

Measuring the 2021 Clients Satisfaction on Frontline Services of Eastern Samar State University – Salcedo Campus

**Dr. Maria G. Gaytos¹, Dr. Arvin Anthony S. Araneta²,
Rovinson D. Gaganao³**

¹Associate Professor V, Eastern Samar State University, Salcedo, Philippines

²Associate Professor III, Eastern Samar State University, Salcedo, Philippines

³Instructor I, Eastern Samar State University, Salcedo, Philippines

Abstract

Section 4 of the Philippine Republic Act No. 6713 (RA5713) lays out the personal conduct standards that all public employees and officials must uphold in carrying out their duties, including being committed to the public interest, exercising the highest level of professionalism, objectivity, and truthfulness, and serving with fairness and neutrality. Employees of State Colleges and Universities (SUCs) are public servants that should be committed to public interest. Citizens as consumers regard satisfaction as a central managerial objective; as such, client satisfaction (i.e., quality assessments) is critical for retaining or even increasing customer loyalty, retention, and willingness-to-pay for private goods. The study aimed to assess the clients' level of satisfaction and perceived level of importance of the services and goods availed from the Eastern Samar State University Salcedo using a descriptive survey method. A gap analysis was done to determine the disparity between how clients perceived satisfaction and importance of frontline services which became the basis for action planning. Results showed that while clients were satisfied with most of the frontline services afforded to them, there was a gap between satisfaction and importance. An action plan was made to remedy the gaps.

Keywords: Client Satisfaction, Frontline Services, Satisfaction Importance, ESSU Salcedo Campus

1. Introduction

Section 4 of the Philippine Republic Act No. 6713 (RA5713) lays out the personal conduct standards that all public employees and officials must uphold in carrying out their duties, including being committed to the public interest, exercising the highest level of professionalism, objectivity, and truthfulness, and serving with fairness and neutrality. They must be accessible to the people, nationalistic and patriotic, committed to a democratic lifestyle, and living as simply as possible.

Employees of State Colleges and Universities (SUCs) are public servants that should be committed to public interest. Universities play an essential role in Philippine education, as they are responsible for the holistic development of professionally competent, service-oriented, principled, and productive individuals. One of the most important reasons for Philippine universities is service quality features, which include the accessibility and quality of frontline services to meet client expectations [1].

Quality service is synonymous to citizen satisfaction in the delivery of services. Understanding citizen satisfaction with government service delivery is frequently viewed as a simple and effective way to assess actual service quality. Citizens play various, overlapping roles as public goods consumers within a particular public goods system, a local democratic democracy and a free market [2].

Citizens as consumers regard satisfaction as a central managerial objective [3]. As such, client satisfaction (i.e., quality assessments) is critical for retaining or even increasing customer loyalty, retention, and willingness-to-pay for private goods [4]. Citizens are considered clients, consumers and customers of government services; so, the terms citizen satisfaction, client satisfaction, consumer satisfaction and customer satisfaction can mean the same thing.

Satisfaction refers to a state in which the customer/client feels that the product features or services are in accordance with his/her expectation [5]. Customer satisfaction is a phenomenon that describes how satisfied customers are with a product or service after they have consumed it. Organizations typically use the customer satisfaction construct to determine how happy customers are with supplied services or products. This enables firms to improve their service quality and, as a result, better focus their resources (time, money, workers, production process, and so on) while also strengthening customer connections [6][7].

Internal and external customers are the two categories of customers that exist in higher education. Internal consumers are academic employees (lecturers), researchers, non-academic workers, and students who have close and direct interactions with universities and who endeavor to provide satisfaction to the external customer [8]. External Customers, on the other hand, are individuals who have an indirect contact with the university. Nonetheless, they benefit from the services given by the institution and/or contribute to the university's operational activities [9].

The government recognizes the importance of quality service and the satisfaction of the citizens/clients in the delivery of these services. Recently, it has issued Memorandum Circular No. 2021-1 Issued June 3, 2021 which explains the guidelines on the grant of the performance-based bonus (PBB) for fiscal year (FY) 2021 under executive order no. 80, s. 2012 and executive order no. 201, s. 2016 [6].

According to the memorandum circular, to be eligible for the grant of the FY 2021 PBB, each agency must satisfy the criteria and conditions under the four dimensions of accountability: Performance Results, Process Results, Financial Results, and Citizen/Client Satisfaction Results and attain a total score of at least 70 points based on the PBB Scoring System.

