

Stakeholders' Satisfaction with Institutional Services and Support Systems a Three-Year Repeated Cross-Sectional Assessment of St. Paul University Philippines from 2024 to 2026

Jesus B. Pizarro and Everett T. Laureta^{1*}

¹St. Paul University Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/>

Received: 21 June 2026; Accepted: 26 June 2026; Published: 18 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed stakeholder satisfaction with the institutional services and support systems of St. Paul University Philippines using 2,401 anonymous survey responses collected between November 27, 2024 and June 10, 2026. The repeated cross-sectional mixed-method assessment covered eight service dimensions and 106 four-point satisfaction items. Not Applicable or Not Observed responses were excluded item by item. Quantitative analysis used valid counts, means, standard deviations, rank-order comparisons, gaps from the maximum scale score, Cronbach alpha coefficients, and Kruskal-Wallis tests with epsilon-squared effect sizes. Of the participants, 86.3% were students, and stakeholder representation became progressively more student-dominant across the three survey periods. Community Engagement and Social Responsibility ranked first overall ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.51$), followed by Academic and Learning Environment ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.52$). Physical and Digital Infrastructure ranked last ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.57$). Year-group differences were statistically significant across all dimensions ($p < .001$), but effect sizes were small (epsilon-squared = .011-.023), indicating that the numerical differences should not be overstated. The most consequential risks were campus Wi-Fi access ($M = 2.70$ in the original three-period aggregation), food affordability ($M = 2.91$), and scholarship accessibility, which declined to $M = 2.98$ in 2025. Among 147 analyzable narrative comments, the most frequently coded themes concerned stakeholder engagement, communication, and service processes (45.6%); academic services and student support (39.5%); and campus facilities (36.7%). The findings support targeted improvements in connectivity, affordability, facilities, and service responsiveness while recognizing strong community engagement and academic-environment results.

Keywords: stakeholder satisfaction, higher education, educational organization management system, service quality, repeated cross-sectional survey, quality assurance

Executive Summary

The revised analysis supports a balanced conclusion. Stakeholders assessed SPUP positively overall, but the broad four-point response labels concealed meaningful differences among items. Rank, dispersion, gap, and qualitative evidence therefore provide the primary basis for interpretation.

Three Institutional Strengths

- Community Engagement and Social Responsibility ranked first ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.51$), supported by strong assessments of outreach programs, partnerships, and responsiveness to community needs.
- Academic and Learning Environment ranked second ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.52$), with curriculum relevance, ethical norms, class size, and experiential learning among the stronger indicators.
- Student and Employee Welfare ranked third ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.54$), reflecting comparatively favorable assessments of professional growth, counseling, inclusivity, and welfare support.

Three Strategic Risks

- Wi-Fi coverage and connectivity remained the most prominent cross-cutting infrastructure risk. Related items appeared in multiple survey dimensions and were reinforced by recurring comments.

- Food affordability was a persistent concern. Prices of food and beverages obtained an overall mean of 2.91 in the original three-period table and were repeatedly mentioned by students and support staff.
- Scholarship accessibility requires policy and communication review. The scholarship item declined to 2.98 in 2025, and narrative comments questioned changed qualification standards and affordability.

Three SMART Actions for 2027

Priority	Accountable Office	2027 Action and Success Measure
Campus Connectivity	ICT Office	Complete a campus wireless site survey by March 31, 2027; remediate documented high-priority dead zones by June 30, 2027; and increase the annual Wi-Fi satisfaction mean to at least 3.10 by December 2027.
Food Affordability	Business Affairs Office and Food Services	Complete quarterly price benchmarking beginning March 2027, introduce at least three budget-meal options priced at or below the median comparable off-campus meal by June 2027, and increase the food-price satisfaction mean to at least 3.10 by December 2027.
Scholarship Access	Scholarship Committee and Office of Student Affairs	Publish scholarship eligibility, decision timelines, and an appeal mechanism before academic year 2027-2028; conduct at least two stakeholder orientations; and increase the scholarship-opportunity satisfaction mean to at least 3.20 in the 2027 survey.

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly dynamic and stakeholder-driven educational environment, higher education institutions are expected to continuously monitor and improve the quality of the services they provide to their students, employees, parents, alumni, community partners, and other stakeholders. Stakeholder satisfaction has become a critical indicator of institutional effectiveness, organizational performance, and service excellence. As educational organizations strive to remain responsive to the evolving needs and expectations of their stakeholders, systematic assessment of customer satisfaction provides valuable evidence that supports strategic planning, quality assurance, resource allocation, and continuous improvement initiatives (Abdullah, 2006; Gruber et al., 2010; Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2013).

St. Paul University Philippines (SPUP) recognizes stakeholder satisfaction as an essential measure of its success in fulfilling its mission of providing transformative education, fostering holistic development, and promoting social responsibility. Consistent with its commitment to quality management, customer focus, and institutional excellence, the University annually conducts a Customer Satisfaction Survey to gather feedback regarding stakeholders' experiences with the University's programs, services, facilities, and support systems. The survey serves as a vital mechanism for understanding stakeholder assessment, identifying institutional strengths, and determining areas requiring enhancement (Alves & Raposo, 2010; Bowden, 2011; Douglas et al., 2015).

The conduct of customer satisfaction surveys is likewise aligned with the requirements of the University's Educational Organizations Management System (EOMS), quality assurance frameworks, accreditation standards, and performance excellence initiatives. Through the systematic collection and analysis of stakeholder feedback, the University is able to evaluate the effectiveness of its service delivery processes and ensure that institutional programs remain responsive to the needs and expectations of its diverse stakeholder groups (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Abdullah, 2006).

