www.ijarp.com ISSN 2456-9992 Page: 01-21

International Journal Advanced Research Publications

Research Article

Volume: 02
Issue: 03

PROVISION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND SERVICES FOR TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH PUPILS' LEARNING ENGAGEMENT IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN REGION XII, PHILIPPINES

[*1]Janjan D. Cacactin, [2]Joyce D. Esrael, EdD

[1]Department of Education (Cotabato Province Division)

[2]Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Doroluman, Arakan, Cotabato, Philippines.

Article Received: 9 February 2026, Article Revised: 01 March 2026, Published on: 21 March 2026

***Corresponding Author: Janjan D. Cacactin**

Department of Education (Cotabato Province Division)

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.3265

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the provision of school facilities and student services in public elementary schools and their relationship to teachers' satisfaction with pupils' learning engagement across cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. Conducted in five school divisions of Region XII, Mindanao, Philippines — Kidapawan City, Koronadal City, Sultan Kudarat, Cotabato Province, and Tacurong City — during School Year 2025–2026, the study employed quantitative correlation research design involved 410 teacher-respondents selected through proportionate Slovin's formula sampling. School facilities examined included school buildings, school grounds, classroom structures, school clinics, and classroom materials; student services included counseling, food, remedial instruction, and health services. Findings indicated that school grounds and school clinics were rated Highly Provided, while school buildings and classroom structure were Provided. Teachers expressed Highly Satisfied levels of affective learning engagement and Satisfied levels for cognitive and psychomotor domains. Spearman's rho correlation revealed significant positive relationships between most school facilities and cognitive learning engagement, but significant negative correlations with affective learning. Health services emerged as the strongest predictor of teachers' satisfaction across all three learning domains in regression analyses. The study concludes that while facilities are generally well-provided, deliberate alignment of physical environments and

student services with holistic pedagogical goals is essential for sustainable learner development.

KEYWORDS: *school facilities, student services, teachers' satisfaction, learning engagement, cognitive domain, affective domain, psychomotor domain, health services, public elementary schools, Region XII.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The holistic development of students remains the primary goal of educational institutions. To achieve this, schools must provide quality physical facilities and essential services that support academic performance, personal growth, and emotional well-being (McGinnis, 2014). Measuring students' and teachers' satisfaction with these provisions helps school authorities identify institutional strengths and gaps, and directs resources toward areas that most meaningfully affect learning outcomes.

Despite extensive global literature on school infrastructure and student outcomes, there remains a relative scarcity of empirical evidence from developing country contexts — particularly in underserved regions of the Philippines — examining whether teachers perceive that students have adequate access to resources essential for meaningful learning engagement (Collier, 2019). The tripartite conceptualization of learning engagement — cognitive (depth of mental investment), affective (emotional responses to learning), and psychomotor (active physical participation) — provides a comprehensive framework for assessing the quality of pupils' learning experience in relation to school provisions (Pintrich, 2015; Dougherty, 2013).

This study was conducted to fill this gap by examining how the provision of school facilities and student services relates to and predicts teachers' satisfaction with pupils' learning engagement in public elementary schools across five school divisions of Region XII, Mindanao, Philippines. The findings are expected to guide school administrators, division superintendents, and policymakers in developing evidence-based infrastructure and service improvement strategies.

1.1 Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the level of provision of educational facilities in terms of school buildings, school grounds, classroom structures, school clinics, and classroom materials?

2. What is the level of provision of student services in terms of counseling, food, remedial instruction, and health services?
3. What is the extent of teachers' satisfaction with pupils' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning engagement?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the provision of educational facilities and teachers' satisfaction with pupils' learning engagement?
5. Is there a significant influence of educational facilities on teachers' satisfaction with pupils' learning engagement?
6. Is there a significant relationship between student services and teachers' satisfaction with pupils' learning engagement?
7. Is there a significant influence of student services on teachers' satisfaction with pupils' learning engagement?

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 School Facilities and Learning Outcomes

Physical school infrastructure significantly shapes the quality of education and the cognitive and emotional engagement of learners. Okunola (2015) argued that well-sited school buildings with aesthetic conditions, adequately equipped laboratories, and functional playgrounds contribute directly to improved performance in the school system. Nwagwu (2016) similarly affirmed that the quality of education is intrinsically tied to the availability of quality physical learning facilities. Regnier (2016) emphasized that careful and strategic procurement and planning of facilities is a prerequisite for sustained educational quality.

