

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE STUDENT SERVICE UNITS AT THE RIZAL TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY: COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ACCREDITATION

Elena T. Paragas, Rodrigo DP. Tomas, Mary Beth C. Miranda

Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Rizal Technological University, Boni Avenue, Mandaluyong City

INTRODUCTION

Most define accreditation as a status, which shows the public that a school has met and is maintaining a high level of standards set by an accrediting agency. It reflects the quality by which an educational institution or a program conducts its business. It speaks to a sense of public trust, as well as to professional quality. Accreditation provides assurance that the program in which a student is enrolled or is considering enrolling is engaged in continuous review and improvement of its quality that it meets nationally endorsed standards in the profession, and that it is accountable for achieving what it sets out to do. Accreditation provides a formal process for ongoing evaluation and improvement of the program and faculty development outcomes, a process by which faculty, students and administration can work together in advancing the educational institution's mission. It ensures a basic level of quality in the education one received from an institution.

Accreditation is the tool we use to monitor, assess, and evaluate the standards and quality of the education a student receives at a college, university, or other institution of higher learning. Because of the process of accreditation, students, returning students and families can trust that the education they are paying for is valuable and worthwhile. As a method, accreditation involves a direct assessment of whether a study program or an institution meets a number of predefined quality criteria. Assessment and evaluation process is done by using a master survey instrument which is considered as the accreditor's main tool for evaluation. This tool of evaluation is criteria based. One of the highlights of this instrument is the criteria used in assessing ten (10) areas. Although all areas are of great importance as far as accreditation is concerned, among the ten areas, *the support to students* is given additional attention for it is a known fact that students are the *raison d'être* for the establishment of learning institution.

The school has the responsibility to support the family and other social institutions in the development of the total personality of the student. Towards this end, a program of *student services* is designed as an integral part of institutional effectiveness. All activities should be planned and implemented to assist the student to attain this maximum potential and become a worthy contributor in his/her social environment. Student support and services complement the academic program. (Master Survey Instrument for the Accreditation of Programs, AACUP, 2005)

For the attainment of institutional goal, that is to provide quality education and ultimate development among student clientele, there should be a well-organized, properly administered and adequately staffed program of student personnel services. Such a program should be provided with adequate resources to attain its objectives. A program of activities and services should be known and accepted by the administration, faculty and students.

This research was anchor on the notion stipulated above, that for the development of the total personality of the students and develop his maximum potential to become a worthy contributor of his/her social environment the *student services* of an institution should be functional and effective in providing assistance expected from each unit. To achieve this goal, that is to ascertain the effectiveness of the student services specifically RTU, this research entitled The Effectiveness of the Student Service Units in Rizal Technological University was undertaken.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study sought to evaluate student services Units at the Rizal Technological University, school year 2013-2014. Specifically, it will answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of sex, college, year level and students classification?
2. What is the level of effectiveness of the services by the Student Services Units when rated in terms of the criteria, such as:
 1. delivery of service
 2. personnel
 3. office facilities
 4. location of the office
3. What are the differences in the assessment of students by the above services?

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

According to Parasuraman, Zeithmal, and Berry (1994), service quality is one of the basic ingredients of customer satisfaction. When dealing about the relationship between service quality and satisfaction, they studied a model developed by Oliver (1993). Oliver's model combines the two concepts and proposes that perceived service quality is antecedent to satisfaction. The outcomes showed that service quality leads to client satisfaction. Parasuraman et al., (1988) compared service quality with satisfaction. They defined service quality as a form of attitude, a longrun overall evaluation, while satisfaction as a transaction-specific measure. Based on such definition, it is considered that perceived service quality is a global measure, and so, the direction of causality was from satisfaction to service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Parasuraman, Zeithmal and Berry (1991) assumed that reliability was basically related to the outcome of service while tangibles, assurance, responsiveness, and empathy were concerned with the process of service delivery. The

results not only judge the reliability and accuracy (i.e. dependability) of the service, but they also determine the other service dimensions that are being provided (Parasuraman et al, 1991). Therefore, customer satisfaction can be dependent not only on the rule of customer about the reliability of the service provided but also on the experience of customer with the service delivery process.

The feedback that is being provided by the students if realized facilitates the improvement of the service quality delivered by units. In addition, the study of Alves&Raposo (2010) it has been found that positive perceptions of service quality has a significant influence on student satisfaction and thus satisfied student would attract more students through word-of-mouth communications. The students can be motivated or inspired from both academic performance as well as the administrative efficiency of their institution. Ahmed & Nawaz (2010) mentioned that service quality is a key performance measure in educational excellence and is a main strategic variable for universities to create a strong perception in consumer's mind.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following literature focuses on perceived quality, which results from the comparison of customer service expectations versus perceptions of actual performance (Zeithaml, 2000). Customers are likely to be satisfied when their perception on services provided exceeds their expectations. Service quality in educational industry is defined on the basis of students overall evaluation on the services they received which is part of their educational experience. This covers a variety of educational activities both inside and outside the classroom such as classroom based activities, faculty member/student interactions, educational facilities, and contacts with the staff of the institution.

Evaluation provides the necessary information to examine how well a program or services units, or plans are being implemented and to determine whether that program is achieving desired results. With gathered information from regular and well-designed evaluations, program administrators can direct limited resources where they are most needed and effective within their communities. This current research will explore on the effectiveness of student services units to improve services and benefit the whole student population they serve.

Fundamental to any profession is the capacity and willingness to objectively assess and evaluate program and service delivery. The student support service is no different. These groups of offices provide a most critical and valuable early warning system to university management on issues affecting students and their social and learning environments. In the forefront of evaluation is data collection that allows comparison and bench-marking among services. Recently, attention of student support services has turned directly to the improvement of student learning outcomes through educational programming that is intended to facilitate the learning goals of the institution. Accordingly, student support services, because of its central mission, is one of the most

appropriately positioned entities for the collection of meaningful student data that, once evaluated and understood, can be used in appropriate research and program development.

