

Students' Perception and Satisfaction in Office Administration Program

Camila E. Benosa¹, Christine Joy A. Javellana², Loren Mae R. Linogon³,
Aldzen Mae B. Rabor⁴, Anna Maria Joy S. Tacalan⁵
^{1,2,3,4,5}Carlos Hilado Memorial State University-Fortune Town Campus, Philippines.

Abstract

Investigating BSOA students' perceptions and satisfaction with the Office Administration Program, this study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. A custom survey questionnaire was used to collect data from 161 students across all program years at Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Fortune Towne Campus. The findings demonstrated that students' perceptions were not only met but exceeded by the program, resulting in overall satisfaction. Interestingly, there were no significant differences in perception and satisfaction based on age, gender, previous school, or family income. However, year-level distinctions did reveal notable differences.

Keywords: *On academics, Perception, Physical facilities, Satisfaction, Student services.*

Date of Submission: 02-01-2024

Date of acceptance: 14-01-2024

I. INTRODUCTION

Perception is the level of regarding, understanding, and interpreting a program or profession (Adesoji, 2011). The institution must know how students perceive, interpret, and understand their chosen program. According to Kanwar & Sanjeeva (2022), student satisfaction is an attitude from assessing students' educational experience, services, and facilities provided by the institution. It is an integral part of the program to understand students' perception and what influence their satisfaction.

The Global Student Satisfaction Report (2019) examines a global survey of student satisfaction levels across different countries. The significant findings show a gap in respondents' age and satisfaction. In comparison, research conducted by Napitupulu et al. (2018) showed that the gap between respondents' perceptions and expectations had a negative value for each item. According to Patalinghug et al. (2021) entitled: "Students' Satisfaction in a State College in the Philippines," students were satisfied with the services offered by those offices that directly attended to their academic and emotional needs. At the same time, areas with inadequate facilities were not satisfied. It certainly affects the institution's existence in the students' eyes. Although research on student perception and satisfaction was gradually studied, it will likely change over time. Despite prior observations, research should be a continual process as no single study conducted at a specific time can entirely capture students' perceptions and satisfaction over time.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Perception

Concerning students' perception, students expressed positive opinions about the facilitators' professionalism, competence, and teaching strategies regarding the fourth objective, students' judgments of facilitator quality. The following areas received positive feedback from students: (a) punctuality; (b) encouraging critical thinking; (c) mastery of the course material; (d) assisting with student concerns related to the course; (e) encouraging creativity through their teaching; and (f) their ability to finish their courses for the semester even though they always ended classes at the scheduled time. The demographic profile of students is changing faster than in the past; hence, the management of educational institutions should regularly monitor students' demography to detect changes in the association between the demography of students (Andoh et al., 2020).

Universities are increasingly offering courses in English Medium Instruction (EMI) rather than most of the population's native language (L1) in Turkey and much of the rest of the non-Anglophone globe. In earlier studies, they investigated how teachers and students felt about EMI and the difficulties they faced. Institutional factors like the year of study, private or public universities, and the gender of the students have received less

attention. There are significant variations in gender, university type, and year of study in their sample of 989 students from 18 universities. They also place these findings in the perspective of Turkish schooling and encourage further research into these variables in various other socioeconomic and cultural settings (Macaro & Akincioglu, 2018).

2.2 Satisfaction

The institutions have extensively considered student satisfaction to improve the programs' quality. In their study, they tried to identify actors that influence the satisfaction of students in higher education (Jereb, 2020). Their findings showed that the teaching staff, administrative assistance, program issues, the physical environment, the institution's location, the social environment, and support resources were strongly associated with student satisfaction. In two satisfaction factors, namely, program issues and administrative support, women were shown to be significantly different from men. Their study suggests that higher education institutions should concentrate on enhancing the quality of teaching aspects to meet their students' needs.

The Global Student Satisfaction Report (2019) represents a thorough analysis of student experiences and examines areas for improvement and where students are satisfied. However, in the significant findings, student satisfaction with their study experience is inherently subjective and dependent on the student's reference frames and expectations and the promises made by national education systems and universities. It indicates that the educational experience was satisfactory on a larger scale. Most universities provide a consistent learning environment for all levels of study, and there are some areas where a bachelor's degree could be improved. Undergraduates who score a little below average and mention a lack of teacher connection because of the sometimes-impossible transition to a more challenging course and more difficult educational system than what they have previously encountered.

Furthermore, the Australian Department of Education, Skills, and Employment (2020) student satisfaction data utilize valuable resources to distribute among institutions throughout numerous nations. For instance, the Australian government recently announced the implementation of the performance-based financing (PBF) program, under which funding for Australian institutions will be determined, in part, by the caliber of the overall student experience.

2.3 On Academics

According to Paul & Pradhan (2019), academic programs, peripheral student support services, and the ability to provide many scholars regarded high-quality services to students is crucial for Higher Education institutions. To withstand the increasingly competitive Higher Education environments in which they must operate. According to Kakada (2019), technological, academic, social, and service support availability was positively associated with student satisfaction.