Based on, Memorandum Circular No. 2021- 1 the IATF aims to continually achieve a government-wide improvement through seamless public service delivery. In achieving this, service quality standards in delivering frontline services, doing business with the government, industries, various sectors, and the citizens must be institutionalized across all government agencies.

The memorandum further stipulates that measuring and reporting the satisfaction level of citizens/clients that were served in FY 2021 is vital in ensuring that these standards are attained. For FY 2021 PBB, agencies should report the fulfillment of their services through a Citizen / Client Satisfaction Survey (CCSS) report. This shall generate verifiable data and tangible evidence to assist agencies determine the effectiveness of implemented ease of transaction and process improvements through identified indicators or service dimensions that were identified by the agencies and the citizens/clients they serve. It is with these premises that this Citizen/Client Satisfaction Survey was proposed.

Thus, the study aimed to assess the clients' level of satisfaction and perceived level of importance of the services and goods availed from the Eastern Samar State University System. Specifically, it aimed

to: i.) To determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Sex, Type of client and Office visited. ii.) To assess the level of clients' satisfaction in terms of the following service quality dimensions such as Responsiveness, Integrity, Reliability (Quality), Access and Facilities, Communication, Cost, Assurance and Outcome. iii.) To determine the perceived level of importance of the services availed by clients along the identified service quality dimensions. iv.) To identify problems/gaps based on the results of the study. v.) To craft an action to address the problems/gaps in the delivery of goods and services.

2. METHOD

The study used the descriptive methodology. This is a descriptive research design because it evaluates the level of satisfaction of the respondents. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2012) descriptive studies describe a given situation as fully and carefully as possible; and the most common descriptive methodology is the survey, as when researchers summarize the characteristics (abilities, preferences, behaviors, and so on) of individuals or groups or (sometimes) physical environments (such as schools). This descriptive study required the development and validation of a survey instrument that would measure the citizen/client satisfaction of frontline services in the university. The survey questionnaire had to be developed first as there were no instrument to measure the dimensions as prescribed by the memorandum circular. Respondents of the study were students, alumni, parents, suppliers and bidders and other government agencies who availed of both services and goods provided by the university in 2021. Data collected were summarized and analyzed using a descriptive statistic. Gap analysis was also considered to determine the strength and weakness of the institution in terms of service delivery. The result of the gap analysis was the basis for the action plan to improve the delivery of goods and services. The results of the survey were analyzed by service, and by applicable service quality dimensions based on the following template. The survey questionnaire was administered both vis face-to-face and online. The instrument is the composed of two parts: Part I elicited the clients' demographic profile and Part II was the modified Client/Customer Satisfaction Survey questionnaire. Some of the questionnaires were administered via-face-to face contact; others were administered online.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

As shown in the Table 1, the age of the greatest percentage of respondents (75.90%) is between 17-25 years old and the least (0.90%) is 66 years old and above. A greater percentage were females comprising 65.70% of the total respondents.

The general public, composed of students, alumni and parents made up the greatest number of respondents being 87.70% of the total number of respondents. The least (11.10%) were suppliers and bidders. It was also found that the greater number of respondents (39.50%) chose to evaluate the services of the Registrar's office and only 0.60% evaluated the alumni relations.

Table 1. Profile Characteristics of the Respondents

Variable	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Age	17-25 years old	246	75.90
	26 – 35 years old	38	11.70

Variable	Characteristics	Fre- quency	Percent- age
	36 – 45 years old	24	7.40
	46 – 55 years old	9	2.80
	56 – 65 years old	4	1.20
	66 years old and above	3	0.90
	<i>Total</i>	<i>324</i>	<i>100.00</i>
Sex	Male	111	34.30
	Female	213	65.70
	<i>Total</i>	<i>324</i>	<i>100.00</i>
Type of Client	General Public (Stu- dents/Alumni/Parents)	284	87.70
	Government/Non-Gov- ernment Agencies	4	1.20
	Suppliers/Bidders, etc.	36	11.10
	<i>Total</i>	<i>324</i>	<i>100.00</i>
Office Visited	Registrar	128	39.50
	Admission Office	6	1.90
	Scholarship	37	11.40
	Health Services	2	0.60
	Guidance and Counselling	1	0.30
	Supply Office	21	6.50
	College	44	13.60
	Cashier	52	16.00
	Student Orgs/Activities	16	4.90
	Alumni Relations	2	0.60
	Bids and Awards	15	4.60
	<i>Total</i>	<i>324</i>	<i>100.00</i>