The Role of Student Affairs and Support Services

The International Association of Student Affairs and Services (IASAS) is currently an informal confederation of higher education student affairs/services professionals from around the world. A number of its members have been actively engaged for some time in defining the need for, and organization of, an international community of student affairs and services professionals. Several national and regional organizations have recognized the need for better communication and the sharing of professional development experiences such as best practices, internships, exchanges, conferences, colloquia and symposia. Others are assisting developing countries to prepare student services workers and create organizational structures as they build their higher education system.

The 1998 World Declaration on Higher Education (WDHE) calls for a major global effort to improve the delivery of higher education in every country in the world. This call was formulated for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the important role that higher education plays in the improvement of the social, cultural, political, economic and environmental aspects of the global society. This progress may well occur in different fashions and on different time lines depending on the region or country; however, if any area of the world wants to provide its citizens with an improved quality of life, it must include the funding of a higher education system that will help move that social group towards a better life through teaching, research, advanced employment and service.

The more traditional and most of the not-so-traditional methods of delivering higher education academic degrees are primarily comprised of the classroom instructional model or approach. In addition, there is increasing evidence that higher education must also address the basic personal needs of students by providing a comprehensive set of out-of-classroom student services and programs commonly referred to as student affairs and services. These efforts should be designed to enable and empower students to focus more intensely on their studies and their personal growth and maturation, both cognitively and emotionally. They should also result in enhanced student learning outcomes. Another important rationale for these efforts is economic, because investments in students and student affairs and services provide a healthy return to national economies as the investments help to assure students' success in higher education and their subsequent contributions to the national welfare.

Student affairs and services professional theory and practice are informed by a number of academic disciplines. Student development theory draws from research in psychology, sociology and human biology. Mental and physical health services rely heavily on medicine, psychiatry, clinical and counseling psychology, education, exercise sciences, and health education amongst others. The effective administration and leadership of the wide variety of student affairs and services is based, in part, on the theories of management, accounting, human resources, marketing, statistics and educational research, and leadership studies. Because the array of the services and

programs offered by student affairs and services is wide and diverse, the latest thinking, research, and practice from an equally wide and diverse set of areas of academic study and practice, necessarily underpin its effectiveness. These perspectives are also utilized in other sectors of society, both private and public.

According to UNESCO (2002), the purposes of student affairs and support services are: a) student affairs and services must be delivered in a manner that is seamless, meaningful, and integrated with the academic mission of the institution. These practices and resulting policies must be built upon sound principles and research, and carried out by partnering with the entire campus community, and b) Student affairs and services professionals are key players in turning the 'brain drain' into a 'brain gain' for all nations. This requires partnerships at the national and international levels.

Defining Student Services

Moving next to a clarification of what is meant by learner services leads to an interesting Atlantic Ocean divide. To most North American's, learner services encompass all of the functions of a formal learning institution that are designed to help and assist learners, but the actual teaching or functions relating to the discipline of study are explicitly excluded. For example Dirr (1999) includes in his survey of learner services a variety of non-academic interactions that the student has with a college or university, including: pre-enrolment services (recruiting, promotion, orientation), admissions and registration, academic advising, program planning, degree and transcript audit, technical assistance, library and bookstore services, personal and career counseling, social support services, and financial planning and management. But note that the actual teaching or academic and discipline related tutorial support is explicitly excluded from the list. By contrast Thorpe from the British Open University defines learner services "... as all those elements capable of responding to a known learner or group of learners, before, during and after the learning process" (Thorpe, 2001, p. 4) and expressly includes the provision of academic support provided by tutors and teaching faculty. Given that we are this morning on the eastern side of the Atlantic, I will go with the much wider and exclusive definition that includes the important academic teaching function.

Service Quality

The service quality in the field of education and higher learning particularly is not only essential and important, but it is also an important parameter of educational excellence. It has been found that positive perceptions of service quality has a significant influence on student satisfaction and thus satisfied student would attract more students through word-of-mouth communications (Alves&Raposos, 2010). The students can be motivated or inspired from both academic performance as well as the administrative efficiency of their institution. Ahmed & Nawaz (2010) mentioned that service quality is a key performance measure in educational excellence and is a main strategic variable for universities to create a strong perception in consumer's mind. Most of the well-established high learning institutions focus highly on strategic issues like providing excellent

customer services. It is important because by doing so they would be able to make and build good relationships with clients who are actually very important in determining their future in the industry (Malik, Danish, & Usman, 2010). Higher learning institutions are like other service based firms which is dependent on people/students perception and one of the easiest yet powerful marketing strategy is through positive word of mouth. One of the most established service quality satisfaction analysis tool is the one developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), which they had identified 10 dimensions of service quality; tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, competency, courtesy, communication, credibility, security, access, and understanding. Moreover, performance measurement of service quality at higher learning institutions is strongly embedded to the matching between students' expectation and their experience of a particular service (Tahar, 2008). Generally, students evaluate and judge the service quality to be satisfactory by comparing what they want or expect against what they are really getting. Gruber, Voss, & Glaser-Zikuda (2010) believe that the behaviors and attitudes of customer contact employees primarily determine the customers' perceptions of the service quality provided. This means, human interaction element is essential to determine whether students consider service delivered satisfactory or not. Apart from that, higher learning institutions need to have appropriate infrastructure too such as admin and academic buildings, residential halls, catering facilities, sports facilities, and recreations centre (Sapri, Kaka, & Finch, 2009). Tahar (2008) discovered that the perception on service quality of higher learning between two nations; the USA and New Zealand varies from New Zealand, as students define quality on the following ranking; ability to create career opportunities, issues of the program, cost/time, physical aspects, location and others. Meanwhile in the USA, they ranked academic reputation as first and later followed by cost/time, program issues, 3 Journal of Southeast Asian Research others, physical aspects and choice influences. Ilias, Hasan, Rahman & Yaso (2008) identified that the main factors that could affect the level of students' satisfaction were; students' perception on learning and teaching, support facilities for teaching and learning such as (libraries, computer and lab facilities), learning environment (rooms of lectures, laboratories, social space and university buildings), support facilities (health facilities, refectories, student accommodation, student services) and external aspects of being a student (such as finance, transportation). With all these capabilities, an institution will be able to meet student expectations and compete competitively.