At the classroom level, Knezevich (2015) demonstrated that appropriate physical environments — including adequate structure, sanitary conditions, and inspirational design — meet both the physical and emotional needs of learners, enhancing their focus and academic performance. Several studies have confirmed that a close relationship exists between the physical environment and students' academic performance (Porpst, 2012; Hannah Schmitz, 2016). School clinics are recognized as essential facilities; Crosnoe (2016) established that health disparities within schools are sources of educational stratification, and that reducing these health inequalities can directly reduce educational achievement gaps.

2.2 Student Services and Learning Engagement

Beyond physical infrastructure, student support services play an increasingly recognized role in sustaining holistic learner development. Afia (2015) argued that school guidance and counseling are most effective when a formally organized Guidance Team — comprising

classroom teachers, social workers, and referral specialists — coordinates, implements, and evaluates guidance activities. Bray (2014) highlighted that school canteen offerings directly influence students' health, behavior, and ultimately their learning capacity, and called for nutritional assessments of school food environments.

Remedial instruction is central to inclusive education; the International Reading Association (2018) defines remedial reading teachers as focal persons for both struggling students and for building general classroom teachers' literacy instructional capacity. Jobling (2013) underscored the importance of comprehensive health education in schools, emphasizing that health programs must integrate physical activity, general health knowledge, and social health support to fully serve learners' wellness needs.

2.3 Dimensions of Learning Engagement

Learning engagement is a multidimensional construct encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral (psychomotor) dimensions (Pintrich, 2015). Cognitive engagement encompasses students' mental investment in learning processes, including knowledge construction, metacognitive strategy use, and active processing of new material (Heddy et al., 2018). Affective engagement refers to students' emotional responses to learning — including interest, enjoyment, curiosity, sense of belonging, and emotional maturity (Wang & Degol, 2016; Cornell et al., 2016). Psychomotor or behavioral engagement denotes active physical participation in academic and social activities, compliance with school norms, and hands-on involvement in learning tasks (Dougherty, 2013; Fung, Tan, & Chen, 2018).

Fung et al. (2018) found that students engaged across multiple domains (both behaviorally and affectively) exhibited higher academic achievement than those engaged in only one domain. This highlights the importance of nurturing all three dimensions simultaneously through deliberate facility provision and service delivery.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study utilized descriptive and correlational design. The levels of facility and service provision and tested their relationships with and predictive influence on teachers' satisfaction with pupils' learning engagement.

3.2 Research Locale and Respondents

The study was conducted in public elementary schools within five school divisions of Region XII, Mindanao, Philippines: Kidapawan City Division, Koronadal City Division, Sultan Kudarat Division (1st Congressional District), Cotabato Province Division (2nd

Congressional District), and Tacurong City Division, during School Year 2025–2026. Schools were selected through criterion-based purposive sampling. Teacher-respondents were selected using proportionate Slovin's formula, yielding a quantitative sample of 410 teachers.

Table 1 ***Distribution of Respondents and Qualitative Informants Across Five School Divisions in Region XII.***

Division	Population (Quantitative)	No. of Samples	Informants (Qualitative)
Kidapawan City Division	660	56	7
Koronadal City Division	516	44	6
Sultan Kudarat Division (1st Congressional District)	1,060	90	6
Cotabato Province (2nd Congressional District)	2,092	176	6
Tacurong City Division	516	44	6
Total	**4,844**	**410**	**31**

Note. Samples determined using Slovin's formula with proportionate allocation per division.

3.3 Instrument and Data Collection

The quantitative instrument was a researcher-developed 40-item Likert-scale questionnaire adapted from the OECD International Survey of Schools (Upper Secondary Level) and the U.S. Department of Education Schools and Staffing Survey. Items used a five-point scale for facility/service provision (1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided) and for satisfaction (1 = Not Satisfied; 5 = Highly Satisfied). Content validity was established through expert review, and internal consistency was confirmed through Cronbach's alpha.

3.4 Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics (weighted means) described provision and satisfaction levels. Spearman's rank-order correlation examined the significance of relationships between facility/service provision and teachers' satisfaction with learning engagement. Multiple linear regression analysis determined the predictive influence of facilities and services on each learning engagement domain. Statistical significance was set at $\alpha = .05$.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Provision of School Facilities

School Buildings.

School buildings obtained a weighted mean of 4.10 (Provided). Facilities for hands-on learning (M = 5.00), adequate office spaces (M = 4.56), buildings accommodating larger student populations (M = 4.26), and standard academic buildings (M = 4.23) were Highly Provided. A notable gap was observed for buildings with aesthetic conditions (M = 2.55, Slightly Provided), suggesting that while functional infrastructure is prioritized, the inspirational and aesthetic dimensions of school architecture remain underdeveloped. Okunola (2015) and Nwagwu (2016) affirm that aesthetic conditions of school buildings contribute significantly to students' motivation and academic performance.