This report presents the results of the Customer Satisfaction Surveys conducted from 2024 to 2026. Specifically, it examines stakeholders' level of satisfaction across eight key dimensions of institutional service

delivery, namely: Quality of Service; Academic and Learning Environment; Campus Facilities; Customer Engagement and Support; Physical and Digital Infrastructure; Student and Employee Welfare; Food and Hospitality Services; and Community Engagement and Social Responsibility. These dimensions represent critical aspects of the University's operations and collectively provide a comprehensive assessment of the stakeholder experience (Epstein, 2018; Healey et al., 2014).

Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to assess stakeholder satisfaction with SPUP services and support systems from 2024 to 2026. Specifically, it sought to determine satisfaction across eight service dimensions; compare results across survey years; rank dimensions and indicators and quantify their gaps from the maximum score; assess the internal consistency of the instrument; identify recurring qualitative themes by stakeholder group; and formulate evidence-based actions for institutional improvement.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used a repeated cross-sectional mixed-method survey design. Quantitative satisfaction ratings were analyzed for each annual survey period, while open-ended comments were coded thematically to clarify the service experiences underlying the numerical results. Because participants were not followed longitudinally, observed year-group differences describe changes in the responding samples and should not be interpreted as within-person change.

Participants and Survey Coverage

The dataset contained 2,401 anonymous responses submitted between November 27, 2024 and June 10, 2026. Annual response yields were 893 in 2024, 816 in 2025, and 692 in 2026. The online form was openly disseminated rather than sent through a documented sampling frame. Consequently, the number of eligible or invited stakeholders was unavailable and a conventional response rate could not be computed. Response yield and stakeholder composition are therefore reported instead.

Table 1. Participant Distribution by Stakeholder Group and Survey Year

Stakeholder Group	2024 n (%)	2025 n (%)	2026 n (%)	Total n (%)
Students	698 (78.2)	723 (88.6)	650 (93.9)	2071 (86.3)
Faculty	97 (10.9)	79 (9.7)	11 (1.6)	187 (7.8)
Support staff	8 (0.9)	2 (0.2)	22 (3.2)	32 (1.3)
Administrators	9 (1.0)	3 (0.4)	2 (0.3)	14 (0.6)
Parents	39 (4.4)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	40 (1.7)
Alumni	33 (3.7)	8 (1.0)	2 (0.3)	43 (1.8)
Other	6 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.7)	11 (0.5)
Multiple roles	3 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.1)
Total	893 (100.0)	816 (100.0)	692 (100.0)	2,401 (100.0)

Note. Percentages are calculated within year. Three respondents reported multiple roles. Students accounted for 86.3% of the full sample and 93.9% of the 2026 respondents.

Research Instrument

The SPUP Customer Satisfaction Survey contained 106 satisfaction indicators grouped conceptually into eight service dimensions and two open-ended feedback questions. Ratings used a four-point response scale: Very Satisfied (4), Satisfied (3), Dissatisfied (2), and Very Dissatisfied (1), with a Not Applicable or Not Observed option. The latter was treated as missing and excluded item by item.

The questionnaire was institution-developed and aligned with the University's service-monitoring and EOMS domains. The available analytic archive did not contain expert content-validation forms or an external criterion measure; therefore, no unsupported claim of formal content or criterion validity is made. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach alpha. Coefficients were very high across the eight dimensions (alpha = .966-.983 overall), indicating consistent responses but also suggesting possible item redundancy.

Table 2. Internal Consistency of the Satisfaction Dimensions

Dimension	Items	Complete-case n	Cronbach Alpha
Quality of Service	15	2,195	0.970
Academic and Learning Environment	14	2,227	0.973
Campus Facilities	15	2,102	0.966
Customer Engagement and Support	10	2,125	0.978
Physical and Digital Infrastructure	15	2,123	0.969
Student and Employee Welfare	15	2,077	0.981
Food and Hospitality Services	12	2,154	0.971
Community Engagement and Social Responsibility	10	2,196	0.983
Full 106-item scale	106	1,828	0.995

Note. Alpha was calculated using respondents with complete numeric ratings within the relevant dimension after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses. Extremely high coefficients can reflect both consistency and overlapping item content.

Data Analysis

Valid n, mean, and sample standard deviation were computed for each item, dimension, and survey year. Dimension scores were each participant's mean across applicable items. Results were ranked from highest to lowest. A gap score was calculated as 4.00 minus the observed mean; a larger gap indicates more room for improvement. The original verbal response labels were retained only as descriptions of the scale anchors and were not used as the primary evidence for prioritization.

Kruskal-Wallis tests compared the independent year groups because the response scale was ordinal and the annual samples differed in composition. Epsilon-squared quantified effect size. Statistical significance was evaluated at alpha = .05, but practical interpretation emphasized effect size, rank, dispersion, and convergence with qualitative evidence. Qualitative comments were coded using a six-theme codebook. A single comment could receive more than one code; therefore, percentages do not sum to 100%. Potentially identifying allegations were not reproduced as quotations.

RESULTS

Overall and Dimension Results

Table 3. Satisfaction by Dimension, Year, Rank, and Gap

Dimension	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap to 4.00
Community Engagement and Social Responsibility	3.32 (0.53)	3.22 (0.53)	3.21 (0.45)	3.26 (0.51)	1	0.74
Academic and Learning Environment	3.30 (0.54)	3.19 (0.54)	3.19 (0.47)	3.23 (0.52)	2	0.77
Student and Employee Welfare	3.26 (0.54)	3.11 (0.57)	3.16 (0.50)	3.18 (0.54)	3	0.82
Quality of Service	3.25 (0.53)	3.10 (0.57)	3.16 (0.51)	3.17 (0.54)	4	0.83
Customer Engagement and Support	3.23 (0.57)	3.09 (0.59)	3.15 (0.50)	3.16 (0.56)	5	0.84
Campus Facilities	3.25 (0.56)	3.07 (0.58)	3.12 (0.51)	3.15 (0.56)	6	0.85
Food and Hospitality Services	3.20 (0.57)	3.07 (0.56)	3.11 (0.50)	3.13 (0.55)	7	0.87
Physical and Digital Infrastructure	3.18 (0.59)	3.03 (0.58)	3.10 (0.52)	3.11 (0.57)	8	0.89

Note. Dimension-score valid n varies because Not Applicable or Not Observed responses were excluded: 2024 n = 867-891; 2025 n = 803-816; 2026 n = 679-692. Gap = 4.00 - overall mean. Ranking is based on the pooled overall mean.

