

Service Quality of the Registrar's Office of a Select Higher Educational Institution

Jonah C. Osalia*, Leda C. Celis

Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Bacolod City, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: jcaronah0523@gmail.com

Date received: October 31, 2025

Date revised: November 21, 2025

Date accepted: December 3, 2025

Originality: 99%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 1%

Recommended citation:

Osalia, J., & Celis, L. (2025). Service quality of the Registrar's Office of a select higher educational institution. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(12), 341-357. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.731>

Abstract. This research assesses the service quality of the Registrar's Office in a selected higher education institution in Victorias City by analyzing the differences between students' expectations and their actual perceptions. Despite the registrar's essential role in delivering student services, limited recent research has examined expectation-perception gaps using the SERVQUAL model, particularly within higher education institutions in local contexts, creating a gap in understanding how well administrative offices meet student needs. To address this gap, the study utilized the SERVQUAL model, focusing on five key dimensions of service quality: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. A descriptive, quantitative research method was used, and data were collected from 349 student respondents via a structured survey. The data were analyzed using the mean and standard deviation, and the Kruskal-Wallis test and Mann-Whitney U test. Findings revealed that students' expectations were consistently high, while their perceptions were also highly satisfactory, with discrepancies observed across all dimensions. Significant differences in expectations and perceptions were found when grouped according to sex, course, and year level ($p < .05$). In contrast, no significant differences emerged based on the type of services availed ($p > .05$). Furthermore, an important relationship was identified between the levels of expectation and perception of service quality ($p > .05$). While overall satisfaction was achieved, the small negative gaps across reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy—ranging from 0.00 to -0.05—indicate areas where service improvements can further enhance the student experience. These findings underscore the importance of continuously evaluating student services to improve satisfaction, support institutional goals, and foster a more responsive, student-centered administrative environment.

Keywords: Expectation; Higher educational institution; Perception; Registrar's Office; Satisfaction; Service quality; Student; Victorias City.

1.0 Introduction

In recent years, registrar operations have been transformed by rapid technological advances. The integration of digital platforms for enrollment processing, online transcript requests, and electronic record-keeping has improved efficiency and accessibility. However, these innovations also present challenges, including the need for continuous staff training, the cost of system upgrades, and the risk of reducing personalized service in an increasingly automated environment (Modern Campus, 2022). Successfully addressing these challenges is essential to ensuring that technological improvements translate into better student experiences.

The quality of service provided by registrar offices is equally important, as it plays a significant role in shaping student satisfaction, trust, and institutional loyalty. Dimensions such as tangibility, reliability, responsiveness,

assurance, and empathy are central to students' evaluations of institutional services. Recent studies affirm this link: Nguyen et al. (2024) found that service quality strongly shapes both satisfaction and loyalty among Vietnamese university students, while Supriyanto et al. (2024) highlighted that academic service quality has a direct impact on student satisfaction and commitment in Indonesian institutions. These findings underscore the need to maintain high service standards to foster institutional credibility and student retention. Despite these insights, a research gap persists, as few recent studies have examined expectation-perception discrepancies in registrar services using the SERVQUAL model, especially within local higher education institutions. Addressing this gap is essential in providing updated evidence on how well registrar offices meet student needs.

Given the researcher's familiarity with registrar operations, the study was designed to examine students' service-quality experiences, focusing on their expectations and perceptions. The primary objective is to identify where gaps exist between what students anticipate and what they actually experience, thereby highlighting areas that require improvement. By analyzing these discrepancies, the study aims to provide evidence-based insights that can strengthen registrar services, enhance student satisfaction, and support the overall effectiveness of higher education institutions. In addition, the study aligns with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4, specifically Target 4.3, which promotes equitable access to quality tertiary education and emphasizes efficient, reliable, and student-centered academic services.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to assess students' expectations and perceptions of service quality in the Registrar's Office of a selected higher education institution in Victoria City. The descriptive component allowed the researcher to examine and present the characteristics of student responses regarding service quality without manipulating any variables. This approach provided a detailed understanding of the participants' views on the five key SERVQUAL dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Siedlecki, 2020). The correlational component was applied to examine relationships between students' expectations and perceptions and to evaluate how gaps between them influence overall satisfaction (Seeram, 2019). This combined design was chosen because it enables the study to not only describe the current state of registrar services but also to examine the degree to which expectation-perception discrepancies are associated with student satisfaction, providing a more comprehensive understanding of service quality outcomes (Leedy & Ormrod, 2020).