Whereas Nastasić et al. (2019) recognize student satisfaction as a multidimensional construct is also evident in identifying numerous dimensions that contribute to, HE students' overall satisfaction levels. Academic aspects comprise one such set of key contributors to student satisfaction in HE. These relate to considerations such as the perceived quality of teaching, instructor feedback, teaching styles, quality of learning experiences, and class sizes.

Moreover, Dinh et al. (2021) study confirmed the model of student satisfaction with higher education services and investigated the relationship between student satisfaction with the quality of educational services. Studies have shown that the student satisfaction model of Hue University's educational services include access to educational services, facilities and teaching aids, educational environment, educational activities, and educational outcomes. Satisfaction with all aspects of educational service quality was influenced the educational outcomes on which educational activities have the most significant impact.

Abdulah (2021) determined which perceived service quality attribute best influences higher education among college students in Panabo City, Philippines. A total of 420 students from higher education institutions in Panabo City, Philippines, were the respondents of a structured survey using two instruments on perceived service quality and higher education satisfaction. Based on the result of the study, the instructor has the highest level of perceived service quality, and academic quality has the highest level of higher education satisfaction.

Weerashinghe& Fernando (2018), the study was a cross-sectional survey, and the SERVQUAL questionnaire collected and analyzed data from 384 University for Development Studies (UDS) students in Ghana. Their finding shows an insignificant difference in the quality of academic, administrative staff,

university administrators, and university location on student satisfaction. While there is a significant influence of degree programs, facilities, and university image on student satisfaction. Service quality dimensions influence students' perception and overall satisfaction concerning the services the university provides.

2.4 On Student Services

Today, a vital indicator of the performance of higher education institutions is how satisfied students are with the caliber of the educational services they receive (Butt & Rehman, 2010; Santini et al., 2017; Weingarten et al., 2018).

Student Support Services play a more significant role in higher education. It helps students improve their learning experiences, helps them avoid dropping out, diversifies their student life, and promotes excellent and logical decision-making when resolving conflicts (Shasheen et al., 2020). Moreover, Kumtepe et al. (2018) stated that SSS is accountable for fostering a supportive environment for interaction among students, faculty, and administration to support an environment conducive to teaching and learning.

Higher education development is rapid due to the tight competition between public universities and private colleges. XYZ University realized to win the competition required continuous quality improvement, including the quality of existing service facilities. Amenities' quality services support the success of learning activities and improve user satisfaction. This study aims to determine the area to which the quality of the effect of services on user satisfaction (Napitupulu et al., 2019).

Htang (2021) investigated university students' perception of service quality and satisfaction in a developing country to guide quality improvement—a quantitative survey design was utilized in the investigation. A new tool was created to gauge the level of service students perceive. Gathered data from 182 undergraduate students enrolled in a five-year BED program at the University of Education in Myanmar. Only one of the service quality aspects, hostel facilities, showed a substantial gender gap. Student satisfaction varied significantly depending on the year level. Students reported levels of service quality varied greatly, facilities, and services. Student satisfaction was significantly associated with all service quality measures.

Furthermore, Pamatmat (2018) examined the relationship between service quality dimensions and the level of student satisfaction with the university's services. A questionnaire was used to collect the data to establish the relationship between service quality dimension variables and students' satisfaction level with identified services. The study also examined how efficient and effective the services provided to LSPU, particularly the students, through an assessment of their expectations and perceptions. After the investigation, the study revealed that students' satisfaction levels correlated with their observations of the five service quality dimensions: reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, and responsiveness.

In addition, in Patalinghug's (2021) study in a State College in the Philippines, students were most satisfied with the library and guidance services, while they were least satisfied with the school cafeteria and the criminology lab. The services provided by those offices that specifically catered to the intellectual and emotional needs of the students were well-received by them.

2.5 On Physical Facilities

Hidayatullah and Suardika (2020) conducted research titled 'Student satisfaction analysis of the quality of education services. The study showed that there still needs to be more quality of service in education due to the state of learning facilities that still have many shortcomings.

According to Tran (2019), a university is a unit that trains highly qualified human resources. Higher education is considered a service provided to students. Students will always consider the quality of educational services when deciding whether to continue learning, especially the quality of the support services that go hand in hand with the level of university instruction with the quality of university training. The factors that affect the students satisfaction with the quality of support services at Lac Hong University was examined based on the SERVPERF model. The study's findings indicate that there are five factors—the capacity of the service, the teaching staff and academic advisers, the movement activities, the facilities, and the procedure by which the service is implemented that influence students' satisfaction with the standard of support services. The element that most significantly affects student satisfaction is the facilities.

Whereas Popoola et al. (2022) investigated the effect of students' perception in choosing Office Information Management as their chosen program at Lead State University. Students' perception of the chosen

program has no significant difference in the level of study, and it inferred that majority of the respondents were satisfied with their present course of study as they better understood the program.

Furthermore, Yahaya et al. (2020) stated that students were delighted with the quality of services of the university. It shows that students were more satisfied with the tangible quality (physical facilities, appearance of the university, and university staff). Students provide high ratings on this element.

