



The correlation between service quality, students' satisfaction, and board exam performance

Wengie Basco Quezada ^{a 1}, North Eastern Mindanao State University-Lianga Campus, Philippines, quezadawengie@gmail.com, +9608481295

Pammaela Nimfa Gawat Quezada ^b, North Eastern Mindanao State University-Lianga Campus, Philippines

Jocelyn Panduyos ^c, North Eastern Mindanao State University-Lianga Campus, Philippines

Ailyn Grace Pantaleon Buquid ^d, North Eastern Mindanao State University-Lianga Campus, Philippines

Suggested Citation:

Quezada, W.B., Quezada, P.N.G., Panduyos, J. & Buquid, A.G.P.B. (2024). The Correlation Between Service Quality, Students' Satisfaction, and Board Exam Performance. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools: Current Perspectives*. 14(2), 104-120. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjgc.v14i2.9461>

Received from February 11, 2024; revised from March 12, 2024; accepted from August 05, 2024.

Selection and peer review under the responsibility of Assoc Prof. Dr. Nur Demirbas Celik, Alanya Alaadin Keykubat University, Turkey

©2024 by the authors. Licensee United World Innovation Research and Publishing Center, North Nicosia, Cyprus. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

©iThenticate Similarity Rate: 8%

Abstract

The study examines how service quality and students' satisfaction affect the performance of graduates in the Licensure Examination conducted by the Philippine Regulation Commission, scrutinizes the quality of service, and assesses the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the rendered services. The researchers made use of a descriptive-correlational, adopted-modified, and validated survey questionnaire as tools of the study. Mann-Whitney, Kruskal-Wallis, Pearson-r correlation, and mean analysis were used as the statistical procedures of the study. Results showed that the perceptions of the graduates in the quality of service of the University that falls in the dimension of tangibility and responsiveness have a positive correlation with their performance in LET. Likewise, the satisfaction of the graduates with the quality of service in the dimension of reliability, responsiveness, and empathy has a positive correlation to the latter. Further study in another discipline is recommended as the study is limited only to science major graduates.

Keywords: Board exam performance; let performance; service quality; students' satisfaction

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Wengie Basco Quezada, North Eastern Mindanao State University-Lianga Campus, Philippines
E-mail address: quezadawengie@gmail.com / Tel.: +9608481295

1. INTRODUCTION

One considerable indication that the Colleges and Universities in the Philippines have quality services is the maximum number of students enrolled, offering programs that have passed different levels of accreditations, and the one hundred passing percentage of the license examination both conducted by the Civil Service Commission and Philippine Regulation Commission of the Philippines. Much more if the takers have topped the examination, this leads to greater satisfaction with the services rendered by the institution.

Service quality as it now conquers the world of education plays a vital role. Universities, private or public must assess the quality of their services both in instruction and supervision. The services delivered by the academe should match the expectations of the students (Lewis and Bloom, 1993). Uplifting the integrity and quality of service in the University leads to the satisfaction of the students towards the rendered services (Hayes, 2007; Roloff et al., 2020) once satisfied, students are eager to attain their goals, achieve their dreams, and now become the source of pride of the University (Ahmed et al., 2010).

With this, the University must increase the quality of services to attain students' satisfaction and to uplift the image of the University in society. Satisfaction towards services exhibits good performance in their academic journey (Bautista et al., 2019). This success attracts new students leads to a greater market increase and gain so much trust in the institution (Brown & Mazarol, 2009; Del Río-Rama et al., 2021; Stribbell & Duangekamong 2022); with quality service acquired society looks at them as an educated and responsible individual (Khan et al., 2011).

Service quality and students' satisfaction have a positive correlation with students' academic performance inside the classroom (Subrahmanyam, 2017). Services are continuously improving (Daran et al., (2018) , with institutions satisfying the needs of their students (Cayanan, 2017). However, despite the efforts of the University in general, instructors, professors, and the administration in putting the name of the institutions in the limelight, still, Universities and Colleges are struggling to raise the performance of graduates in licensure examinations, especially in the field of Science (Antiojo, 2017). The quality of the library and laboratory facilities were predictors of passing the licensure exam (Quiambao et al., 2015). Since gender, review class attendance, and science graduates' academic achievement are all tied to the services provided by the university, these factors should be taken into account when creating policies to improve licensing exam success (Ferrer et al., 2015).

When deciding how much money to grant State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), the Normative Financing Scheme (NFS) is greatly impacted by poor performance. Normative funding adopted in 2005 refers to the application of a set of objectives, criteria, and norms that are designed to promote and reward quality instructions, research, and extension services as well as financial prudence and responsibility (DBM-CHED, 2004).

SUCs' are being challenged in terms of prioritization and budget to address and identify institution-related factors that have a greater impact on the performance of graduates in LET. This could be done by evaluating the quality of service and the student's satisfaction with the rendered services of the University to its graduates. Quality service has a significant effect on students' satisfaction (Hameed & Amjad, 2011)

since it determines the number of students enrolled in the University; the more the number of students enrolled, the better the quality of service the institution has provided (Chen, 2015).