The study was conducted in one higher education institution in Victoria City, where the researcher has direct access and familiarity with registrar operations, facilitating accurate data collection and interpretation. Data were collected using a researcher-made questionnaire developed based on the SERVQUAL model. The questionnaire was carefully constructed to ensure content validity through consultation with subject-matter experts and a review of related literature. To establish reliability, a dry run was conducted, and responses were statistically analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha, yielding scores of 0.969 for expectations and 0.974 for perceptions, demonstrating excellent internal consistency. Participants' responses were encoded and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods to generate insights on expectation-perception gaps and their relationship with overall student satisfaction. This approach ensures that the findings are both accurate and meaningful, thereby supporting evidence-based recommendations to improve registrar services.

2.2 Research Participants

The participants in the study are college students of a private college in the northern part of the Province of Negros Occidental, namely Victoria City. The participants are students, totaling 3,837, from all departments, enrolled in the 2024-2025 academic year. However, since the respondents are students who directly transact with the registrar, the sampling method was corrected to convenience sampling. In addition, purposive sampling was applied to select specific participants based on criteria such as involvement in enrollment, grade verification, and certification requests. The research instrument also included a discussion of how the questionnaire was tailored to the study's objectives and validated for accuracy and reliability. For data collection, the survey was administered via Google Forms, with teacher assistance during distribution and response collection.

The sample size was computed using Cochran's formula with a margin of error of 0.05. A stratified sampling technique was initially considered, dividing participants into subgroups based on shared characteristics, such as department and program, to ensure proportional representation in the study.

2.3. Research Instrument

This study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire composed of three parts. Part I included the participants' profiles, such as the courses they are currently enrolled in, their year level, and the types of records requested. Part II assessed expectations for service quality in Registrar Services across five dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Part III measured the perception of the registrar's office across five dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Part IV measured the registrar's office's level of satisfaction across five dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Part V gathered recommendations from the respondents on the specific experiences that describe their positive and negative interactions with the registrar's office, and on the necessary improvements or action plans to enhance tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, and assurance in the registrar's services. The mean scale to interpret the level of service quality is interpreted as follows: (4) very high level, (3) high level, (2) low level, (1) very low level. The mean scores for assessing the levels of expectation and perception are presented in the format below. Interpretation of the Four-Point Likert Scale on the Level of Expectations on Service Quality of Registrar Office Services as expected by the Participants

The instrument was validated using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR). The evaluators were composed of ten (10) experts in research and business management. The evaluation of the questionnaire was validated by determining which of the items were "essential," "useful but not essential," and "not necessary." Only essential items were included in the final survey questionnaire; 30 items were considered essential and included. The CVR is 0.970 for ten validators, interpreted as valid. Therefore, the researcher-made questionnaire is valid. The evaluators' recommendations and suggestions were incorporated to finalize the research instrument, and their ideas and recommendations were accepted to ensure validity. On reliability, the instrument is considered reliable and accurate if participants' responses are consistent across all items. A test was administered to 30 alums of the school. Their responses were encoded, and the information was statistically analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha. The questionnaire passed the reliability test with scores of 0.969 for expectation and 0.974 for perception, demonstrating its reliability.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering procedure commenced by obtaining the endorsement letter from the dean of the graduate school, seeking permission and approval from the executive director and academic affairs director of the identified private college or institution, and obtaining the endorsement letter from the dean of the graduate school. The researcher gave informed consent, and participants' consent was secured beforehand. Likewise, the researcher discussed the study's purpose, objectives, and goals, as well as the voluntary nature of the study with each participant. Furthermore, a confidentiality clause was emphasized, stipulating that all data collected will remain confidential and will not be used against them in any way.

To obtain the survey questionnaire results, the researcher employed convenience sampling, as the respondents were students who directly transacted with the Registrar's Office. This method was appropriate since the study focused on individuals with firsthand experience of registrar services. In addition, purposive sampling was used to include specific participants directly involved in key registrar-related transactions, such as enrollment, grade verification, and certification requests. These criteria ensured that the responses reflected the experiences of students who regularly interact with the registrar and could provide meaningful insights into service quality.

The research instrument used in this study was a structured survey questionnaire tailored to the SERVQUAL model dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. The questionnaire items were adapted to fit the context of registrar services, ensuring relevance to student experiences. Other than that, the survey was administered primarily through Google Forms, enabling efficient and secure response collection. To maximize participation, teachers assisted in disseminating the online questionnaire link to their respective classes and guided students during the response process. The researcher also personally monitored the administration of the survey to address possible questions or clarifications raised by participants, thereby ensuring the reliability of the data collection process. Following data collection, the researcher compiled and organized all gathered information, carefully reviewed and analyzed the data to produce insightful findings. Using SPSS software, the researcher tallied and encoded responses and calculated the findings for an impartial interpretation.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

In this study, ethical practices ensured participants' rights, privacy, and confidentiality, with informed consent

obtained first to prevent participants from being forced to complete the survey and to ensure they understood the survey questions. The form's content was clearly explained, including the procedures involved, potential risks and benefits, and the voluntary nature of participation. Participants were informed of the measures taken to protect their privacy, including how their data is stored, used, and reported.