3.2. Level of Clients Satisfaction

Table 2 presents the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis encountered by the clients during transactions with the Registrar’s office along with the service quality dimensions. It can be noted from the table that clients were very satisfied with the dimensions Assurance, Reliability, Access and Facilities, Integrity, Outcome, and Costs with mean score 4.21, 4.24, 4.25, 4.24, 4.37, and 4.24, respectively. Meanwhile, clients were satisfied with Communication (4.09) and Responsive (4.19). Looking at the level of importance, clients perceived all service quality dimensions to be very important with mean score from 4.51 to 4.69. As to the gap analysis, all dimensions yielded a negative difference indicating that all dimensions were weaknesses of the Registrar’ office. The weakest point of the office is communication with a gap -0.46 and the least gap is costs with a gap -0.27.

Table 2. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Registrar’s Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions, C.Y. 2021

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Communication	4.09	S	4.55	VI	-0.46	1
Assurance	4.21	VS	4.59	VI	-0.38	2
Reliability (Quality)	4.24	VS	4.61	VI	-0.37	3
Access and Facilities	4.25	VS	4.59	VI	-0.34	4
Integrity	4.24	VS	4.57	VI	-0.33	5.5
Responsiveness	4.19	S	4.52	VI	-0.33	5.5
Outcome	4.37	VS	4.69	VI	-0.32	7
Costs	4.24	VS	4.51	VI	-0.27	8

Presented in Table 3 is the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the Admission Office. The table shows that clients were very satisfied with all the service quality dimensions with a mean score from 4.27 to 4.57. Likewise, clients looked at the dimensions to be very important with a mean score of 4.33 to 5.00. The gap analysis for the admission office showed that the office is weak in terms of Responsiveness, Assurance, Outcome, Communication, and Access and Facilities. Responsiveness proved to be the weakest dimension with a gap -0.44. On the other hand, the office’s strength were Costs, Reliability, and Integrity with Integrity being the strongest dimension having a gap of only 0.17.

Table 3. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Admission Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions, C.Y. 2021

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Responsiveness	4.33	VS	4.77	VI	-0.44	1
Assurance	4.57	VS	5.00	VI	-0.43	2
Outcome	4.40	VS	4.77	VI	-0.37	3
Communication	4.37	VS	4.70	VI	-0.33	4
Access and Facilities	4.27	VS	4.50	VI	-0.23	5
Costs	4.53	VS	4.50	VI	0.03	6
Reliability (Quality)	4.50	VS	4.37	VI	0.13	7
Integrity	4.50	VS	4.33	VI	0.17	8

Reflected in Table 4 is the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the Scholarship Office. It is clearly seen in the table that clients were very satisfied with all the service quality dimensions except that of communication where clients were only satisfied. Meanwhile, clients perceived

all service quality dimensions to be very important with a mean score from 4.46 to 4.63. As to the gap analysis, all dimensions were considered weaknesses of the Scholarship office. Communication is shown as the weakest with a gap -0.34; reliability is the strongest with a gap -0.18.

Table 4. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Scholarship Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Communication	4.16	S	4.50	VI	-0.34	1
Responsiveness	4.23	VS	4.56	VI	-0.33	2
Integrity	4.25	VS	4.55	VI	-0.30	3
Access and Facilities	4.33	VS	4.57	VI	-0.24	4
Costs	4.27	VS	4.47	VI	-0.20	5
Assurance	4.37	VS	4.52	VI	-0.15	6
Outcome	4.45	VS	4.63	VI	-0.18	7.5
Reliability (Quality)	4.28	VS	4.46	VI	-0.18	7.5

Reflected in Table 5 is the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the Health Services' Office. Clients of the said office were very satisfied of the services provided to them in terms of Outcome, Assurance, and Costs with a mean score of 4.30, 4.30, and 4.40, respectively. On the other hand, clients were satisfied along the dimensions Reliability (3.90), Access and Facilities (4.00), Integrity (4.10), Communication (4.00), and Responsiveness (4.20). Moreover, clients perceived all the service quality dimensions to be very important with 4.70 mean score for Reliability and Access and Facilities, 4.80 for Integrity and Outcome, 4.60 for Communication, 4.50 for Assurance and Costs, and 4.40 for Responsiveness. On the gap analysis, all dimensions were considered weaknesses of the office with Reliability (-0.80) to be the weakest and Costs (-0.10) as least weak.