Studies conducted on correlating service quality and student satisfaction found a strong positive relationship (Kajenthiran & Karunanity, 2015; Kanwar & Sanjeeva 2022; Choi et al., 2023). It was proven that service quality and student satisfaction have a significant relationship (Hasan, 2009). Moreover, with the use of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), it was revealed that service quality has a significant impact on the students' satisfaction level in their academic performance inside the classroom.

1.1. Purpose of study

None of the conducted studies have shown the relationship between service quality students' satisfaction and the LET performance of the graduates. This research tries to fill the gap by conducting a study to determine if service quality and student satisfaction have a positive effect on the performance of graduates in taking the licensure examination. The results of this study serve as the baseline in policy-making, calibrating services, and prioritizing the needs of the students. The purpose of the study is to examine the correlation among service quality, students' satisfaction, and board examination performance of the graduates. Specifically, this will seek to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of;
 - 1.1. Sex,
 - 1.2. Age,
 - 1.3. Family Monthly Income,
 - 1.4. Number of Years Enrolled, and
 - 1.5. LET Results?
2. What is the perception of the graduates in the dimensions of service quality in terms of;
 - 2.1. Tangibility,
 - 2.2. Assurance,
 - 2.3. Reliability,
 - 2.4. Responsiveness, and
 - 2.5. Empathy?
3. What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates in terms of;
 - 3.1. Tangibility,
 - 3.2. Assurance,
 - 3.3. Reliability,
 - 3.4. Responsiveness, and
 - 3.5. Empathy?
4. Is there a significant difference between the respondents' demographic profile and their perception and satisfaction on the dimensions of service quality?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' LET performance and their perception and satisfaction on the dimension of service quality?

2. METHOD AND MATERIALS

2.1. Participants

The validated questionnaire was piloted to the thirty-five (35) individuals who were not included in the final survey but also takers of the LET. The study was conducted on the four campuses of North Eastern Mindanao State University namely; NEMSU-Cantilan, NEMSU-Lianga, NEMSU-Tagbina, and NEMSU-Tandag in the province of Surigao del Sur. These campuses were selected because they offer Bachelor of Secondary Education majors in Biology and Physical Sciences.

2.2. Data collection tool

The study made use of an “adopted and modified survey instrument” type of research from a conceptual model of Service Quality (SERVQUAL) (Berry et al., 1985). The instrument underwent content validation and reliability tests to ensure that the questions were not ambiguous and content was appropriate. The questionnaire was rated based on its clarity of direction and items; presentation/organization of items; suitability of items; adequateness of items per category; attainment of the purpose; objectivity; and scale and evaluation of the rating system. The internal consistency was measured using Cronbach’s α .

The questionnaire had three (3) parts to determine how the graduates perceive the quality of services offered by the University and to assess their level of satisfaction. The first part of the survey focused on the profile of the respondents (sex, age, no. of years enrolled in the University, family monthly income, and the rating whether passed or failed result in LET). The second part was for the service quality which aimed to determine how the graduates perceive the quality of service offered in the University. The questions were grouped according to specific dimensions of services such as; tangibility, assurance, reliability, responsiveness, and empathy. A five-point Likert Scale was used to indicate their level of agreement. With a scale of one (1) with the description of “Strongly Disagree” and the interpretation of “respondents were not happy with the services, programs, and facilities”. A scale of two (2) with the description of “Disagree” and the interpretation of “respondents have very little happiness with the services, programs, and facilities”. A scale of three (3) description of the “Neutral” interpretation of “respondents are in the middle of not happy and happy”. On a scale of five (5) with a description of “Strongly Agree” interpretation of “respondents are very happy with the services, programs, and facilities”. The last part is for the students’ satisfaction under the same dimensions. With a scale of one (1) description of “Very Dissatisfied” and has the interpretation of “respondents were not contented with the services, programs, and facilities in the University”. A scale of two (2) with the description of “Dissatisfied” and the interpretation of “respondents have very little contentment with the services program, and facilities in the University”. A scale of three (3) description of the “Neutral” interpretation of “respondents are in the middle of not contented and maybe in doubt of his contentment of the services rendered”. A scale of four (4) with the description of “Satisfied” interpretation of “respondents have high contentment”. A scale of five (5) with a description of “Very Satisfied” interpretation of “respondents have high contentment with the services, programs and facilities” in the University.