Community Engagement and Social Responsibility ranked first (M = 3.26, SD = 0.51), followed by Academic and Learning Environment (M = 3.23, SD = 0.52). Physical and Digital Infrastructure had the largest gap from the maximum score and ranked last (M = 3.11, SD = 0.57). These rank differences are more informative for management prioritization than assigning all results to a broad satisfaction band.

Table 4. Differences in Dimension Scores Across Survey Years

Dimension	H	df	p	Epsilon-squared	Magnitude
Quality of Service	43.93	2	< .001	0.018	Small
Academic and Learning Environment	28.48	2	< .001	0.011	Small
Campus Facilities	56.66	2	< .001	0.023	Small
Customer Engagement and Support	33.86	2	< .001	0.013	Small
Physical and Digital Infrastructure	42.94	2	< .001	0.017	Small
Student and Employee Welfare	42.08	2	< .001	0.017	Small

Food and Hospitality Services	30.59	2	< .001	0.012	Small
Community Engagement and Social Responsibility	27.88	2	< .001	0.011	Small
Overall composite	45.10	2	< .001	0.018	Small

Note. Kruskal-Wallis tests compared independent annual respondent groups. Statistically significant differences had small effect sizes, so the changes should not be described as large institutional gains or declines.

The overall composite decreased from $M = 3.24$ ($SD = 0.52$) in 2024 to $M = 3.11$ ($SD = 0.51$) in 2025, then increased modestly to $M = 3.15$ ($SD = 0.46$) in 2026. The omnibus year-group difference was significant, $H(2) = 45.10$, $p < .001$, but the effect was small (epsilon-squared = 0.018). The different coverage periods and changing stakeholder composition require cautious interpretation.

Quality of Service

Table 5. Item Results for Quality of Service

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
Accessibility of the information about university policies and procedures	3.34 (0.60)	3.17 (0.65)	3.22 (0.57)	3.25 (0.61)	1	0.75
Courtesy and behavior of the staff and personnel	3.30 (0.64)	3.17 (0.67)	3.18 (0.58)	3.22 (0.63)	2	0.78
Clarity and conciseness of the communication emanating from administration	3.30 (0.58)	3.15 (0.63)	3.21 (0.55)	3.22 (0.59)	3	0.78
Office hour convenience in accessing products and services in the university	3.28 (0.60)	3.16 (0.64)	3.20 (0.56)	3.22 (0.61)	4	0.78
Regularity in the conduct of appointments, consultations and meetings with customers (parents, students, faculty, etc.)	3.26 (0.59)	3.17 (0.61)	3.20 (0.54)	3.21 (0.58)	5	0.79
Attitude of staff doing frontline services	3.27 (0.63)	3.16 (0.67)	3.17 (0.61)	3.20 (0.64)	6	0.8
Efficiency of the enrollment process	3.31 (0.60)	3.08 (0.71)	3.21 (0.59)	3.20 (0.64)	7	0.8
Administration's initiative to get feedback from customers to enhance the delivery of services.	3.25 (0.62)	3.12 (0.69)	3.18 (0.57)	3.19 (0.63)	8	0.81
Reliability and user-interface of online services, platforms and portals.	3.24 (0.66)	3.13 (0.67)	3.18 (0.57)	3.18 (0.64)	9	0.82
Dissemination of information, notification and updates affecting	3.26 (0.65)	3.09 (0.66)	3.15 (0.57)	3.17 (0.64)	10	0.83

the customers						
Timeliness in the issuance of official documents (e.g., certification, graduation documents and transfer credentials)	3.23 (0.61)	3.10 (0.66)	3.15 (0.59)	3.16 (0.62)	11	0.84
Promptness in addressing customer queries and concerns	3.24 (0.65)	3.05 (0.72)	3.16 (0.62)	3.15 (0.67)	12	0.85
Availability of support in resolving academic and non-academic issues brought out by the customers	3.23 (0.67)	3.03 (0.75)	3.15 (0.59)	3.14 (0.68)	13	0.86
Promptness in responding to customer complaints and grievances	3.17 (0.69)	2.98 (0.76)	3.13 (0.62)	3.09 (0.70)	14	0.91
Waiting time accorded to customers during peak periods	3.14 (0.70)	2.94 (0.80)	3.06 (0.68)	3.04 (0.73)	15	0.96

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 845-883; 2025 n = 782-814; 2026 n = 672-688. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

With respect to Quality of Service, the highest-ranked indicator was Accessibility of the information about university policies and procedures (M = 3.25, SD = 0.61), whereas Waiting time accorded to customers during peak periods ranked lowest (M = 3.04, SD = 0.73). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.75 and 0.96, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone.

