Satisfaction on the Student Personnel Services of UM Digos College: Basis for a Service Enhancement Program

Glenda Marie H. Mandoñahan[1]**, Alexis Jaime A. Manocdoc**[2]**, Richard B. Mortillero**[3]**, and Marvin M. Cruz**[4,5]*

[1]UM Digos College, Digos City, Davao del Sur, Philippines
[2]College of Law, University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines
[3]Records and Admission Center, University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines
[4]Professional Schools, University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines
[5]Ateneo de Davao University, Davao City, Philippines

*Corresponding email: **marvin.cruz@umindanao.edu.ph**

ABSTRACT

This study determined the satisfaction on the student personnel services of UM Digos College. Non-experimental quantitative research, grounded on a descriptive-evaluative design, was used to describe the level of satisfaction on the student personnel services as well as assess if there are significant differences on students' satisfaction in the eight areas under the student personnel services when grouped according to their profile. Independent sample *t*-test and one-way analysis of variance were the statistical tools used to

address the research problems. Results revealed that the level of satisfaction of students towards the student personnel services is highly satisfactory in all areas. Furthermore, there was no significant difference on students' satisfaction on the student personnel services, except for Learning and Information Center, when students are grouped according to age. There were significant differences on students' satisfaction on the areas of student personnel services, except for the Clinic, when students are grouped according to sex. Lastly, there were no significant differences on the students' satisfaction on the areas of student personnel services, except for the Records and Admission Center and Learning and Information Center, when students are grouped according to their program/department. An intervention plan in the form of service enhancement program was proposed based on the findings.

Keywords: *office management, satisfaction, student personnel services, descriptive research design, Philippines*

INTRODUCTION

Both private and public organizations are faced with increased social and economic change and competition that make continuous renewal and adaptation crucial. Institutional strategies that encourage quality and promote innovation among its stakeholders have been increasingly recognized as key factors in long-term survival (Moynihan, 2005; Xu, Chen, Xie, Liu, Zheng & Wang, 2007; Ambrosini & Bowman, 2009). This implies that the success of an organization may well depend on its capacity to manage and adapt to various challenges.

Globally, the current century has brought profound challenges to the nature, values, and control of higher education in the global sphere. Societal expectations and public resources for higher education have been undergoing fundamental shifts (Akour & Alenezi, 2022; Giesenbauer & Müller-Christ, 2020; Treve, 2021). With these changes, there has been increasing demands for institutional accountability and internal quality management, better quality of services of higher education offices, both academic and non-academic alike, and call for accreditation to recognized institutions (Fernandes & Singh, 2022; Kumar, Shukla & Passey, 2020; Manatos, Rosa & Sarrico, 2018).

In the Philippines, the need to be innovative in serving clients must be coupled with the needs of the times. However, higher education institutions, which are considered as a service industry, were below the required level of standards and educational innovations expected (Kilag et al., 2023; Welch, 2011). The recent drop of rankings of universities in the dynamic and ever-changing learning environment, notwithstanding if the services are academic- or non-academic by nature, entails that the students do not just see the academic side of their learning, but with the support services of the school also (Olvido, 2022).

Locally, the same situation is manifested in a university system like University of Mindanao. In Digos City, the UM Digos College has been on track of the quality of student personnel services as assessed by its primary clienteles – the students. Two accreditation reports detailed the deficiencies of UM Digos College which must be addressed to ensure satisfaction among its students and maintain standard quality education, as gleaned from the PACUCOA Accreditation Committee Report in year 2011. As it gears itself toward the next quality assessment mandated by the Commission on Higher Education

(CHEd) thru the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA), the University must ensure that it has prepared its key areas that support academic learning.

Considering the challenges and the problems mentioned in this study, which are yet to be resolved, the researchers developed an ardent interest in determining how satisfied the students are towards the student personnel services in UM Digos College. Therefore, the study was conducted.

Research Objective

The study determined the satisfaction on student personnel services of UM Digos College. Specifically, it sought to address the following objectives:

1. Determine the overall satisfaction of students towards the services of UM Digos Campus in the following areas:

        1.1 Cashier's Office;

        1.2 Clinic;

        1.3 Guidance and Testing Center;

        1.4 Learning and Information Center;

        1.5 Office of the Student and Alumni Affairs;

        1.6 Records and Admission Center;

        1.7 Student Accounts Office; and

        1.8 UMPX Canteen.

2. Ascertain if there are any significant mean differences on the student personnel services ratings when analyzed according to student profile.

