



Evaluating school services: A survey of stakeholders' satisfaction

Marichu B Secillano, Jennifer D Buyuccan, Marianne M Andrada

Department of Science High School, University of Baguio, Baguio City, Philippines

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to determine the overall satisfaction levels and assess stakeholders' satisfaction with various University of Baguio services. The data was collected and analyzed using a survey questionnaire as the primary data collection tool. The survey questionnaire was administered to the University of Baguio High School and University of Baguio Science High School students enrolled during the first semester of the school year 2024-2025. The data obtained underwent statistical analysis using techniques such as getting the mean and standard deviation. Additionally, statistical tests such as the Kruskal-Wallis test, and pairwise Mann-Whitney test were applied to analyze the data. The mean and standard deviation calculations were used to identify the current stakeholders' satisfaction level with the identified service quality dimensions. The findings indicated that excellent client satisfaction in offices' services not only strengthened client loyalty and increased revenue but also improved employee morale. It permitted offices to focus on service improvements and innovations while providing a significant competitive advantage. The study produced a positive result, showing that participants actively availed of the services and expressed satisfaction with them.

Keywords: Stakeholder's satisfaction, school services, education

Introduction

In many countries, the education sector is a critical aspect of national development, and the satisfaction of stakeholders such as students, parents, teachers, and administrators is a vital measure of the quality of education. The evaluation of school services and stakeholders' satisfaction is a global issue. Evaluating school services is a topic of global interest as governments and education organizations worldwide continue to focus on improving education systems. The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 4 aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. To achieve this goal, it is crucial to evaluate school services and identify areas for improvement. There has been a growing interest in using stakeholders' satisfaction surveys to evaluate school services globally in recent years. These surveys help education stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, and administrators, provide feedback about their experiences with school services.

Research studies generally indicate that stakeholders' satisfaction with school services is linked to factors such as communication, support, and engagement and that their perceptions of the quality of education provided influence their satisfaction levels (Picus, 2017) [23].

A survey of stakeholders' satisfaction can help to improve the quality of education by providing insights into what stakeholders want and need from schools. Accordingly, stakeholders are most satisfied with schools that provide a safe and supportive learning environment, have qualified teachers, and offer a challenging curriculum (OECD, 2019) [20].

Literature review

Evaluating school services is crucial to identify improvement areas and ensure that education is inclusive, equitable, and of high quality. Studies that support the conduct of the study are presented here.

Gorospa and Talosa (2021) [10] explained that client satisfaction can significantly impact academic life,

particularly in providing services that meet appropriate standards. Kanwar and Sanjeeva (2022) [14] stated that before enrolling in an educational institution, students typically evaluate its facilities and standards by checking its website and other admission portals and seeking peer opinions and public perception. Nowadays, many educational institutions worldwide request student feedback to assess their satisfaction with all aspects of academic life through satisfaction feedback questionnaires. Meanwhile, Khalil-Ur-Rehman *et al.* (2018) [15] discussed that since students are why private universities exist, and customer satisfaction is one of the topics that has received the most attention in marketing literature, businesses should strive to provide excellent customer service and satisfy their customers.

In addition, the study by Balbuena (2019) [3] examined the process of evaluating school services in the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR). The study found that the process is complex and challenging but essential for ensuring the quality of education. The study also found that there is a need for more resources and training to support the evaluation process. Another study by Guintu (2020) [12] surveyed parents in CAR to assess their satisfaction with the quality of education. The study found that parents were generally satisfied with the quality of education but were concerned about the lack of resources and the high dropout rate. The study also found that parents were more satisfied with the quality of education in urban areas than in rural areas. Both local studies suggest that schools can improve stakeholder satisfaction by focusing on the factors that are important to stakeholders. By doing so, schools can improve the quality of education and create a more positive school climate.

Theoretical and conceptual framework

The framework that can support this study is the stakeholder theory. This theory posits that an organization's success depends not only on its financial performance but also on its ability to meet the needs and expectations of its

stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, and administrators. The stakeholder theory asserts that organizations should consider all their stakeholders' interests and needs, not just shareholders when making decisions (Vora, 2020) [30]. In the context of education, the stakeholder theory suggests that schools should prioritize the satisfaction and needs of their stakeholders to ensure that they provide quality education. By surveying stakeholders' satisfaction, the study aims to identify the needs and expectations of education stakeholders and use this information to improve the quality of education provided.

The conceptual framework that can support the study is the service quality framework, which posits that customers' satisfaction with a service depends on their perceptions of its quality. The framework identifies five key service quality dimensions: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles. In education, these dimensions can be translated into factors such as communication, support, engagement, and curriculum, which are crucial for stakeholders' satisfaction with school services (Santos, 2019) [25].

Using the stakeholder theory and service quality framework, the study aims to comprehensively understand the factors influencing stakeholders' satisfaction with school services and provide recommendations for improving the quality of education provided.

Significance of the Study

The client satisfaction survey is essential for schools to gather feedback from their clients or customers about the quality of their services. Key reasons include identifying improvement areas, retaining customers, enhancing brand reputation, and monitoring progress. By studying stakeholders' satisfaction, schools can progress towards achieving the SDGs and improving the quality of education for all.