Moreover, Nguyen et al. (2020) examine Lao students' perceptions of education service quality in a selected higher education institution in Central Vietnam. A total of 307 Lao students from 12 departments at Ha Tinh University, Vietnam, 173 males, and 134 females, participated in the survey. The study showed that Lao students highly appreciated the excellent service quality provided by HTU. The satisfaction of Lao students at HTU was most affected by the hostel, the teaching staff, and the clubs, respectively. The training facility factor had the most impact on their satisfaction.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter will present the research design, participants of the study, research instrument, data collection procedure, data analysis, and ethical consideration.

3.1 Research Design

A descriptive correlational research design was used to collect and analyze data related to the perception and satisfaction of students. According to Sousa et al. (2007), descriptive correlational studies describe the variables and the logical connections between and among them.

This study further uses quantitative research. According to Bhandari (2022), quantitative research collects and analyzes numerical data. It can find patterns and averages, make predictions, test causal relationships, and generalize results to broader populations.

The researcher used this method to collect and analyze data related to the perception and satisfaction of the participants. This method can give the researchers an accurate result of data and information. It will provide a systematic description of the participant profiles and the characteristics, including academic, student services, and physical facilities of the Office Administration Program.

3.2 Participants of the Study

The study participants were the 1st - 4th-year BSOA students who enrolled at CHMSU Fortune Towne Campus during 1st semester in Academic Year 2022-2023.

3.3 Research Instrument

A researchers-made instrument was used to gather the data. The instruments comprise two (2) parts. Part I was to determine the demographic profile of the participants. Part II to determine the level of perception before enrolling in the program and the level of satisfaction of students in the Office Administration Program on academic, student services, and physical facilities answerable using the Likert 5-point scale, (5) Very Highly Satisfied, (4) Highly Satisfied, (3) Moderately Satisfied, (2) Satisfied and (1) Not Satisfied.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The data was gathered by constructing a researchers-made survey questionnaire through google forms. First, the researchers asked permission from the Dean of the College of Business Management and Accountancy of CHMSU Fortune Towne Campus to conduct the survey. Second, after securing the said letter, the researchers gave some background information about what the intention is and what the study is all about. After that, the researchers distributed the questionnaire to the respondents. Moreover, the researchers tabulated and interpreted the answers after collecting the data.

3.5 Data Analysis

The data of this research was recorded in readiness for analysis.

For problem no 1, which was to find out the demographic profile of the respondents' frequency count and percentage distribution were used.

For problem no. 2 and 3, which was to find out the perception and satisfaction of students in terms of academic, student services, and physical facilities, mean score and standard deviation were used. The obtained mean score and standard deviation were interpreted as follows:

Mean Score Range	Verbal Interpretations	Description
4.51-5.00	Very High	Very Highly Satisfied
3.51-4.50	High	Highly Satisfied
2.51-3.50	Moderate	Moderately Satisfied
1.51-2.50	Low	Satisfied
1.00-1.50	Very Low	Not Satisfied

For problem no. 4 and 5, which was to find out if there is a significant difference in the participants' level of perception and satisfaction when grouped according to profile variable. Mann-Whitney U test was used for age, sex, school last attended, family monthly income and Kruskal-Wallis test was used for the year level.

For problem no. 6 which was to find out if there is a significant relationship in the level of students' perception and level of satisfaction. Spearman rho was used.

Spearman's rho	Degree of Correlation
≥ 0.70	Very Strong Relationship
0.40-0.69	Strong Relationship
0.30-0.39	Moderate Relationship
0.20-0.29	Weak Relationship
0.01-0.19	No or Negligible Relationship

3. 6 Ethical Consideration

This study adhered to RA No. 10173, the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and source acknowledgment were implied in the study. Researchers informed the respondents regarding the objectives of the study. They were reassured that their answers would be treated as confidential and used for academic purposes and only for the research. Apart from that, participants were not harmed or abused, both physically and psychologically, when conducting the research. Additionally, the researchers recognized any sources used in this study. Once the retention period has passed, the data must be destroyed and irreversible with no chance of recovery.

IV. RESULTS

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data. It presents the study's findings through statistical tools in treating descriptive research.

The result of this study was presented and discussed in four major parts, the descriptive and inferential analysis. The first part is the descriptive analysis of the demographic profile of the participants. The second part describes the level of perception of students in the Office Administration Program and the level of satisfaction of students in the Office Administration Program. The third part is the inferential analyses of the significant differences in the level of perception of students in the Office Administration Program and the level of satisfaction of students in the Office Administration Program when grouped according to profile variables. The last part described the significant difference between the level of perception and satisfaction of students towards the Office Administration Program.

4.1 Profile of the Participants

As shown on Table 1, the participants' profiles when grouped according to the profile variable. As to age, 72.0%, or 116, are 18-21 years old, and 28.0%, or 45, are 22-34. Regarding year level, 32.3%, or 52, are first year; 17.4%, or 28, are in their second year. 26.1%, or 42, are in their third year, and 24.2%, or 39, are in their fourth year. Regarding sex, 93.8%, or 151, are female, and 6.2%, or ten, are male. Regarding the last school attended, 28.0%, or 45, are private, and 72.0%, or 116, are public. Regarding family monthly income, 60.2%, or 97, are 3000-10 000, and 39.8%, or 64, are 10.000-23 000.

