

Student Awareness and Satisfaction Survey on the Student Affairs and Services Programs of a State University

*¹Jesusa E. Pineda., ¹Francis Jose D. Bearneza., ²Maria Victoria G. Violanda

¹Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Talisay City, Negros Occidental, Philippines

²Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Negros Occidental, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000418>

Received: 15 May 2025; Accepted: 19 May 2025; Published: 19 June 2025

ABSTRACT

Higher education institutions, through the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum number 8, series of 2021, otherwise known as Guidelines on the Implementation of Flexible Delivery of Student Affairs and Services (SAS), were enjoined to conduct surveys on students' awareness of and satisfaction with student affairs and services. This study explored the state university students' knowledge, understanding, and satisfaction with the various student affairs and services offered by the Student Affairs and Services office. Mean and standard deviation were used to analyze the data gathered from three hundred seventy-four Carlos Hilado Memorial State University students during the Academic Year 2022-2023. Results show that the level of students' satisfaction with student affairs and services was high when they were grouped according to sex and campus. Furthermore, the students were more aware of student organizations and activities than the other student affairs and services offered by the Office of Student Affairs and Services. This study recommends that scholarship and financial assistance, health services, and career and job placement services be bolstered by the Office of Student Affairs and Services, as the students found these to be available but inadequate.

Keywords: SAS, Services, Awareness and Satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

After a two-year closure caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, schools in the Philippines joined in reintroducing restricted in-person classes while facilitating online learning (Pineda & Javier, 2022). The Commission on Higher Education, through the CMO No. 8, series of 2021, otherwise known as Guidelines on the Implementation of Flexible Delivery of Student Affairs and Services (SAS) (Commission on Higher Education, 2021), enjoined higher education institutions to guarantee the enduring viability of the student affairs and services programs. Consequently, state universities had to ensure that their Student Affairs and Services Office looked into how aware and satisfied students were with their programs and services. Every higher education institution has a crucial role in meeting learners' diverse needs, necessitating various programs to guarantee student welfare (Maniulit, 2022).

Some researchers, including Kutat et al. (2021), Maslang et al. (2021), Maniulit (2022), and Orogo (2022), assessed students' awareness and level of satisfaction regarding different programs and services provided by higher education institutions. However, only a few studies had respondents from state universities. The delivery of student affairs and services programs had to be pursued amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Hence, this study was carried out. Specifically, this study will help the Office of the Student Affairs and Services improve its implementation of various programs and services.

Objectives of the Study

Generally, this study aimed to determine which student affairs and services were students aware of and how satisfied they were with the programs and services that the Office of Student Affairs and Services offered during the Academic Year 2022-2023.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

This research can be classified as descriptive quantitative research, which involves examining the connection between variables to test objective theories. In this type of research, variables are measured using instruments that produce numerical data, which can then be analyzed using statistical methods (Creswell, 2009). As Nassaji (2015) stated, descriptive research aims to portray a phenomenon and its characteristics.

A stratified random sampling method was employed, with respondents selected based on their campus. 374 students from a state university were selected to participate in the study. The population was divided into different strata, as stratified sampling is used when no homogeneous group is available to draw a sample. This technique ensures a representative and high-quality sample (Etikan & Bala, 2017). Specifically, the study included 61 students from Campus A, 84 from Campus B, 55 from Campus C, and 174 from Campus D. To assess student satisfaction, the study utilized the Student Satisfaction Survey on SAS Programs following CHED Memorandum Order 8, series of 2021.

The study adopted the students' satisfaction survey instrument on Student Affairs and Services (SAS) Programs from CMO 8, series of 2021, stated as Guidelines on the Implementation of Flexible Delivery of Student Affairs and Services (SAS) Programs during the COVID-19 Pandemic. In particular, the Student Satisfaction Survey on SAS Programs consisted mainly of three parts, namely: (1) student affairs and services students are aware their school provides; (2) student affairs and services students would like their school to provide; and (3) satisfaction of students with student affairs and services based on specific areas.

Frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used to determine the level of student awareness and satisfaction with the Student Affairs and Services programs at a state university.

RESULTS

Learning Modalities Accessed by State University Students

Table 1 shows that students accessed their courses more through a combination of printed and online learning (66.04%) modality than through learning packets (9.63%), online learning (22.99%), and other learning modalities (1.34%).

Contrarily, Maniulit (2022) revealed that 84% of local university students learned online, 15% through printed and online learning, and 1% through learning packets. Likewise, 44.30% of state university students accessed their lessons through online and learning packets, 36.8% through online learning, and 18.90% through modules (Kutat et al., 2021).

Table 1. Learning Modalities Accessed by State University Students

Learning Modalities	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Learning packet	36	9.63%	3
Online learning	86	22.99%	2
Combination of printed and online	247	66.04%	1
Others	5	1.34%	4

Student Affairs and Services State University Students Were Aware of

Table 2 shows that the students were well-informed about student organizations and activities more than about the other student affairs and services.

In contrast, Maniulit (2022) showed that the majority of local university students, specifically 81.49%, confirmed that scholarships and financial assistance were provided during the pandemic. Following that, information dissemination and orientation accounted for 72.82% of the responses. Institutions also reportedly offered guidance and counseling, as indicated by 233 respondents or 12.47%. However, services such as economic enterprise, student handbook development, safety and security services, multi-faith services, and foreign/international student services were reported as needing to be provided based on the students' responses. These results do not correspond with this study's results as students were primarily aware of student organizations and activities, guidance and counseling services, and information and orientation services, ranked 1, 2, and 3 consecutively.

The respondents in the study of Kutat et al. (2021), however, indicated their highest familiarity with Information and Orientation Services, Guidance and Counseling Services, Registrar, Student Organization and Activities, Library, Scholarship and Financial Assistance, Student Council and Government, and Leadership Training programs. Notably, the Student Handbook Development gained prominence as most student leaders were aware of the Student Handbook 2020. On the contrary, Health Services, Student Publication, Career and Job Placement, and Admission were less visible to the students despite their crucial status and the numerous activities and processes they were involved in throughout the academic year. Less prominent services such as Multi-Faith Services, Student Housing and Residential Services, and Foreign/International Student Services occupied the least visible and familiar positions among the programs.

In addition, Rozikin et al. (2020) showed that their respondents from higher education institutions in Indonesia knew more about scholarship services than other student affairs and services. In the study of Cauilan and Tattao (2022), student discipline was the area of student affairs and services students were aware of.

Table 2. Student Affairs and Services State University Students were Aware of

	Student Affairs and Services	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1	Information and orientation services	227	60.70%	3
2	Guidance and counseling services	243	64.97%	2
3	Career and job placement services	85	22.73%	15
4	Economic enterprise development	38	10.16%	19
5	Student handbook development	178	47.59%	4
6	Student organizations and activities	267	71.39%	1
7	Leadership training	11	2.94%	22
8	Student council/government	25	6.68%	21
9	Student discipline	144	38.50%	10
10	Student publication/yearbook	88	23.53%	14
11	Admission services	117	31.28%	12
12	Scholarship and financial assistance	176	47.06%	5
13	Food services	76	20.32%	16
14	Health services	164	43.85%	7
15	Safety and security services	155	41.44%	8
16	Student housing and residential services	152	40.64%	9
17	Multi-faith services	33	8.82%	20
18	Foreign/international students services	129	34.49%	11

19	Services for specific students (students with disabilities, students belonging to indigenous groups, students who are solo parents, etc.)	40	10.70%	18
20	Cultural and arts and program	169	45.19%	6
21	Sports development program	48	12.83%	17
22	Social and community involvement program	115	30.75%	13
23	Others (please indicate)	5	1.34%	23

Top 3 Student Affairs and Services the University Should Provide According to the Students

Of the twenty-three student affairs and services, scholarship and financial assistance, health, career, and job placement services, ranked numbers 1, 2, and 3, respectively, by students, are the student affairs and services that the Office of the Student Affairs and Services needs to deliver consistently. Table 3 shows the data.

