



ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES ON ACADEMIC SUCCESS AND CAMPUS LIFE 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, "Assessing the Impact of Student Support Services on Academic Success and Campus Life in Higher Education",

International Journal of Current Research and Modern Education, Volume 10, Issue 2, July - December, Page Number 43-46, 2025.

Copy Right: © Crystal Pen Publication, 2025 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16717220>

Abstract:

Globally, higher education institutions are increasingly recognizing the pivotal role of Student Support Services (SSS) in fostering academic achievement, student retention, and holistic development. This study explores the effectiveness, accessibility, and perceived value of SSS across multiple functional dimensions, with a focus on their impact on university students' academic and personal success. Key areas of investigation include peer-assisted learning programs, early intervention strategies, academic mentoring, psychosocial support, and institutional service delivery mechanisms. The findings underscore the significant benefits of structured support initiatives such as Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS), Supplemental Instruction (SI), and proactive academic advising, all of which contribute to enhanced academic performance, increased self-efficacy, and improved graduation rates. Despite these advantages, challenges persist in terms of service accessibility, student engagement, and the alignment of support services with the diverse needs of the student body. The study highlights critical gaps in traditional service delivery models, which may inadvertently marginalize specific student populations. Moreover, the research identifies the mediating effects of faculty involvement, academic resilience, and community integration as key determinants of student success. In response to these insights, the paper proposes a set of evidence-based recommendations aimed at optimizing student support services. These include the integration of technology-enhanced support systems, the development of personalized intervention frameworks, and fostering interdepartmental collaboration to address both academic and non-academic barriers to student success. By bridging the gap between research and practice, this study contributes meaningfully to the ongoing discourse on institutional strategies for promoting equity, inclusion, and long-term student achievement in higher education. The findings call for the implementation of proactive, student centered approaches that not only address academic challenges but also cultivate an inclusive learning environment conducive to sustained success.

Key Words: Student Support Services, Academic Success, Higher Education and Institutional Effectiveness

Introduction:

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) globally are facing growing pressure to develop comprehensive The Evolving Role of Student Support Services in Higher Education support systems that address the diverse and evolving needs of contemporary learners. In today's complex academic environment, the role of institutions extends beyond the delivery of curriculum content. Modern HEIs are expected to assist students in navigating multifaceted educational pathways while simultaneously promoting emotional well-being, social integration, and career preparedness. This expanded institutional mandate has elevated the significance of Student Support Services (SSS), positioning them as essential components of institutional effectiveness. SSS now serve as critical connectors between academic rigor and student success, providing the scaffolding necessary to foster holistic development and ensure that students thrive both within and beyond the classroom.

According to recent research, well-designed support systems that include academic counseling, peer coaching, psychological resources, financial advice, and career planning services have a significant impact on the rate of retention, academic achievement, and general satisfaction among students (Kuh et al., 2005; Tinto, 2012). These programs have progressed from supplementary offers to basic cornerstones of educational justice and excellence, especially in an era of increased diversity among students and mental health challenges. Nonetheless, considerable differences in accessibility of services, awareness among pupils, and perceived value exist between institutions, resulting in different student experiences even within the same learning environment.

This study looks into the various effects of SSS on university students' educational careers and personal development. The research aims to: (1) determine key indicators of success in the delivery of services, (2) evaluate obstacles to access and participation, and (3) develop valid suggestions for maximizing support ecosystems. The findings will help to shape current discussions about institutional responsibilities in promoting student success, providing useful information for administrators, politicians, and student affairs professionals who want to create more welcoming and favourable higher education environments. This study addresses an essential gap for higher educational policy and practice by taking a comprehensive approach that takes into account the educational and psychosocial aspects of student support. As institutions increasingly acknowledge that student achievement goes beyond academic achievement, this study provides current empirical information to help drive the construction of further flexible, fair, and successful support systems for diverse student populations.

Review of Literature:

The Impact of Academic Support Services on Student Performance:

Extensive research consistently highlights the significant role of academic support services in improving student outcomes. In a longitudinal study involving 260 university students, Spedding, Hawkes, and Burgess (2017) examined the effectiveness of Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS). Their findings revealed that participation in PASS significantly predicted

academic performance ($\beta = 1.18$, $p < .001$), with approximately 29% of this effect mediated by increased self-efficacy in statistics. These results underscore the dual benefits of peer learning: skill development and enhanced academic confidence.

Building on these findings, Grillo and Leist (2013) conducted an empirical analysis using survey data and found that regular engagement with academic support services-such as tutoring and supplemental instruction-was strongly associated with higher graduation rates, particularly among students with strong academic standing (high GPAs). Their study highlights the long-term advantages of structured academic assistance programs and supports the argument for their institutional integration as a strategy for boosting student retention and achievement.

Accessibility is emerging as a significant aspect in service efficacy, as Channa's (2023) regression study of 70 students revealed that ease of access was the largest predictor of positive results, with service quality giving extra benefits where available. This emphasizes organizational involvement in removing barriers to help. Early intervention options hold considerable potential. A 2019 Economics of Education Review study utilizing regression discontinuity indicated that students with high risk (scoring <70% at midterm) who accepted tutor recommendations improved performance on exams by 6.5-7.5 percentage points. The largest substantial benefits were among those with low math placement scores.

