

AN EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT SERVICES AT THE RIZAL TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY (RTU) COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURIAL TECHNOLOGY: A TOOL FOR A COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM

Alexander G. Cortez,

Faculty/College of Business and Entrepreneurial Technology
Rizal Technological University,
Boni Ave., Mandaluyong City, Philippines

Imee L. Resurreccion,

Faculty/ College of Business and
Entrepreneurial Technology
Rizal Technological University
Boni Ave., Mandaluyong City, Philippines

Edna P. Conwi,

Faculty/Department Head, College
Business and Entrepreneurial Technology
Rizal Technological University
Boni Ave., Mandaluyong City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Interest in the quality of education has grown considerably over the past years. Higher education institutions are increasingly placing greater emphasis on improving service quality and student satisfaction. As universities become more student orientated, student perceptions of student services are becoming more important. This study attempted to evaluate the degree of service quality and level of satisfaction on the services provided by the institution. The study made use of the descriptive-normative-survey approach. The respondents comprised 272 college students which were purposively selected from the six academic departments from the College of Business and Entrepreneurial Technology. A researcher-made instrument was used to gather data. This study disclosed the degree of service quality got an Over-All Weighted Mean of 2.69 which falls under "average quality" category. On other hand, the level of satisfaction obtained an Over-All Weighted Mean of 3.14 which falls under "satisfied" category. The top three problems were identified as delays during enrolment period, inconvenient hours of operation and discourteous and unaccommodating personnel. There is a significant difference between degree of service quality and level of satisfaction. The students rating to satisfaction is higher than service quality.

Introduction:

Higher education institutions' primary goal is to provide education to the students. But education is only one of the varieties of services that a school provides to the student as he/she stays within the four corners of the institution. In today's competitive academic environment where students have many options available to them, factors that enable educational institutions to attract and retain students should be seriously studied. Increased concern about

the purpose and value of student services and other support groups in tertiary education has forced institutions to re-examine their services. Student services as the frontline service area to the university offers a variety of assistance to students that ranges from library, scholarship, student affairs, medical-dental, guidance and counselling, student admission and retention, cultural, canteen and dormitory services, and other special programs aimed in providing effective and efficient services to students.

Laboratories, classrooms, audio visual rooms provide a structured setting for regular interactions between the teachers and students.

Today's context for higher education presents student services with many challenges. Institutions of higher learning are confronted with a variety of changing conditions that demand attention; indeed, the formulation of appropriate and effective responses to a changing world has become important to institution's vitality and viability. In response to changing conditions, institutions are redoubling their efforts to manage student enrolment-seeking student clientele while striving to retain students to graduation, employing quality management, modifying programs and services to meet student's changing needs.

Two reasons may be attributed to the emergence of student support services as a major issue for HEIs: firstly, the rate of student withdrawal from university education and secondly, the impact of increasing student diversity on students' experience of university. This is something that is being affected by the diversity of students attending HEIs. Casey et al. (2003) claim that the growth in the diversity of students in universities in recent years has been striking. In terms of home students the diversity relates to the academic background and previous experience of students who are entering higher education with a much broader range of qualifications, including vocational and technical qualifications which differ from more traditional academic routes.

Most universities also have a greater number of students participating in their programs. Consequently, many aspects of student life, including academic, social support and pastoral care have become harder to understand and manage in a growing and diverse population (Audin & Davy, 2003). In this context, student support systems have become increasingly important for HEIs.

Among the support services available to students at universities are those which are pertinent to the academic, self-development and emotional needs of students are the most important. McInnis et al (2000) showed that the most desirable forms of support are the employment service, learning support, Counselling service and facilities which cater for students' academic, emotional and self-development needs.