Congruently, scholarship and financial assistance emerged as the most highly regarded program, with a significant response rate (49.28%) in Maniulit's (2022) study. In addition, the response rate for career and job placement reached 34.24%, indicating the students' desire for the institution to provide such services. While in this study, health services ranked second (43.85%), those services only garnered 26% in Maniulit's study (2022).

In contrast, Orogo (2022) found that student council/government, guidance and counseling services, and student organizations and activities were ranked first, second, and third, respectively, by students at a state university in the Philippines.

Table 3. Top 3 Student Affairs and Services the University Should Provide According to the Students

	Student Affairs and Services	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1	Information and orientation services	67	17.91%	6.5
2	Guidance and counseling services	69	18.45%	5
3	Career and job placement services	90	24.06%	3
4	Economic enterprise development	19	5.08%	21
5	Student handbook development	27	7.22%	17
6	Student organizations and activities	46	12.30%	13
7	Leadership training	49	13.10%	10
8	Student council/government	28	7.49%	16
9	Student discipline	67	17.91%	6.5
10	Student publication/yearbook	39	10.43%	15
11	Admission services	10	2.67%	22
12	Scholarship and financial assistance	125	33.42%	1
13	Food services	73	19.52%	4
14	Health services	91	24.33%	2
15	Safety and security services	56	14.97%	8
16	Student housing and residential services	45	12.03%	14
17	Multi-faith services	24	6.42%	19
18	Foreign/international students services	52	13.90%	9

19	Services for specific students (students with disabilities, students belonging to indigenous groups, students who are solo parents, etc.)	48	12. 83%	11.5
20	Cultural and arts and program	20	5. 35%	20
21	Sports development program	48	12. 83%	11.5
22	Social and community involvement program	26	6. 95%	18
23	Others (please indicate)	0	0%	23

Satisfaction with Specific Areas When Grouped According to Sex

Table 4 illustrates that both male ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.79$) and female ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.76$) students exhibited a “High” level of satisfaction with specific areas of student affairs and services at a State University during the COVID-19 pandemic. This result indicates that students were fully convinced of the quality of affairs and services provided by the Office of Student Affairs and Services.

In contrast, Kutat et al. (2021) and Caulan and Tattao (2022) revealed that students at a state university in Palawan and in Cagayan, respectively, were just satisfied with student affairs and services. Moreover, the students at a local university in Manila were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with all the student affairs and services (Maniulit, 2022). Furthermore, The school personnel, including the faculty, advisers, student affairs and services, were accessible and courteous to answer questions or provide feedback, The orientation conducted by the school on flexible learning and student affairs and services were clearly outlined, The school supported online activities of student organizations, The school supported the student council/government, and The school provided safe online/distance/flexible learning environment, were the student affairs and services that the students were satisfied with. Only the following indicators disclosed a dissatisfied interpretation: The student handbook provided by the school contains information such as contact numbers of school personnel, how to access student services, etc., The school publication is active and accessible, The school provided accessible health services such as online medical consultations, among others, and The cultural and arts program provided opportunities to develop and enhance talents, abilities, and values for the appreciation, promotion, and conservation of national culture and multi-cultural heritage (Maniulit, 2022).

In terms of specific aspects, male ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.94$) and female ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.96$) students had high average scores for the item, indicating their perception of the helpfulness of the school personnel in the admissions/registrar’s office. Furthermore, female students displayed the same average score for items related to their perception of the school’s support for student council/government/organizations in their online activities. In contrast, Pendon (2016) discovered that male and female students in a state university in Iloilo were very satisfied with student affairs and services.