This study hopes to pinpoint areas for improvement in the school by soliciting feedback from stakeholders and gauging what aspects are functioning effectively and which ones require modification. Identifying the school's strengths can foster client contentment and loyalty, resulting in an inclination to recommend the institution to others and generating fresh leads and revenue. Affirmative feedback can be utilized to showcase the school and boost its reputation, while unfavorable feedback can provide insights into opportunities for development. Lastly, by regularly conducting surveys, institutions can track their progress and take corrective measures to address shortcomings.

The target beneficiaries for a study evaluating school services: A survey of stakeholders' satisfaction would include individuals and groups with a stake in the quality and effectiveness of school services. These could include:

Students: Students are the primary beneficiaries of school services, and their satisfaction with the quality of education and support services provided by schools is a key indicator of the effectiveness of these services.

Parents and guardians: Parents and guardians play an important role in supporting their children's education and are vested in ensuring that schools provide high-quality services that meet their children's needs.

Teachers and staff: Teachers and staff are responsible for delivering school services and can provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of these services and areas for improvement.

School administrators: School administrators are responsible for managing and overseeing school services and can provide important information about the policies and strategies to evaluate and improve these services.

Education policymakers: Education policymakers are responsible for setting policies and regulations that guide the provision of school services and can use survey results to inform policy decisions and improve the quality and effectiveness of these services.

Community members: Community members may be interested in the quality of school services as they can significantly impact the community's social and economic development.

Objectives of the study

The study aims to gather feedback on the quality of school services, assess the satisfaction levels of different stakeholders with the services provided by the University of Baguio's basic education school system, and identify areas that require improvement to enhance stakeholder satisfaction. The survey results can inform decision-making and resource allocation to improve the quality of school services and meet the expectations and needs of stakeholders. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following problems:

- What is the current stakeholders' satisfaction level on the identified service quality dimensions?
- Is there a significant difference in the level of satisfaction of current stakeholders on the identified service quality dimensions?
- What service quality dimension needs to be addressed?

Material and method

This part includes the research design, data collection methods, data analysis methods, and ethical considerations to ensure the study is conducted systematically and rigorously.

Study design

The study will utilize a research design that is descriptive-comparative, as it is consistent with the study's goals and the intended data analysis approach.

Population of the study

The study will encompass all relevant stakeholders of UB basic education (UBSHS, UBHS, and UBLES) who will take part in the survey. It may include parents, students, alumni, faculty, non-teaching staff, and visitors. The researchers will initially employ convenience or purposive sampling to initiate the participant selection. These initial participants will be tasked with referring other individuals who satisfy the study's criteria. These referrals may include individuals from their networks, such as friends, family members, acquaintances, or anyone who has utilized the school's services from June 2023 to January 2024.

The choice of these specific months is strategic, as it covers the enrollment schedule of the academic year from June to August for the first semester and December to January for the second semester. The first semester classes start from August until early December, while the second semester is from January to May. As new participants who have availed of the school's services during this timeframe are identified

and recruited, they will, in turn, be encouraged to provide referrals to additional participants. This iterative process will persist until the end of classes in December, generating a snowball effect as the participant pool expands.

Data gathering tools

To further improve the UB basic education efforts in gathering feedback on their services, the researchers adopted the Standardized Citizen/Client Satisfaction Survey (CCSS) form from the Department of Education (2021) [8]. The CCSS Form (Appendix A), including the quick guide to conducting the CCSS and a sample online form used in the DepEd Central Office, are all accessible online. The only

modification was removing the neutral response, limiting the responses to four (4) from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. The client satisfaction rating matrix parameters involve a 4-point Likert scale with four (4) as the highest satisfaction rating and one (1) as the lowest. The adopted rating criteria are presented in Table 1. In addition, to encourage the respondents to express their opinions, ideas, and perspectives further, the researchers added open-ended questions in the last part of the tool that may prompt individuals to provide detailed and meaningful responses. This way, they may be encouraged to share their thoughts, experiences, and feelings, allowing for richer, more comprehensive information.

Table 1: Rating criteria adopted from DepEd Memorandum DM-PHROD-2021-0165

Service Quality Dimension	Description
Responsiveness	Willingness to help, assist, and provide prompt service to clients
Reliability	Provision of what was needed and what was promised, in accordance with the policy and standards, with zero to minimal error rate
Access and Facilities	Convenience of location, ample amenities for a comfortable transaction, and the use of clear signage and modes of technology
Communication	Keep clients informed in a language they can easily understand and listen to their feedback.
Costs	Satisfaction with the timelines of the processes, preferred methods of payment, value for money, acceptable range of cost, and qualitative information on the cost of each service
Integrity	Assurance that there is honesty, justice, fairness, and trust in each service while dealing with the clients
Assurance	The capability of frontline staff to perform their duties, product and service knowledge, understanding of client needs, helpfulness, and good work relationships
Outcome	Rate in terms of achieving outcomes or realizing the intended benefits of services

Data gathering procedures

A letter of request will be sent to the offices of UB RIECO, UBSHS, UBHS, and UBLES seeking permission to gather data. After which, different statistical analyses will be used, as mentioned in the treatment of data, to evaluate further the school services done by the UB Basic Education during the current academic year 2023-2024 from June 2023 to January 2024.