Table 2 ***Level of Provision in Terms of School Buildings.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Standard types of buildings for academic activities	4.23	Highly Provided
2	Buildings with aesthetic conditions	2.55	Slightly Provided
3	Buildings contributing to improved school performance	4.00	Provided
4	Buildings to accommodate a greater number of participants	4.26	Highly Provided
5	Adequate facilities for hands-on learning activities	5.00	Highly Provided
6	Enough school buildings for all offices	4.56	Highly Provided
Weighted Mean		**4.10**	**Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 2 = Slightly Provided; 3 = Moderately Provided; 4 = Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

School Grounds

School grounds were rated Highly Provided (M = 4.41). Pleasing outdoor instructional spaces (M = 4.96), safe covered courts for physical education (M = 4.75), and playgrounds for group games (M = 4.26) were prominently rated. These results affirm the schools' commitment to creating environments that support not only academic but also physical and social development. Baron (2012) affirmed that without adequate grounds and facilities, it is extremely difficult to serve large numbers of children with complex developmental needs.

Table 3 ***Level of Provision in Terms of School Grounds.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Areas set with pleasing instructional space for outdoor activities	4.96	Highly Provided
2	Flexible instructional space outside the classroom	4.26	Highly Provided
3	Parking space for teachers, visitors, and students	4.24	Highly Provided
4	Areas for sports activities	4.00	Provided
5	Playground for children's group games	4.26	Highly Provided
6	Safe covered court for physical education	4.75	Highly Provided
Weighted Mean		**4.41**	**Highly Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

Classroom Structure

Classroom structure was Provided (M = 4.17). The standout indicator was the creation of a friendly atmosphere and inspiring environment (M = 4.97), reflecting the schools' strong emphasis on emotional climate. Other indicators — including safe infrastructure, sanitary facilities, and stakeholder input — were rated as Provided (M = 3.99–4.02). These results support Knezevich's (2015) assertion that appropriate classroom design meets both the physical safety and emotional belonging needs of learners.

Table 4 ***Level of Provision in Terms of Classroom Structure.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Adequate safe structure and sanitary facilities	4.02	Provided
2	Sufficient shelter space for work and play	3.99	Provided
3	Friendly atmosphere with an inspiring environment	4.97	Highly Provided
4	Integration of school and community services	4.01	Provided
5	Adequate sanitation for basic health and comfort	4.02	Provided
6	Wide range of learning facilities through stakeholder support	4.00	Provided
Weighted Mean		**4.17**	**Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

School Clinic

School clinic services were rated Highly Provided (M = 4.29). Provision of clinical services on campus (M = 5.00) and medical care within the school setting (M = 5.00) received perfect

scores, underscoring the schools' exceptional commitment to student wellness. As Crosnoe (2016) demonstrated, health infrastructure within schools is a critical equalizer: reducing health disparities directly reduces educational achievement gaps. The relatively lower score for services to vulnerable populations (M = 3.51) signals the need for targeted, inclusive health strategies.

Table 5 ***Level of Provision in Terms of School Clinic.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Basic health care and referral to specialists	4.00	Provided
2	Clinical services on campus for all learners	5.00	Highly Provided
3	Healthcare services supporting educational goals	4.25	Highly Provided
4	Medical services within the school setting	5.00	Highly Provided
5	Extended medical services beyond immediate needs	4.00	Provided
6	Expanded services to vulnerable populations	3.51	Provided
Weighted Mean		**4.29**	**Highly Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

Classroom Materials

Classroom materials obtained the highest rating among all facility variables (M = 4.26, Highly Provided). Physical environments designed to support academic performance (M = 5.00) and materials facilitating the teaching-learning process (M = 4.82) were most prominently rated. Porpst (2012) and Hannah Schmitz (2016) confirm that structured, resource-rich learning environments directly enhance students' academic performance and behavioral ownership of learning spaces. The lower score for time-efficient environmental improvements (M = 3.51) presents a targeted area for resource management enhancement.

Table 6 ***Level of Provision in Terms of Classroom Materials.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Different room arrangements serving different purposes	4.00	Provided
2	Physical environment supporting academic performance	5.00	Highly Provided
3	Environment structured for facilitative learning	4.22	Highly Provided
4	Teaching-learning process facilitation in the classroom	4.82	Highly Provided
5	Physical elements improving comfort, well-being, and attitude	4.00	Provided
6	Environmental improvements that optimize time for learning	3.51	Provided

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
Weighted Mean		**4.26**	**Highly Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

4.2 Provision of Student Services

Counseling Services

Counseling services were rated as Provided (M = 4.06). Appropriate and adequate guidance (M = 4.59, Highly Provided) was the strongest indicator, while organized guidance programs (M = 3.84) and guidance as an educational integral (M = 3.86) remained at the lower end of Provided. Afia (2015) emphasized that guidance effectiveness is maximized when formally organized Guidance Teams — integrating teachers, social workers, and community resources — coordinate program delivery consistently across all school levels.