This encourages proactive systems of detection for struggling students. The psychosocial components of educational assistance are equally important. In a study of 440 students, *Frontiers in Psychology* (2025) found that while resilience to learning predicted achievement ($\beta = 0.49$), teacher support moderated 46% of this effect, emphasizing educators' role in the success of students. In a similar way *Frontiers in Education* (2024) revealed how social support and self-worth might reduce stress-related performance reductions via interpersonal relationships and institutional resources.

Transition times bring distinct obstacles, as demonstrated by the *European Journal of Psychology of Education* (2017), which found that 20-30% of first-year pupils struggle with academic adjustment, a characteristic that predicts grade and persistence beyond prior academic achievement. This requires tailored transition programming. MDPI (2023) examines contemporary help-seeking tendencies and finds that student preferences are evolving towards interpersonal relationships and digital platforms, implying that institutions must change old service delivery models. The impact of established therapies such as Supplemental Instruction (Wikipedia, 2014) is still evident, with participants achieving greater grades and lower dropout rates. Finally, Wikipedia's (2024) meta-analysis of 225 papers demonstrated active learning's superiority, with 11% fewer failures and 0.47 standard deviation score gains, notably in STEM subjects, providing solid evidence for pedagogical reform.

This research highlights the multiple character of effective student assistance, emphasizing the importance of accessible, proactive, and diversified approaches that target both academic and psychosocial aspects of student success. The findings support institutional policies that combine early detection, peer support, faculty participation, and flexible delivery options to improve student outcomes.

Objectives of the Study:

The study aims to analyze the impact of support services for students in higher education institutions on academic success and campus infrastructure.

Research Methodology:

Data Collection Methods:

Data for this study were acquired using a standard survey, which served as the major measurement tool. The questionnaire was created to collect pertinent information from students seeking degrees in logistics and shipping management at business institutions. The survey method aided the collection of quantifiable data, allowing the investigator to capture the opinions of pupils, experiences, and attitudes regarding the variables under inquiry.

Techniques of Data Analysis:

The acquired data was evaluated using a variety of statistical approaches to guarantee that the findings were accurate and valid. Descriptive statistics were first used to characterize the data's basic properties, providing insights into respondents' demographics and response distribution across important factors. To investigate the associations between variables, correlation and regression analyses were used. Correlation analysis helped determine the strength and direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Regression analysis was then used to discover the functional connection between a dependent variable and several independent variables (predictors). This study made it easier to anticipate outcomes and revealed information about each predictor's influence.

The Study Focused on Three Core Aspects:

- Determine the relationship between dependent and independent variables.
- Assess the strength of the relationships.
- Evaluate the statistical significance of observed effects.

All data analyses were conducted using the statistical software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), with the final sample size of 228 individuals. The use of SPSS enabled regular and accurate data processing, which increased the accuracy of the research findings.

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Table1: Descriptive Statistics -Support Services

Factor	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Physical Environment of support service of Career Counselling	228	4.00	4.88	4.5197	0.27868
Supporting Service of Career Guidance would be delivered consistently	228	1.50	3.80	3.0026	0.44671
Supporting staff would be readily available for students' affairs	228	4.25	5.00	4.7818	0.24006
Expertise and Effectiveness of the support services offered	228	4.20	4.90	4.5377	0.16547
Supporting staff would understanding and care when addressing the individual needs	228	1.25	4.00	2.9906	0.49352

(Source: survey data)

According to the findings, students generally rate the physical setting of profession counseling facilities highly favorable (Mean = 4.52, SD = 0.28), with a strong consensus on the level of service, while the presence of assistance workers gets the highest authorization (Mean = 4.78, SD = 0.24), showing excellent accessibility and responsiveness. Furthermore, respondents agree that the services' knowledge and efficacy are high (mean = 4.54, SD = 0.17). However, evaluations of consistency in career advice provision are neutral (mean = 3.00, SD = 0.45), with varying student experiences, and staff empathy for individual needs is perceived less favorably (mean = 2.99, SD = 0.49), indicating inconsistency in this area. Overall, while facilities staff accessibility, and service efficacy are strengths, aspects such as consistent delivery of services and individualized care need to be improved, as evidenced by the diverse standard deviations suggesting different degrees of student satisfaction. Please let me know if you want a graphic representation or more integration into a certain component.

Table 2

Factors	Support Services	Campus Infrastructure
Support Services	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.0527
	N	228
Campus Infrastructure	Pearson Correlation	0.0527
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1
	N	228

** Correlation is significant at the level (2-tailed)(Source: survey data)

The correlation study demonstrates a very weak positive association ($r = 0.0527$) among students' opinions of assistance programs and campus infrastructure, demonstrating that enhancements in one area do not have a major impact on the other. While the p-value (0.000) supports statistical significance, it is most likely owing to the high sample size ($N = 228$) rather than a meaningful association, as the near-zero Pearson correlation coefficient indicates virtually no linear relationship. As a result, despite the statistically significant relationship, the weak association suggests that these two aspects work separately in students' judgments, implying that improvements in one area will not predictably influence impressions of the other.