Student Satisfaction

Kotler and Clarke (1987) define satisfaction as a state felt by a person who has experienced performance or an outcome that fulfill his or her expectation. Satisfaction is a function of relative level of expectations and it perceives performance. Satisfaction is also perceived as the intentional performance which results in one's contentment (Malik & Usman, 2010). According to Sapri and Finch (2009), customers are the lifeblood of any organization, whether private or public enterprise sectors. Student satisfaction plays an important role in determining accuracy and authenticity of the system being used. The expectation of the students may go as far as before they even enter and engage in the higher education (Palacio, Meneses, & Perez, 2002). In contrary, Hasan & Ilias (2008)

assumed that satisfaction actually includes issues of perception and experiences of students during the college years. Student satisfaction is being shaped continually by repeated experiences in life on campus. The results of previous research reveal that students who are satisfied may attract new students by engaging in speech of positive word-of-mouth communication to inform their friends and acquaintances, and they could go back to the university to further continue their study or take other courses (Helgesen&Nesset, 2007; Gruber et al., 2010).

Students are likely to be satisfied in their educational institution when the service provided fits their expectations, or they will be very satisfied when the service is beyond their expectations, or completely satisfied when they receive more than they expect. On the contrary, students are dissatisfied with the educational institution when the service is less than their expectations, and when the gap between perceived and expected service quality is high, they tend to communicate the negative aspects (Petruzzellis, Uggento, & Romanazzi, 2006). Tian and Wang (2010) argued that satisfaction is the function of the congruency between perceived performance and esteemed benefits resulting from consumer personal values, and the configuration of consumer values is affected by central cultural values. Moreover, they mentioned that cultural differences have a direct influence on the level of students' satisfaction regarding their perception of the services, and to satisfy the customers with the same cultural background is not that easy, then to satisfy the customers with different cultural background will be even more difficult. However, Navarro et al. (2005) mentioned that students evaluate the quality of organization on the basis of tangibility (teachers), reliability and responsiveness (methods of teaching) and management of the institution and these factors have direct influence on the level of students' satisfaction.

According to Mavondo and Zaman (2000), academic reputation of the institution, quality of lecturers and the provision of facilities are important while market orientation is found to be a crucial precedent for student satisfaction. The results of this study indicate that satisfied students provide positive word of mouth and recommend Journal of Southeast Asian Research 4 prospective students to the institution at which they are studied.

Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction

Parasuraman, Zeithmal, and Berry (1994) agreed that service quality is one of the basics of customer satisfaction. In addressing the relationship between service quality and satisfaction, they studied a model developed by Oliver (1993). Oliver's model combines the two concepts and proposes that perceived service quality is antecedent to satisfaction. The outcomes showed that service quality leads to satisfaction. Parasuraman et al., (1988) compared service quality with satisfaction. They defined service quality as a form of attitude, a longrun overall evaluation, while satisfaction as a transaction-specific measure. Based on such definition, it is considered that perceived service quality is a global measure, and so, the direction of causality was from satisfaction to service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Parasuraman, Zeithmal and Berry (1991) assumed that reliability was basically related to the outcome of service while tangibles, assurance, responsiveness, and empathy were concerned with the process of service delivery. The results not

only judge the reliability and accuracy (i.e. dependability) of the service, but they also determine the other service dimensions that are being provided (Parasuraman et al, 1991). Therefore, customer satisfaction can be dependent not only on the rule of customer about the reliability of the service provided but also on the experience of customer with the service delivery process.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant difference in the assessment of student respondents on the effectiveness of the services rendered by the Student Service Units at the Rizal Technological University.

METHODS

The descriptive research utilized the survey method; employing researcher made instrument for data collection. Since the students are describing how effective are the services delivered by the Student Support Units, the researchers considered this method as the most appropriate design for this study.

For this particular study, the method sought to determine the effectiveness of the services given by the offices under the Student Services Unit specifically the Student Record Admission Services (SRAS), Guidance and Counseling Center, Library, Scholarship, Department of Student Affairs, Medical and Dental Clinic, Cultural Affairs, Dormitory and Canteen and the researchers included the Sport Development Office though this is not directly under the VPSS however, the accreditors (AACUP) commended that this is under the student services.

purposely selected the 3rd year for Technology students, 4th year and 5th year or the graduating student's batch 2013-2014 to evaluate the effectiveness of the services rendered by the Student Services Units (SSU) of the university.

The participants who were involved in this study included third year technology students, fourth year students and fifth year students of the various colleges of the Rizal Technological University school year 2013-2014.

The respondents were described according to their age, sex, college, year level and their classification. There were 467 third to fifth year students who participated in this study.

Four hundred sixty-seven (467) graduating students coming from the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business and Entrepreneurial Technology, College of Education, College of Engineering and Industrial Technology and the Institute of Physical Education and College of Health and Allied Services, were chosen purposely as student-respondents. With this criterion, it was assumed that the students have an encounter with these student services units. Thus, they were in a better position to "evaluate" whether these SSU has been effective or not in delivering their mandated services.