Theoretical Framework

The theory that guides this research is the "happy-productive" student proposition of Cotton, Dollard and de

Jonge (2002), which suggests that student satisfaction is mediated by psychosocial factors such as coping, stress and well-being. The "happy-productive" theory provided evidence that high levels of psychological distress at university related to lower satisfaction.

Moreover, the pronouncement of Astin (1984) on student satisfaction in business transactions includes universities and colleges as service units or providers. Accordingly, since students are the most direct recipient or "client" of services provided by universities and its offices, it is obvious that they have strong identification and attachment and are capable of assessing student services based on personal satisfaction. Such pronouncements are resonated in later works of scholars (Clemes, Gan & Kao, 2008; Hasan et al., 2009; Arambewela & Hall, 2009), who made mention that satisfaction on services is reflected in the ability to help build up customer loyalty, enhance favorable word-of-mouth, lead-to-repeat purchases, market competitiveness, improve the company's market share, and profitability, among others (Eggert & Ulaga, 2002; Chang & Tu, 2005; Helgesen, 2006; Wangenheim & Bayón, 2007; Brown & Mazzarol, 2009).

The theories mentioned provide a strong theoretical foundation for the development of this study. The theories agreed that in order to maintain and improve students' satisfaction, the services of the school or university must be considered as an important goal of education. A key factor of student satisfaction is the quality of the services extenuated by a school like UM Digos College. As a result, the use of student rating scales as an evaluative component of their service delivery system agrees on the presumption that student satisfaction is indicative of institutional effectiveness.

METHOD

Research Design. The study utilized a quantitative non-experimental research design following a descriptive-evaluative design. As defined by Polit and Beck (2004), descriptive research describes *what it is*, such that it involves the description, recording, analysis and interpretation of the present nature, composition of processes of phenomena. It is in this context that the descriptive type of research was employed in this study to examine the satisfaction of students towards the student personnel services of UM Digos College and characterize them in terms of levels.

Respondents. The study involved the third- and fourth-year students enrolled in the second semester of SY 2012-2013 as the respondents of the services they receive from each of the academic support offices. They were purposively-chosen since they can give a better and sounder judgment as to the quality of the services they receive from the University, considering their length of stay in its portals. They were asked to rate the service quality of the said offices and the degree of their satisfaction.

The participants were chosen purposively yet in random, as their total population was quite large enough to be taken as a final sample. A representative number of students were taken from each department based on the percentage of representation/distribution of students to the whole population.

Department	Sample	Percentage
Business Administration	74	35.2
Nursing	13	6.2
Education	58	27.6
Criminal Justice	31	14.8

Information Technology	34	16.2
Total	**210**	**100**

Research Instruments. The researchers adopted the University's survey instrument of student satisfaction (2010 Version) on its Student Personnel Services. It is a 12-item questionnaire, of which 11 questions involve the evaluation of students towards the level of satisfaction of the SPS office/s, while the twelfth question involves dichotomous answer, asking if the student is satisfied overall or not. The instrument followed the 1-5 Likert scale of measure. Below is the 5-point scale basis in giving interpretation for student satisfaction on Student Personnel Services:

Range of Means	Verbal Description	Descriptive Interpretation
4.20 – 5.00	very satisfactory	The measure described in the item is done at all times.
3.40 – 4.19	satisfactory	The measure described in the item is done oftentimes.
2.60 – 3.39	moderately satisfactory	The measure described in the item is uncertain.
1.80 – 2.59	unsatisfactory	The measure described in the item is done for just a while in long time gap.
1.00 – 1.79	very unsatisfactory	The measure described in the item is never done a single time.

The instrument was used and has been adopted by the University of Mindanao system and is continuously validated by its resident accreditation committee and quality assurance team for suitability. However, for the questionnaire to be suitable for the intent of the study and for the localized nature of the study (which involved students of UM Digos College), certain steps were done to ensure its reliability and consistency. The researchers then employed Cronbach's α to determine the composite reliability of the items, which will then be used in every department/area of the Student Personnel Services of UM Digos College. For the survey instrument to be highly and acceptably reliable, it must not go below 0.70. Employing Cronbach's α, the researchers came up with very high reliability on the 11-item scale as it applies to every SPS unit. Lastly, the final part of the survey instrument included qualitative questions to elicit ideas and opinions on how to improve the service quality of the SPS units of the University.