Even though most universities can give a long list of their student support services, it does not necessarily mean that all the services are actively functioning and benefiting the students effectively. There can be a disagreement between the provision and the accessibility of support services. A few previous studies have identified deficiencies in established student support systems. McInnis (2002) suggested a discrepancy between the most important support services identified by the students (employment service, counselling and learning support) and the most frequently used support facilities (student union

café and libraries). The gap between the importance of the support service and the frequency of the services being used by the students demonstrates some of the problems with university support systems. Some highly important services such as learning support, counselling, employment services may be inflexibly scheduled and clash with students' lecture or placement schedule so that they cannot access the support service easily. the gap between the provision and use of support services can also be caused by the quality of the services. If students find that the personnel in support services are not very accommodating, they may turn to their friends or families rather than support workers in the university. Thus, the provision of support facilities cannot guarantee an effective support system.

A number of colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of services and resources intended to promote persistence by providing academic assistance (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). If students are admitted to a college, then they should have expectations for that college to provide services that will help them succeed. It is important for institutions of higher learning to implement and maintain various academic resources that promote student success and increase student persistence because these resources are needed by a significant number of students who are not adequately prepared for the academic challenges they will face at the university.

A study on Student Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Student Services in an Adventist College in the Philippines found that there were significant differences in the perceptions of the effectiveness of student services when respondents were grouped according to the demographic variables of age, gender, course, and academic year. Service departments that reportedly need attention are Fax services, Security, Library, Maintenance, and Admissions. Prompt delivery of mail, more friendly secretaries, assisting new students especially during enrolment time, and giving more information about the school to prospective students were services suggested for improvement. The study reveals the areas that worth reforming as this will help improve student life in the campus (Apellado, 2007).

This study primarily aims to establish the significant difference between service quality and student satisfaction by evaluating the student services provided by Rizal Technological University. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions;

1. What is the level of RTU service quality on the following;
 - 1.1 Auxiliary Services (Food Services),
 - 1.2 Cultural Affairs,
 - 1.3 Department of Student Affairs,
 - 1.4 Guidance and Counselling Centre,
 - 1.5 Medical-Dental Services,

- 1.6 Scholarship Office,
 - 1.7 Student Records and Admission Services, and
 - 1.8 Reading Centre
2. What is the composite level of satisfaction of students on the services provided by the institution?
 3. What are the problems encountered by the students in acquiring the services provided by the institution?
 4. Is there a significant relationship between the students' service quality and the students' level of satisfaction as provided by Rizal Technological University?

Materials and Methods:

This study made use of the descriptive-normative-survey approach to gather adequate and accurate information for the research. The population of this study comprised 272 regular Third Year students of College of Business and Entrepreneurial Technology (CBET).

The survey questionnaire was used as the main data-gathering instrument for this study. The questionnaires were divided into three main sections: degree of quality of services, level of student satisfaction and problems encountered in the acquisition of services. Ranking, weighted mean and stratified sampling and z-test were used to analyze the data.

Results and Discussion:

1. Level of RTU Service Quality

Table 1: Auxiliary Services (Food Services) Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Cleanliness/sanitation	2.24	Fair Quality
2. Provisions to ensure nutritious food	2.10	Fair Quality
3. Provisions for clean drinking water	3.01	Average Quality
4. Provisions to regulate prices of food	2.74	Average Quality
5. Provisions for value meals	3.02	Average Quality
Overall Mean	2.62	Average Quality

Based on the above table, the Auxiliary Services (Food Services) garnered an over-all weighted mean score of 2.62, translated as average quality. The "provisions for value meals" scored the highest weighted mean of 3.02, followed by "provisions for clean drinking water" with 3.01, "provisions to regulate prices 2.74, and "cleanliness/sanitation" with 2.24 respectively, and being the "provision to ensure nutritious food" with 2.10 as the lowest.

Table 2: Cultural Affairs Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Availability of Aggregate Programs and Services	3.10	Average Quality
2. Promotion of cultural and artistic values	3.43	Average Quality
3. Participation of Faculty and Students	3.01	Average Quality
4. Provision for student development and personal growth	3.20	Average Quality
5. Provision for faculty and students welfare through fund allocation	3.11	Average Quality
Overall Mean	3.17	Average Quality

Table 2 shows the highest weighted mean of 3.43 was accumulated by "promotion of cultural and artistic values" with "provision for student development comes in second with 3.20, "provisions for faculty and students welfare through fund allocation" comes in third with 3.11, and "participation of faculty and students" is on the bottom with 3.01. Promotion of cultural and artistic values was able to garner the highest weighted mean (3.43). On the contrary, the result on "participation of faculty and students" (3.01) received the lowest score.