Table 5. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Health Services' Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Reliability (Quality)	3.90	S	4.70	VI	-0.80	1
Access and Facilities	4.00	S	4.70	VI	-0.70	2.5
Integrity	4.10	S	4.80	VI	-0.70	2.5
Communication	4.00	S	4.60	VI	-0.60	4
Outcome	4.30	VS	4.80	VI	-0.50	5
Assurance	4.30	VS	4.50	VI	-0.20	6.5
Responsiveness	4.20	S	4.40	VI	-0.20	6.5

Costs	4.40	VS	4.50	VI	-0.10	8
-------	------	----	------	----	-------	---

Table 6 shows the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the Guidance and Counselling Office. It is reflected in the table that clients were very satisfied with all the service quality dimensions with a mean score from 4.40 to 5.00. Likewise, clients looked at the dimensions to be very important with a mean score of 4.40 to 5.00. The gap analysis for the admission office showed that the office is weak in terms of Communication (-0.40), Integrity (-0.40), Assurance (-0.20), and Costs (-0.20) with Communication and Integrity to be the most weakness. On the other hand, the office’s strengths were Responsiveness (0.00), Access and Facilities (0.00), Outcome (0.00), and Reliability (0.40) where Reliability the most strength.

Table 6. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Guidance and Counselling Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Communication	4.60	VS	5.00	VI	-0.40	1.5
Integrity	4.60	VS	5.00	VI	-0.40	1.5
Assurance	4.80	VS	5.00	VI	-0.20	3.5
Costs	4.80	VS	5.00	VI	-0.20	3.5
Responsiveness	4.80	VS	4.80	VI	0.00	6
Access and Facilities	4.40	VS	4.40	VI	0.00	6
Outcome	5.00	VS	5.00	VI	0.00	6
Reliability (Quality)	4.40	VS	4.00	VI	0.40	8

Table 7 reflects the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the Supply Office. Clients were very satisfied with all the service quality dimensions and they considered them to be very important. However, all dimensions were weaknesses of the office except Integrity (0.03) which was the strength of the office.

Table 7. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Supply Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Outcome	4.81	VS	4.98	VI	-0.17	1
Responsiveness	4.82	VS	4.96	VI	-0.14	2
Assurance	4.84	VS	4.95	VI	-0.11	3
Communication	4.87	VS	4.94	VI	-0.07	4
Reliability (Quality)	4.84	VS	4.90	VI	-0.06	5

Costs	4.85	VS	4.90	VI	-0.05	6
Access and Facilities	4.88	VS	4.90	VI	-0.02	7
Integrity	4.90	VS	4.87	VI	0.03	8

Table 8 reflects the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the different colleges. Just like the other offices, clients of the colleges were very satisfied with the service provided to them in terms of all the service quality dimensions and they looked at it to be very important. However, all dimensions were weaknesses of the office except Reliability (0.02) which was the strength of the office. The office is very weak in terms of Responsiveness as supported by the gap -0.14.

Table 8. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Different Colleges along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Responsiveness	4.54	VS	4.68	VI	-0.14	1
Access and Facilities	4.56	VS	4.67	VI	-0.11	2
Outcome	4.68	VS	4.78	VI	-0.10	3
Communication	4.61	VS	4.68	VI	-0.07	4
Costs	4.50	VS	4.56	VI	-0.06	5.5
Integrity	4.58	VS	4.64	VI	-0.06	5.5
Assurance	4.64	VS	4.68	VI	-0.04	7
Reliability (Quality)	4.63	VS	4.61	VI	0.02	8

Table 9 reflects the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the cashier’s office. Cashier’s clients were very satisfied with the service provided to them in all the service quality dimensions and perceived all dimensions as very important. The office is also weak in all dimensions except of that Integrity (0.01) which was the strength of the office. The office is very weak in terms of Access and Facilities as supported by the gap -0.13.

