Client Satisfaction on the Services of University of Baguio Support Offices

Froilan Aspa[1]* (ORCID No. 0000-0002-1894-7740), **Leny Estacio[2]** (ORCID No. 0000-0002-9375-4252),
Nona Christina Gabriel[3] (ORCID No. 0000-0003-1463-4349),

[1]Office of Student Affairs, University of Baguio, Baguio City, Philippines
[2]Center for Counseling and Student Development, University of Baguio, Baguio City, Philippines
[3]Research and Development Center, University of Baguio, Baguio City, Philippines
*Corresponding Author: froilancas@e.ubaguio.edu, Second author : estacio_l@e.ubaguio.edu, Third Author: ngabriel@e.ubaguio.edu

ABSTRACT

Customer satisfaction in the educational setting is the experience that students and stakeholders have when interacting with their school or institution. When they experience good customer service, they become happier and more loyal. More so, the provision of customer satisfaction also sets an institution on a competitive edge. Taking these into consideration, the University of Baguio pursued a study to analyze the stakeholders' customer satisfaction with the support offices' different services. The study was carried out through descriptive-survey research where the accomplished client satisfaction survey of the stakeholders who visited the support offices from May 1, 2021, to July 31, 2021, was utilized. Through the analysis of weighted means and the ANOVA, it was found that the different support offices and support office employees were able to provide services that met or went beyond the expectations of the stakeholders. More so, the research findings showed that the stakeholders were very satisfied with the services of the support offices even when there were support office services that were perceived differently by the stakeholders. Thereupon, the university is posed with the challenge of pursuing consistency in providing a satisfactory customer experience through the different services offered.

Introduction

All universities around the globe consider student satisfaction as an important factor in measuring the quality of services provided by the institution (Pamatmat et al., 2018). The provision of quality service to the stakeholders and customer satisfaction sets a university on a competitive edge (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). More so, universities worldwide prioritize continuous development in education, where customer satisfaction provides the metric that can be used for sustained improvement (Orlanda-Ventayen, 2018).

Customer satisfaction in the business setting is described by Chamber and Team (2022) as the key to creating a long-term relationship with customers and where the positive experience leads to more business activities with the customers and, in the long run, leads to customer loyalty. In the educational setting, on the other hand, customer satisfaction refers to the experience that students and stakeholders have when interacting with their school or institution. They become happier and more loyal when they experience good customer service (Freshdesk, n.d.).

In relation, educational institutions have been observed to have become more market-oriented to fulfill the information needs of the target group regarding educational services, degrees, courses, leisure activities, and rankings (Fischer & Suwunphong, 2015; Hemsely-Brown & Oplatka, 2006; Molesworth et al., 2009). This shift was to attract students, build and maintain a certain image, and differentiate themselves from other educational institutions (HemselyBrown & Oplatka, 2006; Mai, 2005), as cited in (Fischer & Suwunphong, 2015). Educational institutions are also aware of the fact that students and parents in this generation look for universities that will give them worthwhile personal and educational experiences (Singh & Singla, 2018). Creating favorable conditions for the students to succeed includes support in terms of the university's services which might lead to retention and loyalty to the university (Miller, 2018).

Also, Kitapci and Taylan (Chandra et al., 2019) state that customers are satisfied whenever the services provided are more than the price paid, and they are dissatisfied whenever services provided are less than the price paid. They added that customer satisfaction does not always relate to complaints, implying that consumers who never complain do not necessarily mean that they are satisfied.

Similarly, the framework proposed by the Expectancy-Disconfirmation Paradigm (EDP) for the assessment of customer satisfaction suggests that consumers purchase goods and services with pre-purchase expectations about the anticipated performance. Thus, once the product or service has been used, the outcomes are compared against expectations. A customer is then either satisfied or dissatisfied as a result of a positive or negative difference between expectations and perceptions (Yüksel & Yüksel, 2008).