Most BSOA students ages 18-21 years old, and most year level is the 1st year students. Majority of the participants are female and public for school last attended. Moreover, most of the participant's families' monthly income was 3000-10 000.

According to Andoh et al. (2020), the demographic profile of students is changing faster than in the past. Hence, the management of educational institutions should regularly monitor students' demography to detect changes in the association between the demography of students.

Table 1. Profile of the participants as to age, year level, sex, school last attended and family monthly income.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
18-21 years old	116	72.0%
22-34 years old	45	28.0%
Total	161	100
Year Level		
1 st year	52	32.3%
2 nd year	28	17.4%
3 rd year	42	26.1%
4 th year	39	24.2%
Total	161	100%
Sex		
Female	151	93.8%
Male	10	6.2%
Total	161	100%
School Last Attended		
Private	45	28.0%
Public	116	72.0%
Total	161	100%
Family Monthly Income		
3000-10 000	97	60.2%
10 000-23000	64	39.8%
Total	161	100%

As shown in Table 2 summarizes the participants' perceptions of academic, student services, and physical facilities. Academic was rated the highest with a mean score of 4.45, interpreted as High, followed by the perception of student services with a mean score of 4.22 interpreted as High. Lastly, with a mean score of 4.27, assistance is interpreted as High for students. The average mean score on participants' perception level was 4.27, interpreted as High. Students highly perceive Office Administration Program.

Thus, the program must meet or exceed that perception of students. Students' perceptions about evaluation methods play a significant role. This study examines evaluation and assessment from the student's point of view. Students strongly view different assessment and evaluation formats (Struyven et al., 2019).

Table 2. Level of perception

Indicators	M	SD	Interpretation
Academic	4.45	.56248	High
Student Services	4.22	.58523	High
Physical Facilities	4.15	.65355	High
Average	4.27	.60042	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 2.1 summarizes the participants' level of perception before enrolling in the program on academic. For instructors demonstrate proper teaching methods using appropriate media such as PPT, video clip, etc., was rated highest with a mean score of 4.57, interpreted as Very High, followed by the perception that

the instructor imparts new knowledge and skills in stenography with a mean score of 4.55 interpreted as Very High. For an instructor who practices proper classroom management, the mean score was 4.42, interpreted as High.

The instructor is well-versed in the course specialization, which means the score was 4.38, which interpreted as High. Lastly, the instructor utilizes the simulation room as a tool for instruction mean score was 4.33, interpreted as High. The average mean score on students' satisfaction level in the Office Administration Program on academic was 4.45, interpreted as High. Student highly perceives that they can acquire leanings through their instructors. Academic standards of students must attain when they are in the BSOA program.

Lecturers should invest much time in lectures to attract students (Tran et al., 2020). According to Ibrinke & Oloye (2022), how teachers and students perceive their academic progress is crucial to education. The entirety of the educational system revolves around it. Students' perceptions of academic success are a foundation for knowledge acquisition, learning skills, and developing abilities. According to some authors, perceived academic achievement relates to the knowledge acquired as determined by a teacher's grades and educational goals established by students and instructors over a predetermined period.

Table 2.1. Level of perception before enrolling to the program on academic

	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Instructor is well versed in the course specialization.	4.38	.62193	High
2. Instructor practices proper classroom management.	4.42	.63796	High
3. Instructor demonstrate proper teaching methods like using appropriate media such as PPT, video clip, etc.	4.57	.59911	Very High
4. Instructor utilizes simulation room as a tool for instruction.	4.33	.70513	High
5. Instructor impart new knowledge and skills in stenography.	4.55	.66097	Very High
Average	4.45	.56248	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 2.2 summarizes the participants' perception of the Office Administration Program on student services. The result shows that the school registrar is responsive in accommodating the student's needs and was rated the highest mean score of 4.56, interpreted as Very High. For guidance and counseling services, an available mean score of 4.49 is interpreted as High. For the Office of Student Affairs, personnel cater to students' queries mean score of 4.41 is interpreted as High. For vital internet access in every building mean score of 3.39 is interpreted as Moderate. Lastly, the school library has abundant study materials mean score of 4.37, interpreted as High. The average mean score on the level of satisfaction of students in the Office Administration Program on students' services was 4.22, interpreted as High. Before enrolling in the program, students had a high perception that the university could provide them with the services needed to succeed in the Office Administration Program. That can help them deal with concerns about their chosen program, guidance, and counseling.

According to Kakada (2019), service support associated positively with student perception. Moreover, Kumtepe et al. (2018) stated that SSS is accountable for fostering a supportive environment for interaction among students, faculty, and administration to support an environment conducive to teaching and learning.

