

SATISFACTION SURVEY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BOHOL VICTORIANO D. TIROL ADVANCED LEARNING CENTER, SY 2025–2026

Leah Wilfreda E. Pilongo , Angelo P. Yuayan,
Sofila La Fuente Gantalao

¹ University of Bohol, VDTALC Tagbilaran City, Philippines

Corresponding Author: leachevarez@universityofbohol.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

Article History

Submission: 19 May 2026
Revised: May 22, 2026
Accepted: May 25, 2026
Publication: September 3, 2026

Keywords— institutional contentment, campus environment, educational quality, stakeholder perceptions, higher education, student satisfaction, institutional services

This study aimed to determine the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders of the University of Bohol Victoriano D. Tirol Advanced Learning Center (UB VDTALC) for the school year 2025 – 2026. The poll explicitly asked about satisfaction with Community, Campus Climate, Campus Support Services, Finance, Instruction and Curriculum, and Instructional Campus Support. The research was quantitative and descriptive and included a modified institutional satisfaction survey. The study randomly selected 1,053 participants, including children,

parents, and instructors. Data analysis was performed using frequency counts and percentages, as well as the Shapiro-Wilk and Kruskal-Wallis tests. The results revealed that most respondents reported being satisfied or highly satisfied with UB VDTALC's institutional service. Campus Climate and Instruction and Curriculum had the highest satisfaction scores, with Finance being the lowest, although still largely acceptable. The results showed that most respondents had their expectations met by their experiences and would choose the institution again. Statistically significant



© Pilongo, L. W. E., Yuayan, A. P., & Gantalao, S. L. F. (2026). Open Access. This article published by University of Bohol Multidisciplinary Research Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material). Under the following terms, you must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not use the material for commercial purposes. To view a copy of this license, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

differences in satisfaction levels were observed among the respondent groups, as indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test, with teachers being the most satisfied and learners the least satisfied. The results show that UB VDTALC has a high institutional performance, underscoring the need for financial support services and carrying out and implementing stakeholder engagement efforts to promote sustainable development.

INTRODUCTION

Institutional self-evaluation has become increasingly important in higher education as universities respond to diverse student populations, changing educational demands, and growing expectations for quality services. Higher education institutions are expected not only to provide instruction but also to create learning environments that support students' academic, social, emotional, and professional development. Satisfaction surveys provide institutions with empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of programs, services, facilities, and governance practices that influence institutional reputation and stakeholder confidence.

Student satisfaction has emerged as an essential indicator of institutional success, measuring universities' ability to meet the requirements and expectations of their stakeholders. Owlia and Aspinwall (1996) describe excellence in higher education as having several dimensions, including academic services, support systems, facilities, and institutional responsiveness. Hill (1995) also stated that fundamental educational services, such as instruction, faculty competence, and learning assistance, are important to students' evaluations of institutional quality.

Campus support services, such as counseling, academic advising, tutorials, and student aid programs, are vital mechanisms that enhance student persistence and success (Purnell & Blank, 2004). Bailey and Alfonso (2005) contended that support systems help students surmount academic and social obstacles, especially for marginalized learners. Karp et al. (2008) elucidated, using Tinto's Integration Framework, that students are more likely to succeed and persist when institutions offer structured opportunities to engage with academic and support services.

School climate has also been found to influence educational outcomes. UNESCO (2006) stressed that a safe and supportive learning environment is crucial to good teaching and learning. Campus environment refers to the interpersonal, intellectual, and professional interactions that promote individuals' feelings of being welcomed, respected, and valued within the institution (Lucero, 2007). Positive campus climates improve learner retention, institutional trust, and academic well-being.

Ramsden (1979) and Ramsden and Entwistle (1981) found that institutional environments had a significant impact on students' learning experiences and academic engagement. Hence, improving institutional quality depends on understanding stakeholders' perceptions of the university's services, facilities, instruction, and support systems.

The present study sought to determine satisfaction levels among students, parents, and teachers with the services provided by the University of Bohol Victoriano D. Tirol Advanced Learning Center (UB VDTALC). In particular, the study evaluated satisfaction with Community, Campus Climate, Campus Support Services, Finance, Instruction and Curriculum, and Instructional Campus Support. The findings provide empirical insights for the institutional design, policy reform, quality assurance, and continuous improvement.

Theoretical and Conceptual Foundation. The study was grounded in Tinto's Integration Theory, which states that students' persistence and satisfaction are determined by their academic and social integration within the institution. "Students who find themselves in supportive learning environments and in effective institutional services are more likely to persist and be satisfied with their educational experiences," Tinto says.