Academic and Learning Environment

Table 6. Item Results for Academic and Learning Environment

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
Advocacy, observance and promotion of ethical norms and values	3.36 (0.58)	3.24 (0.60)	3.20 (0.54)	3.27 (0.58)	1	0.73
Observance of appropriate class sizes for fostering quality learning interactions	3.33 (0.57)	3.23 (0.60)	3.22 (0.52)	3.27 (0.57)	2	0.73
Provision of opportunities for student internships, industry exposure and practical experience	3.32 (0.60)	3.25 (0.59)	3.21 (0.53)	3.26 (0.58)	3	0.74
Relevance and responsiveness of the curriculum to current industry needs and standards.	3.32 (0.61)	3.24 (0.63)	3.22 (0.54)	3.26 (0.60)	4	0.74
Teachers' teaching competence	3.32 (0.64)	3.24 (0.63)	3.18 (0.54)	3.25 (0.62)	5	0.75
University's initiative to foster a culture of innovation and creativity	3.33 (0.59)	3.20 (0.62)	3.20 (0.53)	3.25 (0.59)	6	0.75
Students' ease of access to consultation, mentoring and guidance services	3.29 (0.62)	3.22 (0.60)	3.20 (0.52)	3.24 (0.59)	7	0.76
Effectiveness of the teaching strategies used by the	3.30	3.20	3.19	3.23	8	0.77

teachers	(0.63)	(0.65)	(0.56)	(0.62)		
Provision of laboratories and other learning facilities to meet learners' academic needs	3.28 (0.65)	3.20 (0.63)	3.20 (0.55)	3.23 (0.62)	9	0.77
Updatedness of learning materials and resources	3.28 (0.65)	3.21 (0.65)	3.18 (0.57)	3.23 (0.63)	10	0.77
Implementation of academic and non-academic policies	3.29 (0.63)	3.16 (0.64)	3.17 (0.54)	3.21 (0.61)	11	0.79
Provision of adequate support for student research activities	3.26 (0.64)	3.17 (0.65)	3.18 (0.53)	3.21 (0.61)	12	0.79
Recognition of students' achievements and milestones	3.30 (0.65)	3.11 (0.73)	3.19 (0.57)	3.20 (0.66)	13	0.8
Diversity and relevance of extracurricular and co-curricular activities of learners	3.27 (0.63)	3.09 (0.73)	3.18 (0.55)	3.18 (0.65)	14	0.82

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 854-883; 2025 n = 800-815; 2026 n = 669-687. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

In terms of Academic and Learning Environment, the highest-ranked indicator was Advocacy, observance and promotion of ethical norms and values (M = 3.27, SD = 0.58), whereas Diversity and relevance of extracurricular and co-curricular activities of learners ranked lowest (M = 3.18, SD = 0.65). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.73 and 0.82, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone.

Campus Facilities

Table 7. Item Results for Campus Facilities

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
Maintenance and landscaping of campus grounds	3.46 (0.57)	3.36 (0.62)	3.24 (0.58)	3.36 (0.60)	1	0.64
Provision of special facilities and equipment for emergencies and disasters (e.g., fire extinguishers, fire hydrant)	3.33 (0.59)	3.23 (0.60)	3.18 (0.56)	3.25 (0.59)	2	0.75
Adequacy of learning and study areas for students outside the classroom and the library	3.32 (0.61)	3.18 (0.63)	3.18 (0.58)	3.23 (0.61)	3	0.77
Provision of clear and visible signages in strategic locations in the university	3.32 (0.61)	3.20 (0.59)	3.16 (0.58)	3.23 (0.59)	4	0.77
Provision of up-to-date technology for teaching, learning and work productivity	3.30 (0.62)	3.19 (0.62)	3.19 (0.54)	3.23 (0.60)	5	0.77
Provision of some special facility features for persons with disabilities	3.30 (0.63)	3.18 (0.61)	3.17 (0.56)	3.22 (0.61)	6	0.78
Access to updated research and learning materials in the library	3.29 (0.65)	3.16 (0.63)	3.18 (0.57)	3.21 (0.62)	7	0.79
Implementation of waste management and recycling	3.30	3.16	3.15	3.21	8	0.79

activities	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.58)	(0.62)		
Conduciveness of classrooms for learning	3.35 (0.60)	3.09 (0.72)	3.16 (0.56)	3.21 (0.64)	9	0.79
Functionality and updatedness of classroom and laboratory equipment	3.21 (0.70)	3.08 (0.72)	3.11 (0.60)	3.14 (0.68)	10	0.86
Accessibility and functionality of recreational facilities (e.g., gym, sports areas)	3.19 (0.72)	3.02 (0.74)	3.08 (0.65)	3.10 (0.71)	11	0.9
Adequacy and security of parking spaces	3.11 (0.78)	2.99 (0.76)	3.10 (0.64)	3.07 (0.74)	12	0.93
Maintenance of cleanliness in restrooms or comfort rooms	3.17 (0.81)	2.91 (0.88)	2.97 (0.78)	3.02 (0.83)	13	0.98
Ventilation and air conditioning systems in classrooms and offices	3.19 (0.77)	2.67 (1.01)	3.02 (0.71)	2.97 (0.87)	14	1.03
Reliability and access to internet facilities	3.04 (0.88)	2.75 (0.98)	3.00 (0.76)	2.93 (0.89)	15	1.07

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 826-882; 2025 n = 753-809; 2026 n = 651-690. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

In relation to Campus Facilities, the highest-ranked indicator was Maintenance and landscaping of campus grounds (M = 3.36, SD = 0.60), whereas Reliability and access to internet facilities ranked lowest (M = 2.93, SD = 0.89). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.64 and 1.07, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone.