Another perspective on customer satisfaction in an educational setting is provided by the model conceptualized (Alves & Raposo, 2010), which suggests that satisfaction is determined by the image of the institution, student expectations, perceived technical quality, functional quality, and perceived value. Therefore, when satisfaction increases, customers are bound to be loyal to the institution.

Yanova (2015) adds that measuring customer satisfaction in education is important when it comes to assessing the quality of education. It allows an institution to evaluate if they can deliver a seamless experience and value to all their customers. More so, it assesses if the services experienced were responsive, available, and service-oriented (Freshdesk, n.d.).

In addition, Rudge (2014) suggests that understanding customer satisfaction with student services can help an institution identify strengths and areas to be improved. Having an in-depth assessment of the factors that contribute to satisfaction can help the university better address the needs of the stakeholders through the services offered.

Further, the study conducted by Chandra et al. (2019) showed that serious attention to service quality provided by universities and colleges is needed because the better the service qualities are provided, the higher the student satisfaction will be (Chandra et al., 2019). They also added that when universities and colleges keep on improving their service quality, they are more able to meet the market demands and compete among higher education institutions.

Comparatively, Philippine universities are considered key players in education, responsible for the integral formation of competent, productive, and service-oriented future members of society (Pamatmat et al., 2018). This leads to higher competition among higher education institutions and fuels the thrust to differentiate themselves from their competitors (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017).

In the study conducted by Micabalo et al. (2020), it was mentioned that when services are executed effectively, the experience provided is higher than what was needed by the recipients. The study further showed that when it comes to students as customers, they generally show satisfaction with student services but would want to have a more extensive school climate.

Students' success depends greatly on their satisfaction with the university they are studying. They need to respond to favorable conditions in the university. These conditions for student success include expectations, support, assessment with feedback, and involvement. To succeed, students need to know the expectations of effort. They need a climate of clear expectations on campus. They need an advising roadmap to success (Miller, 2018).

Therefore, looking into the feedback provided by the stakeholders to the services and the service providers of the University of Baguio can be a rich source of information as to what aspects are to be retained as good practices and what aspects must be improved. More so, the research findings could shed light on what will strengthen the loyalty of the stakeholders of the university.

Specifically, the study aims to investigate the following problems:

1. How do the stakeholders perceive the University of Baguio support offices as service providers?
   a. Admissions and Records Center (ARC),
   b. Campus Planning and Development Office (CPDO),
   c. Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD),
   d. Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS),
   e. Library,
   f. Linkages Office,
   g. Management and Information System (MIS),
   h. Medical and Dental Clinic (MDC),
   i. Office of Student Affairs (OSA),
   j. Research and Development Center (RDC),
   k. Security, and
   l. Student Accounts Office (SAO)

2. How do the stakeholders perceive the University of Baguio support office employees as service providers?
   a. Admissions and Records Center (ARC),
   b. Campus Planning and Development Office (CPDO),
   c. Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD),
   d. Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS),
   e. Library,
   f. Linkages Office,
   g. Management and Information System (MIS),
   h. Medical and Dental Clinic (MDC),
   i. Office of Student Affairs (OSA),
   j. Research and Development Center (RDC),
   k. Security, and
   l. Student Accounts Office (SAO)

3. How satisfied are the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office services?
   a. Admissions and Records Center (ARC),
   b. Campus Planning and Development Office (CPDO),
   c. Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD),
   d. Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS),
   e. Library,
   f. Linkages Office,
   g. Management and Information System (MIS),
   h. Medical and Dental Clinic (MDC),
   i. Office of Student Affairs (OSA),
   j. Research and Development Center (RDC),
   k. Security, and
   l. Student Accounts Office (SAO)

3.1 Is there a significant difference in the satisfaction of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office services when compared according to the office?

Materials and Methods

The study used the descriptive-survey research method, which seeks to describe a population, situation, or phenomenon being studied (Blog, 2021). In this study, the situation to be described is the satisfaction of UB stakeholders with the support office services of the University of Baguio. Further, the total enumeration of the University of Baguio stakeholders who voluntarily accomplished the university client satisfaction survey was included.