3. RESULTS

Table 1

Profile of the respondents

Profile	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex		
Male	37	37
Female	63	63
Age		
20-21	66	66
22-23	19	19
24-25	6	6
26-Above	9	9
No. of years enrolled		
4	94	94
5	4	4
6	1	1
7-Above	1	1
Family Monthly Income		
5,000-10,000	43	43
10,001-15,000	36	36
15,001-20,000	16	16
20,001-Above	5	5
LET Result		
Passed	75	75
Failed	25	25

Legend: 5,000-10,000 (low Income), 10,001-15,000 (lower Middle Income), 15,001-20,000 (Upper-Middle Income), 20,000-Above (High Income)

Table 2

Evaluation rating for service quality

Service Quality Dimension	Mean	Verbal Description
Tangibility		
The vision, mission, goals, and quality policy of this University have a great impact on students' achievements.	4.43	Strongly Agree
Faculty is well prepared for their day-to-day lesson activities.	4.33	Strongly Agree
The curriculum is updated.	4.25	Strongly Agree
The university's environment is very suitable for studying.	4.16	Agree
Faculty always come on time to their classes.	4.13	Agree
The University library is well-ventilated and has adequate academic resources/materials that can be utilized for students' research.	4.12	Agree
Campus surroundings are always clean.	4.04	Agree
Classroom surroundings are well arranged, comfortable, and conducive to use.	3.99	Agree
The science laboratory is available with functional machines and facilities.	3.72	Agree
Computers are functional and software is updated.	3.68	Agree
Internet connection services are good, and E-mail facilities are available and accessible at the University.	3.45	Agree

	Overall Mean	4.03	Agree
Assurance			
The University is involved with the society's local and global linkages.		4.33	Strongly Agree
Staff and faculty in the University follow the rules and regulations of the University.		4.11	Agree
The values, beliefs, and communication skills of the students are supported and promoted by the University.		4.05	Agree
The research productivity of the faculty is a reliable source for students' classroom activities.		4.02	Agree
The security system of the University assures the students' safety.		4.01	Agree
Faculty are innovative and strategic in the delivery of lessons.		4.01	Agree
The staff at the University is helpful and approachable.		3.84	Agree
	Overall Mean	4.05	Agree
Reliability			
The University secures the academic credentials of the students.		4.22	Strongly Agree
Instructional materials used by the faculty are attuned to the learning styles of the students.		4.06	Agree
The University staff's assistance is punctual and efficient.		4.02	Agree
The University offices meet its promises of providing efficient and effective services to the students as clientele in the University.		4.01	Agree
Faculty in the University show concern in solving student's problems.		3.87	Agree
Members of the faculty in the University are efficient and effective, have time management, and don't cancel appointments of the students.		3.81	Agree
Members of the staff at the University show sincere involvement in solving students' problems.		3.81	Agree
	Overall Mean	3.97	Agree
Responsiveness			
The University has a responsive counseling personnel that provides counseling services to the student's problems.		3.98	Agree
The University and the faculty prompt positive feedback on students' performance in the class/campus.		3.98	Agree
Faculty is available to respond to student's academic concerns regarding their subjects.		3.95	Agree
Queries of the students in the different University offices are dealt with efficiently and promptly.		3.91	Agree
The university's staff is available when needed.		3.72	Agree
	Overall Mean	3.91	Agree
Empathy			
The University provides good learning experiences and molds globally competitive graduates.		4.30	Strongly Agree
The students' welfare and learning processes are the top priorities of the University administration.		4.10	Agree
Operating hours for the students' facilities in the University like the library, science laboratory, and computer laboratory are convenient for the students.		4.04	Agree
The faculty in the University is sympathetic and supportive of the students in dealing with academic challenges in their course.		4.04	Agree
The faculty treats all the students with equality and fairness. Students feel they have a second parent in the University.		3.88	Agree
	Overall Mean	3.91	Agree

Quezada, W.B., Quezada,P.N.G., Panduyos, J. & Buquid,A.G.P.B. (2024). The Correlation Between Service Quality, Students' Satisfaction, and Board Exam Performance. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools: Current Perspectives*. 14(2), 104-120. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjgc.v14i2.9461>

Legend: 1.0-1.8 (Strongly Disagree), 1.81-2.6 (Disagree), 2.61-3.4 (Neutral), 3.41-4.2 (Agree), 4.21-5.0 (Strongly Agree)

Table 3

Summary of the respondents' perceived service quality of the university

Service Quality Dimension	Mean	Verbal Description
Empathy (the provision of caring and individualized attention to the students, and the access including the communication and understanding of the needs of the students).	4.07	Agree
Assurance (the knowledge and courtesy of the instructors, professors, and staff of the University).	4.05	Agree
Tangibility (the physical evidence found in the services of the University including the appearance of the faculty, and the key officials of the University, classroom, lighting, building structures and set-ups, curriculum, science laboratory with functional laboratory equipment, software, internet, and other physical tools of the University).	4.03	Agree
Reliability (the ability to perform the promised services of the University to the students dependably and accurately).	3.97	Agree
Responsiveness (the willingness to help students and to provide prompt service to its constituents and stakeholders).	3.91	Agree
Overall Mean	4.01	Agree

Legend: 1.0-1.8 (Strongly Disagree), 1.81-2.6 (Disagree), 2.61-3.4 (Neutral), 3.41-4.2 (Agree), 4.21-5.0 (Strongly Agree).