Customer Engagement and Support

Table 8. Item Results for Customer Engagement and Support

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
Opportunities for community involvement are well disseminated	3.26 (0.59)	3.16 (0.62)	3.19 (0.52)	3.20 (0.59)	1	0.8
Involvement of all stakeholders in the university's strategic planning	3.26 (0.61)	3.15 (0.61)	3.17 (0.52)	3.20 (0.59)	2	0.8
Provision of regular updates to the alumni concerning university plans, projects and initiatives	3.27 (0.59)	3.13 (0.62)	3.18 (0.55)	3.20 (0.59)	3	0.8
Provision of opportunities for all stakeholders to participate in on and off campus programs, projects and activities.	3.26 (0.59)	3.14 (0.62)	3.18 (0.52)	3.20 (0.59)	4	0.8
Provision of channels or platforms for parent-teacher communication and collaboration	3.26 (0.62)	3.13 (0.61)	3.19 (0.53)	3.19 (0.59)	5	0.81
Provision of an open and regular communication with external stakeholders	3.24 (0.62)	3.14 (0.64)	3.18 (0.52)	3.19 (0.60)	6	0.81
The support given to parents during student activities is adequate	3.25 (0.62)	3.12 (0.63)	3.16 (0.55)	3.18 (0.60)	7	0.82

Provision of a mechanism for the university to address parents' concerns about student's needs and welfare	3.25 (0.60)	3.09 (0.67)	3.16 (0.54)	3.17 (0.61)	8	0.83
Involvement of stakeholders' feedback and input as basis for the school administrators' decision making	3.22 (0.63)	3.10 (0.65)	3.14 (0.54)	3.15 (0.62)	9	0.85
Provision of timely updates on upcoming university events and activities	3.22 (0.68)	3.03 (0.73)	3.12 (0.60)	3.12 (0.68)	10	0.88

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 819-879; 2025 n = 745-806; 2026 n = 648-684. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

As to Customer Engagement and Support, the highest-ranked indicator was Opportunities for community involvement are well disseminated (M = 3.20, SD = 0.59), whereas Provision of timely updates on upcoming university events and activities ranked lowest (M = 3.12, SD = 0.68). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.80 and 0.88, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone.

Physical and Digital Infrastructure

Table 9. Item Results for Physical and Digital Infrastructure

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
Maintenance and aesthetics of physical infrastructure	3.33 (0.61)	3.20 (0.65)	3.16 (0.56)	3.24 (0.61)	1	0.76
Adequacy of computer access boards to monitor students' grades, balance of payments, etc.	3.29 (0.60)	3.14 (0.62)	3.14 (0.57)	3.20 (0.61)	2	0.8
Adequacy and updatedness of computer labs for student use	3.27 (0.61)	3.11 (0.64)	3.17 (0.55)	3.19 (0.61)	3	0.81
Clarity of signages, school map for wayfinding and directions in campus	3.27 (0.63)	3.14 (0.61)	3.13 (0.57)	3.19 (0.61)	4	0.81
IT support provided to students, faculty and other stakeholders	3.24 (0.65)	3.12 (0.63)	3.17 (0.57)	3.18 (0.62)	5	0.82
Ease of navigation of the official university website	3.24 (0.66)	3.13 (0.66)	3.15 (0.56)	3.18 (0.63)	6	0.82
Security features for online systems	3.23 (0.61)	3.13 (0.62)	3.16 (0.54)	3.18 (0.60)	7	0.82
Accessibility of IT facilities for both students and staff in campus.	3.25 (0.62)	3.11 (0.64)	3.15 (0.55)	3.17 (0.61)	8	0.83
Provision of seamless online student portal	3.21 (0.68)	3.14 (0.64)	3.14 (0.56)	3.17 (0.63)	9	0.83
Availability of smart classrooms to enhance teaching and learning	3.23 (0.66)	3.08 (0.67)	3.14 (0.55)	3.15 (0.63)	10	0.85
Efficiency of online systems for grades, payments, and inquiries	3.22 (0.69)	3.09 (0.66)	3.11 (0.60)	3.15 (0.66)	11	0.85
Digital tools provided for learning	3.22 (0.66)	3.08 (0.67)	3.14 (0.56)	3.15 (0.64)	12	0.85

Multimedia facilities in classrooms	3.20 (0.69)	3.03 (0.72)	3.10 (0.60)	3.11 (0.68)	13	0.89
Reliability and access to internet connectivity on campus	2.91 (0.94)	2.62 (1.01)	2.90 (0.83)	2.81 (0.94)	14	1.19
Wi-Fi access points within the campus	2.82 (0.97)	2.49 (1.04)	2.81 (0.87)	2.70 (0.98)	15	1.3

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 822-876; 2025 n = 771-807; 2026 n = 665-688. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

In terms of Physical and Digital Infrastructure, the highest-ranked indicator was Maintenance and aesthetics of physical infrastructure (M = 3.24, SD = 0.61), whereas Wi-Fi access points within the campus ranked lowest (M = 2.70, SD = 0.98). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.76 and 1.30, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone.

Campus internet connectivity and Wi-Fi access were treated as a cross-cutting risk. The original instrument contained three closely related connectivity indicators across Campus Facilities and Physical and Digital Infrastructure. They were retained in this analysis to preserve the historical records, but future survey versions should consolidate them to reduce redundancy and avoid disproportionate weighting of connectivity in composite scores.