Purposive sampling is defined as a method of judgmental, selective or subjective sampling, purposive sampling relies on the judgment of the researchers when it comes to selecting the units, and one that is selected based on the knowledge of a population and the purpose of the study. In this study the researchers was devised consisting of two parts. The first part consisted the demographic

profile of the student respondents. The second part of the questionnaire consisted five (5) criteria specifically:

- 1) Delivery of service (quality, promptness, accuracy)
- 2) Personnel (accommodating, courteousness, grooming)
- 3) Office and facilities (conduciveness, highly equipped, cleanliness and orderliness)
- 4) Location (strategically located, accessible)
5. "No encounter of this office"

The researcher's decided to include the "no encounter of this office" criteria with the assumption that there might be graduating students who were not able to come across one or some of the offices being evaluated. Objectivity and the desire for bias-free results motivated the researchers for doing so. There were ten(10) offices being evaluated by the students. Student respondents were asked to assess the services of each unit by indicating the level of satisfaction.

To interpret the result of the study the researchers used the following statistical techniques and methods based on the sub-problems presented. Percentage was used to determine the number of respondents in terms of age, sex, college, year level, and the type of students whether they are working, scholar and athlete or not. To determine the effectiveness of the services rendered by the student services units, the student asked to rate their overall satisfaction by ticking *O* - Outstanding, *VS* - Very Satisfactory, *S* -Satisfactory, *FS* -Fairly Satisfactory, and *US* -Unsatisfactory and weighted mean was utilized.

| Scale | Range | Verbal Interpretation |
|--------|-------------|---|
| 5 – O | 4.20 – 5.00 | outstanding/very effective |
| 4 – VS | 3.40 – 4.19 | very satisfactory/effective |
| 3 – S | 2.60 – 3.39 | satisfactory/moderately effective |
| 2 – FS | 1.80 – 2.59 | fairly satisfactory/minimally effective |
| 1 – US | 1.00 – 1.79 | unsatisfactory/Not effective at all |

To find out if a significant difference existed among the student services units in terms of the delivery of service, personnel, office facilities and the location of office, the 1-way ANOVA was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**Table 1: Socio-demographic Profile of Respondents Used**

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| Sex | | |
| Male | 225 | 48.18 |
| Female | 242 | 51.82 |
| Total | 467 | 100.00 |
| Year Level | | |
| 3 rd Year | 67 | 14.35 |
| 4 th Year | 209 | 44.75 |
| 5 th Year | 191 | 40.90 |
| Total | 467 | 100.00 |
| College | | |
| CAS | 48 | 10.27 |
| CED | 16 | 3.42 |
| CBET | 144 | 30.84 |
| CEIT | 246 | 52.68 |
| IPE | 9 | 1.93 |
| CAHS | 4 | .86 |
| Total | 467 | 100.00 |
| Student Classification | | |
| Working | 56 | 11.99 |
| Non- Working | 411 | 80.00 |
| Total | 467 | 100.00 |
| Scholar | 99 | 21.20 |
| Non-Scholar | 368 | 78.80 |
| Total | 467 | 100.00 |
| Athlete | 7 | 1.50 |
| Non-Athlete | 460 | 98.50 |
| Total | 467 | 100.00 |

Table 1 shows the various socio-demographic characteristics of respondents reported from the profile of the sample (467) in this study. Four general profiles were surveyed among the respondents namely (1) sex (2) year level (3) college (4) student classification.

In terms of sex, 48.18% (n=225) male participated in the study, while, 51.85% (n=242) female respondents joined the study. Female respondents dominated the research.

In terms of year level, Fourth year graduating students, outnumbered the other year levels with 44.75% (n=209). There were 14.35% (n=67) third year students, and 40.90% (n=191) fifth year students actively joined the research.

Data shows that CEIT got the highest number of respondents in this study with 52.67% (n=246); followed by the CBET with 30.84 % (n=144). The least number of respondents came from CAHS with 0.86% (n=4).

Lastly in terms of student classification, 88.01% (n=411) are full time students and not working while 11.99% (n=56) are working. There were three hundred sixty eight (n=368), 78.88% respondents who are not scholars, while only 21.20% (n=99) are classified as scholars. Seven, or 1.50% athletes joined the study, majority are not athletes by classification. At the outset, it should

be emphasized that the frequencies (N) of the socio-demographic profiles of the participants maybe double entry.

Table 2: Level of Effectiveness of the SSU Services

| Student Services Units | Delivery of Service | | | Personnel | | | Office Facilities | | | Location of Office | | | Overall | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|----|------|-----------|----|------|-------------------|----|------|--------------------|----|------|---------|----|------|
| | χ | VI | Rank | χ | VI | Rank | χ | VI | Rank | χ | VI | Rank | χ | VI | Rank |
| Student Record | 3.11 | S | 7.5 | 3.23 | S | 6 | 3.23 | S | 6 | 3.56 | V | 2 | 3.28 | S | 4 |
| Guidance | 3.47 | V | 3 | 3.46 | V | 3 | 3.42 | V | 2 | 3.43 | V | 3 | 3.45 | V | 2 |
| Library | 3.21 | S | 5 | 3.25 | S | 5 | 3.25 | S | 4 | 3.18 | S | 7 | 3.22 | S | 6 |
| Scholarship | 3.24 | S | 4 | 3.27 | S | 4 | 3.24 | S | 5 | 3.20 | S | 5.5 | 3.24 | S | 5 |
| DSA | 3.49 | V | 2 | 3.43 | V | 2 | 3.42 | V | 2 | 3.38 | S | 4 | 3.43 | V | 3 |
| M & D Clinic | 3.57 | V | 1 | 3.65 | V | 1 | 3.60 | V | 1 | 3.64 | V | 1 | 3.62 | V | 1 |
| SDO | 3.11 | S | 7.5 | 3.08 | S | 8 | 3.13 | S | 8 | 3.12 | S | 9 | 3.11 | S | 8 |
| Cultural | 3.16 | S | 6 | 3.16 | S | 7 | 3.15 | S | 7 | 3.15 | S | 8 | 3.16 | S | 7 |
| Dormitory | 3.10 | S | 9 | 2.95 | S | 10 | 2.97 | S | 9 | 3.02 | S | 10 | 3.01 | S | 10 |
| University Canteen | 3.02 | S | 10 | 3.02 | S | 9 | 2.94 | S | 10 | 3.20 | S | 5.5 | 3.05 | S | 9 |

Respondents rated very satisfactory with the services provided by the Medical and Dental Clinic (3.62), Guidance and Counseling Center (3.45) and the Department of Student Affairs (3.43). Students were very contented on their delivery of services in terms of promptness, accurateness and the quality of service given to them.