Table 2.2. Level of perception before enrolling in the program on student services

	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Strong internet access in every building.	3.39	.97877	Moderate
2. The school library has abundant study materials	4.37	.80825	High
3. Guidance and counseling services are available.	4.49	.70458	High
4. School registrar are responsive on accommodating the student needs.	4.56	.77685	Very High
5. Office of Student Affairs personnel cater students' queries.	4.41	.75680	High
Average	4.22	.63656	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 2.3 summarizes participants' level of perception before enrolling in the program on physical facilities. The result indicates that IT Laboratories are well-equipped with computers and were rated the highest mean score of 4.36, interpreted as High. The mean score for classrooms conducive to learning was 4.34, which is interpreted as High. The school library is free from distractions; the mean score was 4.25, which is interpreted as High. The BSOA simulation room can accommodate the students during extracurricular activities mean score was 4.24, which is interpreted as High. Lastly, the mean score for well-maintained campus toilets was 3.68, interpreted as High. The average mean score on the level of perception before enrolling in the program on physical facilities on physical facilities was 4.15, interpreted as High. It implies that infrastructure is critical for students to achieve their educational goals. Students expect that the institution can give them a favorable environment where they can focus and learn about their studies.

Smith (2020) mentioned that students find different places and buildings important throughout the campus, but the reasons are often similar. There is also much overlap regarding what aspects of their physical campus environment is valued. Students are aware of the places important to their experiences and the things that stand out on campus as necessary to students. Student perceptions and many aspects of the campus environment also symbolize the administration and the institution they are trying to stand for.

Table 2.3. Level of perception before enrolling to the program on physical facilities

	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Classrooms are conducive for learning.	4.34	.70941	High
2. The school gym is spacious and could hold big audience for activities.	4.01	.91837	High
3. IT Laboratories are well-equipped with computers.	4.36	.69420	High
4. The school library is free from all distractions.	4.25	.82939	High
5. BSOA simulation room can accommodate the students during extracurricular activities.	4.24	.86974	High
6. Campus toilets are well-maintained.	3.68	1.09108	High
Average	4.15	.65355	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 3, it summarizes the participants' level of satisfaction with academic, student services, and physical facilities. Academic was rated the highest with a mean score of 4.48, interpreted as High, followed by the perception of student services with a mean score of 4.19 interpreted as High. Lastly, for students' services with a mean score of 4.39, interpreted as High. The average mean score on participants' perception level was 4.26, interpreted as High. This implies that students were satisfied with the learning provided, the teaching behavior of the instructor, and their academic experiences. Services that this study provided and infrastructure by the institution. They are the driving force that students choose to continue in the program.

According to Jereb (2020), their findings showed that the teaching staff, administrative assistance, program issues, the physical environment, the institution's location, the social environment, and support resources were strongly associated with student satisfaction.

Table 3. Level of Satisfaction

Indicators	M	SD	Interpretation
Academic	4.48	.56271	High
Student Services	4.19	.63656	High
Physical Facilities	4.12	.69519	High
Average	4.26	.63148	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 3.1, it summarizes participants' level of satisfaction with students in the Office Administration Program academics. The result indicates that the instructor demonstrates proper teaching methods like using appropriate media such as PPT, video clip, etc. It was rated the highest mean score of 4.60, interpreted as High. For instructors who impart new knowledge and skills in stenography, the mean score was 4.55, interpreted as Very High. The mean score for an instructor who practices proper classroom management was 4.47, interpreted as High. For instructor is well-versed in the course the mean score was 4.42, interpreted as

High. Lastly, for instructors utilizing simulation rooms as a tool for instruction, the mean score was 4.36, interpreted as High. The average mean score on students' satisfaction level in the Office Administration Program on academic was 4.48, interpreted as High. The effectiveness of instruction, teaching behavior, and educational experiences of the instructors contribute to students' satisfaction.

According to Nastasić et al. (2019), identifying several factors influencing HE students' overall satisfaction levels indicates student satisfaction as a multidimensional entity. Academic aspects are a vital contributor to student satisfaction with the perceived quality of teaching, feedback provided by instructors, education styles of instructors, quality of learning experiences, and class sizes.

Table 3.1. Level of satisfaction of students in Office Administration Program on academic

	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Instructor is well versed in the course specialization.	4.42	.64846	High
2. Instructor practices proper classroom management.	4.47	.63276	High
3. Instructor demonstrate proper teaching methods like using appropriate media such as PPT, video clip, etc.	4.60	.58395	High
4. Instructor utilizes simulation room as a tool for an instruction.	4.36	.69420	High
5. Instructor impart new knowledge and skills in stenography.	4.55	.66097	Very High
Average	4.48	.56271	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 3.2, it summarizes participants' level of satisfaction with students in the Office Administration Program on student services. The result indicates that guidance and counseling services are available and was rated the highest mean score of 4.43, interpreted as High. For the school registrar, who is responsive in accommodating the student needs mean score was 4.40, interpreted as High. For the office of Student Affairs personnel to cater to students' queries, the mean score was 4.37, interpreted as High. The library has abundant study materials mean score for the school was 4.35, which is interpreted as High. Lastly, for vital internet access in every building. Instructor practices proper classroom management mean score was 3.42, interpreted as Moderate. The average mean score on the level of satisfaction of students in the Office Administration Program on student services was 4.19, interpreted as High. The institution should consider having a better internet provider to aid students with their academic needs. Those services provided must maintain and improve, which can lead to higher satisfaction of students. Students are more likely to stick with the program where they are enrolled.