The study's target population consisted of all stakeholders who have visited and were served in the respective offices at the University of Baguio from November 2022 to May 2021. The stakeholders consist of students, parents/guardians, visitors/guests, and employees of the university. Table 1 presents the frequency of the stakeholders who availed of an office service and were able to accomplish the client satisfaction survey form during the specified time frame.

Table 1. Frequency of respondents

Support Office	Number of Respondents
Admission and Records Center (ARC)	42
Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD)	15
Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS)	33
Library	50
Linkages	134
MIS	35
Office of Student Affairs (OSA)	83
Research & Development Center (RDC)	78
University Clinic	53
Security	3
Student Accounts	21
Overall Mean	**547**

The tool utilized was the University of Baguio client satisfaction survey version five which has undergone the validity process of the Research and Development Center (RDC). It was comprised of four parts. The first part asked whether the stakeholder has already availed of any service from the office visited, and the second part asked for the frequency with which the service has been availed from the office visit. The third part reflected the different aspects of services, the office, and the employees or staff as service providers. The last part of the questionnaire manifested the aspects of the services provided by the office visited. A visiting stakeholder accomplished the survey in the different support services in the university.

Permission was sought from the Director of the Research and Development Center before mining the data from their office. The collected data were the summary of responses for each student support office: frequency of stakeholders who accomplished the survey form; percentage of the service has been availed or not and how frequent it was availed; mean averages of the different aspects of the office and the office staff as service providers; the mean averages of the different aspects of the services offered and the verbatim responses as regards comments or suggestions to improve the office services.

The data generated from the University of Baguio client satisfaction survey version five were tallied and tabulated. Table 2 presents the Likert scale and descriptive interpretation of the stakeholder's level of agreement and Table 3 presents the Likert scale and descriptive interpretation of the stakeholder's level of satisfaction.

Table 2. Likert scale and descriptive interpretation for the level of agreement

Mean Range	Descriptor	Verbal Meaning	Interpretation
1.00-1.75	Strongly disagree	I have never observed this	The evaluated aspect was never observed by the stakeholder.
1.76-2.50	Disagree	I have sometimes observed this	The evaluated aspect was sometimes observed by the stakeholder.
2.51-3.25	Agree	I have often observed this	The evaluated aspect was often observed by the stakeholder.
3.26-4.00	Strongly Agree	I have always observed this	The evaluated aspect was always observed by the stakeholder.

Table 3. Likert scale and descriptive interpretation for the level of satisfaction

Mean Range	Descriptor	Verbal Meaning	Interpretation
1.00-1.75	Very Dissatisfied	I am not contented with the service; the service does not meet my expectations	The evaluated aspect does not meet the expectations of the stakeholder.
1.76-2.50	Dissatisfied	I am slightly contented with the service; the service sometimes meets my expectations	The evaluated aspect sometimes meets the expectations of the stakeholder.
2.51-3.25	Satisfied	I am contented with the service; the service meets my expectations	The evaluated aspect meets the expectations of the stakeholder.
3.26-4.00	Very Satisfied	I am slightly contented with the service, the service meets my expectations	The evaluated aspect meets the expectations of the stakeholder.

To compare the mean values of the different aspects according to the office, the Anova was used.

As much as the data used has been previously collected through the Research and Development Center (RDC), the researchers ensured that the appropriate process for requesting the data was carried out. All respondents had the option to participate voluntarily and withdraw from the study. The researchers also ensured that the collected data were treated with objectivity and that the research findings were reported

from a neutral perspective. Moreover, the data privacy policy of the university, as well as the ethical consideration of confidentiality, was strictly followed throughout the conduct of the study. Considering that the researchers belong to the support offices, the objective presentation and discussion of the treated data were guaranteed. Further, the research findings will be primarily disseminated to the concerned student support offices and management for proper action. The research findings will also be made available through publication to the community for further study.