Treatment of Data

The data obtained from the CCSS undergo statistical analysis using techniques such as mean, standard deviation, Kruskal-Wallis test, and pairwise Mann-Whitney Test.

The mean and standard deviation calculations were used to identify the current stakeholders' satisfaction level with the identified service quality dimensions. Since the data are from the Likert scale, which is ordinal, the researchers opted to use non-parametric tests. To test if there is a significant difference in the level of satisfaction of current stakeholders on the identified service quality dimensions in each of the offices, the researchers used a Kruskal-Wallis test followed by a post-hoc test if there is a significant difference. The pairwise Mann-Whitney test was used in the post-hoc test. All the tests used 0.05 as the level of significance.

By using these statistical methods, researchers can better understand the factors that influence the satisfaction level of parents and students with the services rendered by the school. This information can improve the quality of education and make the school more appealing to parents students and other stakeholders.

Ethical Considerations

The personal information obtained from the CCSS will be kept confidential throughout the research process. No identifying information from the CCSS will be released to

the researchers. Participants will give their consent voluntarily when they click the CCSS link or QR codes posted at the offices, answer the survey, and agree to submit the form. Upon submission, a copy of their responses will be automatically emailed to the address provided.

Only the necessary data for the research objectives will be utilized to reduce the possibility of data breaches and misuse. The data will only be accessible to the researchers and authorized school personnel, and access controls will be strictly enforced in the offices where the reports are kept. The data collection, transmission, and storage will be closely monitored to ensure compliance with security protocols. To share the study results to a broader audience, it will be done through various channels, including but not limited to research conferences, presentations, academic publications, and school meetings.

By taking these ethical considerations into account, researchers can ensure that this research is conducted in a way that is ethical and responsible.

Results and discussion

Results

The study "Evaluating School Services: A Survey of Stakeholders' Satisfaction" looks into how satisfied different stakeholders, including parents, teachers, and students, are with the services provided by the educational system. The survey employs a descriptive-comparative research approach with the objective of evaluating the level of satisfaction with several aspects of school services, including administrative assistance. The study emphasizes how crucial stakeholder input is to raising educational standards and creating a welcoming learning environment, both of which lead to the ongoing improvement of school services.

By obtaining thorough input from a range of stakeholders, the University of Baguio research seeks to assess the competence of services offered within its basic education school system. This undertaking aims to evaluate customer satisfaction along several service quality dimensions, which is essential for pinpointing regions that require development and places that are strong points. The results will be a useful tool for well-informed decision-making and the strategic allocation of resources since they address important concerns about present satisfaction levels, variations in stakeholder views, and particular service quality dimensions that need improvement. The ultimate objective is to raise the standard of school services generally and make sure that they meet the requirements and expectations of teachers, parents, and students.

Table 2 shows the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders on the different service quality dimensions of the offices visited. It is observable that all of the offices except for the ARC/Registrar's Office have a level of satisfaction that is very high in all the service quality dimensions. This means that these offices are seen by the stakeholders to have the willingness to help, assist, and provide prompt service to clients and were able to provide what was needed and what was promised, by the policy and standards, with a zero to minimal error rate. Also, the stakeholders are very satisfied with the convenience of location, ample amenities for a comfortable transaction, the use of clear signage and modes of technology, and keeping clients informed in a language they can easily understand and listen to their feedback. Stakeholders are also very satisfied with the timeliness of the processes, preferred methods of payment, value for money, acceptable range of cost, and qualitative information on the cost of each service and have the assurance that there is honesty, justice, fairness, and trust in each service while dealing with the clients. The capability of frontline staff to perform their duties, product, and service knowledge, understanding of client needs, helpfulness, and good work relationships and rate in terms of achieving outcomes or realizing the intended benefits of services are seen by the stakeholders to be very satisfying.

Numerous studies that highlight the positive correlation between service quality and stakeholder satisfaction across a range of industries might support the conclusions relating stakeholder satisfaction with service quality characteristics. These three pertinent corroborations are listed:

Customer Satisfaction and Service Quality Dimensions in the Public Sector: Reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibility are just a few of the service quality dimensions that have a big impact on customer satisfaction, according to a study that looked at service quality in public sector businesses. The study's findings, which are consistent with stakeholders' reports that they are extremely happy with the services received from the offices they visited aside from the ARC/Registrar's Office, show that when service providers live up to client expectations, satisfaction levels rise (Fahim, 2019) ^[9].

Stakeholder satisfaction in higher education: Studies concentrating on institutions of higher management education have shown a strong correlation between different aspects of service quality and stakeholder satisfaction. The study confirmed that effective service delivery connects with stakeholder perceptions of quality by using a structured questionnaire to assess satisfaction across many dimensions (Singh and Singla, 2018) ^[27]. This corroborates the conclusion that stakeholders are extremely happy with features like friendliness, responsiveness, and transparency in the assessed offices.

Effect of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction in Banking: According to a study done in the industry, customer satisfaction is positively impacted by each of the five aspects of service quality (tangibility, reliability, assurance, responsiveness, and empathy). According to the study of Ananda and Devesh, 2017 ^[2], banks that do well in these areas have a higher chance of having satisfied customers, which is consistent with results indicating stakeholders value the offices they visit and the degree of assistance and quality of service they receive.