Table 3: Department of Student Affairs Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Student Grievance/Complaints	2.43	Fair Quality
2. Programs and Services	2.19	Fair Quality
3. Insurance Services	2.12	Fair Quality
4. Disciplinary Proceedings	3.85	Above Average Quality
5. Monitoring Systems	3.66	Above Average Quality
Overall Mean	2.85	Average Quality

Table 3 shows that the Department of Student Affairs scored an over-all weighted mean of 2.85, where "disciplinary proceedings" have garnered the highest mean which was 3.85, followed by "monitoring systems" with 3.66, "student grievance and complaints" with 2.43, "programs and services" with 2.19, the lowest score was obtained by "insurance service" with 2.80.

Table 4: Guidance and Counselling Centres Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Orientation Procedures	3.01	Average Quality
2. Counselling and Advising	2.26	Fair Quality
3. Testing	3.01	Average Quality
4. Job Placement	2.34	Fair Quality
5. Vocational and Career Guidance Information	2.94	Average Quality
Overall Mean	2.71	Average Quality

Guidance and Counselling Centre scored an over-all weighted mean of 2.71 with translation of average quality. The item for “testing” and “orientation procedures” collected an identical mean score which is 3.01, next is “vocational and career guidance” 2.94, followed by the “job placement” with 2.34 while “provision for counselling and advising” got the lowest mean score at 2.26.

Table 5: Medical/Dental Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Free medical/dental consultation/check up	2.85	Average Quality
2. Prophylaxis and restoration of cavities	2.07	Fair Quality
3. Issuance of medical certificate	2.78	Average Quality
4. Maintenance of student health records	2.73	Average Quality
5. Availability of doctors and staff	2.10	Fair Quality
Overall Mean	2.51	Average Quality

Medical/Dental scored an over-all weighted mean score of 2.60 with average quality. Respondents rated “free medical/dental consultation/check-up” with 2.85 weighted mean score as the highest, followed by “issuance of medical certificate” with 2.78, next is “maintenance of student health records” with 2.73, “availability of doctors and staff” with 2.10 and the least mean score was obtained by “prophylaxis and restoration of cavities” with 2.07.

Table 6: Scholarship Office Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Available sponsors, scholarship grants	3.05	Average quality
2. Qualification requirements for admission	2.87	Average quality
3. Application procedures for scholarship	2.78	Average quality
4. Maintenance of scholarship	3.01	Average quality
5. Refund policy	2.68	Average Quality
Overall Mean	2.88	Average quality

Table 6 shows that “available sponsors, scholarship grants” accumulated the highest mean score with 3.05, followed by “maintenance of scholarship” with 3.01, “qualification requirements for admission” with 2.87, “application procedures for scholarship” at 2.78 and “refund policy” with 2.68 garnering the lowest mean score.

Table 7: Student Records and Admission Services (Registrar) Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Admission & registration policies	3.01	Average quality
2. Dropping/withdrawing procedures	2.76	Average quality
3. Transferring procedures	2.87	Average quality
4. Evaluation/graduation requirements	2.78	Average quality
5. Verification / authentication of credentials	2.85	Average quality
Overall Mean	2.85	Average quality

Table 7 indicates that admission & registration policies” garnered the highest mean score with 3.01, next is “transferring procedures” at 2.87, followed by “verification/authentication of credentials” with 2.85, “evaluation/graduation requirements” with 2.78, and the least mean score was obtained by “dropping/withdrawing procedures” with 2.76. On the contrary, respondents think that they have encountered difficulty in regards to “dropping and withdrawing procedures” as shown in the table garnering lowest mean at 2.76.

