

Ascertaining the Quality Educational Services in A Polytechnic College Through Students' Satisfaction

Myrna S. Pangan

Polytechnic College of Botolan

The school must continuously strive to improve its different services to satisfy and retain the students. In order to attract and retain students, school must identify and meet students' satisfaction. In this study, the findings show that administrative support, instructional effectiveness and social relations and school climate posted a strong impact on the students' satisfaction. On the other hand, the result of this study gave a hint to the institution to determine what strategic planning is needed to improve the different services it offers. Teachers, coordinators, school head and the administration must pay attention and work for the improvement on social relation like innovating school activities by integrating socialization and school climate by keeping the respect of the students to one another. The implementation and evaluation of an action plan is deemed necessary to help the school in developing and improving its programs and services.

Keywords: quality, educational services, satisfaction, students

Introduction

Polytechnic College of Botolan is a social service institution, a local non-DepEd tertiary institution catering to students who are mostly from the Indigenous Communities, yet, totally dependent on the budget appropriation from the local government unit (LGU). It was established in 2009 with an initial enrolment of three hundred forty-seven (347), and now has bloated to a total of eight hundred twenty (820) including the Senior High School students (SHS). In this connection, the institution should be aware and give importance to the services it is offering to ensure the kind and quality of education the learners should receive and benefit.

The administration, the school head, the teachers and the whole staff are the sole and direct implementers of programs, projects and activities that are being set by the Commission on Higher Education as well as the Department of Education. They play the very important and crucial role in identifying whether the schools' performance is a success or a failure. Towards the end, the learner who is the end goal of why schools' vision and mission must be served with utmost satisfaction.

The learners as the direct client in the school as beneficiary of all the programs, projects and services being offered by a particular school. They play an important role to measure and evaluate how effective and useful a program that is being implemented. The learner is the keynote factor to evaluate the outcome of the program. Therefore, the result should be according to the satisfaction of the learners.

Over the past two decades, many studies have examined the effectiveness of classroom teaching in influencing present and future behaviors. Some of these studies have examined the importance of the students' satisfaction with school as a variable which explains effect, and in particular what determines their satisfaction with school. The most important predictors of students' satisfaction in their school are students' feeling that they are treated fairly, that they feel safe and that they believe that their teachers are supportive. The findings suggest that, in school promotion interventions, attention needs not only to be

given to classroom teaching materials but also to the quality of students' school experience and the quality of the relationship with the teachers (Samdal, Nutbeam, Wold and Kannas, 1998).

In order to attract and retain students, schools must identify and meet student expectations. This examines which aspects of a student's educational experience are more important in influencing student satisfaction. The findings show that "Student-centeredness," "campus climate," and "instructional effectiveness" have strong impact on how satisfied a student is with his/her overall educational experience. The results also suggest that recruitment strategies may require emphasizing different aspects of a student's educational experience than retention strategies (Elliott & Healy, 2001).

Findings show that the instructors believe that learners' performance is more likely tied to instructors' actions that are focused on course content and provide both proactive (models, expectations) and reactive (feedback) information to learners about their interpersonal communication needs and being treated as individuals as most important, aligning their stated preferences with the instructors' perceptions of what actions are most satisfying to online learners. (Aubteen, Darabia and Li Jin 2013).

Drawing upon a moderately large sample of students, the findings suggest that student loyalty is predicted by student satisfaction, which is in turn predicted by the perceived image of the school. While perceived quality of "human ware" (e.g., people and process) and "hardware" (e.g., infrastructure and tangible service elements) has an impact on perceived value, this was found to be weak and indeterminate. Of most importance was the impact of the institution's institutional image, which strongly predicted perceived value, and to a lesser extent student satisfaction. (Robert M. Brown, Timothy William Mazzarol, 2009)

As such, this study tried to see the relationship of stakeholders' satisfaction on the different services offered by the school. But in the end, it also tried to point out if the final output is affected by the factors.

The researcher also looked into this study to provide the school with the information that could help in addressing the problems pertaining to the school.

Framework of the Study

Quality of education has always been the primary concern of the Philippine public school system. It is a necessity that calls for a well-defined approach by responsible people in the field of education. The need has outgrown the resources, both national and local, as children of school age kept on increasing over the years. Toward this problem, ways and means were offered and solutions were undertaken in varying degrees of efficacy. Obviously, this necessity seemed protracted in all fronts of local and national scene that political leaders and school officials are so challenged.

Education is a key driver of economic growth. With education sector becoming an increasingly competitive market, student satisfaction on the services being offered on the school has become an important component of quality assurance. Thomas and Galambos (2004) argued that students are regarded as consumers of education. Students' satisfaction is important to institutional success; effective institutions have satisfied 'customers' because this satisfaction supports the enrolment of additional students or 'customers.' Ratings of student satisfaction are becoming more transparent and readily

available. As a result, most schools around the world are constantly looking at how to improve the satisfaction of students in their institution.