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.527 ^a	0.278	0.273	0.47798

a. Predictors: (Constant), Support Services -Source: survey data

The regression analysis shows a modest positive correlation ($R = 0.527$) between support services and the dependent variable (e.g., student satisfaction or performance), implying that improvements in support services lead to better results. The R^2 result (0.278) indicates that support services account for 27.8% of the variance in the dependent variable, with the remaining 72.2% impacted by unmeasured factors. The corrected R^2 (0.273) verifies the model's dependability, correcting for sample size and predictors while avoiding overfitting. Additionally, the standard error of the estimate (0.478) indicates moderate prediction accuracy, implying that observed values deviate somewhat from the regression line.

Table 4: Coefficient

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant) Support Services	5.477	0.278	-0.527	19.668	0
	-0.697	0.094		-7.39	0

a. Dependent Variable: Performance-Source: survey data

The regression analysis reveals an unexpectedly negative association between support services and performance, with the intercept (5.477) indicating baseline performance when support services are assumed to be zero. The unstandardized coefficient (-0.697) indicates that for every one-unit increase in support services, performance decreases by 0.697 units, which contradicts typical expectations and may indicate issues such as multicollinearity, measurement errors, or student dissatisfaction despite increased support. The small standard error (0.094) validates the estimate's dependability, and the standardized beta coefficient (-0.527) indicates a moderate-to-strong negative influence. The substantial absolute t-value (-7.390) and very significant p-value (0.000) indicate the statistical significance of this inverse link, highlighting that, while the association is strong, the negative direction calls for more inquiry into the underlying causes impacting these findings.

Findings:

The study's findings show that students had nuanced perspectives of assistance services, with high scores for staff accessibility and expertise but neutral to adverse views on individualized focus and service consistency. While students rated campus infrastructure well, the low association ($r=0.0527$) with assistance services implies that these aspects operate independently in student ratings. Regression analysis revealed a moderate relationship ($R=0.527$), with support services accounting for 27.8% of performance variance; however, the counterintuitive negative coefficient (-0.697) suggests that higher assistance service usage correlates with poorer performance, potentially indicating that struggling students seek additional assistance or revealing service quality issues. Support services have a significant impact on outcomes ($p<0.001$). However, this unexpected negative association requires additional study through mixed-methods studies in order to better comprehend the deeper relationships between service utilization and academic performance.

Suggestions:

To improve the efficacy of assistance programs, schools should prioritize personalization by providing focused staff instruction in empathic communication and student-centered counseling to fill identified gaps in tailored attention. Continuous service audits and comprehensive feedback systems should be created to ensure constant high-quality delivery that meets student expectations. The disturbing negative link between assistance usage and performance implies that these services should be

integrated with academic mentorship services and peer instruction in order to prevent struggling students from becoming overly reliant while preserving academic rigor. Further qualitative research, such as interviews and focus groups, is required to understand the unanticipated inverse link and influence service redesign. While campus infrastructure has a minimal link with support services, smart investments in upgraded student service centers have the ability to increase participation and satisfaction with services by establishing more welcoming and effective venues for support interactions. These ideas attempt to turn assistance programs into a proactive, tailored, and effective approach that improves student achievements.

Conclusion:

This study emphasizes the important but complex function of support services for students in shaping learning environments at logistics and shipping business schools. While students have a high perception of infrastructure and personnel availability, they remain concerned about service consistency and personalized attention. The regression study revealed that support assistance account for a significant portion (27.8%) of the academic variance; however, an unanticipated negative association suggests that improved service engagement may be associated with reduced performance-possibly showing that struggling pupils seek additional assistance or that current strategies need to be refined. These findings highlight the need of schools implementing a more customized student-centered strategy that includes academic mentorship, empathic counselling, and ongoing service evaluations. Shipping and logistics schools may help students succeed in this highly competitive, skill-driven business by matching support structures with their needs and developing both academic and emotional well-being. Further qualitative analysis is suggested to investigate the underlying causes of the unfavourable relationship and tailor assistance interventions accordingly.

References:

1. Channa, A. (2023). The contribution of student support services to academic success and graduation rates in higher education. *International Journal of Education and Cognitive Sciences*, 15, 176-191.
2. European Journal of Psychology of Education. (2017). First-year university students' academic success: Importance of academic adjustment. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 32(3), 421-437.
3. Grillo, M. C., & Leist, C. W. (2013). Academic support as a predictor of retention to graduation. *College Student Journal*, 47(4), 656-663.
4. Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2005). What matters to student success: A review of the literature? National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.
5. MDPI. (2023). College student help-seeking behavior: A systematic review. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(8), 637.
6. Science Direct. (2019). Early intervention in college classes and improved student outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, 72, 23-29.
7. Spedding, J., Hawkes, A. J., & Burgess, M. (2017). Peer assisted study sessions and student performance: The role of academic engagement, student identity, and statistics self-efficacy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 1981-1997.
8. Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
9. Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action*. University of Chicago Press.
10. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/supplemental_instruction
11. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/active_learning