Table 8: University Library (Reading Centre) Service Quality Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Card cataloguing	1.56	Fair quality
2. Unified library systems	1.58	Fair quality
3. Internet services	1.33	Poor quality
4. Open shelf policy	2.50	Average quality
5. Borrowing of books	2.87	Average quality
Overall Mean	1.96	Fair quality

Table 8 reveals that University Library garnered an over-all weighted mean of 1.96. The table also shows that “borrowing of books” scored the highest mean at 2.87, followed by “open shelf policy” with 2.50, “unified library system” with 1.58, “card cataloguing” at 1.56, “internet services” collected the lowest mean score with 1.33.

Table 9: Summary of Service Quality

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Auxiliary Services (Food Services)	2.62	Average Quality
2. Cultural Affairs	3.17	Average Quality
3. Department of Student Affairs	2.85	Average Quality
4. Guidance and Counselling Centre	2.71	Average Quality
5. Medical and Dental Clinic	2.51	Average Quality
6. Scholarship Office	2.88	Average Quality
7. Student Records and Admission Services (Registrar)	2.85	Average Quality
8. Library (Reading Centre)	1.96	Fair Quality
Overall Mean	2.69	Average Quality

Table 9, shows that the level of Service Quality is (2.69). It is shown in the table that Cultural Affairs Office, with an over-all weighted mean score of 3.17, ranked first among all the offices. Scholarship Office 2.88 and Student Records and Admission Services (Registrar) which marked at 2.85 weighted mean score, Guidance and Counselling Centre obtained 2.71. These were followed by Auxiliary Services (Food Services) which obtained an over-all rating of 2.62, Department of Student Affairs which obtained an over-all weighted mean score of 2.52, Medical/Dental Clinic with 2.51, and Reading Centre obtained the lowest over-all weighted mean score of 1.96.

Level of Satisfaction:

Table 10: Food Services Student Satisfaction Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Food services are offering variety of choices	2.89	Fairly Satisfied
2. Adequate food services areas for dining, food storage and preparation.	3.26	Fairly Satisfied
3. Foods provided are wholesome and nutritious.	3.60	Satisfied
4. Foods are affordable.	3.90	Very Satisfied
5. Clean and sanitized surroundings.	3.20	Fairly Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.37	Satisfied

The above table indicates that the over-all weighted mean score garnered by the Auxiliary Services (Food Services) is marked at 3.37; “foods are affordable” obtaining a weighted mean score of 3.90, being the highest among the scores, followed by “Foods provided are wholesome and nutritious” with 3.60, ranked third is “adequate food services areas for dining, food storage and preparation” with 3.26, not far behind is “clean and sanitized surroundings” with 3.20, garnering the lowest score was recorded in “Food services are offering variety of choices” with 2.89.

Table 11: Cultural Affairs Student Satisfaction Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Programs of Cultural Affairs are well organized and functional.	3.28	Satisfied
2. Recruitment and selection are properly administered.	3.38	Satisfied
3. Promotion of learning and wellness.	3.30	Satisfied
4. Provision for scholarship grants/aid	3.85	Very Satisfied
5. Competent and trained personnel.	3.56	Very Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.47	Satisfied

Table 11 reveals that respondents were of the view that Cultural Affairs have “provision for scholarship

grants/aid” at 3.85 as this item earned the highest weighted mean score, followed by “competent and trained personnel” pegged at 3.56, next in rank was obtained by “recruitment and selection” at 3.38, “promotion of learning and wellness” with 3.30 weighted mean, bottom on the list was recorded on the item “programs of cultural affairs are well organized and functional” with 3.28.