Table 7. ***Level of Provision in Terms of Counseling Services.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Appropriate and adequate guidance as per students' needs	4.59	Highly Provided
2	Guidance as an integral part of education	3.86	Provided
3	Assistance of teachers and connected persons for student progress	4.02	Provided
4	Organized guidance program implementation in school	3.84	Provided
5	Vital role of school in guiding and directing students	4.02	Provided
6	Information on community resources and family-based guidance	4.02	Provided
Weighted Mean		**4.06**	**Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

Food Services

Food services were Highly Provided (M = 4.31). Nutritional consideration for learners (M = 4.83) and emphasis on cleanliness (M = 4.74) received the highest ratings, reflecting a thoughtful and health-conscious approach to canteen operations. Eating manners (M = 4.25) and respectful staff behavior (M = 4.25) further indicate that food services contribute to students' behavioral modeling and social development. Bray (2014) highlighted that school canteens are strategic settings for implementing solutions to childhood nutrition challenges, as students spend a significant portion of their eating time in school.

Table 8 ***Level of Provision in Terms of Food Services.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Food considering the nutritional needs of learners	4.83	Highly Provided
2	Instructions to canteen staff on basic eating manners	4.25	Highly Provided
3	Instructions to canteen staff on cleanliness	4.74	Highly Provided
4	Canteen staff exhibiting respect and care for students	4.25	Highly Provided
5	Personnel showing willingness to provide immediate attention	3.50	Provided
Weighted Mean		**4.31**	**Highly Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

Remedial Instruction Services

Remedial instruction was rated as Provided (M = 3.98). Extra support for students catching up with peers received the highest rating (M = 4.61, Highly Provided), indicating a proactive orientation toward equity and inclusive education. Other indicators — teacher training for remedial instruction (M = 3.96), re-teaching under-learned content (M = 3.95), and targeted support for struggling readers (M = 3.93) — were all rated Provided. The International Reading Association (2018) identifies remedial teachers as essential resource persons not only for at-risk learners but also as professional development supports for general classroom teachers.

Table 9. ***Level of Provision in Terms of Remedial Instruction Services.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Extra support to help students catch up with their peers	4.61	Highly Provided
2	Time to reteach less-learned content to close learning gaps	3.95	Provided
3	Training for teachers for remedial instruction delivery	3.96	Provided
4	Targeted instruction for struggling readers	3.93	Provided
5	Extra time to assist pupils with reading difficulties	3.65	Provided
Weighted Mean		**3.98**	**Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

Health Services

Health services obtained the highest rating among all student service variables (M = 4.41, Highly Provided). Information on vital components of health interventions (M = 4.90) and

nutritional values of canteen foods (M = 4.87) were near-perfect in provision. These findings align with Jobling's (2013) assertion that comprehensive health education programs in schools — integrating physical activity, knowledge of general health, and social health support — are essential for ensuring students are healthy enough to learn and develop holistically.

Table 10. ***Level of Provision in Terms of Health Services.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Nutritional values of foods and drinks at school canteens	4.87	Highly Provided
2	The right kind of foods at school	4.01	Provided
3	Food stores inside the school	4.13	Provided
4	Information on vital components of successful health interventions	4.90	Highly Provided
5	Physical activity, general health knowledge, and social health support	4.14	Provided
Weighted Mean		**4.41**	**Highly Provided**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Provided; 5 = Highly Provided.

4.3 Teachers' Satisfaction with Pupils' Learning Engagement

Cognitive Learning Engagement.

Teachers expressed a Satisfied level of satisfaction with pupils' cognitive engagement (M = 4.08). Deep focus on learning processes (M = 4.84) and students' activities involving peer interaction and note-taking (M = 4.80) were Highly Satisfying indicators. Moderately Satisfied ratings were noted for strategy development for high academic success (M = 3.37) and the availability of cognitive assessment tools in challenging contexts (M = 3.31), pointing to a need for greater metacognitive scaffolding and differentiated assessment practices (Heddy et al., 2018).