Student and Employee Welfare

Table 10. Item Results for Student and Employee Welfare

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
Promotion of a culture of inclusivity and diversity in campus	3.30 (0.59)	3.18 (0.60)	3.18 (0.55)	3.22 (0.58)	1	0.78
Staff welfare programs for non-teaching personnel	3.29 (0.57)	3.17 (0.58)	3.19 (0.52)	3.22 (0.56)	2	0.78
Provision of opportunities for professional growth for faculty and staff	3.28 (0.60)	3.16 (0.60)	3.19 (0.54)	3.22 (0.58)	3	0.78
Career development needs of students	3.27 (0.61)	3.18 (0.61)	3.19 (0.54)	3.22 (0.59)	4	0.78
Access to and effectiveness of counseling services for students and employees	3.29 (0.59)	3.17 (0.59)	3.17 (0.53)	3.21 (0.58)	5	0.79
Instructional support for faculty	3.28 (0.59)	3.16 (0.57)	3.18 (0.52)	3.21 (0.57)	6	0.79
Guidance services for students in addressing their academic and personal matters	3.28 (0.59)	3.16 (0.62)	3.19 (0.56)	3.21 (0.60)	7	0.79
Conduct of inhouse workshops and seminars for employee skills enhancement	3.28 (0.57)	3.17 (0.59)	3.16 (0.54)	3.21 (0.57)	8	0.79
Ranking and promotions for faculty and staff	3.26 (0.60)	3.15 (0.60)	3.19 (0.53)	3.20 (0.58)	9	0.8
Health services provided on campus	3.29 (0.60)	3.11 (0.64)	3.17 (0.57)	3.19 (0.61)	10	0.81

Implementation of the mental health program	3.24 (0.64)	3.11 (0.69)	3.18 (0.58)	3.18 (0.64)	11	0.82
Implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms and policies	3.26 (0.59)	3.11 (0.63)	3.15 (0.55)	3.18 (0.60)	12	0.82
Promotion and enforcement of anti-bullying measures on campus	3.24 (0.67)	3.09 (0.68)	3.15 (0.58)	3.16 (0.65)	13	0.84
Awards and recognition programs for both students and employees	3.25 (0.63)	3.03 (0.74)	3.18 (0.54)	3.16 (0.65)	14	0.84
Scholarship offering and opportunities for faculty and students	3.23 (0.69)	2.98 (0.80)	3.15 (0.62)	3.12 (0.72)	15	0.88

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 799-860; 2025 n = 729-795; 2026 n = 640-686. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

Within Student and Employee Welfare, the highest-ranked indicator was Promotion of a culture of inclusivity and diversity in campus (M = 3.22, SD = 0.58), whereas Scholarship offering and opportunities for faculty and students ranked lowest (M = 3.12, SD = 0.72). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.78 and 0.88, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone.

Scholarship offerings and opportunities require a year-specific reading. The item reached M = 2.98 in 2025 before improving in 2026. This annual decline and the related comments justify policy and communication review even though the pooled result was higher.

Food and Hospitality Services

Table 11. Item Results for Food and Hospitality Services

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
Visitor accommodations during on campus events	3.27 (0.59)	3.17 (0.58)	3.17 (0.54)	3.21 (0.57)	1	0.79
Maintenance of cleanliness and order in designated dining areas in campus	3.29 (0.61)	3.15 (0.60)	3.11 (0.56)	3.19 (0.60)	2	0.81
Quality of event coordination and hospitality services	3.26 (0.61)	3.13 (0.61)	3.15 (0.53)	3.18 (0.59)	3	0.82
Staff handling food services are courteous and efficient.	3.27 (0.58)	3.12 (0.64)	3.14 (0.55)	3.18 (0.60)	4	0.82
The ambiance of dining areas is comfortable and inviting	3.24 (0.59)	3.15 (0.62)	3.14 (0.54)	3.18 (0.59)	5	0.82
Provision of special dietary needs by food services	3.24 (0.60)	3.13 (0.62)	3.14 (0.55)	3.17 (0.60)	6	0.83
Adequacy of seating arrangements (e.g., tables and chairs) in dining areas	3.23 (0.63)	3.12 (0.62)	3.14 (0.56)	3.16 (0.61)	7	0.84
Feedback about dining services is welcomed and acted upon	3.22 (0.61)	3.09 (0.64)	3.12 (0.56)	3.14 (0.61)	8	0.86
Variety and quality of food available in the	3.18	3.05	3.10	3.11 (0.65)	9	0.89

canteen and food satellites	(0.67)	(0.66)	(0.60)			
Efficiency of catering services during events in campus	3.17 (0.70)	3.04 (0.68)	3.11 (0.60)	3.11 (0.67)	10	0.89
Waiting time in food service lines	3.12 (0.70)	3.00 (0.72)	3.08 (0.61)	3.07 (0.68)	11	0.93
Prices of food and beverages	3.01 (0.80)	2.75 (0.85)	2.98 (0.71)	2.91 (0.80)	12	1.09

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 814-860; 2025 n = 757-806; 2026 n = 667-687. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

As to Food and Hospitality Services, the highest-ranked indicator was Visitor accommodations during on campus events (M = 3.21, SD = 0.57), whereas Prices of food and beverages ranked lowest (M = 2.91, SD = 0.80). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.79 and 1.09, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone. The price of food and beverages remained a strategic concern. Although its numerical result fell within the response interval associated with satisfaction, its rank, gap, and qualitative recurrence indicate an affordability risk that warrants action.

Community Engagement and Social Responsibility

Table 12. Item Results for Community Engagement and Social Responsibility

Item	2024 M (SD)	2025 M (SD)	2026 M (SD)	Overall M (SD)	Rank	Gap
University community outreach programs	3.36 (0.57)	3.24 (0.57)	3.23 (0.51)	3.28 (0.56)	1	0.72
The university's partnerships with NGOs and government agencies in implementing community extension programs and projects	3.34 (0.57)	3.26 (0.55)	3.22 (0.49)	3.28 (0.54)	2	0.72
Environmental sustainability initiatives and efforts of the community outreach programs and projects	3.34 (0.57)	3.24 (0.55)	3.21 (0.49)	3.27 (0.54)	3	0.73
Responsiveness of the university's extension program to local community needs and expectations	3.33 (0.57)	3.24 (0.56)	3.21 (0.48)	3.26 (0.54)	4	0.74
The impact of community extension services program and activities	3.32 (0.56)	3.24 (0.57)	3.22 (0.52)	3.26 (0.55)	5	0.74
Collaboration with local organizations in community extension services projects	3.34 (0.56)	3.23 (0.57)	3.20 (0.51)	3.26 (0.55)	6	0.74
Diversity and inclusivity of the university's social responsibility programs	3.33 (0.56)	3.23 (0.57)	3.22 (0.50)	3.26 (0.55)	7	0.74
The university's integration of civic engagement into its curriculum	3.32 (0.55)	3.22 (0.54)	3.20 (0.49)	3.25 (0.53)	8	0.75
Involvement of external stakeholders to support social responsibility projects	3.29 (0.58)	3.22 (0.57)	3.21 (0.51)	3.24 (0.56)	9	0.76
Involvement of students, faculty, staff and alumni in community extension services activities	3.31 (0.58)	3.20 (0.60)	3.21 (0.51)	3.24 (0.57)	10	0.76