Students' satisfaction in their institution has individual, institutional and social implications. From an institutional point of view, satisfied students are more likely to continue in their studies (retention) and are more likely to succeed academically and this is likely to enhance the financial position and reputation of the institution. Satisfied students also make effective public relations agents. High student satisfaction helps in attracting and retaining high achievers who in turn increase the reputation and standing of the school.

Maintaining and improving students' satisfaction has been considered an important goal of education and schools (Orpen, 2016) with the assumption that student satisfaction is indicative of institutional effectiveness (Barton, 2016). A key factor of student satisfaction is the quality of teaching staff. As a result, the use of student rating scales as an evaluative component of their teaching system has increased. The majority, if not all, teaching staff in most schools have been required or expected to administer some types of teaching evaluation forms to their students during each course offering for some time (Seldin, 1997).

Assessing student satisfaction provides a way that schools can focus directly on issues of quality development in order to ensure that educational standards are high (Wiers-Jenssen, Stensaker, and Groggaard, 2002). Measures of student satisfaction can also assist in identifying and implementing areas for development.

Schools initially set up satisfaction surveys to serve the following purposes: to help administrators monitor teaching quality, to help teaching staff improve on their teaching and to help the school improve the different other services offered by the school. Student satisfaction surveys are being used today in more ways than even before (Kulik, 2001), for example, to evaluate the quality, availability, accessibility of the library resources, to assess whether there is sufficient IT assistance and support for students and to consider student opinions on the social aspects of university life, to name a few.

Many teachers approve the increased use of satisfaction surveys. Teaching staff view this survey as reliable and valid measures that bring methodical precision to the evaluation of teaching. However, not all teachers share this view. Some teachers view students' satisfaction surveys as meaningless qualification. Teaching staff fear that students often abuse this anonymous power to get even or get back at teaching staff and warn that satisfaction surveys may turn the evaluation of effective teaching into a personality contest (Kulik, 2001).

Programs, events or culminating activities excite the learners to stay in the school; some decided to transfer to other school with activities like the JS Promenade just to experience it,

The Department of Education released an order (DepEd Order no. 9, s. 2015) mandates the schools on the different culmination activities a school should conduct.

Another factor that affects the student's satisfaction in school is the social relations or the climate inside the school.

What determines school climate?

School climate is affected by five primary determinants:

Organization – the vision and leadership of educational leaders and their commitment to using the school climate as the guiding principle for planning and decision-making, the policies they enact and the processes for determining and enforcing them, the lines of communication and access to authority, and opportunities to participate in decision-making.

Staff – the ways school staff relate to each other and to students, their classroom management and discipline practices, and the priority they place on being half-friendly asset builders who demonstrate care for students' well-being.

Students – the degree to which students are engaged in leadership opportunities and the ways students relate to one another and to adults in authority. Seeing and treating students as contributors and not consumers go a long way in gaining their involvement and their commitment to speak up and resolve conflicts peacefully.

Families – the values, beliefs, and practices that are instilled and reinforced in children by parents and other relatives, especially regarding how to behave with adults and authority and how to resolve differences with other peers, and also what value is placed on education, tolerance, communication and non-violence.

Community – the values, beliefs and practices that are evident outside the walls of school and home, particularly the value a community places on its children and youth, how its members treat youth when they encounter them in their neighborhoods, and how they invest time and resources to support youth development.

In this study, the aim is to see the effects or relationship of the level of students' satisfaction on the school and the students' performance. A careful analysis is needed in order to find its relation which may possibly contribute to the achievement of the school.

It is anchored on the idea that students' satisfaction on school has a great impact on their performance. Their attitude toward learning is affected by the different conditions that are related to their performance such as education/teaching, campus, utility/relevance, technology/library, administration support/flexibility, programs/activities and social/climate.

Methods

Research Design

A descriptive-survey design was used in the study. Gay (1976) stressed that descriptive method is used to involve collection of data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. The purpose of descriptive research is to describe the nature of the situation as it exists at the time of the study and to explore the causes of particular phenomena (Travers, 1978).

According to Sevilla (1984) the descriptive method involves collection of data, and testing hypothesis to answer the questions concerning the method if necessary to gather information about existing condition.

Descriptive method of research may also help to point out the extent of a problem and indicate how serious and widespread it is. This method would systematically and factually describe and illustrate the characteristics and the connection between the phenomena studied (Gay, 1987). Thus, descriptive type of research is the most appropriate method in conducting this study because it assesses the instruction, facilities, security and maintenance, library and instructional media, administrative support/flexibility, programs/activities, and social relation and school climate which affect the satisfaction of the students affecting their performances and the number of enrollees of the school.