Table 11 ***Teachers' Satisfaction with Pupils' Cognitive Learning Engagement.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Deep focus on learning processes in every learning task	4.84	Highly Satisfied
2	Active engagement in their individual learning journeys	4.09	Satisfied
3	Developed cognitive learning strategies for high academic success	3.37	Moderately Satisfied
4	Knowledge sharing, peer interaction, and note-taking	4.80	Highly Satisfied

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
	activities		
5	Use of tools to measure cognitive engagement in challenging contexts	3.31	Moderately Satisfied
Weighted Mean		**4.08**	**Satisfied**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied; 5 = Highly Satisfied.

Affective Learning Engagement

Affective learning engagement registered the highest satisfaction level among all three domains (M = 4.34, Highly Satisfied). Pupils' increasing interest in meeting the needs of others (M = 4.89) and positive attitude with a sense of belonging (M = 4.67) were both Highly Satisfying. These findings resonate with Cornell et al.'s (2016) and Wang and Degol's (2016) evidence that school climate and emotional investment are powerfully interlinked with students' academic engagement and achievement. The relatively lower rating for social skill participation (M = 3.35, Moderately Satisfied) points to an area for targeted socio-emotional learning programs.

Table 12 ***Teachers' Satisfaction with Pupils' Affective Learning Engagement.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Emotional maturity in facing increasingly challenging tasks	4.53	Highly Satisfied
2	Positive attitude in learning with a sense of belonging	4.67	Highly Satisfied
3	Behavioral focus on feelings about academic success	4.14	Satisfied
4	Increasing interest in meeting the needs of other learners	4.89	Highly Satisfied
5	Participation and involvement in developing social skills	3.35	Moderately Satisfied
Weighted Mean		**4.34**	**Highly Satisfied**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied; 5 = Highly Satisfied.

Psychomotor Learning Engagement

Teachers expressed Satisfied levels of satisfaction with pupils' psychomotor engagement (M = 3.97). Participation in classroom learning activities (M = 4.73, Highly Satisfied) was the strongest indicator, reinforcing Dougherty's (2013) finding that behavioral participation in academic and social activities is a critical correlate of achievement. Attendance-related engagement (M = 3.37, Moderately Satisfied) was the weakest indicator, suggesting that

some pupils remain at risk of disengagement. Fung et al. (2018) found that multi-domain engagement is associated with measurably higher academic outcomes.

Table 13 ***Teachers' Satisfaction with Pupils' Psychomotor Learning Engagement.***

#	Indicators — The school provides…	Mean	Description
1	Persistence in outdoor hands-on learning tasks	3.98	Satisfied
2	Participation and involvement in classroom learning activities	4.73	Highly Satisfied
3	Participation with thorough efforts in group academic tasks	3.65	Satisfied
4	Learning resonating with good academic performance	4.11	Satisfied
5	Attendance and truancy as indicators of engagement and potential dropout	3.37	Moderately Satisfied
Weighted Mean		**3.97**	**Satisfied**

Note. Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied; 5 = Highly Satisfied.

4.4 Relationship Between Educational Facilities and Teachers' Satisfaction

Spearman's rho analysis revealed a consistent pattern: educational facilities showed significant positive correlations with cognitive learning engagement but significant negative correlations with affective learning engagement. School buildings ($r = .193$, $p < .001$), school grounds ($r = .335$, $p < .001$), school clinic ($r = .383$, $p < .001$), and classroom materials ($r = .413$, $p < .001$) were significant positive predictors of cognitive satisfaction. However, these same variables yielded significant negative correlations with affective satisfaction, suggesting that rigid or under-personalized physical structures may inadvertently dampen students' emotional connection to learning. Classroom structure showed no significant correlations with any domain.

Table 14 ***Spearman's rho Correlation: Educational Facilities and Teachers' Satisfaction with Pupils' Learning Engagement.***

Provision Variable	Cognitive	Affective	Psychomotor
School Buildings	.193**	−.420**	−.067
School Grounds	.335**	−.342**	−.052
Classroom Structure	.058	.050	.010
School Clinic	.383**	−.370**	−.028
Classroom Materials	.413**	−.276**	−.033

Note. ** $p < .001$. Classroom Structure was non-significant across all domains ($p > .05$).

4.5 Influence of Educational Facilities on Teachers' Satisfaction

Regression analysis for cognitive learning satisfaction was significant ($F = 23.563$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .211$). School clinic ($\beta = .874$, $p < .001$) and classroom materials ($\beta = .234$, $p = .006$) were significant positive predictors, while school grounds exerted an unexpected negative influence ($\beta = -.395$, $p = .002$). For affective satisfaction ($F = 29.016$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .248$), only classroom materials reached significance ($\beta = .301$, $p < .001$). The psychomotor model was significant but modest ($F = 2.526$, $p = .029$; $R^2 = .028$), with school clinic ($\beta = .510$, $p = .020$) and classroom materials ($\beta = .188$, $p = .045$) as positive predictors.