Data Collection Procedures. The researchers drafted a letter addressed to the Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Mindanao signed by the research adviser, asking for approval to conduct the study. After the approval, the researchers wrote a letter to the Assistant Vice-President (AVP) of University of Mindanao Digos Campus, asking her permission to allow the researchers conduct the study in the campus and that such study will involve the investigation of the services of the SPS units of the Branch which will be ascertained by the student-respondents.

Upon the approval of the study by the AVP of UM Digos and the final improvement of the survey instruments, the researchers coordinated with the Office of the AVP of UMDC for the schedule of the conduct of the survey to the student-respondents. In the same manner, the masterlist of all third, fourth and graduating students were secured from the Records

and Admission Center (RAC). The researchers then commenced the survey process on the students, taking consideration of the process not to interfere with the respondents' regular classes. A masterlist of student-respondents on each time period will be posted in the form of announcements to ensure their appearance as well as to conform to the AVP's condition that the survey will be in an orderly, systematic process. A total of 210 student respondents were able to participate in the study. The researchers oriented the students of the study's intent and purpose, giving clear instructions and assuring the anonymity of their responses. The survey questionnaires were then distributed, and a time limit of 15 minutes is allotted for them to finish the evaluation.

After the retrieval of the questionnaires, the researchers then coded, encoded, summarized and treated the results individually with the intended statistical treatment. The summarized results were then readied for interpretation – such will be essential to address the questions this study sought to answer.

Statistical Tools. The researchers used the following statistical tests in analyzing and interpreting the data and result of the survey: **weighted mean** was used to test the level of satisfaction of the students on the student personnel services of UM Digos College, while **parametric tests of difference (independent sample *t*-test and one-way analysis of variance)** were used to determine any significant differences on the level of satisfaction when analyzed according to student profile.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Presented in Table 1 is the level of student satisfaction with the student personnel services of UM Digos College, with the overall mean of 4.33 with a descriptive equivalent of very highly satisfied, indicating that the students perceive that the offices performed excellent and that all indicators were found to be done all of the time, with exception to the Learning and Information Center (LIC), which was found to be rated the least but highly satisfactory. The overall mean was the result obtained from the mean of the indicators for the specific items from the questionnaire intended for this particular indicator which is appended in this study.

More so, the offices that garnered the highest ratings are the Cashier's Office and the Student Accounts' Office (SAO), both are having an overall mean of 4.41, which is described as very highly satisfactory. This means that both offices were able to fulfil students' expectations based on the services, which include having clear guidelines in availing of service, having functional and adequate equipment and devices, showing a pleasing personal appearance, having an easy-to-follow procedures, being courteous in dealing with customers, having properly trained and skillful staff, being friendly and accommodating, providing prompt service, and ensuring fast service.

The Cashier's Office and Student Accounts' Office are followed by the Clinic with a mean of 4.40, described as very satisfactory; Guidance and Testing Center with a mean of 4.38, described as very satisfactory; Office of the Student and Alumni Affairs (OSAA) and Records and Admission Center (RAC), both with a mean of 4.35 that is described as very satisfactory; and the Canteen/UMPX. On the other hand, student personnel service office that was rated the least was the Learning and

Information Center (LIC), having a mean of 4.12, which is described as satisfactory.

Table 1. *Level of Satisfaction towards the Student Personnel Services of UM Digos College*

SPS Area	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Cashier's Office	4.41	0.741	very satisfactory
Clinic	4.40	0.821	very satisfactory
Guidance and Testing (GSTC)	4.38	0.903	very satisfactory
Learning and Information (LIC)	4.12	0.682	satisfactory
Student Affairs/Alumni (OSAA)	4.35	0.625	very satisfactory
Records and Admission (RAC)	4.35	0.664	very satisfactory
Student Accounts (SAO)	4.41	0.886	very satisfactory
Canteen (UMPX)	4.24	0.717	very satisfactory
Overall	4.33	0.619	very satisfactory

The very high satisfaction of the students in these two offices implies that the offices are indeed meeting and exceeding the expected service deliverables. This pronouncement coheres with the statements of Wong and Sohal (2003), Athanasopoulou (2009), and Jamal and Anastasiadou (2009), whose studies unanimously agreed that competitive advantage lies in delivering high quality services that will in turn result in satisfied customers. Moreover, very high satisfaction in the part of the students is a proof of satisfied customers. As it was reverberated in the respective pronouncements of Hansemark and Albinsson (2004), Lam, Shankar, Erramilli and Murthy (2004), and Johnson and

Gustafsson (2006), a satisfied customer often stays loyal longer, and is likely to patronize the firm in future.