The university should focus on improving the quality of support services and the internet system so that students can better access and search for information and serve their learning and research (Chandra et al., 2018). According to Napitupulu et al. (2019), amenities and quality services support the success of learning activities and improve user satisfaction.

Table 3.2. Level of satisfaction of students in Office Administration Program on student services

	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Strong internet access in every building.	3.42	.97877	Moderate
2. The school library has abundant study materials	4.35	.80825	High
3. Guidance and counseling services are available.	4.43	.70458	High
4. School registrar are responsive on accommodating the student needs.	4.40	.77685	High
5. Office of Student Affairs personnel cater to student's queries.	4.37	.75680	High
Average	4.19	.63656	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 3.3, it summarizes participants' level of satisfaction with students in the Office Administration Program on physical facilities. The result shows that IT Laboratories are well-equipped with computers was rated the highest mean score of 4.37, interpreted as High. The mean score for classrooms conducive to learning was 4.29, interpreted as High. The school library is free from distractions; the mean score

was 4.24, which is interpreted as High. The BSOA simulation room can accommodate the students during extracurricular activities mean score was 4.20, which is interpreted as High. Lastly, the spacious school gym could hold a big audience for activities mean score was 3.98. The average mean score on the level of satisfaction of students in the Office Administration Program on physical facilities was 4.12, interpreted as High. Students are more satisfied when the institution provides them with a safe, favorable environment for developing the skills and abilities they need to learn effectively. That aids them in being safe and enhances their skills and knowledge.

According to Tran (2019), a university is a unit that trains highly qualified human resources. Their results show that five factors affect student satisfaction with the quality of support services, including service implementation process, service capacity, teaching staff and academic advisors, movement activities, and facilities. Facilities are the factor that has the most substantial impact on student satisfaction.

Table 3.3. Level of satisfaction of students in Office Administration Program on physical facilities

Physical Facilities	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Classrooms are conducive for learning.	4.29	.74522	High
2. The school gym is spacious and could hold big audience for activities.	3.98	.92162	High
3. IT Laboratories are well-equipped with computers.	4.37	.71317	High
4. The school library is free from all distractions.	4.24	.88399	High
5. BSOA simulation room can accommodate the students during extracurricular activities.	4.20	.90014	High
6. Campus toilets are well-maintained.	3.68	1.16416	High
Average	4.12	.69519	High

Note: 4.51-5.00 (Very High); 3.51-4.50 (High); 2.51-3.50 (Moderate); 1.51-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.50 (Very Low)

As shown in Table 4, it reveals the result that age, sex, school last attended, and family monthly income has no significant difference. The variable age has a result of .359 p-value, sex has a result of .817 p-value, school last attended has a result of .253 p-value and family monthly income has a result of .939 p-value. This indicates that p-value is greater than .05. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

In contrast, year level has a result of .004 p-values which means that there is a significant difference in the level of satisfaction in accordance with year level. This indicates that p-value is less than .05. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. For 1st and 2nd year there is a significant difference on 3rd year level. As to 1st and 2nd year have no significant difference to 4th year. There was a significant difference on 3rd year in 1st and 2nd year level. As to 1st and 2nd year have no significant to 4th year. Also, there is no significant difference between 4th year in 1st, 2nd and 3rd year level. Additionally, 1st and 2nd year is highly significant to 3rd year.

This implies that perception of students on academics, student services and physical facilities vary differently according to year level. Lower years tend to perceive differently compared to higher years. As, switching from high school to college is a new experience to them.

In contrast to Oyindamola et al. (2022), students' perception of the chosen program has no significant difference in the level of study, and it could further be inferred that most of the respondents were satisfied with their present course of study as they have a better understanding in the program.

Table 4. Significant difference on the level of perception

Variable	Computed Value	P-Value	Interpretation
Age	13.247	.359	Not Significant
Year Level	2367.000	.004	Significant
Sex	722.000	.817	Not Significant
School Last Attended	2307.000	.253	Not Significant
Family Monthly Income	3082.000	.939	Not Significant

Note: Significant p-value ≤ 0.05

As shown in Table 5 reveals that age, sex, school last attended, and family monthly income has no significant difference. The variable age has a result of .198 p-value, sex has a result of .817 p-value, school last attended has a result of .218 p-value and family monthly income has a result of .352 p-value. This indicates that p-values are greater than .05. Thus, the hypothesis was accepted.

In contrast, year level has a result of .000 p-value which means that there is significant difference in the level of satisfaction in accordance with year level. This indicates that p-value is less than .05. For 1st and 2nd year have a significant difference on 3rd year level. As to 1st and 2nd year have no significant to 4th year. There was a significant difference between 3rd year in 1st, 2nd, and 4th year level. For 4th year have a significant difference on 3rd year level. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Additionally, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year is highly significant to 1st year.