Results and Discussions

Sekulov et al. (2020) suggest that in the educational setting, the stakeholders, particularly the students, are the universities' main concerns. That is why the level of their satisfaction consequently influences the success or failure of the universities. It was further suggested that the feedback gathered from stakeholders has a major impact on the future workings of the university. Therefore, it adds that higher education institutions ought to continue offering quality service and satisfy their clients to achieve sustainability in a competitive service environment (DeShields et al., 2005). Thus, this section presents a discussion of the analyzed data.

Perception of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support offices as service providers

Table 4 presents the perception of the stakeholders towards the University of Baguio support offices as service providers, the obtained weighted mean, and the corresponding descriptive interpretation.

University clinics obtained the highest mean of 3.89, which suggests that the support services office provides a high satisfaction level, considering that, at the onset of the pandemic, they are at the forefront of the university's effort to contain the virus. The mean rating of 3.33 of the Admission and Records Center suggests that all the aspects evaluated were always observed; however, the high dispersion of 1.07 suggests otherwise. Some stakeholders were dissatisfied with the services provided by the office. At the time of the data gathering, stakeholders were limited in visiting the university. Thus, it can be the reason for the dissatisfaction among stakeholders who wanted clear instructions on how to process their documents on time.

The overall mean of **3.60** suggests that the stakeholders perceive that the different support offices were able to manifest the aspects which made them efficient as service providers. The aspects which were observed to be displayed by the different support offices pertained to the accessibility of offline and online services, provision of up-to-date information about the services, response to requests at a reasonable timeframe, accurate completion of requests, and the delivery of the requested service with the specified timeframe. Thus, it can be inferred that the different offices generally carried out their role as service providers with excellence.

Table 4. Perception of stakeholders with the University of Baguio support offices as service providers

Support Office	WTD MEAN	SD	Interpretation
Admission and Records Center (ARC)	3.38	1.07	aspect evaluated is always observed
Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD)	3.40	0.82	aspect evaluated is always observed
Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS)	3.52	0.76	aspect evaluated is always observed
Library	3.70	0.61	aspect evaluated is always observed
Linkages	3.84	0.43	aspect evaluated is always observed
MIS	3.80	0.65	aspect evaluated is always observed
Office of Student Affairs (OSA)	3.63	0.64	aspect evaluated is always observed
Research & Development Center (RDC)	3.73	0.47	aspect evaluated is always observed
University Clinic	3.89	0.35	aspect evaluated is always observed
Security	3.33	0.58	aspect evaluated is always observed
Student Accounts	3.33	0.78	aspect evaluated is always observed

Overall Mean	3.60	aspect evaluated is always observed

The satisfaction model of Elliot and Healy (2001) supports the research finding with their statement that service excellence is one of the key factors that influence satisfaction. In addition, HEIs that give proper customer service provide a satisfactory experience (Patalinghug et al., 2021). In contrast, in as much as stakeholders express general satisfaction with services, the issue of accessibility and familiarity with the services influence the service quality (Kutat et al., 2021).

In as much as all the support offices were able to always display the aspects that contribute to satisfactory service quality, differences in the weighted means can be noted. This may be attributed to the subjective evaluation of the outcome and experience that the stakeholder associated with the availed service (Elliot & Zimmerman, 2002). Also, client expectations are said to have a significant contribution to the appraisal of the clients' general view of service quality (Patalinghug et al., 2021). It can also be noted that the stakeholder's responses were not classified. Thus, there might be a difference in their perceptions.

On account of these, the different support offices were perceived as excellent service providers considering that they were always able to display the evaluated aspects. Thus, the support offices are given the challenge to pursue consistency in displaying the evaluated aspects to secure a satisfactory experience for the stakeholders.

Based on the comments from the stakeholders, information dissemination is needed on the available services of the different support offices. School closures due to the pandemic impacted not only the students but also other stakeholders, thus, social media greatly helped information dissemination (Lund & Wang, 2020).

Perception of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office employees as service providers

Table 5 presents the perception of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office employees as service providers, the weighted means, and the interpretation.