The level of effectiveness of the services rendered by the SSUs was reflected in the level of satisfaction rating of the students. Thus, according to Kotler and Clarke (1987), if the expectation of students has been met he is in the state of satisfaction. This statement supported also by Petruzzellis, Uggento, & Romanazzi (2006), that they will be very satisfied when the service provided to them fits their expectations or beyond their expectations.

In table 2, it was notably seen that Medical & dental Clinic, Guidance and Counseling Center and Department of Student Affairs got the same impressions about the accommodation, courteousness, grooming of the personnel as well as the conduciveness, highly equipped,

cleanliness and orderliness of their offices. Students rated very satisfactorily to SRAS, GCC and M&D Clinic in the location of office because it was strategically located and accessible to the client.

The overall level of effectiveness on the delivery of service of the SSUs is moderately effective as assessed by the student respondents. However, Dormitory and University Canteen apparently consistent ranked as the least office, suggests that these units are definitely need attention.

Although all other units were evaluated satisfactorily by the respondents, it is still worth noting that these can still find an effective ways to improve their services, from moderately effective to very effective or outstanding status.

4. Difference on the Effectiveness of the SSU Services Rendered

Table 3: Z-test Results on the Evaluation of Student Services by Respondents When Grouped According to Sex

| SS Units | Sex | | Mean Diff | t | Sig |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | Male | Female | | | |
| <i>Student Record</i> | 3.3480 | 3.2218 | .12620 | 1.719 | .086 |
| <i>Guidance</i> | 3.5117 | 3.3800 | .13167 | 1.735 | .083 |
| <i>Library</i> | 3.2483 | 3.2009 | .04740 | .539 | .590 |
| <i>Scholarship</i> | 3.3307 | 3.1539 | .17682 | 2.437 | .015** |
| <i>DSA</i> | 3.5680 | 3.3034 | .26459 | 3.179 | .002** |
| <i>M&D Clinic</i> | 3.6802 | 3.5535 | .12664 | 1.570 | .117 |
| <i>SDO</i> | 3.1309 | 3.0880 | .04294 | .603 | .547 |
| <i>Cultural</i> | 3.1528 | 3.1286 | .02416 | .383 | .702 |
| <i>Dormitory</i> | 2.9676 | 2.9595 | .00805 | .132 | .895 |
| <i>University Canteen</i> | 2.9994 | 3.0868 | -.08733 | -1.044 | .297 |

**Significant

It can be gleaned on Table 3, that there were significant differences in the perceived effectiveness of the Student Support Units (SSU) by sex in offices such as: Scholarship (.015) and DSA (.002), thus, rejecting the null hypothesis with .05 level of significance. The differences found significantly in these two units imply male respondents are more likely to see the offered services as effective when compared to their female counterparts. Results also show that male seems to be more satisfied with their services as compared to female respondents.

Table 4: ANOVA Test on the Evaluation of Student Services by Respondents when Group According to College

| College SS Units | Mean | | | | | | F | Sig |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| | CAS | CED | CBET | CEIT | IPE | CAHS | | |
| <i>Student Record</i> | 2.9757 | 2.9167 | 3.3166 | 3.3657 | 2.9167 | 2.9167 | 3.335 | .006** |
| <i>Guidance</i> | 3.0000 | 3.000 | 3.4705 | 3.5664 | 3.000 | 3.000 | 5.920 | .000** |
| <i>Library</i> | 3.0000 | 3.000 | 3.3293 | 3.2320 | 3.000 | 3.000 | 1.219 | .299 |
| <i>Scholarship</i> | 3.1528 | 3.2865 | 3.2772 | 3.2060 | 3.7130 | 3.6875 | 1.195 | .311 |
| <i>DSA</i> | 3.1667 | 3.3125 | 3.3958 | 3.4927 | 3.778 | 3.7500 | 1.510 | .185 |
| <i>M&D Clinic</i> | 3.2457 | 3.3750 | 3.7431 | 3.6174 | 3.8056 | 3.7708 | 2.746 | .019** |
| <i>SDO</i> | 3.1302 | 3.1823 | 3.2830 | 2.9748 | 3.5370 | 3.5521 | 3.966 | .002** |
| <i>Cultural</i> | 3.1701 | 3.2760 | 3.2691 | 3.0225 | 3.6620 | 3.667 | 4.334 | .001** |
| <i>Dormitory</i> | 2.9306 | 2.9818 | 3.0110 | 2.9368 | 3.0185 | 3.0833 | .293 | .917 |
| <i>University Canteen</i> | 3.0339 | 3.0833 | 2.9586 | 3.0882 | 3.1296 | 3.2500 | .438 | .822 |

**Significant

Table 4 shows that there were significant differences in the perceptions of the student respondents on the services offered by the university according to their college/department. Students found significantly different in evaluating the effectiveness of the services offered by Student Records and Admission Services (SRAS/Registrar), Guidance and Counseling Center (GCC), Medical & Dental Clinic (M&DC), Sports Development Office (SDO) and Cultural Affairs Office (CAO). Some were satisfied or contented to the services rendered and some were not. In the account of SDO and CAO, only those who are athletes and members of the cultural troops were able to have direct access to these units. Likewise, students who do not have direct encounter with these units regarded their services differently. These results imply that respondents gave varying scores or rating to the effectiveness of each student support units without considering their college origin.

