International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME)
International Peer Reviewed - Refereed Research Journal, Website: www.crystalpen.in
Impact Factor: 7.137, ISSN (Online): 2455 - 5630, Volume 10, Issue 2, July - December, 2025

ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND ITS IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

D. Rajasekar*, Harikumar Pallathadka & Yuhlung Cheithou Charles*****
* Post Doctoral Research Scholar, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India
** Senior Professor & Vice Chancellor, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India
*** Professor, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India

Cite This Article: D. Rajasekar, Harikumar Pallathadka & Yuhlung Cheithou Charles, "Academic Infrastructure and Its Impact on Student Learning in Higher Education", International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education, Volume 10, Issue 2, July - December, Page Number 42-45, 2025.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16717964

Abstract:

Academic infrastructure encompasses the physical, technological, and learning resources utilized by higher education institutions to facilitate teaching, research, and student development. This includes library resources, research facilities, classrooms, computer labs, and digital technologies such as e-learning systems and smart tools, all of which create a positive learning environment and enhance the academic experience. This study explores how academic facilities, specifically libraries, labs, and digital technology, influence learning outcomes in higher education. Using literature reviews and data from MBA students in shipping and logistics programs, the study shows that modern, well-integrated academic facilities significantly impact student engagement, academic success, and institutional excellence. Factor analysis and correlation studies reveal that smart classrooms, e-learning systems, and well-equipped labs strongly and positively affect student learning. The findings emphasize that as education progresses, academic facilities become essential for fostering student achievement, creativity, and employment opportunities. The study suggests that strategic development and the integration of academic tools are crucial for advancing a connected, engaging, and future-ready higher education system.

Key Words: Academic Infrastructure, Higher Education and Student Satisfaction

Introduction:

Academic infrastructure significantly impacts student learning outcomes and experiences in higher education. Libraries, laboratories, and digital technologies are vital components of effective learning and teaching environments at educational institutions. Well-equipped libraries provide students with access to a broad range of information resources, enabling independent study and fostering a culture of intellectual curiosity. Similarly, modern laboratories allow students to translate theoretical knowledge into practical, hands-on experiences, enhancing their understanding of complex topics and their problem-solving skills. The integration of digital technologies, such as smart classrooms, e-learning platforms, and virtual labs, has transformed the delivery and accessibility of education, creating flexible and engaging learning environments that meet diverse student needs. Higher education institutions strive to meet global academic standards and prepare students for a highly competitive, technology-driven world. The quality, availability, and responsiveness of academic infrastructure are crucial to educational success. The development of higher education in the twenty-first century is largely driven by advancements in academic infrastructure, which reshape how students engage with content, peers, and instructors. Learning outcomes-measured by student achievement, analytical thinking, creativity, and employability-are deeply connected to the quality of educational infrastructure and tools accessible to students.

Consequently, strategic investments in library resources, labs, and online materials are essential not only for enhancing academic achievement but also for fostering student creativity, analytical skills, and lifelong learning. This study examines how core academic resources contribute to improving academic outcomes in higher education, focusing on business school programs in logistics and shipping. It highlights the significance of a solid academic infrastructure in increasing student engagement and institutional excellence, while also offering evidence-based recommendations to improve educational environments to address modern learning needs.

Objectives of the Study:

- Examine how academic infrastructure affects student learning results in higher education.
- Evaluate the impact of library resources, laboratories, and digital technology on student involvement, conceptual comprehension, and academic achievement.
- Identify best practices for planning and developing academic infrastructure that promotes great teaching and learning.
- Provide evidence-based recommendations for governments and educational institutions to improve academic facilities for holistic student development and excellence.

Review of Literature:

The function of academic facilities in improving learning outcomes has been extensively addressed in both worldwide and Indian higher education contexts. Kumar and Rao (2020) investigated the transition of educational libraries from traditional to dynamic, technology-driven educational settings, concluding that modernized libraries improve independent learning, research output, and student involvement. Mehta et al. (2021) emphasized the relevance of adequate laboratories in promoting experiential learning and deeper understanding among STEM students, indicating that dynamic lab environments greatly boost academic performance.