Table 5. Perception of stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office employees as service providers

Support Office	WTD MEAN	SD	Interpretation
Admission and Records Center (ARC)	3.48	0.97	aspect evaluated is always observed
Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD)	3.53	0.83	aspect evaluated is always observed
Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS)	3.64	0.74	aspect evaluated is always observed
Library	3.70	0.61	aspect evaluated is always observed
Linkages	3.87	0.40	aspect evaluated is always observed
MIS	3.71	0.57	aspect evaluated is always observed
Office of Student Affairs (OSA)	3.73	0.54	aspect evaluated is always observed
Research & Development Center (RDC)	3.82	0.38	aspect evaluated is always observed
University Clinic	3.79	0.41	aspect evaluated is always observed
Security	3.67	0.58	aspect evaluated is always observed
Student Accounts	3.24	0.77	aspect evaluated is often observed
Overall Mean	3.66		aspect evaluated is always observed

The overall mean of 3.66 insinuates that the employees of the different support offices always manifested the aspects of a satisfactory service provider. The employees were observed to be accommodating, prompt in attending to the concerns of the clients, willing to help, trustworthy, and made the clients comfortable in the provision of their office service/s. The management also encourages its employees to attend customer

services training. Hence, how the employees delivered their office service/s contributed to the overall satisfaction of the stakeholders.

The research finding is corroborated by Micabalo et al. (2020). They mentioned that when services are executed effectively, the experience provided is higher than what was needed by the recipients, thus, leading to a satisfactory customer experience. In addition, the SERVQUAL dimension responsiveness captures the research finding, which Pamatmat et al. (2018) elaborate as the dimension that refers to the availability of officials, faculty, personnel, and staff to assist.

Given the stakeholders' perception of the support office employees as service providers, it can be observed that how the aspects that contribute to a satisfactory quality service were manifested was perceived differently by the stakeholders when it comes to the Student Accounts office. The difference in perception can be explained through the filter theory of Broadbent (1958, as cited in (Bater & Jordan, 2020), which suggests that an individual's perceptual system processes only the information which it believes to be relevant. Accordingly, the individual will be selective in his or her interpretation. In addition, the study by Amoako and Asamoah-Gyimah (2020) showed that the respondents who have observed the university staff as committed to delivering services gave a satisfactory appraisal of the university services.

In light of the derived research finding, the employees of the different support offices were undeniably able always to manifest the aspects and give the impression that they are excellent service providers. However, encouraging the support office personnel to be mindful of how the aspects are manifested will help address the difference in the stakeholders' perception regarding how these aspects were displayed.

Satisfaction of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office services

Table 6 presents the satisfaction of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office services, the weighted means, the descriptor, and the interpretation.

Table 6. Satisfaction of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office services				
Support Office	**WTD MEAN**	**SD**	**Descriptor**	**Interpretation**
Admission and Records Center (ARC)	3.31	1.07	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD)	3.33	0.82	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS)	3.52	0.76	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Library	3.70	0.61	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Linkages	3.83	0.43	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
MIS	3.63	0.65	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Office of Student Affairs (OSA)	3.63	0.64	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Research & Development Center (RDC)	3.73	0.47	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
University Clinic	3.86	0.35	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Security	3.67	0.58	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Student Accounts	3.29	0.78	VS	totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder
Overall Mean	**3.59**		**VS**	**totally meets the expectations of the stakeholder**

Legend: vs- very satisfied

The overall rating of 3.59 means that the delivered services of the University of Baguio totally meet the expectations of the stakeholders. The findings connote that when the stakeholders compare the service outcome against their expectations, service quality is observed, leading to satisfactory customer service.

The research finding is supported by the statement of Abdullah (2006, as cited in (Șerban & Stoian, 2019) that the perceived quality of service depends on the magnitude of the differences between expectations and perceptions. Therefore, the smaller the difference, the higher the quality of the services perceived. Similarly,

Patalinghug et al. (2021) suggest that clients are satisfied when their expectations are fulfilled. The study of Pamatmat et al. (2018), on the other hand, revealed that when customers observe the different dimensions of service quality, their appraisal of customer experience is satisfactory.