Participants were given sufficient time to review the informed consent form and ask any questions they may have. They were assured their participation was entirely voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. Additionally, participants were informed that their decision to participate or not would not affect their current or future relationship with the researchers or the organization they represent. It was emphasized that all collected data are anonymized and summarized to ensure confidentiality. Personal identifying information is kept separate and stored securely. At least six months after the completion of the research study, all copies of the questionnaires with participants' information are deleted from the researcher's computer, and all hard copies are shredded to dispose of the papers.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 349 respondents by sex, course, year level, and the types of services they availed from the registrar's office. These data provide important context in understanding how different student groups interact with registrar services in a selected higher education institution in Victoria's City. Regarding sex, the majority of respondents were female (57.0%), while male respondents accounted for 43.0%. This indicates a slight dominance of female students, which may reflect the institution's overall gender distribution. The higher number of female respondents could also be associated with the nature of courses offered, where women are often more represented, such as in education and business-related programs.

Table 1. Profile of the Respondent

ProfileVariab	Frequency	Percentage
Sex Category		
Male	150	43.00%
Female	199	57.00%
Course Category		
BEED, BPED, & TCP	45	12.90 %
BS-CRIM	145	41.60%
BSOA, BSAIS, BSA & BSTM	85	24.40%
BS-PSYC & BSSW	34	9.70%
BSIS & BSCS	26	7.50%
BSME & BSCE	14	4.00%
Year Level Category		
First Year	109	31.20%
Second Year	165	47.30%
Third Year	43	12.30%
Fourth Year	32	9.20%
Service Availed Category		
Enrollment	104	29.80%
Grade & TOR	167	47.90%
Certification, Verification & Others	78	22.30%

For the course distribution, the data show that students from the Bachelor of Science in Criminology (BS-CRIM) had the highest representation at 41.6%. This was followed by students from BSOA, BSAIS, BSA, and BSTM courses at 24.4%, and BEED, BPED, and TCP at 12.9%. Smaller percentages were observed among students in BS Psychology and Social Work (9.7%), Information and Computer Science (7.4%), and Engineering (4.0%). This distribution suggests that BS-CRIM is the most populous program in the institution, possibly due to the high demand and growing interest in public safety and law enforcement careers.

At the year level, the majority of respondents were second-year students (47.3%), followed by first-year students (31.2%). Meanwhile, third- and fourth-year students comprised 12.3% and 9.2%, respectively. The high percentage of lower-year students indicates that they are more actively engaged with registrar services, likely due to frequent transactions related to enrollment and academic requirements during their initial years in college.

As for the types of services availed, the most commonly used service was related to grades and Transcript of Records, 47.9%. This was followed by enrollment services (29.8%) and certification, verification, and other requests (22.3%). These findings imply that most students approach the registrar for processing academic documents, especially transcripts and grades, which are essential for academic progress, employment, and scholarship applications.

Several empirical studies highlight the role of demographic factors in shaping students' perceptions of administrative service quality. Nadiri, Kandampully, and Hussain (2009) applied the SERVQUAL model to higher education administration and found that service-quality dimensions significantly influence student satisfaction across different demographic groups. Gao (2020) reported that administrative service quality strongly affects student satisfaction and loyalty, emphasizing the importance of non-academic services. Similarly, Rizos, Sfakianaki, and Kakouris (2022) identified gaps in all five SERVQUAL dimensions (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy) between students' expectations and perceptions, noting that variables such as year level and program are important when planning service improvements. Together, these studies show that sex, course, year level, and the type of services used are meaningful factors in understanding and enhancing registrar service quality.

The results show that the registrar's offices across the six departments operate with consistent procedures and cater to a wide range of student needs. The variables of tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy observed in registrar services may reflect the strength of an established administrative system, experienced staff, and structured protocols, thereby contributing to an efficient, stable, and student-centered service environment.