The study was also based on Owlia and Aspinwall's (1996) Service Quality Theory in Higher Education. Their theory argues that institutional quality is multidimensional and involves instructional quality, administrative efficiency, campus facilities, responsiveness, and student support systems. "Satisfaction occurs when the institutional services meet or exceed the expectations of the stakeholders". Furthermore, the study supports the notion of Campus Climate Theory by highlighting that healthy interpersonal interactions, inclusion, and institutional respect have a major role in students' educational experience and well-being (Lucero, 2007).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive research methodology employing a modified institutional satisfaction survey questionnaire. The study surveyed stakeholders' satisfaction with the community, campus support services, financing, instructional support, instruction and curriculum, and campus climate. The respondents were 1,053 randomly selected stakeholders of UB VDTALC, comprised of students, parents, and teachers. Ethical principles were scrupulously followed, in particular, voluntary participation and the confidentiality of responses.

Table 6. *Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality*

Group	Statistic	p-value	Interpretation
Parents	0.933	< .05	Skewed
Students	0.961	< .05	Skewed
Teachers	0.874	< .05	Skewed

The Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that the satisfaction data were not normally distributed; hence, nonparametric statistical analysis was appropriate.

Frequency counts, percentages, the Shapiro-Wilk test, and the Kruskal-Wallis test were used to analyze the data. The Shapiro-Wilk test determined the normality of data distribution, while the Kruskal-Wallis test assessed significant differences in satisfaction levels among respondent groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents an analysis and interpretation of data gathered from respondents regarding their satisfaction with the services and overall experience at the University of Bohol Victoriano D. Tirol Advanced Learning Center (UB VDTALC). The discussion highlights the demographics of respondents, their satisfaction levels across institutional areas, overall institutional experience, and significant differences in perceptions among different respondent groups. The findings provide empirical evidence on institutional strengths and areas requiring continuous improvement to enhance the quality of educational services and stakeholder satisfaction.

The study encompassed students, parents, and instructors as key stakeholders of the University of Bohol Victoriano D. Tirol Advanced Learning Center. Their participation facilitated a comprehensive assessment of institutional services from many viewpoints. Students' direct engagement with the institution's instructional and support services resulted in their anticipated overrepresentation in the study. Parents and instructors were included because of their crucial roles in evaluating the effectiveness of educational delivery, campus support services, and the overall learning environment.

Table 1. *Distribution of Respondents (n = 1053)*

Respondent Group	Frequency	Percentage
Parents	298	28.3
Students	695	66.0
Teachers	60	5.7
Total	1053	100.0

The majority of the respondents were students, comprising 66% of the total sample, followed by parents and teachers. The distribution reflects the centrality of students as the institution's primary stakeholders, while also recognizing the important perspectives of parents and teachers in evaluating institutional services.

Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents. Understanding the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents provides important context in interpreting stakeholder perceptions and satisfaction levels. Variables such as nationality, sex, educational attainment, and family income may influence expectations, experiences, and evaluations of institutional services. The socio-demographic profile also reflects the diversity and socioeconomic background of the school community served by UB VDTALC.

Table 2. *Summary of Respondents' Socio-Demographic Profile*

Variable	Dominant Category	Percentage
Nationality	Filipino	89.6
Sex	Female	58.7
Educational Attainment	College Graduate	42.7

Most respondents were Filipino and female. A substantial proportion were college graduates, indicating relatively educated stakeholders.

Level of Satisfaction among Respondents. Stakeholder satisfaction is a key indicator of institutional effectiveness, service quality, and responsiveness to stakeholder needs. The assessment of satisfaction levels provides insights into how respondents perceive the institution's educational services, support systems, facilities, and learning environment. High satisfaction ratings may indicate effective institutional practices, while lower ratings may identify areas needing improvement.

Table 3. *Overall Satisfaction with UB VDTALC Services*

Level of Satisfaction	Percentage
Not Satisfied at All	0.9
Less Satisfied	6.0
Satisfied	47.8
Highly Satisfied	45.4

The results indicated that 93.2% of respondents expressed satisfaction or strong satisfaction with the services provided by UB VDTALC. Educators consistently reported the highest levels of happiness, whereas students typically expressed lower satisfaction than parents and teachers. The results demonstrate robust institutional efficacy in providing educational and support services.

Stakeholder satisfaction is a critical measure of institutional efficacy, service excellence, and responsiveness to stakeholder requirements. The evaluation of satisfaction levels offers insights into respondents' perceptions of the institution's educational offerings, support systems, facilities, and learning environment. Elevated satisfaction ratings may signify effective institutional processes, whilst diminished ratings may highlight areas requiring enhancement.

Table 4. *Combined Satisfaction Ratings across Institutional Areas*

Area	Combined Satisfaction (%)
Campus Climate	93.6
Community	92.9
Campus Support Services	92.8
Instruction and Curriculum	93.6
Instructional Campus Support	91.4
Finance	87.6

The Campus Climate and Instruction and Curriculum received the highest satisfaction scores, reflecting confidence in the institution's educational environment and instructional quality. The Finance department received the lowest overall satisfaction rating, yet the majority of respondents expressed positive views. The results reveal that instructional delivery and campus environment are institutional strengths, and financial challenges require increased attention. The findings validate previous studies emphasizing the importance of instructional quality, support services, and campus environment in improving institutional satisfaction (Hill, 1995; UNESCO, 2006).