In the study of Arora and Narula (2018), service quality positively impacts customer satisfaction and loyalty. A linkage between service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty came out with direct and indirect effects of service quality on customer loyalty through customer satisfaction. Thus, the quality of service each office provides the stakeholders greatly affects their satisfaction. However, Subrahmanyam (2017) revealed that service quality has an indirect effect on student loyalty. He suggested that it would be beneficial for the administration of the institution to allocate resources properly in order to offer better educational services. This study is thought to have a considerable capacity for producing more precise applications relating to service quality, particularly with students' satisfaction, loyalty, and motivation (Subrahmanyam, 2017).

As can be seen, regardless of what office the service was availed of, the stakeholders found the services provided by the University of Baguio very satisfactory. As such, the university has to ensure that the manifested satisfactory service quality will consistently characterize the university services.

Comparison of the Satisfaction of the Stakeholders with the University of Baguio Support Office Services

The perceived service quality mediates the satisfaction and trust in the University (Latif et al., 2021) and the client satisfaction index itself incorporates a subjective evaluation of the service outcome (Zhu & Shek, 2021). Considering these, it would be of interest to look into the satisfaction of the stakeholders when compared according to the office which provided the service/s.

It can be seen from the data presented in Table 7 that the stakeholders perceived no difference in the quality of service provided by most of the support offices. Thus, the similarity of the satisfaction experienced. The results imply that, in general, how the offices delivered the quality of service was relatively the same. The perceived absence of difference as regards the satisfaction experienced by the stakeholders with the UB support office service/s may be attributed to the perceived pleasure of seeing the requested service fulfilled regardless of what support office the service was requested from (Oliver, 2014). Dotchin and Oakland (1994, as cited in Pamatmat et al., 2018) also suggest that customers are satisfied when their requirements and hopes are fulfilled. The awareness of the non-teaching employees with the importance of the support role carried out in achieving the University's vision, mission, and institutional objectives can also explain the commitment to keep customers satisfied (University of Baguio Revised Manual for Non-teaching Personnel, 2017, p. 22).

Further, the difference in the experienced satisfaction of the stakeholders can be observed from the Library, Management Information System (MIS), and Office of Student Affairs (OSA). The Student Affairs and Services programs found few faults with the personnel and the delivery of services, accessibility of and familiarity with essential services (Kutat et al., 2021). The disparity may be due to factors influencing customer satisfaction, such as customer understanding, the service itself, and deliverability (Carter, 2017; Commence, 2018).

In the study of Twum et al. (2022), all the service quality dimensions had a significant positive relationship with library user satisfaction, except for the exception of the library as a place. The study further established a significant positive relationship between user satisfaction and user loyalty. The practical implication is that the attainment of library user loyalty is possible when the management of libraries improves the level of user

satisfaction with services. The study by Cristobal (2018) also found a positive correlation between patrons' satisfaction with the various library services and their loyalty to the institution, which is shown by patrons' use of the library for purposes other than book borrowing, encouraging friends and coworkers to do the same, praising the library's services to others, and recommending the library to someone who asks for their opinion. Customer happiness and library service quality are significantly correlated, according to correlation.

Table 7. Satisfaction of the stakeholders with the University of Baguio support office services when compared according to office

Support Office	WTD Mean	p-value	Interpretation
Admission and Records Center (ARC)	3.31 (very satisfactory)	-.36	not significant
Center for Counseling and Student Development (CCSD)	3.33 (very satisfactory)	.33	not significant
Extension and Community Outreach Services (ECOS)	3.52 (very satisfactory)	-.15	not significant
Library	3.70 (very satisfactory)	-.03	significant
Linkages	3.83 (very satisfactory)	-.16	not significant
MIS	3.63 (very satisfactory)	.04	significant
Office of Student Affairs (OSA)	3.63 (very satisfactory)	.04	significant
Research & Development Center (RDC)	3.73 (very satisfactory)	-.06	not significant
University Clinic	3.89 (very satisfactory)	-.19	not significant
Security	3.67 (very satisfactory)	-.38	not significant
Student Accounts	3.29 (very satisfactory)	-.38	not significant