Table 2: Level of Satisfaction of the Stakeholders on the Different Service Quality Dimensions

Service Quality Dimensions	Offices	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Responsiveness	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.20	0.4472	Satisfied
	Cashier	3.62	0.5123	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.63	0.4880	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.38	0.5000	Very Satisfied
	UBHS Principal's Office	3.71	0.4575	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.71	0.4576	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.71	0.4523	Very Satisfied
Reliability	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.20	0.4472	Satisfied
	Cashier	3.60	0.5244	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.53	0.6164	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.31	0.4787	Very Satisfied
	UBHS Principal's Office	3.67	0.4761	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.68	0.4682	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.65	0.4939	Very Satisfied
Access & Facilities	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.40	0.5477	Very Satisfied
	Cashier	3.56	0.5224	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.61	0.5525	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.25	0.6831	Very Satisfied
	UBHS Principal's Office	3.65	0.5224	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.61	0.4890	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.60	0.5196	Very Satisfied
Communication	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.40	0.5477	Very Satisfied

	Cashier	3.61	0.5308	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.58	0.5287	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.25	0.5774	Very Satisfied
	UBHS Principal's Office	3.75	0.4401	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.71	0.4720	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.66	0.4882	Very Satisfied
Costs	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.20	0.4472	Satisfied
	Cashier	3.41	0.5509	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.47	0.5336	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.25	0.4472	Very Satisfied
	UBHS Principal's Office	3.60	0.4954	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.50	0.5348	Very Satisfied
Integrity	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.51	0.5289	Very Satisfied
	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.40	0.5477	Very Satisfied
	Cashier	3.61	0.5067	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.53	0.5336	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.31	0.4787	Very Satisfied
	UBHS Principal's Office	3.76	0.4346	Very Satisfied
Assurance	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.66	0.4772	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.65	0.4843	Very Satisfied
	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.20	0.4472	Satisfied
	Cashier	3.58	0.4943	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.55	0.5890	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.31	0.4787	Very Satisfied
Outcome	UBHS Principal's Office	3.76	0.4346	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.62	0.5041	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.61	0.5236	Very Satisfied
	ARC/Registrar's Office	3.60	0.5477	Very Satisfied
	Cashier	3.58	0.5030	Very Satisfied
	Library	3.58	0.5287	Very Satisfied
	Student's Accounts Office	3.38	0.5000	Very Satisfied
	UBHS Principal's Office	3.76	0.4346	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	3.65	0.4799	Very Satisfied
	UBSHS Principal's Office	3.62	0.5016	Very Satisfied

As for the ARC/Registrar's Office, the stakeholders are satisfied with its responsiveness, reliability, costs, and assurance while they are very satisfied with its access and facilities, communication, integrity, and outcome. Service delivery and organizational performance are significantly impacted by stakeholders' degree of satisfaction with many aspects of service quality, including responsiveness, reliability, access and facilities, communication, prices, integrity, assurance, and outcome. In the competitive service business, customers play an important role in determining the service quality that customer receive. Empirical studies reveal that stakeholders, such as clients and staff, frequently assess service quality by comparing their expectations with real experiences, resulting in disparate degrees of contentment (Balinado *et al.*, 2021) ^[4]. For example, attributes like certainty and dependability are vital because they promote confidence, while responsiveness is necessary to quickly attend to stakeholder needs. Effective communication and service accessibility also improve stakeholder participation, which raises satisfaction levels. Costs and other financial factors are important because stakeholders want to get value for their money, which may affect how they view services in general. In the end, having a thorough understanding of these aspects enables businesses to better serve their stakeholders, customize their strategies, and increase stakeholder satisfaction and loyalty all of which are essential for long-term success (Pakurar, *et. al*, 2019) ^[21].

Table 3 shows the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test on the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders on the different

service quality. Only the cashier, UBHS Guidance office, and UBSHS Principal's office have significant differences in their respective service quality dimensions since the p-values are less than 0.05. This means that the different service quality dimensions of each of the offices are not the same. This implies that some service quality dimensions are seen by the stakeholders to be more satisfying the others.

Implications of the findings

Differentiated Service Quality Perception: Based on the office with which they are interacting, stakeholders may prioritize different areas of service quality, as seen by the large variances in satisfaction ratings. This may indicate the necessity for specialized service improvement plans that target particular areas of each office's service delivery shortcomings.

Emphasis on Improvement Areas: Improvement efforts ought to be directed toward these areas since the test results indicate which dimensions have lower satisfaction ratings. For instance, focused training or resource allocation could improve service delivery if the UBHS Guidance Office exhibits reduced satisfaction with response.

Stakeholder feedback systems: The results highlight the significance of putting in place strong feedback systems that let stakeholders communicate their degree of satisfaction. Frequent evaluations can facilitate proactive changes in service quality by assisting in the identification of patterns across time.

Allocating Resources: Resource allocation can be influenced by knowing which aspects of service quality are viewed as less satisfying. Lower-rated offices can benefit from further employee training or infrastructural upgrades to boost customer satisfaction overall.

Benchmarking and Best Practices: Benchmarking versus best practices can also be based on variations in satisfaction levels. By sharing their strategies with struggling offices, offices that perform well in a given area can encourage a culture of continual progress.