Table 4

Evaluation rating for students' satisfaction

Service Quality Dimension	Mean	Verbal Description
Tangibility		
I am satisfied with the University's vision, mission, goals, and quality policy in molding excellent graduates with exemplary achievements.	4.39	Very Satisfied
I am satisfied with the faculty's lesson activities and knowledge imparted to the class.	4.16	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the University's curriculum offered.	4.16	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the classroom surroundings.	4.08	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the faculty's consumption of their classes' hours.	4.06	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the University's environment and its ambiance while studying.	4.04	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the academic materials available in the University library.	4.00	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the services in the guidance counselor's office and the staff in counseling problematic students at the University.	4.00	Satisfied

I am satisfied with the classroom arrangements and its available materials are always conducive to use.	3.86	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the availability of the machines, equipment, and facilities in the science laboratory.	3.73	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the internet connection that is available at the University.	3.42	Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.99	Agree
Assurance		
I am satisfied with the University's involvement in the local and global linkages.	4.32	Very Satisfied
I am satisfied with the teaching strategies of the faculty and their creativity in imparting knowledge during class discussions.	4.31	Very Satisfied
I am satisfied with the rules and regulations being implemented and followed by the University staff and faculty.	4.18	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the conducted research of the University faculty as it contributes to the student's learning activities in the classroom.	4.13	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the University's security system services in ensuring the student's safety in the University vicinity.	4.11	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the unbiased treatment of the University to students' diverse beliefs, values, and communication skills.	4.05	Satisfied
I am satisfied with the helpful and approachable assistance rendered by the University staff.	3.99	Satisfied
Overall Mean	4.16	Satisfied
Reliability		
I am satisfied that the University secures the academic credentials of the students.	4.22	Very Satisfied
I am satisfied that the instructional materials used by the faculty are attuned to the learning styles of the students.	4.15	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the University staff's assistance is punctual and efficient.	4.10	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the University offices meet its promises in providing efficient and effective services to the students as clientele in the University.	4.06	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the faculty in the University show concern in solving student's problems.	4.04	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the members of the faculty in the University are efficient and effective, have time management, and don't cancel appointments of the students.	4.01	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the members of the staff at the University show sincere involvement in solving students' problems.	3.87	Satisfied
Overall Mean	4.06	Satisfied
Responsiveness		
I am satisfied that the University has a responsive counseling personnel that provides counseling services to the student's problems.	4.19	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the University and the faculty have prompt positive feedback on students' performance in the class/campus.	4.04	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the faculty is available to respond to student's academic concerns regarding their subjects.	4.03	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the queries of the students in the different University offices are dealt with efficiently and promptly.	3.99	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the University's staff is available when needed.	3.94	Satisfied
Overall Mean	4.04	Satisfied

Quezada, W.B., Quezada,P.N.G., Panduyos, J. & Buquid,A.G.P.B. (2024). The Correlation Between Service Quality, Students' Satisfaction, and Board Exam Performance. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools: Current Perspectives*. 14(2), 104-120. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjgc.v14i2.9461>

Empathy		
I am satisfied that the University provides good learning experiences and molds globally competitive graduates.	4.31	Very Satisfied
I am satisfied that the student's welfare and learning processes are the top priorities of the University administration.	4.12	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the operating hours for the students' facilities in the University like the library, science laboratory, and computer laboratory are convenient for the students.	4.10	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the faculty at the University are sympathetic and supportive to the students in dealing with academic challenges in their course.	3.96	Satisfied
I am satisfied that the faculty treats all the students with equality and fairness. Students feel they have a second parent in the University.	3.94	Satisfied
Overall Mean	4.09	Satisfied

Legend: 1.0-1.8 (Very Dissatisfied), 1.81-2.6 (Dissatisfied), 2.61-3.4 (Somewhat Satisfied), 3.41-4.2 (Satisfied), 4.21-5.0 (Very Satisfied).

Table 5

Summary of the respondent's satisfaction with the five dimensions of service quality

Service Quality Dimension	Mean	Verbal Description
Assurance (the knowledge and courtesy of the instructors, professors, and staff of the University).	4.16	Satisfied
Empathy (the provision of caring and individualized attention to the students, and the access including the communication and understanding of the needs of the students).	4.09	Satisfied
Reliability (the ability to perform the promised services of the University to the students dependably and accurately).	4.04	Satisfied
Responsiveness (the willingness to help students and to provide prompt service to its constituents and stakeholders).	4.04	Satisfied
Tangibility (the physical evidence found in the services of the University including the appearance of the faculty, and the key officials of the University, classroom, lighting, building structures and set-ups, curriculum, science laboratory with functional laboratory equipment, software, internet, and other physical tools of the University).	3.99	Satisfied
Overall Mean	4.07	Satisfied