Table 2 shows the statistical treatments of the mean scores of the respondents when they are grouped according to their age. This study utilized bracketing only for the purpose of consolidating nearly similar ages of the respondents. Though variance is accurately attained when respondents respond to actual age, the age brackets provide a nearly similar result. The mean scores were tested per student personnel service area to check of there are variances on their services, as each student personnel service area have distinct services of their own.

Results reveal that the satisfaction scores on the Learning and Information Center has a computed F-value of 2.832 with a p-value of 0.001, which is significant at 0.05 level. This indicates that there are significant differences on the satisfaction on the services of the LIC when students are grouped according to age.

On the other hand, results revealed that are no significant differences in the satisfaction of the students towards the following student personnel service areas: Cashier's Office satisfaction ratings do not vary as to age, as evidenced by the F-value of 1.374, with a p-value of 0.163, which is not significant at 0.05 level. The Clinic's ratings do not significantly vary as to students' age, evidenced by the computed F-value of 0.853, with a p-value of 0.617, which is not significant at 0.05 level. The Guidance and Testing Center has a computed F-value was 1.554, with a p-value of 0.090, which is not significant at the 0.05 level. Similar results were attained for the Office of the Student and Alumni Affairs (F=1.297, p=0.207), Records and Admission Center (F=0.979, p=0.479), Student Accounts Office (F=0.915, p=0.548) and UMPX Canteen (F=1.096, p=0.362). This indicates that the satisfaction of students on the services of these student personnel service

areas does not significantly differ when looking at their different age brackets.

Table 2. *Significant Difference of SPS Offices Ratings when Grouped According to Students' Age*

SPS Area	Age Bracket	Mean	F	p-value	Decision on Ho
Cashier	< 18 years	4.32	1.374	0.163^{ns}	Not Rejected
	19-23 years	4.29			
	24-26 years	4.26			
	27-30 years	4.20			
	Above 31 years	4.15			
Clinic	< 18 years	4.28	0.853	0.617^{ns}	Not Rejected
	19-23 years	4.38			
	24-26 years	4.58			
	27-30 years	4.62			
	Above 31 years	4.21			
Guidance	< 18 years	4.16	1.554	0.090^{ns}	Not Rejected
	19-23 years	4.28			
	24-26 years	4.15			
	27-30 years	4.38			
	Above 31 years	4.59			
LIC	< 18 years	4.26	2.832	0.001^{**}	Rejected
	19-23 years	4.35			
	24-26 years	4.10			
	27-30 years	4.74			
	Above 31 years	3.96			
OSAA	< 18 years	4.26	1.297	0.207^{ns}	

	19-23 years	4.58			Not Rejected
	24-26 years	4.45			
	27-30 years	4.49			
	Above 31 years	4.39			
RAC	< 18 years	4.24	0.979	0.479[ns]	Not Rejected
	19-23 years	4.08			
	24-26 years	4.36			
	27-30 years	4.25			
	Above 31 years	4.29			
SAO	< 18 years	4.23	.915	.548[ns]	Not Rejected
	19-23 years	4.10			
	24-26 years	4.34			
	27-30 years	4.27			
	Above 31 years	4.11			
UMPX	< 18 years	4.43	1.096	0.362[ns]	Not Rejected
	19-23 years	4.30			
	24-26 years	4.34			
	27-30 years	4.47			
	Above 31 years	4.11			

Moreover, table 3 shows the results of the *t*-test conducted to the satisfaction ratings' means per SPS component, with the assumption that there are differences of the mean scores when they are grouped into male and female groups. The *t*-values are presented, along with the significance values and interpretations.