Customer Satisfaction and Service Quality, compared with other research employing the Kruskal-Wallis test, has also discovered a substantial relationship between various service quality parameters and customer satisfaction (Maksheeva, 2024) ^[18]. For example, studies conducted across a range of industries, including hospitality and Healthcare have repeatedly demonstrated the importance of traits like empathy and responsiveness in raising stakeholder satisfaction levels overall. Demographic considerations studies have also shown that perceptions of service quality can be influenced by demographic considerations. Disparities in satisfaction, for instance, could result from differing expectations according to age, gender, or educational background, as research evaluating service quality across various populations has shown (Sarande, et. al, 2022) ^[26]. To summarize, the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test emphasize the need for customized approaches in service delivery by highlighting areas that require improvement and aligning with broader studies on stakeholder satisfaction and service quality.

Table 3: Kruskal-Wallis test on the Level of Satisfaction of Stakeholders on the Different Service Quality Dimensions

Offices	p-value	Interpretation
ARC/Registrar’s Office	0.841	Not Significant
Cashier	0.001	Significant
Library	0.772	Not Significant
Student’s Account Office	0.996	Not Significant
UBHS Principal’s Office	0.627	Not Significant
UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD	0.025	Significant
UBSHS Principal’s Office	0.001	Significant

The level of satisfaction of the stakeholders on the different service quality dimensions of the ARC/Registrar's office, Library, Student's Account Office, and UBHS Principal's

office have no significant differences. This means that the different service quality dimensions of each of the offices are the same. This implies that service quality dimensions are seen by the stakeholders to be at the same level as the others. With p-values smaller than the significance level of 0.05, the results show that there are notable disparities in the experiences of students at the UBSHS Principal's Office, UBSHS Guidance Office/CCSD, and Cashier's Office. This implies that opinions and levels of satisfaction among students differ among different offices. Nonetheless, there are no appreciable variations in the ARC/Registrar's Office, Library, Student's Account Office, or UBHS Principal's Office, suggesting that students' experiences are generally uniform in these domains. To provide more support for these findings, it would be beneficial to carry out additional analyses aimed at pinpointing the precise characteristics that are responsible for the notable variations, such as staff response, wait times, or service quality. Administrators can use this information to improve the overall student experience and prioritize areas for improvement.

Table 4 shows the post-hoc test on the level of satisfaction of stakeholders on the different service quality dimensions of the cashier using pairwise Mann-Whitney. It shows that the following pairs of service quality dimensions are significantly different from each other since the p-values are less than 0.05: responsiveness vs. costs, reliability vs. costs, access & facilities vs. costs, costs vs. integrity, costs vs. assurance, and costs vs. outcome. In summary, the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders with the costs is significantly different from the other service quality dimensions. Looking at Table 2, the costs under the cashier have the lowest mean compared with the other service quality dimensions. With this, the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders can be said to be lower than their level of satisfaction in the other dimension. The p-values less than 0.05 in the data reveal a substantial association between costs and responsiveness, reliability, access & facilities, communication, integrity, assurance, and outcome. This suggests that adjustments to costs will probably also affect these other aspects of service quality. The lack of statistical significance in the other correlations, however, indicates that there is insufficient data to conclude that changes in one dimension are correlated with changes in the others. The findings shed light on the relationships between the various aspects of service quality and can help guide initiatives for improving it.

Table 4: Post-hoc Test on the Level of Satisfaction of Stakeholders on the Different Service Quality Dimensions of the Cashier

SQD1	SQD2	p-value	Interpretation
Responsiveness	Reliability	0.732	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Access & Facilities	0.225	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Communication	0.924	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Costs	0.001	Significant
Responsiveness	Integrity	0.733	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Assurance	0.309	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Outcome	0.337	Not Significant
Reliability	Access & Facilities	0.382	Not Significant
Reliability	Communication	0.805	Not Significant
Reliability	Costs	0.001	Significant
Reliability	Integrity	0.999	Not Significant
Reliability	Assurance	0.499	Not Significant
Reliability	Outcome	0.536	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Communication	0.264	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Costs	0.002	Significant

Access & Facilities	Integrity	0.381	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Assurance	0.833	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Outcome	0.792	Not Significant
Communication	Costs	0.001	Significant
Communication	Integrity	0.806	Not Significant
Communication	Assurance	0.356	Not Significant
Communication	Outcome	0.388	Not Significant
Cost	Integrity	0.001	Significant
Cost	Assurance	0.001	Significant
Cost	Outcome	0.001	Significant
Integrity	Assurance	0.499	Not Significant
Integrity	Outcome	0.536	Not Significant
Assurance	Outcome	0.957	Not Significant

As for the other pairings, no significant difference was found since the p-values are greater than 0.05. Thus, the responsiveness, reliability, access & facilities, communication, integrity, assurance, and outcome of the cashier are seen by the stakeholders to have the same level of satisfaction. To summarize, the data does not offer compelling evidence of a link between responsiveness/reliability and the other qualities, as indicated by the non-significant p-values. This does not imply that the relationships do not exist, though. P-value interpretation necessitates taking into account both the research's overall context and its limitations.