Legend: 1.0-1.8 (Very Dissatisfied), 1.81-2.6 (Dissatisfied), 2.61-3.4 (Somewhat Satisfied), 3.41-4.2 (Satisfied), 4.21-5.0 (Very Satisfied)

Table 6

A significant difference between the respondents' demographic profile and their perceived service quality

Group	Mean	Computed	p-value	Decision	Conclusion
--------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------

		Value				
Sex	Male	3.99	20409.5	0.155	Failed to reject Ho	There is no significant difference.
	Female	4.03				
Age	20-21	4.10	28.68	0.000	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is a significant difference.
	22-23	3.89				
	24-above	3.87				
FMI	5,000-10,000	4.05	13.040	0.001	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is a significant difference.
	10,001-15,000	4.05				
	15,000	3.89				
	15,001-above					
LET	Passed	4.00	2.340	0.127	Failed to reject Ho	There is no significant difference.
	Failed	4.08				

Using the Mann-Whitney test for two groups (since the data does not follow a normal distribution).

Using the Kruskal-Wallis test for more than two groups.

Number of years enrolled was not included in the analysis since the distribution of the frequency varies from each group.

Table 7

A significant difference between the respondents' demographic profile and their satisfaction with service quality

	Group	Mean	Computed Value	p-value	Decision	Conclusion
Sex	Male	4.06	21258.5	0.452	Failed to reject Ho	There is no significant difference.
	Female	4.02				
Age	20-21	4.11	16.879	0.000	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is a significant difference.
	22-23	3.95				
	24-above	3.89				
FMI	5,000-10,000	4.03	19.171	0.000	Reject Null Hypothesis	There is a significant difference.
	10,001-15,000	4.05				
	15,000	3.90				
	15,001-above					
LET	Passed	4.07	16688.0	0.944	Failed to reject Ho	There is no significant difference.
	Failed	3.97				

Using the Mann-Whitney test for two groups (since the data does not follow a normal distribution).

Using the Kruskal-Wallis test for more than two groups.

Number of years enrolled was not included in the analysis since the distribution of the frequency varies from each group.

Table 8

Significant relationship between LET performance and the perceived service quality

Service Quality Dimension	LET Performance		Decision
	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	
Tangibility	-0.376	0.000	Significant
Assurance	-0.004	0.966	Not Significant

Reliability	-0.113	0.233	Not Significant
Responsiveness	-0.211	0.022	Significant
Empathy	-0.141	0.129	Not Significant
Overall	-0.233	0.011	Significant

Table 9

Significant relationship of LET performance and satisfaction on the service quality

Service Quality Dimension	LET Performance		Decision
	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	
Tangibility	-0.017	0.722	Not Significant
Assurance	0.048	0.314	Not Significant
Reliability	0.156	0.001	Significant
Responsiveness	0.175	0.000	Significant
Empathy	0.098	0.042	Significant
Overall	0.089	0.063	Not Significant

4. DISCUSSION

From the data shown in Table 1, the majority of the graduates and exam takers are female with 63% of the total population. The results are supported by the idea of Sario, (2015) that in general, female students are more attracted to the teaching profession than males. The age bracket with 66% of the total population falls on 20-21, which signifies that students have finished their studies within four years staying in the University with 94% of the total population. It indicates that right after they graduate from their secondary level, they pursue studies at the tertiary level. Most of the graduates' economic status ranges from low income to lower middle income. However, despite having a low economic status it does not affect the performance of the graduates in their licensure exam, as 75% of the total population have passed the exam. It indicates that, since they have spent within a range of time in the University, they took the LE right after, and their learnings and services rendered by the University are still fresh they were able to recall in their minds.

Table 3, showed the overall weighted mean average based on the perception of the graduates to the five dimensions of service quality. In general, the services in the dimensions of tangibility, assurance, reliability, responsiveness, and empathy obtained an overall mean of 4.01 with a verbal description of "Agree" indicating, that the graduates were happy with the rendered services overall. However, as shown in Table 2, there are services in each dimension have garnered low scores. Services that are present in the University that got a low score should be subjected to service enhancement, program calibration, and up-to-date check-ups of facilities. To ensure the quality of service and to meet the maximum level of agreement of students. The results are supported by the ideas of Hasbolah et al., (2018), that to provide good quality services, paying attention to students' needs, demands, and preferences should be

considered fundamental.

The summary of graduates' satisfaction with university services can be found by looking at Table 5. An overall mean of 4.07 signifies that the graduates were satisfied with the services given by the University. However, although the graduates have high contentment towards the rendered services, still the dimension of tangibility got the lowest scores. As shown in Table 4, some services need enhancement to meet the maximum level of satisfaction of the graduates especially in the dimension of tangibility. Quality service had a positive impact on students' satisfaction; once satisfied, it boosted the image of the University towards sustainability in the higher education sector. A positive insight into the services offered leads to a higher level of satisfaction and contributes to the positive image of the University (Mancao, 2005), and quality service has a significant relationship with students' satisfaction (Ari, 2011; Pedro et al., 2023).