On the contrary, some students viewed that Library(.299), Scholarship (.311), DSA (.185), Dormitory (.917) and University Canteen (.822), are accessible and available to all students regardless of what college they belong.

Table 5 reflects the result of Anova test on the evaluation of student services by respondents according to year level.

As revealed from the SPSS, there were significant differences in the services of following six (6) Student Service Units (SSU) namely; Guidance, Scholarship, DSA, Clinic, SDO and Cultural, when year level is considered. With these results, student respondents differ their assessment with the Guidance and Counseling Center because the higher the level they were in, the lower the need for assistance from the guidance counselors.

Table 5: ANOVA Test on the Evaluation of Student Services by Respondents when Group According to Year Level

| Year Level SS Units | Mean | | | F | Sig |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|--------|
| | 3 rd Yr | 4 th | 5 th Yr | | |
| <i>Student Record</i> | 3.1466 | 3.2049 | 3.4204 | 2.626 | .034** |
| <i>Guidance</i> | 3.3261 | 3.3242 | 3.6230 | 4.083 | .003** |
| <i>Library</i> | 2.9885 | 3.2269 | 3.3019 | 1.335 | .256 |
| <i>Scholarship</i> | 2.8915 | 3.2436 | 3.3220 | 4.605 | .001** |
| <i>DSA</i> | 3.1710 | 3.3301 | 3.6075 | 4.468 | .001** |
| <i>M&D Clinic</i> | 3.3721 | 3.5911 | 3.7070 | 2.142 | .075 |
| <i>SDO</i> | 2.7026 | 3.2329 | 3.0801 | 6.890 | .000** |
| <i>Cultural</i> | 2.7917 | 3.2408 | 3.1152 | 7.092 | .000** |
| <i>Dormitory</i> | 2.8010 | 2.9843 | 2.9952 | 1.258 | .286 |
| <i>University Canteen</i> | 3.0568 | 2.9731 | 3.1191 | .685 | .603 |

**Significant

They assumed maturity when they reached fourth year and fifth year. Most of the graduating students were having their Cooperative Education (COE) or on-the-job-training outside the campus so they have less encounter with these six (6) student service units mentioned. The researchers can conclude from the table that the longer the students stay in the university, the more they appear to be satisfied with the services offered by the SSU.

On the other hand, no significant differences were observed on the services being rendered by University Canteen and Library and Medical Clinic as far as year level is concerned. This observation would reveal that the perception of the respondents on the services of these three units is not affected by whether they have stayed long or not in the university. These units were not respecter of person; they cater to all types of students from first year to fifth year.

Table 6 showed the evaluation of the athlete- respondents to the effectiveness of the SSUs. There were significant differences in the perception of the athlete and non-athlete respondents on the services offered by the Scholarship Office, DSA, SDO and Dormitory, (see Table 6). The athletes indicated a higher level of satisfaction on the above-mentioned units. This observation can be supported of the fact that athletes are mainly served by these units. Rizal Technological University athletes are considered scholars, and are provided free board and lodging and are under the direct supervision of the SDO. Because of these privileges, athletes are then most of the time availed and enjoyed the services of the said units, by frequent encounters to these units, they expressed a high level of satisfaction and to them the quality of service delivered by Scholarship Office, Department of Student Affairs and Sports Development Office is effective, the personnel are accommodating, the conduciveness and orderliness of the office, facilities and the accessibility of the office location are also appraised as effective by the student athletes.

Table 6: Z-Test Results on the Evaluation of Student Services by Respondents According to their Classification – Athlete

| SS Units | Athlete | Mean | | Mean Diff | t | Sig |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | | Athlete | Non-athlete | | | |
| <i>Student Record</i> | | 2.8452 | 3.2920 | -.44679 | -1.479 | .140 |
| <i>Guidance</i> | | 2.9643 | 3.4537 | -.4840 | -1.568 | .117 |
| <i>Library</i> | | 2.8571 | 3.2321 | -.37499 | -1.039 | .299 |
| <i>Scholarship</i> | | 4.0238 | 3.2256 | .7924 | 2.685 | .008** |
| <i>DSA</i> | | 4.1429 | 3.4179 | .72501 | 2.107 | .036** |
| <i>M&D Clinic</i> | | 4.1905 | 3.6032 | .58727 | 1.772 | .077 |
| <i>SDO</i> | | 3.8571 | 3.0969 | .76022 | 2.620 | .009** |
| <i>Cultural</i> | | 3.8512 | 3.1276 | .72364 | 2.823 | .070 |
| <i>Dormitory</i> | | 3.5714 | 2.9539 | .61756 | 2.468 | .014** |
| <i>University Canteen</i> | | 3.3929 | 3.0378 | .35502 | 1.030 | .303 |

**Significant

Table 7. Evaluation on the effectiveness of the SSUs by classification - scholar and non-scholar- respondents.

It is evident from the Table 7 that differences on the perception of scholars and non-scholars regarding the services of certain offices in the university exist on Scholarship, DSA, M & D Clinic, SDO, Cultural, Dormitory and University Canteen. This result is predictable because many of these

students are really using and seeking the assistance of these offices; hence, they have the same experiences of the services being delivered, the assistance offered by the personnel and the use of facilities of these offices.

Students in all disciplinary may avail themselves of various academic scholarships subject to university rules and regulations. In addition to academic scholarships, RTU students may avail the following grants as: editorial staff member, drum and lyre corps members, athletes, cultural troupe member, rondalla members, student assistants, COE trainees in RTU, and barangay scholarship (RTU Student Manual). Hence, students seeking and availing such scholarships pass through the above student service units.

However, differences exist on the perception of the respondents on the Student Record, Guidance and Library offices. This result only shows that some students are availing the services of these offices while others do not. What is surprising in this result is that, students have different perceptions on the services of the Library as computed value is negative. This implies that some students are using their facilities while others are not. With the presence of WI-Fi services students and faculty members can now access the university wide Internet connection demarcate students to visit library or college reading centers. There were Internet café available in all corners outside the vicinity of the campus.