Note. Values are M (SD). Valid counts vary after excluding Not Applicable or Not Observed responses: 2024 n = 822-858; 2025 n = 763-795; 2026 n = 657-674. Rank is within dimension; Gap = 4.00 - pooled item mean.

In terms of Community Engagement and Social Responsibility, the highest-ranked indicator was University community outreach programs (M = 3.28, SD = 0.56), whereas Involvement of students, faculty, staff and alumni in community extension services activities ranked lowest (M = 3.24, SD = 0.57). The corresponding gaps from 4.00 were 0.72 and 0.76, respectively. Management attention should be guided by the lower-ranked indicator, its dispersion, annual pattern, and related stakeholder comments rather than by the broad verbal category alone.

Qualitative Findings

The open-ended section contained 157 text entries. Ten entries such as no, none, or nothing did not contain analyzable feedback, leaving 147 comments for thematic coding. Multiple coding was permitted when a comment addressed more than one issue. The stakeholder distribution of theme mentions is shown to prevent the overwhelmingly student-dominant sample from being mistaken for equal representation of all stakeholder groups.

Table 13. Themes, Frequency, Stakeholder Distribution, Evidence, and Responsible Offices

Theme and Frequency	Year Distribution	Stakeholder Distribution	Representative Quotation	Office in Charge
Institutional strengths and commendations n = 38 (25.9%)	2024: 18, 2025: 11, 2026: 9	Students: 34; Faculty: 2; Alumni: 1; Support staff: 1	“The University is very accommodating and the ambience is nice.”	Quality Assurance Office and University Management
Internet connectivity and digital infrastructure n = 35 (23.8%)	2024: 13, 2025: 14, 2026: 8	Students: 31; Faculty: 4	“Kindly improve the university's internet connection, specifically the SPUP Wi-Fi. We need it for research purposes inside the classroom.”	Information and Communications Technology Office
Campus facilities and physical environment n = 54 (36.7%)	2024: 24, 2025: 16, 2026: 14	Students: 43; Faculty: 8; Support staff: 1; Parents: 1; Alumni: 1	“Please check the air-conditioning and comfort rooms.”	Business Affairs Office and General Services
Food services and affordability n = 12 (8.2%)	2024: 8, 2025: 0, 2026: 4	Students: 9; Support staff: 2; Faculty: 1	“Offer more affordable meals in the canteen.”	Business Affairs Office and Food Services
Academic services and student	2024: 29, 2025:	Students: 48; Faculty: 7; Administrators: 2;	“Bring back the old standards of scholarship grants.”	Office of the Vice President for Academics, academic

support n = 58 (39.5%)	20, 2026: 9	Parents: 1		units, and Office of Student Affairs
Stakeholder engagement communication and service n = 67 (45.6%)	2024: 32, 2025: 20, 2026: 15	Students: 54; Faculty: 6; Support staff: 3; Administrators: 2; Parents: 2	“Please listen to the concerns of students and understand our situation too.”	Registrar, Office of Student Affairs, Human Resource Office, and service- unit heads

Note. Denominator = 147 analyzable comments. Comments could receive multiple theme codes, so percentages exceed 100% when summed. Quotations were lightly corrected for capitalization and punctuation without changing meaning. Identifying allegations were excluded from quotations and should be addressed through confidential grievance procedures.

Stakeholder engagement, communication, and service processes generated the most theme mentions, followed by academic services and student support, campus facilities, internet and digital infrastructure, institutional commendations, and food affordability. The qualitative evidence converged with the lower quantitative results for connectivity, facilities, food prices, and scholarship access. It also identified service interactions, enrollment processes, grade release, event scheduling, and responsiveness as operational concerns that are not fully captured by a single dimension mean.

DISCUSSION

The results indicate a generally favorable but uneven service experience. Community Engagement and Social Responsibility remained the leading dimension, consistent with the role of mission-driven higher education institutions in developing reciprocal community partnerships and socially responsive programs (Boyer, 1996; Epstein, 2018; Fitzgerald et al., 2016; UNESCO, 2022). Academic and Learning Environment also ranked highly, particularly on curriculum relevance, ethical norms, and experiential learning. These strengths should be sustained through outcome evidence and participatory improvement processes (Healey et al., 2014).

The principal operational weakness concerned connectivity. Reliable internet access is foundational to online learning, research, communication, and administrative systems (Al-Fraihat et al., 2020; Bond et al., 2021; Pham et al., 2019). The convergence of low-ranked connectivity indicators and recurring comments makes this a strategic risk even when a broad scale band labels a mean as satisfied. Restroom conditions, air-conditioning, classroom equipment, parking, and wayfinding likewise require facilities-level monitoring because physical learning environments influence comfort, participation, and institutional assessment (Price et al., 2003; Temple, 2008).