Results reveal that the student satisfaction ratings of the following offices have significant differences when analyzed by sex: Cashier's Office with computed t-value of 2.380, $p < 0.05$;

Table 3. *Significant Difference of SPS Offices Ratings When Grouped According to Respondents' Sex*

SPS Areas	Sex	Mean	t	p-value	Decision on Ho
Cashier	Male	4.52	2.380	0.018*	Rejected
	Female	4.33			
Clinic	Male	4.48	1.650	0.100^{ns}	Not Rejected
	Female	4.35			
Guidance	Male	4.47	2.117	0.035*	Rejected
	Female	4.30			
LIC	Male	4.24	2.104	0.037*	Rejected
	Female	4.03			
OSAA	Male	4.47	2.648	0.009**	Rejected
	Female	4.26			
RAC	Male	4.48	2.892	0.004**	Rejected
	Female	4.23			
SAO	Male	4.55	3.112	0.002**	Rejected
	Female	4.30			
UMPX	Male	4.36	2.360	0.019*	Rejected
	Female	4.16			

Guidance and Testing Center with computed t-value of 2.117, $p<0.05$; Learning and Information Center with computed t-value of 2.104, $p<0.05$; Office of the Students and Alumni Affairs

with computed t-value of 2.648, $p<0.05$; Records and Admission Center with computed t-value of 2.892, $p<0.05$; Student Accounts' Office with computed t-value of 3.112, $p<0.05$; and UMPX Canteen with a computed t-value of 2.360, $p<0.05$. Having significant differences, it was found out that male students expressed higher satisfaction compared with their female counterparts in these offices.

On the other hand, the ratings of the Clinic were found to have no significant differences between the male and female students, having a computed t-value of 1.650 with a p-value of 0.100, which is greater than 0.05 significance level. This means that the overall satisfaction of males and females do not significantly vary. This indicates that the ratings of the students on the services of the Clinic were close to one another across the sample, and that age is not a discriminating factor in assessing this area's satisfaction.

Lastly, table 4 illustrates the results of the one-way analysis of variance of satisfaction of the students per student personnel service area when analyzed by program (department). Results reveal that student satisfaction means of the Learning and Information Center per department have a computed F-value of 4.461, $p<0.05$, while those of Records and Admission Center have a computed F-value of 3.117, $p<0.05$, which are both significant at the 0.05 level. Having significant differences, it was found out that male students expressed higher satisfaction compared with their female counterparts in these offices. A further test of multiple comparison revealed that in terms of satisfaction on the Learning and Information Center, students from IT and Criminology programs have higher satisfaction compared to students from the Nursing program, while in terms of satisfaction on the services of the Records and Admission Center, IT students tend to express higher satisfaction significantly different from Education.

Table 4. *Significant Difference of SPS Offices Ratings When Grouped According to Respondents' Department*

SPS Area	Department	Mean	F	p-value	Decision on Ho
Cashier	CBA	4.42	1.504	0.202[ns]	Not Rejected
	Education	4.19			
	Criminology	4.46			
	IT	4.50			
	Nursing	4.45			
Clinic	CBA	4.38	1.805	0.129[ns]	Not Rejected
	Education	4.18			
	Criminology	4.48			
	IT	4.52			
	Nursing	4.41			
Guidance	CBA	4.36	1.452	0.218[ns]	Not Rejected
	Education	4.28			
	Criminology	4.35			
	IT	4.58			
	Nursing	4.29			
LIC	CBA	4.16	4.461	0.002**	Rejected
	Education	4.05			
	Criminology	4.20			
	IT	4.24			
	Nursing	3.36			
OSAA	CBA	4.36	1.452	0.218[ns]	Not Rejected
	Education	4.28			
	Criminology	4.35			
	IT	4.59			
	Nursing	4.29			
RAC	CBA	4.34	3.177	0.015*	Rejected
	Education	4.07			
	Criminology	4.36			

	IT	4.55			
	Nursing	4.19			
SAO	CBA	4.43	2.233	0.067[ns]	Not
	Education	4.20			Rejected
	Criminology	4.44			
	IT	4.57			
	Nursing	4.21			
UMPX	CBA	4.22	1.050	0.383[ns]	Not
	Education	4.09			Rejected
	Criminology	4.29			
	IT	4.38			
	Nursing	4.18			

On the other hand, the study found out that there are no significant differences on the satisfaction of the students towards the following student personnel services office when analyzed by program/department: Cashier's Office, with a computed F-value of 1.504 with a p-value of 0.202, which is greater than 0.05; Clinic, with a computed F-value of 1.805 with a p-value of 0.129, which is greater than 0.05; Guidance and Testing Center, with a computed F-value of 1.452 with a p-value of 0.218, which is greater than 0.05; Office of the Students and Alumni Affairs, with a computed F-value of 1.452 with a p-value of 0.218, which is greater than 0.05; Student Accounts Office, with a computed F-value of 2.233 with p-value of 0.067, which is greater than 0.05; and UMPX Canteen, with a computed F-value of 1.050 with a p-value of 0.383, which is also not significant at the 0.05. The result indicates that the satisfaction ratings of the students in these areas do not significantly differ, therefore almost similar, when they are grouped according to their program (department).