It is noteworthy that both male and female respondents reported high satisfaction levels, but males consistently indicated a slightly higher level of satisfaction across all items.

Table 4. Level of Satisfaction with Student Affairs and Services in a State University during the COVID-19 Pandemic when Grouped According to Sex

Item	Male			Female		
	M	SD	Intrp.	M	SD	Intrp.
1	4.13	1.00	High	4.06	0.92	High
2	4.02	0.91	High	4.02	0.94	High
3	4.01	1.03	High	4.02	0.99	High
4	3.94	1.09	High	3.89	0.99	High
5	4.08	1.08	High	3.92	0.97	High

6	4.19	1.05	High	3.99	0.98	High
7	4.12	0.98	High	4.09	0.95	High
8	4.21	0.92	High	4.09	0.97	High
9	4.20	0.95	High	4.01	0.97	High
10	4.23	0.94	High	4.09	0.96	High
11	4.06	1.03	High	3.98	1.02	High
12	4.06	1.02	High	3.95	1.02	High
13	4.13	0.95	High	3.99	0.98	High
14	4.10	1.20	High	3.97	1.12	High
15	4.01	1.02	High	4.02	0.90	High
16	4.11	1.01	High	4.05	0.92	High
17	4.01	1.01	High	3.95	0.86	High
Whole	4.10	0.79	High	4.00	0.76	High
Over all Mean	4.05	0.76	High			

Mean scale: 1.00-1.49 Very low, 1.50-2.49 Low, 2.50-3.49 Average, 3.50-4.49 High, and 4.50-5.00 Very High

Level of Satisfaction of Student Affairs And Services in A State University During the Covid-19 Pandemic When Grouped According to Campus

Table 5 shows that students on all campuses had a "High" level of satisfaction when taken as a whole. Students from Campus A ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.10$) had a high mean satisfaction value on item 16 ("The sports development program provided physical fitness and wellness other than Physical Education subjects."). Meanwhile, students from Campus B ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.94$) had a high mean value on item 12 (The school provided accessible health services such as online medical consultations among others.), indicating their satisfaction with the school providing a safe online/distance/flexible learning environment during the pandemic. Lastly, students from Campus C ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.87$) and Campus D ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.85$) were very satisfied with item 10 (The school personnel in the admissions'/registrar's office are helpful.), as indicated by their mean values.

Campus A recorded higher levels of satisfaction with Student Affairs and Services across all items compared to Campuses B, C, and D. In terms of sex, both male and female respondents reported high levels of satisfaction, but males consistently indicated a slightly higher level of satisfaction across all items.

Kutat et al. (2021) conducted a study involving seven campuses of a state university in Palawan, and their results revealed that the respondents expressed satisfaction with the student affairs and services provided by their school.

Table 5. Level of Satisfaction of Student Affairs and Services in a State University during the COVID-19 Pandemic when Grouped According to Campus

Items	Campus A			Campus B			Campus C			Campus D		
	M	SD	Intrp.	M	SD	Intrp.	M	SD	Intrp.	M	SD	Intrp.
1	3.89	1.25	H	4.20	0.95	H	4.24	0.74	H	4.07	0.89	H
2	3.72	1.16	H	4.25	0.88	H	4.18	0.80	H	3.96	0.87	H
3	3.87	1.18	H	4.18	0.98	H	3.95	1.01	H	4.01	0.96	H
4	3.69	1.34	H	4.20	0.86	H	3.83	0.77	H	3.87	1.03	H
5	3.87	1.02	H	4.10	0.83	H	4.04	1.05	H	3.97	1.09	H
6	3.80	1.25	H	4.29	0.98	H	4.13	0.98	H	4.06	0.94	H