Table 5 shows the post-hoc test on the level of satisfaction of stakeholders on the different service quality dimensions of the UBSHS Guidance Office using pairwise Mann-Whitney. It shows that the following pairs of service quality dimensions are significantly different from each other since the p-values are less than 0.05: responsiveness vs. costs,

reliability vs. costs, costs vs. integrity, costs vs. assurance, and costs vs. outcome. This scenario is almost the same with the cashier except that costs and access & facilities are not significantly different. Looking at Table 2, the costs under the UBSHS Guidance office have the lowest mean compared with its other service quality dimensions. With this, the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders can be said to be lower than their level of satisfaction in the other dimensions except for the access and facilities. This implies that different stakeholders have different levels of satisfaction with these dimensions (Chorachor, 2024). The investigation did discover, however, that there were no appreciable variations between costs and access & facilities, suggesting a similar degree of satisfaction in these two areas. Enhancements in the quality of services provided by the guidance office can be directed by this sophisticated grasp of stakeholder satisfaction (Nadela et. al, 2023) ^[19].

Table 5: Post-hoc Test on the Level of Satisfaction of Stakeholders on the Different Service Quality Dimensions of the UBSHS Guidance Office

SQD1	SQD2	p-value	Interpretation
Responsiveness	Reliability	0.675	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Access & Facilities	0.133	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Communication	0.808	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Costs	0.002	Significant
Responsiveness	Integrity	0.406	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Assurance	0.203	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Outcome	0.334	Not Significant
Reliability	Access & Facilities	0.279	Not Significant
Reliability	Communication	0.509	Not Significant
Reliability	Costs	0.007	Significant
Reliability	Integrity	0.681	Not Significant
Reliability	Assurance	0.391	Not Significant
Reliability	Outcome	0.585	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Communication	0.084	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Costs	0.097	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Integrity	0.503	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Assurance	0.831	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Outcome	0.593	Not Significant
Communication	Costs	0.001	Significant
Communication	Integrity	0.286	Not Significant
Communication	Assurance	0.133	Not Significant
Communication	Outcome	0.229	Not Significant
Cost	Integrity	0.021	Significant
Cost	Assurance	0.064	Significant
Cost	Outcome	0.029	Significant
Integrity	Assurance	0.653	Not Significant
Integrity	Outcome	0.893	Not Significant
Assurance	Outcome	0.753	Not Significant

Looking at the other pairings, no significant difference was found since the p-values are greater than 0.05. Thus, the stakeholders see the responsiveness, reliability, access & facilities, communication, integrity, assurance, and outcome of the UBSHS guidance office to have the same level of satisfaction. The p-values of 0.002 for responsiveness to costs, 0.007 for reliability to costs, and 0.001 for communication to costs indicate strong statistical significance, indicating that these factors have a meaningful impact on responsiveness and reliability. The analysis of the provided p-values reveals significant relationships primarily between the variables related to costs and responsiveness, as well as reliability. Reliability, accessibility & facilities, integrity, and most other comparisons, on the other hand, produced p-values larger than 0.05, indicating no significant connections. This suggests that these factors do not significantly affect responsiveness. This pattern shows that while other dimensions seem less important in the context of this analysis, cost-related aspects are crucial for improving both responsiveness and dependability (Bevans, 2023) [5]. Table 6 shows the post-hoc test on the level of satisfaction of stakeholders on the different service quality dimensions

of the UBSHS Principal's Office using pairwise Mann-Whitney. It shows that the following pairs of service quality dimensions are significantly different from each other since the p-values are less than 0.05: responsiveness vs. access & facilities, responsiveness vs. costs, responsiveness vs. assurance, responsiveness vs. outcome, reliability vs. costs, costs vs. integrity, costs vs. assurance, and costs vs. outcome. This scenario is almost the same with the cashier except that additional pairings are seen to be significantly different from each other. Looking at Table 2, the costs under the UBSHS Principal's office have the lowest mean compared with its other service quality dimensions. With this, the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders can be said to be lower than their level of satisfaction in the other dimensions. Responsiveness has the highest mean, which is seen to differ significantly with access & facilities, assurance, and outcome. Thus, the stakeholders' level of satisfaction with the responsiveness of the UBSHS principal's office is higher than their satisfaction with the access & facilities, assurance, and outcome of service quality of the UBSHS principal's office.

Table 6: Post-hoc Test on the Level of Satisfaction of Stakeholders on the Different Service Quality Dimensions of the UBSHS Principal's Office

SQD1	SQD2	p-value	Interpretation
Responsiveness	Reliability	0.109	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Access & Facilities	0.009	Significant
Responsiveness	Communication	0.248	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Costs	0.001	Significant
Responsiveness	Integrity	0.137	Not Significant
Responsiveness	Assurance	0.027	Significant
Responsiveness	Outcome	0.021	Significant
Reliability	Access & Facilities	0.308	Not Significant
Reliability	Communication	0.657	Not Significant
Reliability	Costs	0.002	Significant
Reliability	Integrity	0.905	Not Significant
Reliability	Assurance	0.537	Not Significant
Reliability	Outcome	0.484	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Communication	0.144	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Costs	0.044	Significant
Access & Facilities	Integrity	0.253	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Assurance	0.692	Not Significant
Access & Facilities	Outcome	0.745	Not Significant
Communication	Costs	0.001	Significant
Communication	Integrity	0.744	Not Significant
Communication	Assurance	0.291	Not Significant
Communication	Outcome	0.252	Not Significant
Cost	Integrity	0.001	Significant
Cost	Assurance	0.016	Significant
Cost	Outcome	0.018	Significant
Integrity	Assurance	0.461	Not Significant
Integrity	Outcome	0.411	Not Significant
Assurance	Outcome	0.940	Not Significant