Ohliati and Abas (2018) study revealed that service quality is the most dominant factor affecting students' satisfaction with the learning management system. Moreover, "e-learning" significantly adds to the body of service literature into the most well-known and widely applied SERVQUAL (tangibility, dependability, empathy, assurance, and responsiveness) model. Quality is increased (Rasheed, 2022). Thus, it corroborates the study's findings that MIS must also provide good quality service as a service provider.

Ozdemir et al. (2020) study showed that services to students, physical means, responsiveness, natural resources, and environmental sensitiveness were related to sustainability and service quality in higher education. A "sustainable service quality" is only one way to attract enrollees to sustain the university's operations. Furthermore, higher education institutions strived to sustain quality instruction and extension and service quality through their support services offices.

Also, the study conducted by Amoako and Asamoah-Gyimah (2020) showed that the satisfaction derived from customer experience is due to the connecting set of factors integrated into the educational environment, technological, psychological, and instructional. Thus, a safe environment, committed staff, or student-friendly policies are just some manifestations of the interplay of factors that consequently satisfy a customer. For Pendon and Pendon (2016), on the other hand, the heart of the satisfaction process is the comparison of what was expected and the service's performance. Therefore, the difference between customers' prior expectations and service consumption influences their perceived quality.

In summary, the different stakeholders experience satisfaction with the services given by the university. Thus, consistency in providing service that satisfies the UB stakeholders or customers remains crucial,

considering that stakeholders hold a subjective perception towards the services provided, and the service delivery itself influences the perceived performance of the university.

Conclusion

In view of the research findings, the University of Baguio support offices and the support office employees can deliver services that meet or even go beyond the expectations of the stakeholders. Seeing their expectations fulfilled consequently leads to a satisfactory experience. However, though the service level seems very satisfactory in meeting customer needs and demands, the support services still need some modification and improvement in the office's strategies to keep the service at a high standard.

In as much as the stakeholders have different satisfaction experiences when it comes to the support offices, it remains to be seen that the quality of service provided by the university is relatively the same in the different support offices. The study's findings do not coincide that excellent support services promote loyalty among stakeholders. Further study was also recommended to delve deeper into the retention and loyalty of the students aside from the services they can get from the support services offices of the university. Stakeholders' classification responses were not discussed in the paper. Thus, it is one of the limitations of the study.

Acknowledgement

References

Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2010). The influence of university image on student behaviour. *International Journal of Educational Management*.

Amoako, I., & Asamoah-Gyimah, K. (2020). Indicators of students' satisfaction of quality education services in some selected universities in Ghana. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *34*(5), 61–72.

Arora, P., & Narula, S. (2018). Linkages between service quality, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty: A literature review. *IUP Journal of Marketing Management, 17* (4). https://www.proquest.com/openview/48a589bc526754673c894f436c0c7755/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=54464

Bater, L. R., & Jordan, S. S. (2020). Selective attention. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, 4624–4628.

Blog, F. (2021). *Descriptive research designs: Types, examples & methods*.

Chamber, G. A., & Team, N. E. O. (2022). *Polymer industry cluster initiative*.

Chandra, T., Hafni, L., Chandra, S., Purwati, A. A., & Chandra, J. (2019). The influence of service quality, university image on student satisfaction and student loyalty. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*.

Cristobal, A. S. (2018). Expectations on Library Services, Library Quality (LibQual) dimension and

library customer satisfaction: Relationship to customer loyalty. Library Philosophy and Practice. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/189477103.pdf

DeShields, O. W., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Journal of Educational Management*.

Elliot, J., & Zimmerman, A. (2002). *A comparison between career and technical education and other students on a high stakes test.*

Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *10*(4), 1–11.