Table 6 shows that the profile in terms of sex and LET results drew no significant difference since the perceptions are the same among them, having a p-value > 0.05. This means that male and female respondents have the same perceptions towards the rendered services. Since all the services given by the University to the graduates together with the type of examination rendered by the PRC to its takers or examinees have no sex discrimination, all are given equal access to experience the different services found in the University and all were given the privilege to take the board exam. This result conforms to the study of Tefera & Migiros (2017) that perceptions between males and females towards rendered services have no significant difference. However, in terms of age and family monthly income, findings in the table suggest that perception differs among them having a p-value < 0.05. This is because different age levels may have different levels of perceptions and understanding. Since most of the respondents belong to different age brackets, this signifies that the younger respondents perceive differently from the older ones (Tefera & Migiros, 2017). In the study of Akareem and Hossain (2016), age indicates maturity level, and students with lower age have higher expectations about the quality of service compared to the higher age. It further implies that family income has a direct influence on their perception of the quality of service in higher education. Moreover, students from lower-income families are more likely to perceive a high level of education compared to students belonging to a higher family income. Furthermore, Hasan (2009), based on students' perceptions of service quality results suggests that improving the quality of services may also improve the performance of graduates in their chosen careers.

Table 7 showed that profile in terms of sex and LET results drew no significant difference since their satisfaction towards the service quality is the same among them having a p-value > 0.05. This means that males and females have the same level of satisfaction with the services rendered by the University. The results conform to the study of Chandra et al., (2018) although women are more sensitive than men, still, both sexes have equal levels of satisfaction with the services. It further implies that the services in the University were equally given to both sexes, with no bias treatment and both received with no signs of favoritism. Furthermore, in the study of Dhagane & Afrah (2016), students' satisfaction with the different services at the University drew a positive relationship to the academic performance of the students. Hence, a quality service could lead to one's satisfaction; it suggested that from time to time services in the University should be subjected to a thorough evaluation.

However, in terms of age and family monthly income, findings in the table suggest that perception differs among them having a p-value < 0.05. This result affirmed the study of Chandra et al., (2018) that age has a significant impact on the level of satisfaction on the quality of service rendered by the University. It further stated that younger students were less satisfied with the rendered services as it associated with low scores; it is because younger students drew higher expectations on the services, which they believe the university did not ultimately live up to their expectations. Compared to older students who drew higher levels of expectations, it indicates that because they came first, they were able to experience the different services of the University. Later on, they settled on the available services rendered by the University. The result in family monthly income of the respondents drew significant difference in the overall satisfaction of the students.

The result in Table 8 showed the correlation test in the respondents' LET performance, that is, their rating in the exam and the perception of the dimension of the service quality. The test showed that tangibility and responsiveness have a significant contribution to the LET performance of the graduates. Furthermore, the dimensions of assurance, reliability, and empathy show no significance to the LET performance of the graduates. This indicates that the services in these dimensions should be subjected to evaluation, hence this dimension has brought a weak positive impact to the University in general. But, looking at the overall quality of service, it shows a p-value of 0.011 which is less than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship in the LET performance under the perception of the dimension of service quality. However, based on the perception of the graduates towards the quality of service in the University, it is concluded that these services have a weak significant contribution. The weak significant result indicates that the University should be more attentive in dealing with the needs of its clients. Students in general are the primary source of pride of the University, their achievement directly reflects the positive image of the University. Therefore, services in the five dimensions should be subjected to service enhancement and recalibration especially dimensions that have a poor contribution to the LET performance of the graduates.

The data are shown in Table 9, the correlation test in the respondents' LET performance or their rating in the exam and their satisfaction on the dimension of service quality. The test result showed that the level of satisfaction on the three dimensions (reliability, responsiveness, and empathy) has a weak positive relationship to the LET performance of the graduates. It further suggests that dimension tangibility and assurance drew no significant relationship. However, as to the overall result, the level of satisfaction with the quality of service has a p-value of 0.063 which is higher than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between LET performance and their satisfaction level on the dimension of service quality. These results differ from the result obtained in Table 8, based on the perception of the graduates the five dimensions in general have a significant relationship, although it was perceived that the services in those dimensions have a weak significant relationship to the LET performance of the graduates.