Table 12: Department of Student Affairs Student Satisfaction Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Programs of Student Affairs are well organized and functional.	3.56	Very Satisfied
2. Students are well informed regarding rules on student discipline and programs and services.	2.38	Fairly satisfied
3. Prompt and efficient transaction between the DSA and students.	3.45	Satisfied
4. Student complaints are immediately addressed.	3.27	Satisfied
5. Competent and trained professionals.	3.32	Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.20	Satisfied

Table 12 manifests that respondents were satisfied with the programs of the Department of Student Affairs as manifested in “programs are well organized and functional” which got the highest mean score at 3.56, near second is “competent and trained professionals “ with 3.45, distant third is “student complaints are immediately addressed” with 3.27 , ‘prompt and efficient transaction between the DSA and students” with 3.20, “students are well informed regarding rules on student discipline and programs and services” at 2.38, thus, preceding items were ranked 4th and 5th respectively.

Table 13: Guidance and Counselling Centre Student Satisfaction Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Entrance examinations are properly administered	3.58	Very satisfied
2. Effectiveness of student orientation program.	2.28	Fairly Satisfied
3. Availability of Counselling services.	3.31	Satisfied
4. Availability of career and occupational services.	2.86	Satisfied
5. Competent and trained counselors	3.43	Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.10	Satisfied

Table 13 reveals that respondents were of the opinion that item on “entrance examinations are properly administered” as this garnered the highest mean score

at 3.58, followed by “competent and trained counselors” with 3.43, “availability of Counselling services” with 3.31, “availability of career and occupational services” with 2.86, at the bottom of the list is “effectiveness of student orientation program at 2.28.

Table 14: Medical and Dental Student Satisfaction Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Availability of first aid supplies and services.	3.52	Very satisfied
2. A health and safety problem that relates to student functioning is reported to authorities.	3.45	Satisfied
3. School requires and maintains necessary health records.	3.50	Very satisfied
4. Students are informed regarding the procedures to follow in case of injury, illness and emergency.	3.33	Satisfied
5. Competent and trained staff.	3.53	Very satisfied
Overall Mean	3.46	Satisfied

Table 14 reveals that the respondents were of the view that they were generally satisfied with the services provided by Medical/Dental as it obtained a weighted mean of 3.46. Respondents felt that Medical/Dental are surrounded “competent and trained staff”, as this obtained the highest mean at 3.53, following closely is the “availability of first aid supplies and services” which received 3.52, followed by “school requires and maintains necessary health records” at 3.50, next will be “health and safety problems that relates to student functioning is reported to authorities with 3.45, last on the list is “students are informed regarding the procedures to follow in case of injury, illness and emergency” with 3.33.

Table 15: Scholarship Office Student Satisfaction Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Availability of scholarship grants	3.65	Very satisfied
2. Effective screening procedures.	3.52	Very satisfied
3. Adequacy of scholarship grants	3.45	Satisfied
4. Scholarship requirements are substantial.	3.49	Satisfied
5. Competent and trained personnel.	3.50	Very satisfied
Overall Mean	3.52	Very satisfied

As can be seen on Table 15, the highest mean score was registered on “the availability of scholarship grants” with 3.65. Also, respondents were very satisfied with “effective screening procedures” with

3.52, “competent and trained personnel” with 3.50, respondents are quite satisfied with “scholarship requirements are substantial” as it garnered a 3.49, and “adequacy of scholarship grants” at 3.45. Scholarship Office got the highest rating of “very satisfied” among all the offices under student services.

Table 16: Student Records and Admission Services (Registrar)

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Effective and efficient record collection and maintenance	1.83	Unsatisfied
2. Efficient and prompt release of student records.	2.22	Fairly Satisfied
3. Systematic admission and registration procedures.	3.45	Satisfied
4. Effective information dissemination (School calendar, enrolment, graduation)	3.49	Satisfied
5. Competent and trained staff	3.35	Satisfied
Overall Mean	2.86	Satisfied

As indicated in Table 16, the item on “effective information dissemination got the highest mean at 3.49, followed by “systematic admission and registration procedures” with 3.45, “competent and trained staff” with 3.35, “effective and efficient record collection and maintenance”, and “efficient and prompt release of student records” were on the bottom of the list with 1.83 and 2.22 respectively.

