing for examinations.

**Theme 2: Support for academic productivity and collaboration**

Students reported that campus facilities supported the timely completion of academic requirements, including research tasks, projects, and group work. Study spaces enabled students to use vacant periods efficiently and collaborate with peers when necessary. The availability of shared academic spaces facilitated both independent and collaborative learning activities.

**Theme 3: Contribution to academic confidence and professional preparation**

Several students linked access to campus facilities with increased academic confidence and preparedness for the teaching profession. Study spaces were perceived as venues for developing skills such as lesson planning, presentation delivery, and content mastery. These findings suggest that learning facilities play a role not only in academic performance but also in shaping students' professional identity as future educators.

**Suggested Improvements for the Bachelor of Elementary Education Program**

**Theme 1: Enhancement of learning resources and instructional materials**

A dominant recommendation involved improving access to updated books, instructional materials, and teaching resources. Students emphasized the need for adequate and current learning materials that align with the demands of teacher education coursework and professional preparation.

**Theme 2: Improvement of internet connectivity and technology integration**

Students strongly recommended strengthening campus internet connectivity to support online learning activities and research requirements. Alongside connectivity, students suggested more effective integration of technology into teaching, including ensuring that presentation equipment and digital tools are functional and accessible.

**Theme 3: Improvement of learning environments and expansion of study spaces**

Students advocated for improved learning environments through better maintenance of classrooms, enhanced ventilation and comfort, and the provision of additional study spaces. Clean, organized, and well-managed facilities were viewed as essential for supporting academic focus and well-being.

**Theme 4: Expansion of hands-on teaching experiences**

A recurring recommendation emphasized increasing practical teaching exposure, including earlier practice teaching, classroom observations, and applied learning activities. Students perceived hands-on experiences as critical to bridging theoretical coursework with real classroom practice.

**Theme 5: Strengthening faculty support and assessment practices**

Some students highlighted the importance of supportive teaching approaches, professional conduct, and fair assessment practices. These responses indicate that perceptions of program quality are influenced not only by physical resources but also by instructional relationships and evaluation processes.

Overall, the qualitative findings demonstrate that BEED students primarily rely on the library, digital learning resources, and conducive study spaces to support their academic performance. However, persistent challenges related to internet connectivity, overcrowding, limited learning materials, and infrastructure constraints continue to affect students' learning experiences. Students' recommendations focused on enhancing instructional resources, improving technological access, expanding practical teaching opportunities, and strengthening supportive learning environments. These qualitative insights provide contextual depth to the quantitative findings and offer evidence-based directions for program improvement grounded in students' lived academic experiences.

## CONCLUSION

This study examined the offering of learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces and their relationship to the academic performance, perceptions, and overall satisfaction of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students at Negros Oriental State University. Using a mixed-methods approach, the findings provide a comprehensive understanding of how institutional resources support students' learning experiences and academic outcomes.

Quantitative results indicated that BEED students generally demonstrated satisfactory to very good academic performance, with the majority of respondents attaining grade point averages within the good and very satisfactory ranges. Despite this, correlational analyses revealed no statistically significant relationship between students' grade point average and their perceived quality of learning resources, instructional

facilities, study spaces, or overall satisfaction with the program. These findings suggest that while institutional resources are positively perceived, students' academic performance is influenced by a broader set of factors beyond physical resources and facilities alone.

Descriptive findings further showed that students expressed high levels of satisfaction with learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces. Respondents strongly acknowledged the contribution of these institutional resources to their understanding of course concepts, completion of academic requirements, and ability to focus during learning activities. Overall satisfaction with the BEED program was likewise rated very high, indicating that students perceived their learning environment as supportive of their academic and professional development as future teachers.

The qualitative findings provided contextual depth to these results by revealing that the library, digital learning resources, and quiet study spaces were central to students' academic engagement and productivity. These facilities were valued for enabling focus, independent learning, collaboration, and effective completion of academic tasks. At the same time, students articulated challenges related to limited internet connectivity, overcrowding, insufficient instructional materials, and infrastructure constraints, highlighting that resource effectiveness is shaped not only by availability but also by accessibility and usability.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are proposed to enhance the learning environment, academic support systems, and overall educational experience of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students.