5. CONCLUSION

Service quality and student satisfaction are independent of each other but are closely related. However,

they differ when matched with the relationship to LET performance. There may be many factors contributing to the graduates' passing the board examination but, between service quality and students' satisfaction, service quality matters most. Those visible aspects of the service and those that can be felt are the ones that impact students' performance in LE. Students' satisfaction and perceptions of these services may vary according to their age and economic status but on average, those services along with tangibility and responsiveness contribute to students' success. To ensure the continuous and better performance of the graduates in their LE, the University or any higher institution should be more responsive to students' needs, particularly in providing good physical facilities, functional and efficient equipment, approachable and efficient faculty and staff, and effective and efficient communications skills materials. This is for the University's share in helping students to succeed in their careers.

In addition to the provision of the facilities in the University and personnel (faculty & staff), updating students or regular feedback on his performance can push students to perform better. Coaching and follow-up of the LE-related activities of students to pass the LET can have a significant impact on their success especially those potential to top in the board exam. The engagement of students outside classroom learning is also important, so as not to limit their exploration inside the traditional classroom. Thus, access to the internet within the University should be provided. When the budget is limited, the administration may prioritize those needs affecting students' preparations like teachers, classrooms, and other academic facilities. A rapid participatory assessment of students' needs can be done if the University and the administration want to know these needs directly from students.

In particular, the following services must be improved and strengthened: internet access, science laboratory facilities, classroom surroundings, treatment of students, on-time and error-free assistance, availability of staff in offices, and the equal and fair treatment of the faculty in the University. In addition, there is a need to review and enhance the quality of service found in the five dimensions of SERVQUAL. It is recommended that the University from time to time should gather feedback and suggestions, not only from the students but also from the stakeholders such as private firms, government agencies, parents, and the community to maintain the quality of service. Moreso, further studies should be conducted in other majors of discipline in the University to determine the quality of service rendered across disciplines as the basis for program enhancement since the study was limited only to the Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Biological and Physical Sciences.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval: The study adheres to the ethical guidelines for conducting research.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M. M., Ahmad, Z., Ahmad, Z., Shaukat, M. Z., Usman, A., & Ahmed, N. (2010). Does service quality affect students' performance? Evidence from institutes of higher learning. *African journal of business management*, 4(12), 2527.

- Quezada, W.B., Quezada,P.N.G., Panduyos, J. & Buquid,A.G.P.B. (2024). The Correlation Between Service Quality, Students' Satisfaction, and Board Exam Performance. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools: Current Perspectives*. 14(2), 104-120. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjgc.v14i2.9461>
- Akareem, H. S., & Hossain, S. S. (2016). Determinants of education quality: what makes students' perception different? *Open review of educational research*, 3(1), 52-67. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/23265507.2016.1155167>
- Antiojo, L. P. (2017). Performance of education graduates in the licensure examination for teachers (LET). *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 1363-1384. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ligaya_Antiojo/publication/320384905_PERFORMANCE_OF_EDUCATION_GRADUATES_IN_THE_LICENSEURE_EXAMINATION_FOR_TEACHERS_LET/links/5a2bf81aa6fdccfbf8713f0/PERFORMANCE-OF-EDUCATION-GRADUATES-IN-THE-LICENSEURE-EXAMINATION-FOR-TEACHERS-LET.pdf
- Ari, W. (2011). Service Quality and Students' Satisfaction at Higher Learning Institutions: The Competing Dimensions of Malaysian Universities' Competitiveness. *Journal of Southeast Asian Research*. 1-10.
- Bautista, A. S., Reynaldo, T. G., & Gonzales, R.D. (2019). Work Status of Alumni and their Satisfaction on Selected Indicators in the School of Advanced Studies. *World Journal of Education*, 9(2), 56.
- Berry, L. L., Parasuraman, A., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Brown, R. M., & Mazzarol, T. W. (2009). The importance of institutional image to student satisfaction and loyalty within higher education. *Higher education*, 58, 81-95. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-008-9183-8>
- Cayanan, C. D. (2017). Service quality of private tertiary education institutions in the province of Pampanga: A Gap Analysis. In *DLSU Research Congress 2017*.
- Chandra, T. N. M., Chandra, S., & Privono. P. (2018). The Effect of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction and Students' Loyalty. *An Empirical Study Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(3), 109-31. <https://jsser.org/index.php/jsser/article/view/282>
- Chen, Y. C. (2015). An empirical study on the student experience of higher education service quality in Taiwan. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, 6(12), 582-594. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/rss/jnljms/v6i12p4.html>
- Choi, Y., Han, J., & Kim, H. (2023). Exploring key service-learning experiences that promote students' learning in higher education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 1-16. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12564-023-09833-5>
- Daran, A. M., Dominguez, L. L., Pamatmat, F. V., & Pamin, C.D. (2018). Service Quality Dimensions of a Philippine State University and Students' Satisfaction: Bridging Gaps to Excellence. *Int J Adv. Res.* 6(7), 673-681.
- Del Río-Rama, M. D. L. C., Álvarez-García, J., Mun, N. K., & Durán-Sánchez, A. (2021). Influence of the quality perceived of service of a higher education center on the loyalty of students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 671407. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.671407/full>
- Department of Budget and Management – Commission on Higher Education (DBM-CHED) Joint Circular No. 2 s. (2004). *Application of Normative Funding in the Allocation of Expenditures of State Colleges and Universities Starting FY 2005 and Every Year Thereafter*.