Instrument

A questionnaire-checklist was constructed by the researcher in order to gather the needed data for the study. It is composed of two parts:

Part I extracted information on the profile of the respondents such as age, gender, and grade/year level.

Part II acquired information on the extent or level of satisfaction of students in terms of instructions, facilities, security and maintenance, library and instructional media, administrative support/flexibility, programs and activities, and social relation and school climate.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher personally administered the questionnaire to the respondents after necessary permit was obtained from the Office of the Vice President for Administration. The endorsement was forwarded to the Director of Instruction and the College Coordinator of Polytechnic College of Botolan. The revised questionnaire was given to the respondents to answer the questionnaire. To ensure the speedy answering of the questionnaires, the researcher was present in case there are questions that are not clear to the respondents.

Treatment of Data

The following statistical tools were used to analyze and interpret the quantitative gathered data from the study.

1. Frequency count and percentage to determine the profile of the respondents.
2. Mean to ascertain the overall centrality of tendency of the data characteristics
3. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is a statistical test which analyzes variance. It is helpful in making comparison of two or more means which enables a researcher to draw various results and predictions about two or more sets of data. Anova test includes one-way anova, two-way anova or multiple anova depending upon the type and arrangement of the data.

Results/Findings

1. Profile of the Respondents

1.1 Age. The respondents from the Polytechnic College of Botolan were comprised of mid-teens and early twenties. The highest percentage was obtained from the age bracket of 18-19 years old with 43% among the total number of respondents.

1.2 Gender. The respondents were dominated by female students. Results show that 55% were female while 45% were male.

1.3 Grade/Year Level. Fifty respondents were from Senior High School and fifty from the College level.

2. Level of Satisfaction

2.1 Instructions. The result of the survey on the overall or average weighted mean of instructions is 3.985 with a descriptive rating of “Satisfied.” This implies that the instructions of the teachers are meeting the expectations of the learners. It might result to students requiring good standing in the different subjects.

2.2 Facilities. The school facilities got a weighted mean of 3.558 with a descriptive rating of “Satisfied”. The students are “moderately satisfied” with the comfort rooms and science laboratory. This might be caused by poor conditions of the comfort rooms and lack of scientific apparatus.

2.3 Security and Maintenance. This segment received a weighted mean of 3.598 with a descriptive rating of “Satisfied.” It is indeed a good response from the learners knowing that they feel secured inside the school premises.

2.4 Library and Instructional Media. The overall weighted mean is 3.55 with a descriptive rating of “Satisfied.” Library and instructional media help in the improvement of student performance.

2.5 Administrative Support/Flexibility. Administration plays a big role in the teaching and learning process. It gained a weighted mean of 3.88 with a descriptive rating of “Satisfied.”

2.6 Programs and Activities. Students are always encouraged to participate in different co-curricular and culminating activities. A weighted mean of 3.78 was obtained with a descriptive rating of “Satisfied.”

2.7 Social Relation and School Climate. School environment affects the performance of a learner. The overall weighted mean for social relation and school climate is 3.785 with a descriptive rating of “Satisfied”.

3. Significant Variations and Differences on the Perceived Level of Satisfaction of the Students when Grouped according to Personal Profile

In terms of age, the computed significance or P-value of 0.019 is less than 0.05 level of significance; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

On the other hand, the perceived level of satisfaction on Instructions, Facilities, Security and Maintenance, Library and Instructional Materials, Administrative Support/Flexibility, and Programs and Activities when grouped according to age shows no significant variation at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

In terms of gender, there is no significant difference on the perception of the respondents regarding the level of satisfaction on all the variables. The values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance; therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

In terms of grade/year level, there are significant differences on the perception of the respondents regarding the level of satisfaction on Security and Maintenance, Administrative Support/Flexibility, and Social relation and School Climate with computed significance or P-values of 0.009, 0.035 and 0.019, respectively at 0.05 level of significance; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

On the other hand, the perceived level of satisfaction on Instructions, Facilities, Library and Instructional Materials, and Programs and Activities when grouped according to year/grade level show no significant variation at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings:

1. Most of the student respondents of Polytechnic College of Botolan are aged 18-19 years old where female got larger percentage and both the senior high school and college students were equally selected with fifty respondents each.
2. The level of satisfaction revealed that the students of Polytechnic College of Botolan are “satisfied” on all the variables, namely: Instructions, Facilities, Security and Maintenance, Library and Instructional Media, Administrative Support/Flexibility, Programs and Activities, and Social relation and School climate.
3. When variables were grouped according to age, most of the result showed that there is no significant variation on the variables as null hypothesis was accepted. But in the result on other variables such as Social relations and School climate, the null hypothesis was rejected indicating that there is significance on this variable. According to gender, all the variables have no significant variations as the null hypotheses were accepted. When it comes to grade/year level, Security and Maintenance, Administrative Support/Flexibility, and Social relation and School Climate have significant variations as the null hypotheses were rejected. The rest of the variables were accepted showing that there were no significant variations.
4. Findings of the study imply that satisfaction of the students varies and these variations may be considered to create an action plan for the improvement of the school.