First, while learning resources, instructional facilities, library services, and study spaces were generally rated positively, qualitative findings revealed persistent concerns related to accessibility, overcrowding, and limited technological infrastructure. It is therefore recommended that the institution prioritize the continuous improvement and expansion of learning spaces, particularly library and study areas, to accommodate the growing student population and to ensure that quiet, conducive environments remain available for independent and collaborative learning.

Second, the recurring challenge of unstable internet connectivity and limited digital resources highlights the need to strengthen campus-wide technological infrastructure. Enhancing internet reliability and expanding access to digital learning platforms and electronic academic resources may further support students' research activities, online coursework, and academic productivity, especially in resource-intensive education courses.

Third, although no significant relationship was found between academic performance and students' perceptions of institutional resources, students strongly acknowledged the contribution of these resources to their learning experiences and academic engagement. As such, program administrators and faculty members may consider sustaining and optimizing the effective use of existing resources through structured integration into teaching strategies, including the purposeful use of library resources, instructional technologies, and learning spaces to support varied pedagogical approaches.

Fourth, qualitative insights emphasized the importance of updated instructional materials, functional classroom equipment, and hands-on learning opportunities. Strengthening the provision and maintenance of instructional tools, including audio-visual equipment and teaching aids, may enhance instructional delivery and better prepare BEED students for classroom practice and professional teaching responsibilities.

Finally, given students' expressed need for greater academic guidance, mentorship, and professional preparation, it is recommended that the BEED program continue to support faculty development initiatives that promote effective teaching practices, fair assessment, and student-centered learning. Enhancing early exposure to practical teaching experiences may further strengthen students' readiness for the teaching profession and align academic preparation with real-world classroom demands.

**REFERENCES**

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

[2] Abidoye, F. O., Adebisi, A. M., Rihanat, A. A., & Aliyu, M. Z. (2022). Availability of laboratory facilities on students' performance in upper basic schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. International Journal of Educational Research Review.

[3] 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.

[4] 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

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

[6] Alokluk, J. (2020). Attitude of students towards the use of library facilities: A case study. International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education, 7(1), 24–36. https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.0701003

[7] Amarasekara, K. M. R. K., & Marasinghe, M. M. I. K. (2020). User satisfaction on library resources and services: Survey conducted in main library of the Open University of Sri Lanka. Journal of the University Librarians Association of Sri Lanka, 23(2), 27–46. https://doi.org/10.4038/jula.v23i2.8007

[8] 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

[9] Nja, C. O., Anari, M. I., Erim, C. M., Idiege, K. J., Ilhami, A., Ukah, J. U., Eneyo, O. E., Uwe, U. E., & Cornelius-Ukpepi, B. U. (2023). Learning space, students'

collaboration, educational outcomes, and interest: Exploring the physical, social and psychological mediators. Heliyon, 9, e15456.

[10] Dearborn, C., & Braun, J. (2025). Space and pedagogy: A survey of special collections instructional spaces. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 51, 103006.

[11] 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

[12] Papaioannou, G., Volakaki, M.-G., Kokolakis, S., & Vouyioukas, D. (2023). Learning spaces in higher education: A state-of-the-art review. Trends in Higher Education, 2, 526–545. https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu2030032

[13] 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

[14] 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, 392. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12040392

[15] Ymana, R. A. (2021). Pre-service teaching challenges of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) students: Basis for pedagogical competence and strategic readiness enhancement. Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 12(7), 3347–3353.

[16] Napanoy, J. B., Gayagay, G. C., & Tuazon, J. R. C. (2021). Difficulties encountered by pre-service teachers: Basis of a pre-service training program. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 9(2), 342–349. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2021.090210

[17] Rudio, V. O., Carreon, R. D., & Ocampo, E. S. (2020). Student teachers' perceptions toward elementary education student teaching program in the Philippines. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(12), 7036–7046. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081271

[18] Festiyed, Desnita, Afradisca, E., & Sari, I. P. (2020). Availability of learning resources for enrichment learning at senior high school in West Sumatra. IOP Conference Series: Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1481, 012119. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1481/1/012119

[19] 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.

[20] Nurmayani, Semaya, N. N., Salsabila, D., Bangun, N. C., & Situmorang, R. E. (2025). The impact of educational resources availability on students' learning motivation in primary schools. Jurnal of Pedagogi: Jurnal Pendidikan, 2(5), 51–61. https://doi.org/10.62872/yqggv879

[21] 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

[22] 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 Innovation and Implications in Education, 8(4), 521–530.

[23] 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).