Table 17: University Library Student Satisfaction Dimensions

Service Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Adequacy of books commonly needed by students	2.43	Fairly Satisfied
2. Stocks of books are available.	3.11	Satisfied
3. Open shelves are accessible.	3.45	Satisfied
4. Card catalogue are functional.	3.76	Very Satisfied
5. Competent and Trained Staff	2.29	Fairly Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.00	Satisfied

Table 17 shows that the University Library got a miserable over-all weighted mean of 3.00. The results of the survey indicated that respondents rated “card catalogue are functional” with a mean of 3.76 being the highest, followed by “open shelves are accessible” 3.45, “stocks of books were available” with 3.11, on the two preceding items, respondents were fairly satisfied, while, on the “adequacy of books commonly needed by students” and “competent and trained staff”, respondents gave the lowest mean at 2.43 and 2.23 respectively.

Table 18: Summary of Level of Student Satisfaction

	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Auxiliary Services (Food Services)	2.60	Satisfied
2. Cultural Affairs	3.35	Satisfied
3. Department of Student Affairs	3.20	Satisfied
4. Guidance and Counselling Centre	3.10	Satisfied
5. Medical and Dental Clinic	3.46	Satisfied
6. Scholarship Office	3.52	Very satisfied
7. Student Records and Admission Services (Registrar)	2.86	Satisfied
8. University Library	3.00	Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.14	Satisfied

In Table 18, it can be seen that the highest mean score was obtained by Scholarship Office with 3.52, Medical and Dental came at second with 3.46, followed by Cultural Affairs with 3.35, Department of Student Affairs with 3.20, Guidance and Counselling Centres with 3.10, University Library 3.00, Student Records and Admission Services (Registrar) at 2.86, and the lowest mean were registered by Auxiliary Services (Food Services) at 2.60.

Problems Encountered by Students:

Table 19: Problems Encountered by Students

Problems Encountered by Students	Rank
1. Inconvenient hours of operation (general)	2
2. Delays during enrolment period (general)	1
3. Discourteous and unaccommodating personnel (general)	3
4. Denied access to journal, database and references (university library)	8
5. Inadequate facilities (general)	4
6. Insufficient advising and Counselling services (guidance and Counselling)	11
7. Lack of medical supplies and equipment (medical and dental services)	10
8. Absence of personnel in charge of operation (general)	7
9. Partiality in selection and admission of scholarship (scholarship)	12
10. Delayed release and processing of school credentials (registrar)	5
11. Bias in the implementation of school policies (DSA)	6
12. Food personnel are untidy and inappropriately dressed. (food services)	9
13. Programs not suited to student activities that will promote positive cultural and artistic values (cultural affairs)	13

Delays during enrolment period” (Rank 1), can be ascribed to situations which are common during enrolment period such as long lines and difficulties arising from each respective enrolment procedure. Inconvenient hours of operation” (Rank 2), students complained that some offices are either closing earlier

than the office hours or opening the office late that contributes to delays. Discourteous and unaccommodating personnel” (Rank 3), inadequate facilities (Rank 4) and delayed release and processing of school credentials (Rank 5). Bias in the implementation of school policies” (Rank 6), the results of the interview shows that students were complaining on how security guards implement school policies, they seem to favor some students. Absence of personnel in charge of operation” (Rank 7), like in signing of clearances and document where students were asked to return due to the unavailability of personnel in charge of operation. Denied access to Journal, database and references (Rank 8), and “food personnel are untidy and inappropriately dressed ranked last.

Difference between Service Quality and Student Satisfaction:

Table 20 shows the z-value given by students in the service quality and student satisfaction survey. The z-computed value of 1.92 is lower than the tabular value of 1.96, which means that there is a significant difference between service quality and student satisfaction.