The findings are consistent with the claim of several authors, including Mukhopadhyay (2005), Martín (2006) and Muniapan (2008), who averred that older students to be more dubious and particular on what services they receive. This is grounded on the belief that the success of the total academic operation depends upon an institution's capability to improve the quality of its academic and non-academic offices alike, and that student personnel services must take into consideration the differences of student demography to suit with their respective individual and collective needs.

On a similar note, based on t-test for independent samples, there exists significant difference on students' satisfaction on the student personnel services of UM Digos College when analyzed by students' sex, except for the Clinic. Having significant differences, it was found out that male students expressed higher satisfaction compared with their female counterparts in these offices. These findings are contrary with the pronouncements of the studies of Pegden and Tucker (2009) and Alhija and Fresko (2009) that posited higher assessment scores of females than males in student services in the Australian setting. Moreover, the study of Aldeguer (2005) found out that female students are more appreciative of services extended to them in the context of a specific university unit in Manila.

Lastly, there are no significant differences on satisfaction on the student personnel services of UMDC when students are grouped to program (department), except for the Records and Admission Center and Learning and Information Center. A closer look on the areas with significant difference revealed that in terms of satisfaction on the Learning and Information Center, students from IT and Criminology programs have higher satisfaction compared to students from the Nursing program, while in terms of satisfaction on the

services of the Records and Admission Center, IT students tend to express higher satisfaction significantly different from students coming from Education programs. The low rating of the BS Nursing students can also be attributed to the strict policies of the Learning and Information Center with regards to personnel taking charge in the loaning out of textbooks and references in the Nursing program that are mostly scanty and limited. Moreover, the current opening of the BSIT program lends to the fact that more books and updated references are prioritized at the time of the evaluation, which may also have contributed to the high assessment of the students from this program. As for the Records and Admission Center, the variance may be attributed to the departmentalized accommodation of students in a manner that there is personnel in-charge for students coming from different departments. Having these in mind, it is therefore important for an institution of higher learning to focus on the first of these target customers and the quality of what students expect from their university (Blasco & Saura, 2006; Koris et al., 2015; Kundu, 2017).

Proposed Intervention Program

Title: *Service Enhancement Proposal for UMDC Student Personnel Services*

Proponent/s: Mandoñahan, Glenda Marie H.
Manocdoc, Alexis Jaime A.
Mortillero, Richard B.

Rationale

At the center of all academic and non-academic activities in higher institutions are students who are to be educated in various disciplines in order to make them worthy both in learning and character at graduation. In order to

achieve this objective, effective management of students' personnel services need to be provided. This is important particularly in the face of the decline in the quality of graduates produced globally by higher institutions and the challenge of producing well-educated, functional, cultured, disciplined, productive and employable graduates.

For higher education institutions like UM Digos College, there is the need to put in place adequate students' personnel services and to manage them in order to produce graduates that can meet the challenges of global competitiveness. Premised on these facts, the task of producing quality graduates in our higher educational institutions depends greatly on the proper management of students' personnel services. As a result, the study the researcher conducted revealed very high level of satisfaction of college students on all student personnel services of UM Digos College, yet the Learning and Information Center got the lowest score despite garnering a satisfactory rating (> 4.0). Moreover, staff accommodation came with varying levels of satisfaction among students across demographics and in almost all areas. With these results in mind, a service efficiency enhancement program focused on improving service efficiency of staff is proposed.

Objectives

The activity aims to:

1. Inculcate in the participants the importance of efficient client service approaches to ensure highly satisfactory ratings;
2. Provide standards on client concerns management with emphasis on proper feedbacks handling and communication; and

3. Learn the how-to's of effective service efficiency based from industry standards that can be applicable to UM Digos College student services personnel.