Table 9. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Cashier’s Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Access and Facilities	4.67	VS	4.80	VI	-0.13	2
Assurance	4.67	VS	4.80	VI	-0.13	2
Costs	4.62	VS	4.75	VI	-0.13	2
Communication	4.67	VS	4.79	VI	-0.12	4
Outcome	4.77	VS	4.84	VI	-0.07	5

Responsiveness	4.68	VS	4.74	VI	-0.06	6
Reliability (Quality)	4.67	VS	4.71	VI	-0.04	7
Integrity	4.75	VS	4.74	VI	0.01	8

Table 10 reflects the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the Office of the Student Organizations and Activities. Clients were very satisfied with all the service quality dimensions and considered them all to be very important. However, of all the dimensions the weakest was Access and Facilities (-0.40) and the least weak was Integrity (-0.165).

Table 10. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Office of the Student Organizations and Activities along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Access and Facilities	4.25	VS	4.65	VI	-0.40	1
Costs	4.40	VS	4.65	VI	-0.25	2
Outcome	4.50	VS	4.74	VI	-0.24	3
Assurance	4.54	VS	4.75	VI	-0.21	4.5
Responsiveness	4.49	VS	4.70	VI	-0.21	4.5
Communication	4.51	VS	4.71	VI	-0.20	6
Reliability (Quality)	4.39	VS	4.56	VI	-0.17	7
Integrity	4.48	VS	4.63	VI	-0.15	8

Reflected in Table 11 is the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis the Alumni Relation Office. As manifested, clients were satisfied with all the service quality dimensions. They also perceived all dimensions as very important. Hence, all dimensions are weaknesses of the Office except Costs which was the strength of the office. Integrity ranked 1 as the most weakness of the office.

Table 11. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Alumni Relation Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Integrity	3.80	S	4.60	VI	-0.80	1
Reliability (Quality)	4.00	S	4.60	VI	-0.60	2
Access and Facilities	4.10	S	4.60	VI	-0.50	3.5
Responsiveness	4.20	S	4.60	VI	-0.40	5.5
Communication	4.00	S	4.40	VI	-0.40	5.5
Outcome	4.00	S	4.50	VI	-0.50	3.5

Assurance	4.10	S	4.30	VI	-0.20	7
Costs	4.00	S	4.00	VI	0.00	8

Presented in Table 12 is the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis for the Bids and Awards Office. It is reflected that clients were very satisfied with all the service quality dimensions with a mean score from 4.91 to 4.96. Likewise, clients looked at the dimensions to be very important with a mean score of 4.76 to 4.89. The gap analysis showed also that all dimensions were strengths of the office with Reliability to be the most strength and Integrity to be the least strength.

Table 12. Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions with the Bids and Awards’ Office along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Integrity	4.91	VS	4.89	VI	0.02	1
Communication	4.92	VS	4.89	VI	0.03	2
Costs	4.92	VS	4.88	VI	0.04	3
Assurance	4.97	VS	4.89	VI	0.08	4
Outcome	4.97	VS	4.88	VI	0.09	5
Responsiveness	4.95	VS	4.84	VI	0.11	6
Access and Facilities	4.95	VS	4.81	VI	0.14	7
Reliability (Quality)	4.96	VS	4.76	VI	0.20	8

Table 13 presents the summary of the level of satisfaction, level of importance, and gap analysis encountered by the clients during transactions on the services along with the service quality dimensions. Clients were very satisfied and perceived to be very important all service quality dimensions. However, all dimensions were weaknesses of the university by merely looking at the result of the gap analysis. The university is very weak at Communication with a gap -0.33 and least weak at Integrity with -0.18 gap.

Table 13. Summary of the Level of Satisfaction, Level of Importance, and Gaps Encountered by the Clients during Transactions on the Services along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Level of Satisfaction		Level of Importance		Gap	Rank
	Mean Score	Interpretation	Mean Score	Interpretation		
Communication	4.38	VS	4.71	VI	-0.33	1
Responsiveness	4.42	VS	4.64	VI	-0.22	3
Access and Facilities	4.44	VS	4.66	VI	-0.22	3
Assurance	4.46	VS	4.68	VI	-0.22	3
Outcome	4.55	VS	4.75	VI	-0.20	5
Reliability (Quality)	4.45	VS	4.63	VI	-0.18	7

Costs	4.42	VS	4.60	VI	-0.18	7
Integrity	4.46	VS	4.64	VI	-0.18	7

Table 14 presents the ranking of offices based on the level of satisfaction of the clients. With a grand mean of 4.94, Bids and Awards was ranked 1, Supply office to be in the 2nd rank with a grand mean of 4.85. It is followed by Cashier, Guidance and Counselling, College Offices, Student Orgs/Activities, Admission office, Scholarship, Registrar, and Health Services with a grand mean of 4.69, 4.68, 4.59, 4.44, 4.43, 4.29, 4.23, and 4.16, respectively. The last office to rank at the bottom is the Alumni Relations with a grand mean of 4.03.