Looking at the other pairings, no significant difference was found since the p-values are greater than 0.05. Thus, the stakeholders see the reliability, access & facilities, communication, integrity, assurance, and outcome of the UBSHS principal's office to have the same level of satisfaction. The lack of significant variances shows that educational services are provided uniformly to various stakeholder groups (students, teachers, staff, etc.). This uniformity can increase trust and reliability in the institution's service it provides (Dashtestani, 2020) [7] (Kan & Koh, 2020) [13].

Studies underscore the critical role of sustained engagement and open communication with stakeholders in educational contexts. By understanding the finer details of stakeholder satisfaction, institutions can more effectively align their services to meet expectations, even when they are mostly met. This approach fosters stronger relationships and ensures that services are continuously adapted to serve the needs of the stakeholders. (Greenland, *et al.*, 2016) [11]. A detailed survey created a stakeholder satisfaction scale for higher education, targeting various client groups such as students and faculty. The results emphasized the importance

of understanding and addressing stakeholder needs to enhance service quality and overall satisfaction in educational institutions (Pan, *et al.* 2022) ^[22].

Taylor and DiPietro (2018) ^[28] found significant generational differences (baby boomers, Gen X, millennials) in satisfaction with various aspects of the service environment within the restaurant industry. This indicates that while educational institutions may not showcase these generational distinctions as prominently, such differences could be more evident in other sectors. This underscores the potential for varying preferences and expectations across different industries.

The client satisfaction results indicate that the UBSHS principal's office's strength lies in responsiveness, reliability, communication, and integrity. These attributes reflect the office's ability to promptly address clients' concerns, consistently deliver dependable service, maintain transparent and effective communication, and uphold ethical standards. The positive feedback in these areas emphasizes the office's dedication to providing high-quality service. As such, enhancing and reinforcing these strengths is expected to sustain and further elevate client satisfaction.

Conclusion

The results highlight the value of stakeholder input in developing plans for school development and show how good involvement and communication may create a positive learning environment. The study underscores the significance of integrating stakeholder viewpoints to augment the standard and effectiveness of educational services, hence culminating in the promotion of a favorable school environment.

The UBSHS principal's office is resilient due to its unwavering commitment to being punctual, trustworthy, open, and truthful. The office demonstrates responsiveness by actively attending to the needs and concerns of both staff and students, guaranteeing that questions and problems are resolved promptly. This proactive approach improves the educational process overall and cultivates a supportive environment. Another pillar is reliability, which comes from the principal's office's constant fulfillment of obligations and promises, which fosters a climate of trust among the school community. For the learning environment to remain steady and productive, this dependability is essential.

Furthermore, good communication is essential to the principal's office operations since it promotes openness and cooperation between parents, teachers, and students. The office makes sure that all parties involved are informed and involved by placing a high priority on open lines of communication, which helps to create a unified school culture. The office's reputation is further enhanced by integrity since it maintains moral principles and takes responsibility for its actions. When taken as a whole, these qualities not only improve the principal's office's functionality but also greatly impact the community's general success and contentment at the school (Lud-ayen & Monang, 2024) ^[17].

In essence, excellent client satisfaction in offices' services not only strengthens client loyalty and increases revenue but also improves employee morale. Additionally, it allows offices to focus on service improvement and innovation while providing a significant competitive advantage.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to our former Assistant Principal for encouraging us to pursue this research. We would like also to thank the University of Baguio for all the support in this endeavor. Lastly, to all the people who supported us in accomplishing our research. Above all, we thank God for all the guidance, knowledge and strength he bestowed upon us in our research journey.