Target Beneficiaries
- All employees under the SPS cluster
- All STAs assigned in SPS offices

Inclusive Dates
To be conducted three times annually (April, August and November)

Venue
Instructional Resource Center/Accreditation Room, UMDC
Resource Speakers
Dr. Michelle Y. Acledan   **Miss Gina Prohorrov**
AVP, HRDC   Transformational Speaker

Budget

Honorarium for Speaker/Facilitator	Php 20,000.00
*** Php 10,000/day for external facilitator***	
Tokens for Speakers/Facilitators	Php 1,500.00
Certificates/frame	Php 1,000.00
Ink for toner/printer	Php 800.00
AM/PM Snacks (50 pax x Php 40 x 2 x 2 days)	Php 8,000.00
Buffet Lunch (50 pax x Php 250 x 2 days)	Php 25,000.00
Total	**Php 56,300.00**

Source of funding: **Employee Development Fund**

Programme

Seminar on Customer Satisfaction
Venue: IRC, UM Digos Campus
8:00 am - 4:00 pm

Time:	Activity
8:00 AM	Registration/Attendance
8:15 AM	Preliminaries
• Opening Prayer	
• National Anthem	
• UM Hymn	
8:30 AM	Welcome Message
	Dr. Tessie G. Miralles
	VP/BOO, UMDC
8:45 AM	Seminar Proper
	Miss Gina Prohorrov
	Transformational Speaker
10:45	Light Snacks
11:00	Continuation
12:00	Lunch
1:00	Workshop
3:30	Synthesis
	Dr. Michelle Acledan
	AVP, HRDC
4:00	Giving of Certificates
*** Program to be facilitated by a Xenia-trained host	

Evaluation/Follow-up
- Standard evaluation form from UM-Human Resource Development Center will be used. Evaluation will be facilitated by the HRDC staff.
- Focus-group discussions will be conducted by the proponents as a means of follow-up.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The level of satisfaction of students towards the student personnel service areas is predominantly very satisfactory, except for the Learning and Information Center that was rated satisfactory. This means that the student personnel service areas were able to fulfil students' expectations based on the services, which include having clear guidelines in availing of service, having functional and adequate equipment and devices, showing a pleasing personal appearance, having an easy-to-follow procedures, being courteous in dealing with customers, having properly trained and skillful staff, being friendly and accommodating, providing prompt service, and ensuring fast service.

There is no significant difference on students' satisfaction on the student personnel services of UMDC when students are grouped according to age, except for Guidance and Testing Center. Similarly, there are significant differences on satisfaction on the student personnel services of UMDC when students are grouped to sex, except for the Clinic. Lastly, there are no significant differences on satisfaction on the student personnel services of UMDC when students are grouped to program (department), except for the Records and Admission Center and Learning and Information Center.

Recommendations

Looking at the results and the conclusions drawn beforehand, these recommendations are elicited:

For the students, make use of available means of showing a time-to-time assessment of the services of the College's student personnel services by accessing all of its

services and addressing concerned employees and in-charge of their suggestions to improve their services.

For UM Digos College's Management Council as well as its Committee of Student Personnel Services, suggest for the adoption of the results of the study as a basis for: (a) improvement of the services of the eight areas of the SPS; (b) strategic planning and formulation of revitalized student personnel service operational guidelines that utilize the findings of the study; and (c) institutional research.

For the future researchers, make use of the study as one of the bases in the conduct of researches on the student personnel services areas using various quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

REFERENCES

Akour, M., & Alenezi, M. (2022). Higher education future in the era of digital transformation. *Education Sciences*, *12*(11), 784.

Aldeguer, C. C. (2005). Institute *of Accounts, Business and Finance at Far Eastern University, Philippines: An organizational behavior analysis*. Accessed last May 17, 2008 from http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2429992.

Alhija, F. N. A., & Fresko, B. (2009). Student evaluation of instruction: what can be learned from students' written comments?. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 35(1), 37-44.

Ambrosini, V., & Bowman, C. (2009). What are dynamic capabilities and are they a useful construct in strategic management?. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11(1), 29-49.

Arambewela, R., & Hall, J. (2009). An empirical model of international student satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 21(4), 555-569.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.

Athanasopoulou, P. (2009). Relationship quality: a critical literature review and research agenda. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(5/6), 583-610.

Blasco, M. F., & Saura, I. G. (2006). Segmenting university students on the basis of their expectations. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *16*(1), 25-45.

Brown, R. M., & Mazzarol, T. W. (2009). The importance of institutional image to student satisfaction and loyalty within higher education. *Higher Education*, 58(1), 81-95.

Chang, C. H., & Tu, C. Y. (2005). Exploring store image, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty relationship: evidence from Taiwanese hypermarket industry. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 7(2), 197-202.

Clemes, M. D., Gan, C. E., & Kao, T. H. (2008). University student satisfaction: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *17*(2), 292-325.