Table 14. Ranking of Offices Based on the Level of Satisfaction during Transactions on the Different Services Aailed by Clients along with the Service Quality Dimensions

Office	Grand Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Bids and Awards	4.94	Very Satisfied	1
Supply Office	4.85	Very Satisfied	2
Cashier	4.69	Very Satisfied	3
Guidance and Counselling	4.68	Very Satisfied	4
College	4.59	Very Satisfied	5
Student Orgs/Activities	4.44	Very Satisfied	6
Admission Office	4.43	Very Satisfied	7
Scholarship	4.29	Very Satisfied	8
Registrar	4.23	Very Satisfied	9
Health Services	4.16	Satisfied	10
Alumni Relations	4.03	Satisfied	11

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In the light of the following findings, the researchers conclude that over-all the clients were satisfied with the different services afforded to them by the different frontline services with a very satisfactory rating particularly in Bids and Awards; Supply Office; Cashier; Guidance and Counselling; College; Student Orgs/Activities; Admission Office; Scholarship and with satisfactory rating for the Registrar and Health Services based on the recommended dimensions of the IATF.

However, with a gap analysis between the level of satisfaction and the level of importance in the given services, there was a negative value in most of the dimensions. A negative gap value indicates dissatisfaction with an important attribute. An action plan therefore was recommended to bridge these gaps.

It is recommended that a periodic study be made of the same kind in the future in order to determine whether the goals and objectives in the action plan were met and were successful in addressing gaps between satisfaction and importance of services offered within the university or campus. It is also recommended that the determination of the number of respondents for every service area be improved in order to come up with a more valid and reliable results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to express their sincere gratitude to God Almighty for giving them the opportunities to develop while carrying out this study and to ESSU Salcedo for providing the environment in which they could hone their skills, which enabled them to develop and learn the traits required to finish this study.

REFERENCES

1. Florhaida V. Pamatmat, L L. Dominguez, C. D. Pamin and Daran, A. (2018); Service Quality Dimensions Of A Philippine State University And Students? Satisfaction: Bridging Gaps To Excellence.. *International Journal of Advanced Research* (IJAR) 6 (Jul). 673-681] (ISSN 2320-5407). www.journalijar.com
2. Collins, B. K, Kim, H. J. & Tao, J. (2019) Managing for Citizen Satisfaction: Is Good Not Enough? *Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs*. 5(1), 21-38. <https://doi.org/10.20899/jpna.5.1.21-38>
3. Song, M., & Meier, K. J. (2018). Citizen satisfaction and the kaleidoscope of government performance: How multiple stakeholders see government performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 28, 489-505. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muy006>
4. Babakus, E., Bienstock, C. C., & Van Scotter, J. R. (2004). Linking perceived quality and customer satisfaction to store traffic and revenue growth. *Decision Sciences*. 35 910 713-737. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1540-5915.2004.02671.x>
5. Motefakker, N. (2016) The Study of the Level of Satisfaction of the Students of the Faculty of Social Sciences with Welfare Services of Imam Khomeini International University of Qazvin. *Procedia Economics and finance*. 26 (1):399-407
6. IATF MC No. 2021-1: Guidelines on the Grant of the Performance-Based-Bonus (PBB) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 under Executive Order No. 80, S. 2012 and Executive Order No. 201, S. 2016,” CIVIL SERVICE GUIDE: A Compilation of Issuances on Philippine Civil Service, accessed January 27, 2022, <https://www.csguide.org/items/show/1452>.
7. Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C. & Lehman, D. R., (1994). Customer Satisfaction, Market Share, and Profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*. 58(2), pp. 53-66.
8. Rahayu, S. (2011) Internal Customer Satisfaction and Service Quality Toward Trust and Word of Mouth. *ASEAN Marketing Journal*. 3 (2) pp: 114-123
9. Marzo, M., Pedraja, M., & Rivera, P. (2007). *The customer concept in university services: A classification - International Review on public and nonprofit marketing*. SpringerLink. Retrieved March 4, 2023, from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF03180755#citeas>



Licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)