7	3.92	1.24	H	4.24	0.95	H	4.31	0.86	H	4.04	0.87	H
8	3.90	1.25	H	4.32	0.96	H	4.27	0.80	H	4.10	0.84	H
9	3.84	1.24	H	4.26	0.93	H	4.13	0.80	H	4.10	0.90	H
10	3.84	1.24	H	4.10	0.92	H	4.36	0.87	H	4.12	0.85	H
11	3.87	1.28	H	4.35	0.93	H	4.07	0.88	H	3.89	0.97	H
12	3.84	1.27	H	4.36	0.94	H	4.06	0.89	H	3.87	0.97	H
13	3.87	1.19	H	4.27	0.96	H	4.09	0.85	H	4.00	0.90	H
14	3.84	1.31	H	4.33	0.97	H	4.00	1.39	H	3.95	1.09	H
15	3.79	1.20	H	4.14	0.97	H	3.93	0.92	H	4.06	0.84	H
16	3.95	1.10	H	4.18	0.91	H	3.98	0.97	H	4.11	0.93	H
17	3.80	1.22	H	4.18	0.95	H	3.96	0.72	H	3.94	0.85	H
Whole	3.84	1.10	H	4.24	0.80	H	4.09	0.68	H	4.01	0.62	H
Over all Mean			H	4.05	0.76							

Mean scale: 1.00-1.49 Very low, 1.50-2.49 Low, 2.50-3.49 Average, 3.50-4.49 High, and 4.50-5.00 High

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Students attending the state university expressed awareness of and great satisfaction with the Office of Student Affairs and Services, regardless of their gender or campus affiliation. This finding implies that despite the combination of in-person and online learning, the university efficiently provided student affairs and services, resulting in high student contentment.

It is worth noting that a lack of research on students' awareness and satisfaction regarding student affairs and services makes this study a valuable contribution to the field.

It is important for higher education institutions to annually assess students' awareness of and satisfaction with the student affairs and services they provide.

REFERENCES

1. Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Development. <https://www.middlesex.mass.edu/ace/downloads/astininv.pdf>
2. Commission on Higher Education (2021). Guidelines on the implementation of flexible delivery of student affairs and services (SAS) programs during the COVID-19 pandemic. https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/CMO-No.-8-s.-2021.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0uitSs7MMEbtJwe7-yOjLysElsUb2bqkQs7skEiu1unEzgJI5GZPP_j0
3. Creswell, J. (2009). Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. SAGE Publications
4. Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal, 5(6)
5. Kutat, R., Cayaon, C., Colis, I., & Jagmis, M.G. (2021). Student satisfaction survey on student affairs and services (SAS) programs of Western Philippines University. European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability (EJRDS), 2(9). <https://www.scholarzest.com>
6. Maslang, K., Baguilat, I., Mania, E.E., Damayon, S., & Dacles, D.D. (2021). Student services awareness and satisfaction in a private higher education institution amid the pandemic. American Journal of Educational Research, 9(12), 708-719 <http://www.sciepub.com/EDUCATION/abstract/13987>

7. Maniulit, J. (2022). Student satisfaction survey on student affairs and services programs of taguig city university. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363364793> Student_Satisfaction_Survey_on_Student_Affairs_and_Services_Programs_of_Taguig_City_University
8. Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis. *Language Teaching Research* 2015, 9(2), 129 –132
9. Orogo, M. A. (2022). Awareness and level of satisfaction of students with the support services at Central Bicol State University of Agriculture. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 10(9). <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2022/September-2022/06.pdf>
10. Pendon, G. (2016). Students' degree of satisfaction of student services. *IRA-International Journal of Education & Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(3). <http://research-advances.org/index.php/IJEMS>
11. Pineda, J. & Javier, R. (2023). Self-regulation among state university students in an online learning environment. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, Volume, 6(6). <https://ijsshr.in/v6i6/15.php>
12. Rozikin, M., Muttaqin, A., Pratama, B.I., Putra, E., Kumalasari, K.P., Sugiastuti, R.H. & Ningsih, D.N.C. (2020). Evaluation of student affairs services in higher education in East Java. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 7(1) pp. 49-55. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1248184>