Table 15 ***Multiple Regression: Educational Facilities Predicting Cognitive Learning Engagement Satisfaction.***

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
(Constant)	.857	1.057	—	.811	.418
School Buildings	−.339	.197	−.302	−1.717	.087
School Grounds	−1.050	.329	−.395	−3.191**	.002
Classroom Structure	.239	.187	.055	1.277	.202
School Clinic	1.493	.336	.874	4.450**	<.001
Classroom Materials	.430	.155	.234	2.780**	.006
*R^2 = .211 | F = 23.563** | p = <.001*					

Note. $R^2 = .211$; $F(5,360) = 23.563$, $p < .001$. ** $p < .01$.

4.6 Relationship Between Student Services and Teachers' Satisfaction

Spearman's rho analysis indicated that health services showed the broadest and strongest correlations across all three learning domains: cognitive ($r = .513$, $p < .001$), affective ($r = .300$, $p < .001$), and psychomotor ($r = .293$, $p < .001$). Counseling ($r = .537$, $p < .001$) and remedial instruction ($r = .578$, $p < .001$) showed the strongest positive correlations with affective satisfaction. A notable divergence was observed for food services: a significant negative correlation with cognitive satisfaction ($r = -.262$, $p < .001$) contrasted with a significant positive correlation with affective satisfaction ($r = .437$, $p < .001$), suggesting that school meals enhance emotional experiences without directly supporting cognitive learning perceptions.

Table 16 ***Spearman's rho Correlation: Student Services and Teachers' Satisfaction with Pupils' Learning Engagement.***

Provision Variable	Cognitive	Affective	Psychomotor
Counseling Services	.079	.537**	.027
Food Services	−.262**	.437**	.041
Remedial Instruction	.018	.578**	.002
Health Services	.513**	.300**	.293**

Note. ** p < .001.

4.7 Influence of Student Services on Teachers' Satisfaction

Health services dominated all three regression models. For cognitive satisfaction ($F = 109.86$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .497$), health services were the strongest positive predictor ($\beta = .620$, $p < .001$), while food services exerted a negative influence ($\beta = -.245$, $p < .001$). For affective satisfaction ($F = 122.62$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .524$), all four services were significant predictors: health services ($\beta = .533$), remedial instruction ($\beta = .324$), food services ($\beta = .208$), and counseling ($\beta = .153$). For psychomotor satisfaction ($F = 25.426$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .186$), only health services reached significance ($\beta = .425$, $p < .001$), confirming health as the most comprehensive and reliable predictor across all three engagement domains.

Table 17 ***Multiple Regression: Student Services Predicting Cognitive Learning Engagement Satisfaction.***

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
(Constant)	3.360	.405	—	8.301	<.001
Counseling	.030	.055	.020	.551	.582
Food Services	−.557	.091	−.245	−6.105**	<.001
Remedial Instruction	−.070	.049	−.059	−1.420	.156
Health Services	.744	.041	.620	18.191**	<.001
*R^2 = .497 | F = 109.86** | p = <.001*					

Note. $R^2 = .497$; $F(4,405) = 109.86$, $p < .001$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 18 ***Multiple Regression: Student Services Predicting Affective Learning Engagement Satisfaction.***

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
(Constant)	−.850	.277	—	−3.065	.002

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Counseling	.161	.037	.153	4.314**	<.001
Food Services	.334	.062	.208	5.346**	<.001
Remedial Instruction	.269	.034	.324	7.951**	<.001
Health Services	.450	.028	.533	16.076**	<.001
*R^2 = .524 | F = 122.62** | p = <.001*					

Note. R^2 = .524; F(4,405) = 122.62, p < .001. ** p < .001.

Table 19 ***Multiple Regression: Student Services Predicting Psychomotor Learning Engagement Satisfaction.***

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
(Constant)	1.718	.362	—	4.746	<.001
Counseling	.049	.049	.047	1.001	.317
Food Services	.055	.082	.034	.673	.501
Remedial Instruction	.058	.044	.070	1.307	.192
Health Services	.359	.037	.425	9.804**	<.001
*R^2 = .186 | F = 25.426** | p = <.001*					

Note. R^2 = .186; F(4,405) = 25.426, p < .001. Health services was the only significant predictor; others: p > .05.