Table 20: z-value of Service Quality and Student Satisfaction

Item	Frequency	Over-all Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Z	
				Computed	Tabular
Service quality	91	2.69	0.69	1.92	1.96
Student satisfaction	91	3.14	0.16		

Findings:

1. The degree of service quality got an Over-All Weighted Mean of 2.69 which falls under “average quality” category. The Cultural Affairs obtained the highest rating (3.17), while the Reading Centre garnered the lowest rating (1.96).
2. The level of satisfaction obtained an Over-All Weighted Mean of 3.14 which falls under “satisfied” category. In this category, the Scholarship Office obtained the highest rating (3.52), on the other hand, Auxiliary Services got the lowest rating (2.60)
3. Majority of the respondents rank the problems according to the degree of frequency (1 being the most frequent and 13 the least frequent). The top three problems were identified as “delays during enrolment period” (Rank 1), followed by “inconvenient hours of operation” (Rank 2), and “Discourteous and unaccommodating personnel (general)” (Rank 3),
4. The Over-All Weighted Mean Score of service quality and student satisfaction were 2.69 and 3.14 respectively. Meanwhile, for the Standard

Deviation, the values are 0.16 and 0.69 and the z-computed value of 1.91 is lower than the tabular value of 1.95, which tells that there is a significant difference between service quality and student satisfaction.

Conclusions:

1. There is an “average quality” on the level of service quality on services provided by the institution.
2. Majority of respondents were “satisfied” towards the management of student services.
3. Most frequently encountered problems by students in acquiring services provided by the institution were delays during enrolment period, inconvenient hours of operation and discourteous and unaccommodating personnel.
4. There is a significant difference between degree of service quality and level of satisfaction. The students rating to satisfaction is higher than service quality.

Recommendations:

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are hereby offered:

1. Reading Centre should allocate resources to improve service quality, more computer terminals and internet access points must be provided and complete re-arrangement of the library. Likewise, assigned more competent and qualified staff to manage the library.
2. Food Services must provide additional supply of clean drinking water; provide quality food at reasonable prices and conduct regular evaluation of food services with inputs from students and other customers.
3. Registrar’s Office should employ additional personnel in order to cope up with the large volume of request for documents.
4. University Library can purchase additional books for instructional use, require employees to undergo training session on customer service and develop a systematic shelving of books and make use of online cataloguing.
5. Use electronic number systems, strictly follow office hours, utilize student organizations during enrolment periods, proper information dissemination of enrolment procedures, and decentralized enrolment per college.

References:

- [1] Apellado, Joefel G, (2007). Student Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Student Services in Adventist College in the Philippines. CIRCLE, 10,1
- [2] Audin, K., and Davy, J., (2003). University quality of life and learning: an approach to student well-being, satisfaction and institutional change. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27,365-382
- [3] Baker, S.H. (2000). *School Counselling for the twenty-first century*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- [4] Blimling, G. (2001). Uniting scholarship and communities of practice in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*. 42, 381-396
- [5] Casey, L. Quinn, J., Slack, K. and Thomas, L. (2003) Student services project: Effective approaches to retaining students in higher education.
- [6] Cullen, Rowena. (2001) Perspectives on User Satisfaction Surveys. *Library Trends*, 49, 662-688
- [7] Elliot, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: an alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24, 197-209
- [8] Goetsch, D.L and Davis S.B (2003). *Quality Management: Introduction to Total Quality Management for Production, Processing and Services*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [9] Ham, L., & Hayduk, S. (2003). Gaining competitive advantages in higher education: analyzing the gap between expectations and perceptions of service quality. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, 16, 223-242
- [10] Mc Innis, Craig, (2002). Signs of Disengagement: responding to the changing work patterns of full time undergraduates in universities. *Educational Research Information System*
- [11] Mendez III, Vicente Camilo T., (2007), *The Implementation of Electronic Student Record Management Systems Selected Higher Education Institutions in the National Capital Region* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Rizal Technological University, Mandaluyong, Philippines.
- [12] Pascarella, Ernest T. and Terenzini, Patrick T. (2005). *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research*, 2
- [13] Sandeen, A., & Barr, M. J. (2006). *Critical issues for student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [14] Schuh, J. H., & Uprcrat, M. L. (2008). *Assessment methods in student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- [15] Uprcrat, M. L., & Schuh, J. H. (1996). *Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