Fischer, A.-C., & Suwunphong, P. (2015). *Customer satisfaction in the higher education industry.*

Kutat, R. J., Cayaon, C. J., Colis, I. D., & Jagmis, M. G. A. (2021). *Student satisfaction survey on student affairs and services (sas) programs of Western Philippines University.*

Latif, K. F., Bunce, L., & Ahmad, M. S. (2021). How can universities improve student loyalty? The roles of university social responsibility, service quality, and "customer" satisfaction and trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*.

Lund, B., & Wang, T. (2020). *Information dissemination and interactions in higher education social media posts*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2020.1851848

Micabalo, K. G., Cano, J. B., & Montilla, R. D. (2020). University performance satisfaction: A student experience in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Engineering and Applied Technology*, *9*(2), 29–35.

Miller, P. M. (2018). Fostering equanimity through spiritual disciplines to increase undergraduate retention at Greenville University. *Doctor of Ministry*. *262*. http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/dmin/262

Ohliati, J., & Abbas, B. S. (2019). Measuring students satisfaction in using learning management system. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Online), 14(4), 180.

Oliver, R. L. (2014). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. Routledge.

Orlanda-Ventayen, C. C. (2018). Customer Satisfaction Results of the Pangasinan State University, Open University Systems. *Asian Journal of Business and Technology Studies*, *1*(2), 29–32.

Ozdemir, Y., Kaya, S. K., & Turhan, E. (2020). A scale to measure sustainable campus services in higher education:"Sustainable Service Quality". Journal of Cleaner Production, 245, 118839.

Pamatmat, F. v, Dominguez, L. L., Pamin, C. D., & Daran, A. M. (2018). Service quality dimensions of a Philippine state university and students' satisfaction: Bridging gaps to excellence. *International Journal of Advanced Research. Retrieved on April*, *26*, 2020.

Patalinghug, M. E., Hortilano, J., Repaso, E., Mollona, A., & Patalinghug, H. F. (2021). Students' satisfaction on school services in a state college in the Philippines. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, *11*(2), 165–175.

Pendon, G. P., & Pendon, G. (2016). Students' degree of satisfaction of student services. *IRA International Journal of Education and Multidisciplinary Studies*, *3*(3), 283–295.
Rudge, N. (2014). *Examining student satisfaction with the student services center at a local community college*.

Rasheed, H. M. W., He, Y., Khalid, J., Khizar, H. M. U., & Sharif, S. (2022). The relationship between e-learning and academic performance of students. Journal of Public Affairs, 22(3), e2492.

Sekulov, M., Kovaci, I., & Tahiri, A. (2020). The link between students satisfaction and the quality of higher education in Republic of Macedonia. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Œconomica*, *16*(2).

Șerban, V., & Stoian, E. (2019). Quality assessment in higher education based on SERVQUAL model. *Scientific Papers Series-Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development*, *19*(2), 427–436.

Singh, A., & Singla, L. (2018). Stakeholders satisfaction regarding service quality in higher management education. *International Journal of Management Studies*, *3*(6), 2231–2356.

Subrahmanyam, A. (2017). Relationship between service quality, satisfaction, motivation and loyalty: A multi-dimensional perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education, 25* (2), pp. 171-188. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-04-2013-0016

Twum, K. K., Adams, M., Budu, S., & Budu, R. A. A. (2022). Achieving university libraries user loyalty through user satisfaction: The role of service quality. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 32* (1), 54-72. https://doi: 10.1080/08841241.2020.1825030

Weerasinghe, I. M. S., & Fernando, R. L. (2017). Students' satisfaction in higher education. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *5*(5), 533–539.

Yanova, N. (2015). Assessment of satisfaction with the quality of education: Customer satisfaction index. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *182*, 566–573.

Yüksel, A., & Yüksel, F. (2008). Consumer satisfaction theories: A critical review. *Tourist Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior: Measurement and Management Issues in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry*, 65–88.

Zhu, X., & Shek, D. T. L. (2021). Subjective outcome evaluation of a positive youth development program in Mainland China. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *31*(3), 285–297.