Overall Satisfaction regarding UB VDTALC Experience. Beyond satisfaction with individual institutional areas, the study examined respondents' overall educational experience and indicators of institutional loyalty. These indicators reflect whether stakeholder expectations were met, whether they are willing to continue their association with the institution, and whether they perceive improvements in the institution over time.

Table 5. *Overall Institutional Experience and Loyalty Indicators*

Indicators	Yes (%)
Experience met expectations	75.8
Willingness to choose UB VDTALC again	74.9
Experienced in institutional improvement	59.0

The majority of respondents reported that their experiences aligned with expectations and that they were ready to select UB VDTALC again, indicating institutional loyalty and favorable perceptions. Over 50% also recognized enhancements relative to the prior year, indicating that stakeholders acknowledge ongoing institutional advancement initiatives.

Significant Variance in Satisfaction Levels. Differences in satisfaction perceptions among stakeholder groups were further examined using inferential statistics. Since the satisfaction data did not meet the assumption of normality, a nonparametric statistical test was employed to determine whether significant differences existed among respondent groups.

Table 7. *Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test of Significant Variance in Satisfaction*

Variables	H-value	df	p-value	Interpretation
Respondent Groups and Satisfaction Level	92.931	2	< .05	Significant

Note. $H(2) = 92.931, p < .05$.

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed statistically significant differences in satisfaction levels among respondent groups. Teachers obtained the highest satisfaction ratings, while students reported relatively lower ratings. The findings indicate differing stakeholder perceptions regarding institutional services and experiences.

CONCLUSION

The survey found that the UB VDTALC obtained predominantly positive satisfaction ratings from students, parents, and teachers. The top-

ranked areas were campus climate, instruction, curriculum, and community. This indicates that the institution is performing well in generating a conducive learning environment and providing quality instruction.

Teachers were highly satisfied, while pupils were less satisfied. Overall satisfaction remained high, although there is room for improvement in finance and instructional campus support. The discrepancies among respondent categories are significant and underscore the need for responsive, tailored institutional policies that account for diverse stakeholder expectations and experiences.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Strengthen financial assistance programs and improve transparency in school fees and payment schemes.
2. Continue enhancing instructional quality, curriculum development, and faculty training programs.
3. Expand campus support services, counseling programs, and academic assistance mechanisms for students.
4. Sustain programs promoting positive campus climate, safety, inclusivity, and community engagement.
5. Institutionalize regular satisfaction surveys and stakeholder feedback mechanisms for continuous quality improvement.
6. Develop targeted interventions addressing the concerns of students, parents, and teachers.
7. Utilize survey findings in institutional planning, accreditation, and policy formulation initiatives.

REFERENCES CITED

- Bailey, T., & Alfonso, M. (2005). *Paths to persistence: An analysis of research on program effectiveness at community colleges*—Lumina Foundation for Education. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/paths-to-persistence.html>
- Hill, F.M. (1995). Managing service quality in higher education: The role of the student as primary consumer. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 3(3), 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684889510093497>

- Karp, M. M., Hughes, K. L., & O’Gara, L. (2008). *An exploration of Tinto’s integration framework for community college students* (CCRC Working Paper No. 12). Community College Research Center, Columbia University. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED501335.pdf>
- Kinash, S., Knight, D., Naidu, V., Bolton, L., Booth, S., Miller, J., Nair, C. S., Santhanam, E., Tucker, B., & Tulloch, M. (2013). Using student feedback through online surveys to improve learning and teaching: Research conducted by eight Australian universities. In *EDULEARN13 Proceedings* (pp. 629–638). IATED Academy. <https://library.iated.org/view/KINASH2013USI>
- Lucero, O. (2007). *Study group on university diversity campus climate report*. University of California, Riverside. https://diversity.ucr.edu/sites/default/files/2019-06/ucr_diversity_report.pdf
- Owlia, M. S., & Aspinwall, E. M. (1996). A framework for the dimensions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4(2), 12–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684889610116012>
- Purnell, R., & Blank, S. (2004). *Support success: Services that may help low-income students succeed in community college*. MDRC. <https://www.mdrc.org/publication/support-success>
- Ramsden, P. (1979). Student learning and perceptions of the academic environment. *Higher Education*, 8(4), 411–427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01680529>
- Ramsden, P., & Entwistle, N. J. (1981). Effects of academic departments on students’ approaches to studying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51(3), 368–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1981.tb02493.x>
- UNESCO. (2006). *Fact book on education for all (EFA)*. UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Africa. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/>