Table 7: Z-Test Results on the Evaluation of Student Services by Respondents According to their Classification – Scholar

| SS Units | Scholar | Mean | | Mean Diff | t | Sig |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | | Scholar | Non-Scholar | | | |
| <i>Student Record</i> | | 3.2125 | 3.3040 | -.09142 | -1.017 | .310 |
| <i>Guidance</i> | | 3.3923 | 3.4597 | -.06744 | -.726 | .468 |
| <i>Library</i> | | 3.1982 | 3.2335 | -.03526 | -.329 | .743 |
| <i>Scholarship</i> | | 3.4941 | 3.1726 | 3.2152 | 3.647 | .000** |
| <i>DSA</i> | | 3.6692 | 3.3681 | .30114 | 2.950 | .003** |
| <i>M&D Clinic</i> | | 3.8729 | 3.5453 | .32759 | 3.346 | .001** |
| <i>SDO</i> | | 3.3531 | 3.0457 | .30746 | 3.578 | .000** |
| <i>Cultural</i> | | 3.3565 | 3.0839 | .27258 | 3.575 | .000** |
| <i>Dormitory</i> | | 3.1709 | 2.9080 | .26286 | 3.558 | .000** |
| <i>University Canteen</i> | | 3.0842 | 3.0347 | .04945 | .482 | .630 |

**Significant

Table 8 shows the z-test on the evaluation of students' services by respondents in terms of their classification as working and non-working students. It can be gleaned from table that there is no significant difference on the perception of working and non-working students as to the delivery of service, personnel, office facilities and location of the various student services units (SSU) of the university. Working or non-working status does not affect the perception of the respondents in terms of the effectiveness of these units.

The ten student support units dispense their utmost service to the studentry as a whole whether or not they are scholars, athletes and working. Regardless of the gender, year level and college they belong they can avail the services they need as far as RTU is concerned.

Table 8: Z-Test Results on the Evaluation of Student Services by Respondents According to their Classification – Working

| SS Units | Working | Mean | | Mean Diff | t | Sig |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------|-------|------|
| | | Working | Non-Working | | | |
| <i>Student Record</i> | | 3.3542 | 3.2750 | .07921 | .700 | .484 |
| <i>Guidance</i> | | 3.5052 | 3.4371 | .06806 | .582 | .561 |
| <i>Library</i> | | 3.3036 | 3.2154 | .08821 | .654 | .514 |
| <i>Scholarship</i> | | 3.2507 | 3.2397 | .01103 | .098 | .922 |
| <i>DSA</i> | | 3.4360 | 3.4316 | .00437 | .034 | .973 |
| <i>M&D Clinic</i> | | 3.5751 | 3.6205 | -.04537 | -.364 | .716 |
| <i>SDO</i> | | 3.1629 | 3.1040 | .05893 | .538 | .591 |
| <i>Cultural</i> | | 3.1719 | 3.1319 | .03404 | .350 | .726 |
| <i>Dormitory</i> | | 2.9100 | 2.9714 | -.06140 | -.652 | .495 |
| <i>Canteen</i> | | 2.9717 | 3.0533 | -.08359 | -.648 | .517 |

**Significant

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. Profile of the Respondents

There were 467 student respondents participated in the study. Two hundred forty two or 51.58% are female and 225 or 48.18% are male respondents. Two hundred nine (209) with 44.75% were fourth year students; 191 or 40.90% were fifth year; while the third year students consisted of 67 or 14.35%.

College of Engineering and Industrial Technology got the highest number of respondents with 52.67% (264); CBET with 30.84% (144); CAS 10.28% (48); CED has 3.43% (16); IPE with 1.97% (9) and least number of respondents came from CAHS with only .86% (4).

In terms of the classification of students, 411 or 88.01% were full time students while 56 or 11.99% were working students. There were 368 or 78.88% are not scholars and only 21.20% or 99 are classified as scholars. Seven, with 1.50% athletes joined the study, majority are non-athlete students.

2. Level of Effectiveness of the SSUs

The Medical and Dental Clinic, Guidance and Counseling Center and the Department of Student Affairs, were consistently ranked 1,2,and 3 in all parameters respectively. It goes to show that the graduating students were very contented with how these three offices served them. However, the rest of the SSUs were assessed by the respondents as satisfactory and good enough. It is still worth noting that these can still find effective ways to improve their services from moderately effective to very effective.

3. Difference on the Effectiveness of the SSU Services rendered

Results showed that male are more likely satisfied and perceived that the services given by the Scholarship Office and the DSA seemed effective than their female counterpart. Student found significantly different in evaluating all of the SSU except for Library (.299), Scholarship (.311), DSA (.185), Dormitory (.917) and University Canteen (.822), thus accepting the null hypothesis with .05 level of significance. Results also revealed that there were significant differences in the services of the following six (6) SSU namely: Guidance, Scholarship, DSA, Clinic, SDO and Cultural, when year level is considered. The average mean by year of study from 3rd year to 5th year are 3.02, 3.23 and 3.32 respectively. Based on the results, the researchers found out that the longer students stayed in the university, the more they appeared to be satisfied with the services offered by SSU. There were significant differences in the perception of the athlete and non-athlete respondents to the services offered by the Scholarship Office, DSA, Sports Development Office (SDO) and Dormitory. Athletes indicated a higher level of satisfaction on the above units mainly because they were considered scholars by the university and they were provided free board and lodging and were under the direct supervision of the SDO and they have frequent encounter with these offices.

Scholars and non-scholars differ their perception on the services rendered by Scholarship, DSA, M&D Clinic, SDO, Cultural, Dormitory and University Canteen. This result is predictable because many of the above respondents have often interaction with these units.