Zhang et al. (2022) investigated the use of Learning Management Systems (LMS) and virtual classrooms in India, concluding that technology-enabled learning practices increase student engagement and flexibility. Singh and Thurman (2019) did a systematic study of blended learning and concluded that blended models have a favorable impact on student engagement when combined with excellent pedagogy and technical investments. Bhuasiri et al. (2012) identified key success characteristics for e-

learning in underdeveloped countries, highlighting the importance of strong infrastructure, qualified teachers, and institutional commitment. Similarly, Anderson and Dron (2011) examined the history of distance education pedagogy, proposing adaptable and individualized learning models that include evolving technology. UNESCO (2023) emphasized the importance of equitable access to digital tools, modern libraries, and innovation laboratories in modernizing higher education to ensure long-term academic success. Ali and Kim (2020) investigated the impact of service quality on student satisfaction and discovered that responsive academic assistance and infrastructural quality improve institutional reputation and student outcomes.

Al-Kumaim et al. (2021) investigated e-learning service quality during the COVID-19 pandemic and concluded that dependable online infrastructure and timely support are critical for student satisfaction and learning continuity. Tinto (2017) underlined that academic and social assistance structures, including contemporary facilities, have a substantial impact on student retention and achievement. Astin (1999) contended that student participation, aided by accessible and engaging learning environments, is critical to academic accomplishment.

Salmi (2009) stressed the need of world-class educational resources for institutional success, arguing that investments in modern labs and libraries are crucial. Oblinger (2006) underlined the significance of technology-integrated learning spaces in supporting student-centered learning, indicating that adaptable, well-equipped environments encourage active participation. The literature emphasizes that well-developed academic facilities, such as smart classrooms, labs, e-learning systems, and modern libraries, have an important role in improving learning outcomes, increasing engagement, and providing equal access to excellent higher education.

Research Methodology:

The study examined academic facilities and their relevance to student performance in higher education. The research participants were business school students seeking an MBA in Shipping and Logistics Management. This study's sample consisted of students who were willing to contribute valid data to the survey. A non-probability convenience sample technique was used, with data collected via a self-administered questionnaire with a five-point rating system. The researcher individually gave the questionnaire to 282 pupils. Of the 282 surveys distributed, 238 were returned. The acquired data was coded, and statistical tests such as factor analysis and correlation analysis were used to generate meaningful results.

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Table 1: Academic Facilities [Principal Axis Factoring]

Product Features	**F1**	**F2**
Smart Classrooms	0.941	-
Industry Standard Software	0.938	-
E-Learning Platform	0.923	-
Case Study Room	0.732	-
Seminar Halls	0.722	-
Incubation And Entrepreneurship Cells	-	0.885
Soft Skill Lab	-	0.806
Language Lab	-	0.765
Simulation Lab	-	0.616
Training Room	-	0.564
Cronbach's Alpha	0.856	0.826
Eigen Value	4.291	4.054
% of Variance	18.645	18.808
Cumulative %	19.125	18.121

Table 1 shows the findings of Principal Axis Factoring applied to instructional facilities at MBA Shipping and Logistics colleges. Two components were recovered with eigen values of 4.291 and 4.054, accounting for 18.645% and 18.808% of the the variance, respectively. The first factor (F1) includes facilities like innovative educational environments (0.941), software that meets industry standards (0.938), e-learning systems (0.923), case study rooms (0.732), and conference halls (0.722), showing a strong cluster of technology-enabled and interactive educational infrastructures. The second factor (F2) consists of incubation and entrepreneurial cells (0.885), soft- skills labs (0.806), language laboratories (0.765), simulated labs (0.616), as well as training rooms (0.564), which emphasize developing skills and experiential learning opportunities. Cronbach's alpha values of 0.856 for F1 and 0.826 for F2 indicate that the extracted factors are internally consistent and reliable. These findings show that academic facilities at business schools may be divided into two categories: technology-integrated spaces for learning and instructional facilities both of which considerably improve student achievement in higher education.

Table 2: Correlation of Academic Facilities with Student Leaning in Higher Education

Relationship of Academic Facilities with Student Learning in Higher Education		
Factors	Correlation	Higher Education
Smart Classroom	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238
Industry Standard Software	Pearson Correlation	0.886
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238
E-Learning Platform	Pearson Correlation	0.886
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238

Case Study Room	Pearson Correlation	0.921
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238
Seminar Halls	Pearson Correlation	0.862
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238
Incubation and Entrepreneurship Cells	Pearson Correlation	0.709
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238
Soft Skill Lab	Pearson Correlation	0.845
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238
Language Lab	Pearson Correlation	0.766
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238
Simulation Lab	Pearson Correlation	0.766
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0. 000
	N	238

Table 2 shows the association analysis of educational resources and learning for students in higher education, which was conducted using the Pearson correlation coefficient on a sample of 238 participants. All academic facilities have a favorable and substantial link with student learning at the 0.000 level ($p < 0.01$). Smart classrooms have a perfect correlation score of 1.000, suggesting a good alignment with student learning views. Industry-standard technology and e-learning platforms have high correlations of 0.886, while the case study rooms had the greatest correlation of all the listed facilities, at 0.921, indicating their significant impact on applied learning. Seminar halls have a correlation of 0.862, while soft skill labs have a correlation of 0.845, suggesting the value of these engaging and skills-based facilities in increasing student engagement.