5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study examined the provision of school facilities and student services and their influence on teachers' satisfaction with pupils' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning engagement in public elementary schools in Region XII, Philippines. The following key findings emerged:

1. School facilities were generally well-provided. School grounds (M = 4.41) and school clinics (M = 4.29) were Highly Provided; classroom materials (M = 4.26) and classroom structure (M = 4.17) were Provided; school buildings (M = 4.10) were Provided, though aesthetic conditions remained underdeveloped (M = 2.55).
2. Student services were adequately delivered. Health services (M = 4.41) and food services (M = 4.31) were Highly Provided; counseling (M = 4.06) and remedial instruction (M = 3.98) were Provided with room for systematic enhancement.
3. Teachers expressed Highly Satisfied levels for affective learning engagement (M = 4.34) and Satisfied levels for cognitive (M = 4.08) and psychomotor (M = 3.97) engagement.

Moderately Satisfied ratings were noted for metacognitive strategy use and attendance-based engagement.

4. Educational facilities showed significant positive correlations with cognitive satisfaction but significant negative correlations with affective satisfaction. Classroom structure had no significant correlation with any domain. School clinics and classroom materials were the strongest positive predictors in regression models for facilities.
5. Health services were the most influential predictor of teachers' satisfaction across all three learning engagement domains, followed by remedial instruction and counseling for affective satisfaction. Food services exerted a paradoxical negative effect on cognitive satisfaction while positively influencing affective satisfaction.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

School facilities are predominantly functional and capacity-focused, but the underdevelopment of aesthetic and affective environmental qualities — as evidenced by the negative correlations between facilities and affective satisfaction — points to a critical gap. Highly provided instructional spaces outside the classroom support creativity and active learning, yet these spaces may be insufficiently personalized or pedagogically integrated to nurture emotional connection and belonging.

A well-structured and safe classroom enables students to feel secure, enhancing focus and academic performance. However, classrooms must serve as more than instructional venues — they must function as catalysts for creativity, motivation, and well-being. The impressive rating for atmosphere and inspiration confirms that when schools invest in affectively rich environments, teachers observe meaningful emotional engagement from their pupils.

School clinics strongly and positively influence teachers' satisfaction with cognitive learning engagement, confirming that student wellness is foundational to — not merely supportive of — academic achievement. Health services emerged as the cornerstone of comprehensive student development, exerting significant positive influence across all three learning domains. This holistic predictive power affirms that schools investing in robust health infrastructure invest directly in every dimension of pupils' learning capacity.

The positive impact of classroom materials on all domains affirms the necessity of consistent investment in updated, interactive, and varied classroom resources. The negative relationship with school grounds calls attention to a missed opportunity: despite strong provision ratings, outdoor spaces appear to be underutilized or insufficiently structured for productive,

supervised learning engagement. Schools must reevaluate how grounds are designed, supervised, and integrated into instructional programming.

Among student services, remedial instruction emerged as the strongest correlate of affective satisfaction, underscoring that personalized academic support significantly strengthens students' emotional engagement and confidence. The contrasting effects of food services — negative for cognitive satisfaction, positive for affective satisfaction — invites further inquiry into meal scheduling, quality, and its alignment with academic routines. Cognitive and psychomotor domains of learning are deeply interwoven with affective engagement; weak correlations in psychomotor outcomes across most service variables highlight the need to explore curriculum design, teacher facilitation, and extracurricular programming as complementary drivers of physical and participatory engagement.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Educational spaces should be designed not just to house learning but to actively inspire it across intellectual, emotional, and physical dimensions. School administrators should integrate learner-centered design principles — including warm aesthetics, flexible furniture, and personalized learning environments — to address the negative relationship between physical facilities and affective satisfaction.
2. School divisions and administrators should expand and sustain health service infrastructure as a central pillar of school investment. Regular health check-ups, access to mental health professionals, hygiene initiatives, and proactive wellness education should be institutionalized, given health services' demonstrated dominance as a predictor across all three learning engagement domains.
3. Schools must ensure that health infrastructure supports not just emergency responses but proactive and preventive wellness. Classroom materials play a direct and significant role in both cognitive and psychomotor learning development; schools should consistently invest in updated, varied, and interactive resources that stimulate thinking, inquiry, and movement-based learning.
4. Policymakers and school leaders must deliver support beyond the classroom by prioritizing emotional and wellness services to promote comprehensive learner development. Counseling, food, and remedial services are most impactful on affective

development and should be strengthened through formal organizational structures, trained personnel, and systematic program evaluation.