CONCLUSIONS

The present undertaking attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of the different Student Services Units in Rizal Technological University. The results of the study established the following:

1. The study was participated by the graduating students from the various colleges at Rizal Technological University. Female respondents dominated male respondents. Most of them were full time students, non-scholars and non-athlete students.
2. Services offered by the Medical and Dental clinic, Guidance and Counseling Center and the Department of Student Affairs were effective as rated by the student respondents. While Scholarship office, Library, Cultural Affairs office, Student Record, Dormitory, University Canteen and SDO were perceived to have moderately effective level of service.
3. Results revealed that there were significant differences in the services offered by the SSUs as perceived by the graduating students when grouped according to sex, year level and student classification.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the view of the results and findings of the present study, it is hereby recommended that:

1. The institution must conduct a regular evaluation on the effectiveness of the Student Services Units.
2. Further studies may be done and consider a larger number of population such as teachers, parents, employees to be participants of the study considering the fact that they also may be served by these units. Large number of respondents can produce a more reliable evaluation.
3. Reinforced orientation to the new employees of the SSUs as to their duties and functions are concerned.
4. Staff development program such as personality development and other service oriented activities for the personnel and staff of the university canteen and dormitory can be proposed to enhance the delivery of service to their clientele.
5. Suggestions box maybe provided to strategic places for teachers, employees, students and other stakeholders to improve the SSUs services.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M. M., Ahmad, Z., Ahmad, Z., Shaukat, M. Z., Usman, A., Wasim-ul- Rehman & Ahmed, N. (2010). Does Service Quality Affect Students' Performance? Evidence from Institutes of Higher Learning," *African Journal of Business Management*, 4 (12). 2527-2533.

Alves, H. & Raposo M (2010). "The Influence of University Image on Students' Behavior," *International Journal of Educational Management*. 24 (1): 73-85.

Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C. & Lehmann, D. R. (1994). "Customer Satisfaction, Market Share, and Profitability: Findings From Sweden," *Journal of Marketing*, vol.58 (July). 53- 66.

Dirr, P.J. (1999). *Putting principles into practice: Promoting effective support services for students in distance learning programs: A report on the findings of a survey*. Boulder CO: WICHE. Retrieved February 22, 2004, from www.wiche.edu/telecom/Projects/student_services/

Gallifa, J. & Batalle, P (2010). "Student Perceptions of Service Quality in a Multi-Campus Higher Education System in Spain," *Quality Assurance in Education*, 18 (2). 156-170

Gruber, T., Fuß, S., Voss, R. & Glaser-Zikuda, M. (2010). "Examining Student Satisfaction with Higher Education Services Using a New Journal of Southeast Asian Research 10 Measurement Tool," *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23 (2). 105-123

Thorpe M. (2001). *Learner support: A new model for online teaching and learning*. 20th World conference ICDE (14 p.). Retrieved January 4, 2004, from http://www.scrolla.ac.uk/papers/s1/thorpe_paper.rtf

Zeithaml, V. A. (2000). "Service Quality, Profitability, and the Economic Worth of Customers: What We Know and what We Need to Learn," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28 (1), 67-85

Helgesen, O. & Nasset, E. (2007). "What Accounts for Students' Loyalty? Some Field Study Evidence," *International Journal of Educational Management* 21(2). 126-43

Ilias, A., Hasan, H. F. A., Rahman, R. A. & Yaso, M. R (2008). "Student Satisfaction and Service Quality: Any Differences in Demographic Factors?," *International Business Research*, 1(4). 131:143.

Kotler, P. & Clarke, R.N. (1987). "Marketing For Health Care Organizations," *Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall*. Lee, M. C. & Hwan, I. S. (2005). 'Relationships among Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Profitability in the Taiwanese Banking Industry,' *International Journal of Management*, 22 (4). 635-648.

Mavondo, F. & Zaman, M. (2000). "Student Satisfaction with Tertiary Institution and Recommending It to Prospective Students," 787-792.

Navarro, M. M., Iglesias, M. P. & Torres, P. R. (2005a). "A New Management Element of Universities: Satisfaction With the Courses Offered," *International Journal of Education Management*, 19 (6). 505- 526

Oliver, R. L. (1993). "A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Service Satisfaction: Compatible Goals, Different Concepts," *Advances in Services Marketing and Management*, JAI Press, Greenwich. CT, vol. 2, 65-85.

Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L. & Zeithaml, V. A. (1991). 'Refinement and Reassessment of the SERVQUAL Scale,' *Journal of Retailing*, 67 (4). 420-50

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. & Berry, L. L. (1988). "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 64, 12-40

Petruzzellis, L., D'Uggento, A. M. & Romanazzi, S. (2006). Student Satisfaction and Quality of Service in Italian Universities, *Managing Service Quality*, 16 (4). 349-364.

Sapri, M., Kaka, A. & Finch, E. (2009). 'Factors that Influence Student's Level of Satisfaction with Regards to Higher Educational Facilities Services,' *Malaysian Journal of Real Estate*, 4 (1).34:51
Tahar, E. B. M. (2008). "Expectation and Perception of Postgraduate Students for Service Quality in UTM," Thesis, Unpublished.

Tian, R. G. & Wang, C. H. (2010). "Cross- Cultural Customer Satisfaction at a Chinese Restaurant: The Implications to China Foodservice Marketing," *International Journal of China Marketing*, 1 (1). 62-72.

Ugboma, C., Ogwude, I. C., Ugboma, O. & Nadi, K. (2007). "Service quality and Satisfaction Measurements in Nigerian Ports: An Exploration," *Maritime Policy & Management* 34 (4). 331-346.

Usman, A. (2010). "The Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab," *Journal of Management Research*, 2 (2).

Zeithaml, V. A. (2000). "Service Quality, Profitability, and the Economic Worth of Customers: What We Know and what We Need