Food affordability and scholarship access reflect the financial dimension of stakeholder experience. Price and service-environment concerns may affect daily campus participation, especially for students with limited resources (Ryu & Han, 2010). Similarly, scholarship criteria and communication can influence perceptions of fairness and institutional support. Service responsiveness is another cross-cutting issue: waiting time, complaint handling, enrollment processes, grade release, and staff interactions shape stakeholder trust, satisfaction, and loyalty (Ali et al., 2016; Clemes et al., 2013; Douglas et al., 2015).

The comparatively favorable Student and Employee Welfare result should be interpreted as a strength to sustain, not evidence that all needs have been resolved. Engagement-supportive employment practices and inclusive institutional climates can strengthen stakeholder well-being and participation, while weaknesses in access or communication can undermine those benefits (Saks, 2022; Shore et al., 2018).

All year-group comparisons were statistically significant, but effect sizes were small. Accordingly, the

revision avoids characterizing minor mean changes as major improvements or deterioration. The 2024 and 2026 periods were also partial calendar years, and the stakeholder profile shifted toward students over time. The observed patterns may therefore reflect both institutional conditions and changes in who responded.

CONCLUSION

SPUP demonstrated clear strengths in community engagement, academic and learning environment, and stakeholder welfare. Nevertheless, the data do not support an unqualified conclusion of uniformly strong performance. Physical and digital infrastructure ranked lowest, and recurring comments confirmed problems involving Wi-Fi coverage, restrooms, air-conditioning, classrooms, and other facilities. Food affordability, scholarship access, service responsiveness, and stakeholder communication also require focused management attention.

The significant year-group differences were small in magnitude and should not be interpreted as evidence of large longitudinal change. The results are best used as screening and prioritization evidence, supplemented by service-level measures, complaint records, facilities audits, and follow-up consultations. Future surveys should use a documented sampling frame, monitor response rates, maintain balanced stakeholder representation, and refine overlapping items.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The University should implement the three 2027 SMART actions presented in the Executive Summary and monitor them through bi-annual management review. The ICT Office should use technical coverage and service-ticket measures alongside satisfaction results. The Business Affairs Office should link food-price benchmarking and facilities inspection records to improvement actions. The Scholarship Committee and Office of Student Affairs should publish clear eligibility and appeal procedures and monitor awareness among students.

The Quality Assurance Office should establish annual sampling targets for each stakeholder group, document the number invited and the number responding, and report nonresponse and Not Applicable patterns. The questionnaire should undergo formal content validation by qualified experts before the next major administration. Overlapping connectivity items should be consolidated, stakeholder-specific modules should be considered, and qualitative coding should retain year and stakeholder identifiers for disaggregated reporting.

LIMITATIONS

The survey used voluntary open participation and did not retain a documented denominator for calculating response rates. The sample was dominated by students, especially in 2025 and 2026, which limits generalization to parents, alumni, employees, and external stakeholders. The annual periods were unequal in duration, and the design did not follow the same participants over time. Not Applicable or Not Observed responses reduced valid counts for some indicators. Formal content-validity records were not included in the analytic archive, and the very high internal-consistency coefficients may partly reflect redundant item wording. The qualitative frequencies describe mentions among submitted comments and are not prevalence estimates for the entire stakeholder population.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring service quality in higher education: HEDPERF versus SERVPERF. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 24(1), 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500610641543>
2. Al-Fraihat, D., Joy, M., Masa'deh, R., & Sinclair, J. (2020). Evaluating e-learning systems success: An empirical study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 102, 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.08.004>
3. Ali, F., Zhou, Y., Hussain, K., Nair, P. K., & Ragavan, N. A. (2016). Does higher education service quality effect student satisfaction, image and loyalty? A study of international students in Malaysian

- public universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24(1), 70–94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-02-2014-0008>
4. Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2010). The influence of university image on student behaviour. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(1), 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541011013060>
5. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2021). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00282-x>
6. Bowden, J. L.-H. (2011). Engaging the student as a customer: A relationship marketing approach. *Marketing Education Review*, 21(3), 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MER1052-8008210302>
7. Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11–20.
8. Clemes, M. D., Cohen, D. A., & Wang, Y. (2013). Understanding Chinese university students' experiences: An empirical analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 25(3), 391–427. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-07-2012-0068>
9. Douglas, J. A., Douglas, A., McClelland, R., & Davies, J. (2015). Understanding student satisfaction and dissatisfaction: An interpretive study in the UK higher education context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(2), 329–349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.842217>
10. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494673>
11. Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S. T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2016). The centrality of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 20(1), 223–244.
12. Gruber, T., Fuß, S., Voss, R., & Gläser-Zikuda, M. (2010). Examining student satisfaction with higher education services. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(2), 105–123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513551011022474>
13. Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). Engagement through partnership: Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Academy*.
14. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer assessment of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
15. Pham, L., Limbu, Y. B., Bui, T. K., Nguyen, H. T., & Pham, H. T. (2019). Does e-learning service quality influence e-learning student satisfaction and loyalty? Evidence from Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(7), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0136-3>
16. Price, I., Matzdorf, F., Smith, L., & Agahi, H. (2003). The impact of facilities on student choice of university. *Facilities*, 21(10), 212–222. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02632770310493580>
17. Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2010). Influence of the quality of food, service, and physical environment on customer satisfaction and behavioral intention in quick-casual restaurants. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34(3), 310–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348009350624>
18. Saks, A. M. (2022). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100835>
19. Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 176–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.003>
20. Temple, P. (2008). Learning spaces in higher education: An under-researched topic. *London Review of Education*, 6(3), 229–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14748460802489363>
21. UNESCO. (2022). *Knowledge-driven actions: Transforming higher education for global sustainability*. UNESCO Publishing.
22. Wilkins, S., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2013). Assessing student satisfaction in transnational higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(2), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541311297568>