These differences are sensible given that their perceptions highly influence their satisfaction. Higher levels tend to manage their perception accordingly than lower years, evaluate their experience differently and focus on the advantages their college experience brings to them.

This indicates that the educational experience was satisfactory on a larger scale of things. Most universities provide a consistent learning environment for all levels of study. There are some areas where this study could improve a bachelor's degree. Undergraduates who score below average mention a lack of teacher connection because of the sometimes-impossible transition to a more challenging course and more complex educational system than they have previously encountered (Global Student Satisfaction Report, 2019).

Table 5. Significant difference on the level of satisfaction in Office Administration Program

Variable	Computed Value	P-Value	Interpretation
Age	2269.000	.198	Not Significant
Year Level	20.112	.000	Significant
Sex	722.000	.817	Not Significant
School Last Attended	2284.000	.218	Not Significant
Family Monthly Income	2835.000	.352	Not Significant

Note: Significant: p-value ≤ 0.05

As shown on Table 6, the p-value is less than 0.01. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. There is a significant relationship between the level of perception and satisfaction. Moreover, it is considered a very strong relationship since the correlation coefficient is .845. This implies that perception and satisfaction levels are directly proportional to each other. As perception increases, satisfaction also increases.

The third theoretical approach considered satisfaction as a function of how well students' expectations of the university. Suppose met with positive confirmations of expectations that can lead to higher satisfaction levels (Churchill & Suprenant, 1982, as cited in University Student Satisfaction, 2022).

Table 6. Spearman's Rho result between the level of perception and satisfaction

Variable	Computed Value	P-Value	Interpretation
Perception	.845	.000	Significant
Satisfaction			

Note: Significant: p-value ≤ 0.01 (2 tailed)

V. Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, the following are the conclusions:

Students' perception of the program was met and exceeded, which led to the participants' satisfaction. Furthermore, there is no significant difference in the level of perception and satisfaction of students in the Office Administration Program regarding age, sex, school last attended, and family monthly income. At the same time, there is a significant difference in the year level. Moreover, results revealed a significant relationship between students' perception and satisfaction. Furthermore, perception and satisfaction levels are directly proportional to each other. As perception increases, satisfaction also increases.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adesoji, F. (2011). Undergraduate students' perception of the effectiveness of ICT uses in improving teaching and learning in Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 4(7), 121-130.
- [2]. Kanwar, A., & Sanjeeva, M. (2022). Student satisfaction survey: a key for quality improvement in the higher education institution. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11(1), 1-10.
- [3]. The Global Student Satisfaction Report (2019). Global Student Satisfaction Report a 2019 Global Overview. <https://www.studyportals.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Global-Student-Satisfaction-Report-A-2019-global-overview.pdf>
- [4]. Napitupulu, D., Rahim, R., Abdullah, D., Setiawan, M. I., Abdillah, L. A., Ahmar, A. S., ... & Pranolo, A. (2018). Analysis of student satisfaction toward quality-of-service facility. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 954, No. 1, p. 012019). IOP Publishing.
- [5]. Patalinghug, M. E., Hortilano, J., Repaso, E., Mollona, A., & Patalinghug, H. F. (2021). Students' satisfaction on school services in a state college in the Philippines. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 11(2), 165-175.
- [6]. Andoh, R. P. K., Appiah, R., & Agyei, P. M. (2020). Postgraduate distance education in university of cape coast, Ghana: Students' perspectives. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 21(2), 118-135.
- [7]. Macaro, E., & Akincioglu, M. (2018). Turkish university students' perceptions about English medium instruction: Exploring year group, gender, and university type as variables. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(3), 256-270.
- [8]. Jereb, E., Jerebic, J., & Urh, M. (2018). Revising the importance of factors pertaining to student satisfaction in higher education. *Organizacija*, 51(4), 271-285.
- [9]. Student Satisfaction A 2019 Global Review. (2019). Study Portals. <https://www.studyportals.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Global-Student-Satisfaction-Report-A-2019-global-overview.pdf>
- [10]. Australian Government Department of Education, Skills, and Employment. Copyright Commonwealth of Australia reproduced by permission, GPO Box 9880, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia. Tel: +61-2-0036-3079; e-mail: feedback@deewur.gov.au; Web site: <https://www.dese.gov.au>
- [11]. Paul, R., & Pradhan, S. (2019). Achieving student satisfaction and student loyalty in higher education: a focus on service value dimensions. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 40, 245-268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332969.2019.1630177>.
- [12]. Kakada, P., Deshpande, Y., & Bisen, S. (2019). Technology Support, Social Support, Academic Support, Service Support, and Student Satisfaction. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 18.
- [13]. Nastasić, A., Banjević, K., & Gardašević, D. (2019). Student satisfaction as a performance indicator of higher education institution. *Mednarodnoinovativnopoloslovanje= Journal of Innovative Business and Management*, 11(2), 67-76.
- [14]. Dinh, H. V. T., Nguyen, Q. A. T., Phan, M. H. T., Nguyen, T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2021). Vietnamese Students' Satisfaction toward Higher Education Service: The Relationship between Education Service Quality and Educational Outcomes. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 10(3), 1397-1410.
- [15]. Abdullah, 2021. "Perceived Service Quality and Higher Education Satisfaction of College Students in Panabo City, Philippines," *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *International Journal of Research, and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, vol. 5(09), pages 412-417, September.
- [16]. Weerasinghe, I. M. S., & Fernando, R. L. S. I. (2018). Critical factors affecting students' satisfaction with higher education in Sri Lanka. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 26(1), 115-130.
- [17]. Butt, B. Z., & Ur Rehman, K. (2010). A study examining the student's satisfaction in higher education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5446-5450.
- [18]. Santini, F. D. O., Ladeira, W. J., Sampaio, C. H., & da Silva Costa, G. (2017). Student satisfaction in higher education: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 27(1), 1-18.
- [19]. Shaheen, S., Mahmood, Z., & Shah, N. H. (2020). Impact of Student Support Services on Students Development at University Level. *Global Regional Review*, 1, 222-229.
- [20]. Kumtepe, E. G., Toprak, E., Ozturk, A., Buyukkose, G. T., Kilinc, H., & Menderis, İ. A. (2018, May). Support services in open and distance education: An integrated model of open universities. In *Conference paper*.
- [21]. Pamatmat, F., Dominguez, L., Pamin, C., & Daran, A. (2018). Service quality dimensions of a Philippine state university and students' satisfaction: Bridging gaps to excellence. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 6(7), 673-681.
- [22]. Hidayatullah, N., & Suardika, I. B. (2020). Analysis of Student Satisfaction Levels with the Quality of Educational Services (Case Study of the FTI ITN Malang Undergraduate Industrial Engineering Study Program). *Valtech Journal*, 3(1), 68-74
- [23]. Tran, T. K. C. (2019). A study on factors affecting student's satisfaction with support services at Lac Hong University]. *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science/ Tạp chí Khoa học Trường Đại học Sư phạm TP. Hồ Chí Minh*, 16(11), 775-786. <https://bom.to/IUjC57>
- [24]. University, Ibadan, Oyo State. <https://nioaim.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Assessment-of-Students-Perception-of-Office-andInformation-Management-as-a-Course-of-Study-at-the-Lead-City-University.pdf>
- [25]. Popoola, K. O., Anene, C. E. & Ige, J. (2022). Assessment of Students' Perception of Office and Information Management as a Course of Study at the Lead City University, Ibadan, Oyo State. <https://nioaim.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Assessment-of-Students-Perception-of-Office-andInformation-Management-as-a-Course-of-Study-at-the-Lead-City-University.pdf>
- [26]. Yahaya, W., Asante, J., & Alhassan, I. (2020). Institutional service quality and students' satisfaction: Perceptions from the University for Development Studies. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 22(7), 31-42.
- [27]. Nguyen, A. N., Tran, N. H., Tran-Chi, V. L., & Tran, C. V. (2020). Lao Students' Perceptions towards the Education Service Quality in a Selected Higher Education Institution in Central Vietnam. *Int J Edu Sci*, 28(1-3), 63-71.
- [28]. Sousa, V. D., Driessnacker, M., & Mendes, I. A. C. (2007, June). An overview of research designs relevant to nursing: Part 1: quantitative research designs. *Revista Latino-Americana De Enfermagem*, 15(3), 502-507. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0104-11692007000300022>
- [29]. Bhandari, P. (2022). What Is Quantitative Research? | Definition, Uses & Methods. [Scribbr.https://www.scribbr.com/author/pritha/page/7/](https://www.scribbr.com/author/pritha/page/7/)
- [30]. Garone, A., Bruggeman, B., Philipsen, B., Pynoo, B., Tondeur, J., & Struyven, K. (2022). Evaluating professional development for blended learning in higher education: A synthesis of qualitative evidence. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(6), 7599-7628.

- [31]. Ojokobirikale, s., & Sokunbi, H. Instructional Facilities and Perceived Academic Performance of Office and Information Management Students in Lead City University, Ibadan Ibronke, Oluwakemi. E; Oloye, Rachael A.
- [32]. Uçar, H., & Kumtepe, A. T. (2018). Integrating motivational strategies into massive open online courses (MOOCs): The application and administration of the motivation design model. In Administrative leadership in open and distance learning programs (pp. 213-235). IGI Global.
- [33]. Smith, D. G. (2020). Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work. JHU Press.
- [34]. Chandra et al., (2018) The Effect of Service Quality on Student Satisfaction and Student Loyalty: An Empirical Study September 2018 Journal of Social Studies Education Research 9(3):109-131
- [35]. Oyindamola et al. (2022) Analysing the Impact of Human Capital on Renewable Energy Penetration: A Bibliometric Reviews. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148852>
- [36]. Churchill G. A., Surprenant C. (1982). An investigation into the determinants of customer satisfaction. Journal of Marketing Research, 19(4), 491–504.