Cotton, S. J., Dollard, M. F., & de Jonge, J. (2002). Stress and student job design: Satisfaction, well-being, and performance in university students. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *9*, 147-162.

Eggert, A., & Ulaga, W. (2002). Customer perceived value: a substitute for satisfaction in business markets?. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 17(2/3), 107-118.

Fernandes, J. O., & Singh, B. (2022). Accreditation and ranking of higher education institutions (HEIs): review, observations and recommendations for the Indian

higher education system. *The TQM Journal*, *34*(5), 1013-1038.

Giesenbauer, B., & Müller-Christ, G. (2020). University 4.0: Promoting the transformation of higher education institutions toward sustainable development. *Sustainability*, *12*(8), 3371.

Hansemark, O. C., & Albinsson, M. (2004). Customer satisfaction and retention: the experiences of individual employees. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 14(1), 40-57.

Hasan, H. F. A., Ilias, A., Rahman, R. A., & Razak, M. Z. A. (2009). Service quality and student satisfaction: A case study at private higher education institutions. *International Business Research*, 1(3), 163.

Helgesen, Ø. (2006). Are loyal customers profitable? Customer satisfaction, customer (action) loyalty and customer profitability at the individual level. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22(3-4), 245-266.

Jamal, A., & Anastasiadou, K. (2009). Investigating the effects of service quality dimensions and expertise on loyalty. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(3/4), 398-420.

Johnson, M., & Gustafsson, A. (2006). *Improving customer satisfaction, loyalty and profit: An integrated measurement and management system*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kilag, O. K. T., Zarco, J. P., Zamora, M. B., Caballero, J. D., Yntig, C. A. L., Suba-an, J. D., & Sasan, J. M. V. (2023). How does Philippines's education system compared to Finland's?. *European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education*, *3*(6), 11-20.

Koris, R., Örtenblad, A., Kerem, K., & Ojala, T. (2015). Student-customer orientation at a higher education institution: The perspective of undergraduate business

students. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *25*(1), 29-44.

Kumar, P., Shukla, B., & Passey, D. (2020). Impact of accreditation on quality and excellence of higher education institutions. *Investigación Operacional*, *41*(2), 151-167.

Kundu, G. K. (2017). Wuality in higher education from different perspectives: a literature review. *International Journal for Quality Research*, *11*(1).

Lam, S. Y., Shankar, V., Erramilli, M. K., & Murthy, B. (2004). Customer value, satisfaction, loyalty, and switching costs: an illustration from a business-to-business service context. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(3), 293-311.

Manatos, M. J., Rosa, M. J., & Sarrico, C. S. (2018). Quality management in universities: towards an integrated approach?. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, *35*(1), 126-144.

Martín, E. (2006). Efficiency and Quality in the Current Higher Education Context in Europe: an application of the data envelopment analysis methodology to performance assessment of departments within the University of Zaragoza. *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), 57-79.

Moynihan, D. P. (2005). Goal-based learning and the future of performance management. *Public Administration Review*, 65(2), 203-216.

Mukhopadhyay, M. (2005). *Total quality management in education*. Sage.

Muniapan, B. (2008). Perspectives and reflections on management education in Malaysia. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 2(1), 77-87.

Olvido, M. M. (2022). Developing research cultures in teacher education institutions: the gestation-expansion-maturation theory. *Routledge Open Research*, *1*(14), 14.

Pegden, J., & Tucker, B. (2009). Student evaluation of their learning: Differences in male and female students' perceptions of their units. In *7th Annual Australasian Higher Education Evaluation Forum* (pp. 21-23).

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2004). *Nursing research: Principles and methods*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Treve, M. (2021). What COVID-19 has introduced into education: Challenges facing higher education institutions (HEIs). *Higher Education Pedagogies*, *6*(1), 212-227.

Wangenheim, F. V., & Bayón, T. (2007). The chain from customer satisfaction via word-of-mouth referrals to new customer acquisition. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35(2), 233-249.

Welch, A. (2011). *Higher education in Southeast Asia: Blurring borders, changing balance*. Routledge.

Wong, A., & Sohal, A. (2003). Service quality and customer loyalty perspectives on two levels of retail relationships. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17(5), 495-513.

Xu, Q., Chen, J., Xie, Z., Liu, J., Zheng, G., & Wang, Y. (2007). Total Innovation Management: a novel paradigm of innovation management in the 21st century. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 32(1-2), 9-25.