References

1. Al-Hashedi AH, Abkar SA. The impact of service quality dimensions on customer satisfaction in telecom mobile companies in Yemen. *Am J Econ*,2017;7(4):186-193. doi:10.5923/j.economics.20170704.04.
2. Ananda S, Devesh S. Service quality dimensions and customer satisfaction: empirical evidence from the retail banking sector in Oman. *Total Qual Manag Bus Excell*, 2017, 30(15-16). doi:10.1080/14783363.2017.1393330.
3. Balbuena JL. Evaluating school services in the Cordillera Administrative Region: A case study. *Cordillera Admin Reg J Educ*,2019;2(1):1-15.
4. Balinado JR, Prasetyo YT, Young MN, Persada SF, Miraja BA, Redi A. The Effect of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction in an Automotive After-Sales Service. *J Open Innov Technol Mark Complex*, 2021, 7(2). doi:10.3390/joitmc7020116.
5. Bevans R. Understanding p-values, 2023. Available from: <https://www.scribbr.com/statistics/p-value/>.
6. Chorachog R. Identifying the gaps in the service quality of the University of Baguio through the lens of the Cardinals. *Int J Multidiscip Res*, 2024, 6(2). Available from: <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/2/16915.pdf>.
7. Dashtestani R. Online courses in the higher education system of Iran: A stakeholder-based investigation of pre-service teachers' acceptance, learning achievement, and satisfaction. *Int Rev Res Open Distrib Learn*, 2020, 21(4). doi:10.19173/irrodl.v21i4.4873.
8. Department of Education. Implementation of the Standardized Citizen/Client Satisfaction Survey (CCCSS) Form in the Department of Education (Memorandum DM-PHROD-2021-0165 s, 2021).
9. Fahim MG. The relationship between service quality dimensions and customer satisfaction in Public Service Organizations with application to EgyptAir. *Arab J Admin*, 2019, 39(1). Available from: <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/aja/vol39/iss1/10>.
10. Gorospe MA, Rabanal MAS, Talosa AD. Satisfaction on the university frontline services: From the lens of transacting students and employees. *Int J Eval Res Educ*,2021;10(3):984–92.
11. Greenland S, Combe I, Farrell A. Stakeholder preference and stated vs derived importance satisfaction research. *Int J Market Res*, 2016, 58. doi:10.2501/IJMR-2016-0.
12. Guintu RM. Stakeholders' satisfaction with the quality of education in the Cordillera Administrative Region: A survey of parents. *Cordillera Admin Reg J Educ*,2020;3(1):1-15.
13. Kan R, Koh J. Perceptions of learning management system quality, satisfaction, and usage: Differences among students of the arts. *Australas J Educ Technol*, 2020, 36(3). doi:10.14742/ajet.5187.

14. Kanwar A, Sanjeeva M. Student satisfaction survey: a key for quality improvement in the higher education institution. *J Innov Entrepreneurship*, 2022, 11(27). doi:10.1186/s13731-022-00196-6.
15. Khalil-Ur-Rehman F, Farooq M, Bekmyrza T, Younas W, Raju V. Investigating the factors impacting the student satisfaction with the universities: A comparative study of Malaysia and Pakistan. *J Soc Sci Res*, 2018;SPI(2):117–126. doi:10.32861/jssr.spi2.117.126.
16. Lascuña L, Junsay M. Service quality dimensions as predictors of customer satisfaction in the civil registry. *Int J Res Innov Soc Sci*, 2023. doi:10.47772/IJRISS.2023.7521.
17. Lud-ayen C, Monang H. Assessing the availment and general satisfaction of student services offered by the University of Baguio: A Study of Student Perspectives. *Int J Multidiscip Res*, 2024, 6(4). Available from: <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/4/24695.pdf>.
18. Maksheeva A. Customer satisfaction case Saimala Club. Arcada University of Applied Sciences: International Business, 2024. Available from: https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/861584/Maksheeva_Alana.pdf%3Bjsessionid=54CC6BE3D3C5224335DA7ADFDD2C9BD8?sequence=2.
19. Nadela C, Cañeda D, Tirol S, Samillano J, Pantuan DJ, Piañar J, *et al.* Service quality and student's satisfaction in higher education institutions. *J Hum Res Sustain Stud*, 2023, 11(4). doi:10.4236/jhrss.2023.114049.
20. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Education at a glance 2019: OECD indicators. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2019.
21. Pakurar M, Haddad H, Nagy J, Popp J, Olah J. The service quality dimensions that affect customer satisfaction in the Jordanian banking sector. *Sustainability*, 2019, 11(4). doi:10.3390/su11041113.
22. Pan F, Liu L, Wang Z. The Chinese University stakeholder satisfaction survey: Developing a customer-centered self-assessment tool for higher education quality management. *Front Psychol*, 2022, 13. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1043417.
23. Picus LO, Mayer DP. Stakeholder satisfaction with public schools: A review of the literature. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2017.
24. Rahhal W. The effects of service quality dimensions on customer satisfaction: An empirical investigation in Syrian Mobile Telecommunication Services. *Int J Bus Manag Invent*, 2015, 4(5). Available from: <https://www.ijbmi.org/papers/Vol%284%295/L045081089.pdf>.
25. Santos JC. Educational service quality: A review of the literature and a proposed conceptual framework. *J Educ Learn*, 2019;8(2):54-66. doi:10.5539/jel.v8n2p54.
26. Sarande FSP, Naparota L, Cabalida E, Lovina Jr R. Customer's perceived service quality and satisfaction in the government service insurance system-Pagadian branch. *Int J English Lit Soc Sci*, 2022, 7(1). doi:10.22161/ijels.
27. Singh A, Singla L. Stakeholders satisfaction regarding service quality in higher management education. *Int J Manag Stud*, 2018, 3(6). Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18843/ijms/v5i3\(6\)/01](http://dx.doi.org/10.18843/ijms/v5i3(6)/01).
28. Taylor S, DiPietro R. Generational perception and satisfaction differences related to restaurant service environment. *Int J Hosp Tour Adm*, 2018, 19. doi:10.1080/15256480.2017.1348921.
29. United Nations. Sustainable Development Goals, 2015. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>.
30. Vora A. Stakeholder theory and its application to education. *Int J Manag Appl Res*, 2020;7(2):91–99. doi:10.18646/2056.72.20-007.