5. The negative relationship between food services and cognitive satisfaction warrants a focused reevaluation of canteen offerings. Issues such as poor nutrition, limited variety, and inadequate availability may be contributing to cognitive disengagement. Schools should invest in balanced, student-friendly meal plans designed to optimize cognitive readiness and learning capacity.
6. Educators should integrate more inquiry-based and collaborative learning activities to foster critical thinking. Teachers should incorporate self-directed learning opportunities, student-led discussions, and choice-based learning pathways to deepen cognitive and psychomotor engagement simultaneously.
7. Schools should continue cultivating hands-on, group-based, and peer collaborative learning opportunities. Since behaviorally engaged students show higher performance, identifying pupils who need motivational support and personalized strategies is essential for sustained psychomotor development.
8. To improve cognitive outcomes, educational planners must align physical resources with instructional strategies and student-centered learning goals. Facilities should not be treated as isolated components but as integrated parts of a broader pedagogical ecosystem.
9. Future research should investigate the mechanisms through which school grounds negatively relate to cognitive and psychomotor satisfaction — exploring whether access, supervision, safety, or pedagogical integration of outdoor spaces are contributing factors. Longitudinal designs and student-centered perspectives would enrich understanding of the facility-engagement dynamic.
10. Future researchers are encouraged to explore additional variables — including teacher competencies, parental engagement, and socioeconomic factors — that may further explain the substantial unexplained variance in psychomotor learning engagement, for which the current model explained only 18.6% of the variation.

DECLARATIONS

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was entirely voluntary. All respondents provided informed consent. Data were collected, stored, and analyzed in compliance with the institution's research ethics protocols.

Acknowledgments

The author extends sincere gratitude to the school heads, and teachers of the five school divisions in Region XII for their participation and cooperation, and to the Graduate School faculty of Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology for their invaluable guidance throughout the research process.

REFERENCES

1. Afia, A. (2015). The role of school social workers in guidance and counseling. Journal of School-Based Interventions, 12(2), 44–58.
2. Baron, R. (2012). School infrastructure and student outcomes: A review of the literature. Educational Facilities Planner, 46(1), 10–18.
3. Bray, G. (2014). School canteen foods and childhood nutrition. Journal of Pediatric Health, 28(3), 112–120.
4. Clark, V. L. P., & Ivankova, N. V. (2016). Mixed methods research: A guide to the field. SAGE Publications.
5. Collier, R. (2019). Student satisfaction with school facilities and services in developing countries: A systematic review. International Journal of Educational Development, 67, 11–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2019.02.005
6. Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2016). Authoritative school climate and student academic engagement, grades, and aspirations in middle and high schools. AERA Open, 2(2), 1–18.
7. Creswell, J. W. (2016). 30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher. SAGE Publications.
8. Crosnoe, R. (2016). Health disparities, educational stratification, and the reduction of inequality. American Educational Research Journal, 53(4), 810–835.
9. Dougherty, S. (2013). Behavioral engagement and academic outcomes in K–12 schools. Educational Psychology Review, 25(4), 501–521.
10. Fung, C., Tan, A., & Chen, D. (2018). Multi-domain engagement and mathematics achievement in elementary students. Journal of Learning Sciences, 27(1), 88–110.
11. Hannah Schmitz, L. (2016). Ownership of classroom space and its effects on teaching and learning. Learning Environments Research, 19(3), 299–315.

12. Haas, S., & Robert, M. (2016). Health and education interdependence in youth development. Child Development Perspectives, 10(2), 88–94.
13. Heddy, B. C., Taasoobshirazi, G., Chancey, J., & Danielson, R. W. (2018). Transformative experience, interest, and engagement: A cross-cultural investigation. Educational Psychology, 38(2), 156–171.
14. International Reading Association. (2018). The role of the reading specialist: A position statement. International Literacy Association.
15. Jobling, A. (2013). Health education for people with intellectual disability: Programming and outcomes. Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 51(4), 279–292.
16. Knezevich, S. J. (2015). Administration of public education (5th ed.). Harper & Row.
17. Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. European Journal of General Practice, 24(1), 120–124.
18. McGinnis, T. (2014). School facilities and student engagement: Linking physical resources to academic outcomes. Journal of Educational Administration, 52(4), 479–500.
19. Nwagwu, L. (2016). Provision of quality physical facilities and learning outcomes in public primary schools. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 30(2), 177–190.
20. Okunola, P. (2015). School buildings, facilities, and academic performance: An empirical investigation. International Journal of Education and Research, 3(9), 123–138.
21. Pintrich, P. R. (2015). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation (pp. 451–502). Academic Press.
22. Porpst, T. (2012). Physical learning environments and student performance: A meta-analytic review. Review of Educational Research, 82(2), 200–229.
23. Regnier, V. (2016). Planning and design for educational facilities. Routledge.
24. Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. Educational Psychology Review, 28(2), 315–352.