Language laboratories and simulation labs have a correlation of 0.766, while incubation and entrepreneurship cells have a relatively significant association (0.709) with student learning. These findings suggest that all indicated academic facilities contribute positively to increasing student achievement in higher educational institutions, with engaging and practical educational environments such as case study rooms and innovative classrooms demonstrating the strongest associations.

Findings:

The study found that academic facilities had a considerable influence on the learning results of students in higher education. Principal Axis Factoring classified the facilities into two categories: technology-integrated learning spaces and skill development infrastructure, both of which demonstrated good reliability. Innovative classrooms, industry-standard software, and online educational resources all showed high factor loadings, demonstrating their importance in promoting student engagement and knowledge. Correlation analysis revealed even stronger favourable associations between academic facilities and student learning, with the strongest correlations found for case study rooms (0.921), software that meets industry standards (0.886), and e-learning platforms (0.886). All indicated facilities were statistically significant, demonstrating that interactive, technology-enabled, and skill-oriented environments are crucial to improving MBA students' learning experiences in shipping and logistics programs.

Suggestions:

To strengthen the academic facilities in logistics and shipping education, institutions should prioritize improving their technology infrastructure, such as increasing the availability of innovative classrooms, industry-standard software, and e-learning platforms that support interactive and practical learning. Furthermore, a greater emphasis should be placed on classroom instruction through well-equipped case study rooms, simulator laboratories, and incubation centers, which allow students to obtain hands-on industry experience and build key problem-solving abilities. Integrating language laboratories and soft skill labs into the curriculum would assist students enhance their communication and management skills, which are critical in this industry. Finally, having a regular feedback process will enable institutions to evaluate the efficacy of their facilities and make required improvements to meet changing student and industry expectations.

Conclusion:

In higher education, academic infrastructure is critical to improving educational quality and student learning outcomes. The libraries, labs, and digital technology are critical resources for research, instruction, and practical learning. When these tools are current, readily available, and well-maintained, they foster a good learning environment that promotes student engagement, knowledge acquisition, and academic success. As a result, investing in and improving academic infrastructure is essential. This study suggests that investing in contemporary accessible infrastructure is critical to improving learning results and preparing learners for future professions. Institutions must continue to modernize and integrate their educational resources to suit the changing needs of students and the expectations of the 21st-century educational system. This is critical for institutions that want to provide efficient, accessible, and future-ready education.

References:

1. Ali, F., & Kim, W. G. (2020). The role of physical environment, price perceptions, and consumption emotions in developing student satisfaction in higher education settings. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 32(3), 123-135.
2. Anderson, T., & Dron, J. (2011). Three generations of distance education pedagogy. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 12(3), 80-97.
3. Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Development, 40(5), 518-529.

4. Bhuasiri, W., Xaymoungkhoun, O., Zo, H., Rho, J. J., & Ciganek, A. P. (2012). Critical success factors for e-learning in developing countries: A comparative analysis. Computers & Education, 58(2), 843-855.
5. Brown, J. S., & Adler, R. P. (2008). Minds on fire: Open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0. Educause Review, 43(1), 16-32.
6. Kumar, S., & Rao, P. (2020). Transforming academic libraries into digital learning hubs: A study of Indian higher education institutions. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 46(5), 102-115.
7. Mehta, R., Sharma, A., & Gupta, P. (2021). Impact of laboratory-based experiential learning on STEM education outcomes. International Journal of Science Education, 43(8), 1125-1145.
8. Oblinger, D. G. (2006). Learning spaces. Educause.
9. Salmi, J. (2009). The challenge of establishing world-class universities. World Bank Publications.
10. Singh, H., & Thurman, A. (2019). How many ways can we define blended learning? A systematic literature review. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(1), 1-23.
11. Tinto, V. (2017). Reflections on student persistence. Student Success, 8(2), 1-8.
12. UNESCO. (2023). Reimagining higher education infrastructure for sustainable development. UNESCO Publishing.
13. World Bank. (2022). Bridging the gap: Infrastructure development in South Asian higher education. World Bank Reports.
14. Zhang, L., Patel, R., & Joshi, A. (2022). Digital transformation in Indian higher education: Adoption and impact of LMS and virtual classrooms. Computers & Education, 185, 104-120.