Recommendations

Based on the foregoing conclusions, the researcher proposes the following recommendations:

1. The school should be aware of the age population of the students in the implementation of some programs and activities of the school where students still need the consent of their parents.
2. Though the students are satisfied with all the variables, the school should continue to find ways and means to improve more for its growth, advancement and innovations.
3. Teachers, coordinators, school head and the admin must pay attention and work for improvement on social relation like innovating school activities by integrating socialization and school climate by keeping the respect of the students to one another.
4. Implementation and evaluation of development plan is deemed necessary to help the school in developing and improving its programs and services.
5. Try to find out other factors that are relevant to the satisfaction rate of the learners in connection with their class standings on performance and conduct similar studies.

References

1. Berg, B. and Ostergren, B. (1979) 'Innovative processes in higher education', *Studies in HE* 4(2): 14–16
2. Bourke, P. (1985) *Quality Measures in Universities*, The Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission
3. Cuenin, S. (1987) 'The Case of Performance Indicators in Universities: An International Survey', *International Journal of Institutional Management*. Vol 11 No2 pp 117–139
4. CVCP/UGC (1986) *The First Statement by a Joint CVCP/UGC Working Group on Performance Indicators in Universities*, CVCP/UGC
5. CVCP/UGC (1987) *The Second Statement by a Joint CVCP/UGC Working Group on Performance Indicators in Universities*, CVCP/UGC
6. DES (1985) *The Development of Higher Education until the 1990s*, Cmnd 9524, HMSO
7. DES (1991) *Performance Indicators in Higher Education*, Report by HMI (ref 14/91/NS), HMSO
8. *Distance Education*, 2013 Vol. 34 no. 1, 21-36 AubteenDarabia and Li Jin
9. Dochy, F. and Segers, M. (1990) *Selecting Indicators on the Basis of Essential Criteria and Appropriate Assessment Methods for a Quality Assurance System*. Paper prepared for the CHEPS Conference, "Quality Assessment in Higher Education" at Utrecht, March 16th, 1990
10. Doherty G.D. and Storey, S. (1992) *Developing Total Quality in Education*. Occasional paper. Quality Methods Association
11. Elliot, KM, & Healy MA (2001) Article: "Conceptual Model of Student Satisfaction in Higher Education" vol. 22
12. *Higher Education: The importance of Institutional image to Student Satisfaction and Loyalty within Higher Education*, Vol. 58, no. 1 pp. 81-95 (July 2009)
13. James A. Kulik, 2001 *Student Ratings: Validity, Utility and Controversy*
14. *Jarratt Report (1985) Report of Steering Committee for Efficiency Studies in Universities*, CVCP, London
15. Johnes, J. and Taylor, J. (1989) *Performance Indicators in Higher Education*, SRHE
16. L. R. Gay (1976) *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application* (Digitized 2006)
17. Lawrence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W. (1969) *Developing Organizations diagnosis and action*. Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley
18. Miller, J. and Innis, S. (1990) *Managing Quality Improvement: a guide for Middle Managers*. Ware: Consultants at Work
19. Miller, J. and Innis, S. (1992) *Strategic Quality Management: a guide for Senior Managers*. Ware: Consultants at Work
20. Page, E. S. (1989) *Management Statistics and Performance Indicators in British Universities*. Paper presented at the 11th European Association for Institutional Research Forum Trier 27–30 August 1989
21. Peter Seldin (1997), *Using Student Feedback to Improve Teaching*, vol 16, issue 1
22. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 6 No. 4, 2016 Orpen and Barton
23. Samdal, Nutbeam, Wold and Kannas (1998) *Achieving Health and Educational Goals Through Schools*
24. Storey, S. (1992) 'Laying the Foundations for Total Quality Management at Wolverhampton Polytechnic' in Ellis, R. (ed.), *Quality Assurance for University Teaching*. Buckingham, OUP
25. Theodosen, E. (1989) *The Responsive College Project*, London: Department of Trade and Industry
26. West (1986) *The use of Performance Indicators in Decision Making in the University of Strathclyde*. Paper to OECD/CERI IMHE Programme's Special Topic Workshop, Paris, 8–10 December
27. Wiers-Jenssen, Stensaker, and Groggaard, 2002 *Quality in Higher Education* vol. 8, issue 2
28. Williams, P. (1992) *Academic Audit Unit: Annual Report of the Director 1990/1991*. University of Birmingham: CVCP Academic Audit Unit