- Quezada, W.B., Quezada, P.N.G., Panduyos, J. & Buquid, A.G.P.B. (2024). The Correlation Between Service Quality, Students' Satisfaction, and Board Exam Performance. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools: Current Perspectives*. 14(2), 104-120. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjgc.v14i2.9461>
- Dhaqane, M. K., & Afrah, N. A. (2016). Satisfaction of students and academic performance in Benadir University. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(24), 59-63. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1112855>
- Ferrer, R. C., Buted, D. R., & Ferrer, I. M. C. (2015). Performance of BSEd science graduates in licensure examination for teachers: basis for a regression model. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(5), 1-6. <https://www.academia.edu/download/62091865/APJMR-2015-3.5.3.0120200213-46446-1rmqsyv.pdf>
- Hameed, A., & Amjad, S. (2011). Students' satisfaction in higher learning institutions: a case study of COMSATS Abbottabad, Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Management Studies (Formerly known as Iranian Journal of Management Studies)*, 4(1), 63-77. https://ijms.ut.ac.ir/article_23445_2351.html
- Hasan, H. F. A. (2009). Service Quality and Students' Satisfaction: A Case Study at Private Higher Institutions. *International Business Research*. 1(30) 63.
- Hasbolah, F., Kumarasamy, M. M., & Fazmi, K. N. M. (2018). Students' perception of service quality delivery in a private higher education institution. *Journal of Management, Business & Social Sciences Impact*, 1, 35-43. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mokana-Muthu/publication/341820986_Students_perception_of_service_quality_delivery_in_a_private_higher_education_institution/links/5ed5fdd0299bf1c67d328ccb/Students-perception-of-service-quality-delivery-in-a-private-higher-education-institution.pdf
- Hayes, T. (2007). Delphi study of the future of marketing of higher education. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(9), 927-931. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296307000537>
- Kajenthiran, K., & Karunanithy, M. (2015). Service quality and student satisfaction: A case study of private external higher education institutions in Jaffna, Sri Lanka. <http://repo.lib.jfn.ac.lk/ujrr/handle/123456789/5537>
- 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), 27. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s13731-022-00196-6>
- Khan, M. M., Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M. M. (2011). Student's perspective of service quality in higher learning institutions; An evidence-based approach. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(11). <https://search.proquest.com/openview/7590d5624c74f754cc65433ba8818dc5/1.pdf?pg-origsite=gscholar&cbl=646295>
- Lewis, R., & Booms, B. (1993). The Marketing Aspects of Service Quality. In; Kadlubek, M., & Grabara, J. (2015). Customers' Expectations and Experience within Chosen Aspects of Logistics Customer Service Quality. *International Journal for Quality Research* 9(2) 265-278.
- Mancao, M. C. (2005). Students' Satisfaction Survey. *Philippine Normal University Research*. 79.
- Pedro, E. D. M., Leitão, J., & Alves, H. (2023). Students' satisfaction and empowerment of a sustainable university campus. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1-24. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10668-023-03903-9>

- Quezada, W.B., Quezada,P.N.G., Panduyos, J. & Buquid,A.G.P.B. (2024). The Correlation Between Service Quality, Students' Satisfaction, and Board Exam Performance. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counseling in Schools: Current Perspectives*. 14(2), 104-120. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjgc.v14i2.9461>
- Quiambao, D. T., Baking, E. G., Buenviaje, L., Nuqui, A. V., & Cruz, R. C. (2015). Predictors of board exam performance of the DHVTSU college of education graduates. *Journal of Business & Management Studies*, 1(1), 1-4. https://www.academia.edu/download/50874198/reference_1.pdf
- Roloff, J., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., & Trautwein, U. (2020). The Predictive Validity of Teachers' Personality, Cognitive and Academic Abilities at the End of High School on Instructional Quality in Germany: A Longitudinal Study. *AERA Open*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419897884>
- Sario, L. P. (2015). Students' Satisfaction Survey on PNU–NL Services. *International Refereed Research Journal*, 6(3).
- Stribbell, H., & Duangekanong, S. (2022). Satisfaction as a key antecedent for word of mouth and an essential mediator for service quality and brand trust in international education. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), 1-11. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-022-01459-z>
- Subrahmanyam, A. (2017). Relationship between service quality, satisfaction, motivation, and loyalty: A multi-dimensional perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 25(2), 171-188. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/QAE-04-2013-0016/full/html>
- Tefera, O., & Migiro, S. (2017). The relationship between demographic and tripographic factors and customers' expectation, perception, and service quality: A case of star-rated hotel guests in Ethiopia. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(4), 1-20. https://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_49_vol_6_4_2017.pdf