3.2 Level of Expectation in Terms of Tangibility

The results in Table 2 reveal that the highest mean scores were found in Item 3, "Has modern and functional equipment (computers & printers) to efficiently handle the tasks" ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.68$), and Item 5, "The office staff present themselves professionally and are neatly dressed" ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.66$). These findings indicate that students place great importance on technological readiness and the professional presentation of staff as primary indicators of service quality in registrar offices. The relatively low standard deviations indicate strong consensus, suggesting that most students consistently value modern facilities and professional staff. This aligns with the findings of Nguyen et al. (2024), who demonstrated that service tangibility—including updated facilities and staff appearance—significantly contributes to student satisfaction and loyalty in higher education. Similarly, Ramirez-Rama et al. (2021) confirmed that tangible resources and professional service delivery foster trust and enhance the learning environment.

Table 2. *Level of Expectation in Terms of Tangibility*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The Registrar's Office physical facilities are clean, organized, and professional-looking.	3.34	High	0.60
2. Easy accessibility and clearness of the forms, signage, and brochures.	3.28	High	0.66
3. Has modern and functional equipment (computers & printers) to handle the tasks efficiently.	3.30	High	0.68
4. Adequacy and comfort of the waiting area.	3.14	High	0.72
5. The office staff present themselves professionally and are neatly dressed.	3.39	High	0.66
6. The office provides high-quality printed materials with accurate information.	3.34	High	0.64
As a Whole	3.32	High	0.56

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

On the other hand, the lowest mean score was observed in Item 4, "Adequacy and comfort of the waiting area" ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 0.72$). Although this still falls under the "High" category, the lower score and relatively higher standard deviation indicate that students are less consistent in valuing waiting-area comfort than in valuing technological efficiency and professionalism. This suggests that while waiting facilities are relevant, students prioritize operational effectiveness over physical amenities. Umar et al. (2024) similarly noted that students tend to emphasize responsiveness and resources that directly affect service efficiency rather than the physical environment. In summary, the results suggest that registrar offices should focus on investing in modern technology and maintaining professional staff presentation, as these are the most valued factors by students. While comfort in the waiting area is important, it remains a secondary consideration compared to the efficiency and professionalism of registrar services.

3.3 Level of Expectation in Terms of Reliability

Table 3 presents the level of expectation regarding the reliability of the Registrar's Office services. The highest score was recorded for the item stating that the office has maintained a dependable system for managing requests ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 0.64$), indicating strong agreement. This indicates that respondents place strong emphasis on the office's ability to consistently and dependably manage student requests. According to the SERVQUAL framework, reliability is one of the most critical service quality dimensions because it represents an institution's capacity to deliver promised services accurately and without failure (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Hoque et al. (2023) further emphasized that dependable systems of operation strengthen trust and overall satisfaction, as students perceive reliability as assurance that academic records and services will be processed effectively.

Table 3. *Level of Expectation in Terms of Reliability*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The Registrar's Office handles my request and documents accurately without errors every time.	3.20	High	0.69
2. The Registrar's Office fulfills my request within the promised time frame.	3.20	High	0.72
3. The Registrars' Office adheres to scheduled office hours without unannounced closures.	3.19	High	0.69
4. Academic records (e.g., grades, certification) are accurate, free of errors, and delivered on time.	3.21	High	0.72
5. The office has maintained a dependable system of managing requests.	3.29	High	0.64
As a Whole	3.21	High	0.59

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

Conversely, the lowest score was observed for the item on the Registrar's Office's adherence to scheduled office hours without unannounced closures ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.69$), yet it was still interpreted as "high." While this suggests that students believe the office is generally reliable, the lower rating implies higher expectations for greater consistency in service availability. Even minor unplanned closures or schedule deviations may undermine the service unit's perceived reliability, as students may feel inconvenienced or uncertain about how and when to access support. This is consistent with the findings of Johnson et al. (2022), who observed that variable access to student-support services erodes trust and diminishes service utilization, as students expect predictable, accessible support. Deviations reduce confidence in the institution's responsiveness. Similarly, Ban et al. (2024) emphasize that service availability and adherence to posted operational norms significantly contribute to the reliability dimension of perceived service quality; when institutions fail to maintain predictable service windows, students – regardless of service accuracy or outcome – may still rate reliability lower. For the Registrar's Office, then, ensuring strict adherence to published office hours with minimal unannounced closures could meaningfully enhance stakeholders' perceptions of the office's reliability and overall service quality.

3.4 Level of Expectation in Terms of Responsiveness

Table 4 presents the level of expectation regarding the Registrar's Office's responsiveness. The statement that the Registrar's Office staff respond quickly to students' questions or concerns received the highest score ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 0.66$), indicating high agreement. This suggests that students appreciate the staff's prompt attention and assistance in addressing their questions. A key component of service quality, responsiveness emphasizes promptness and a readiness to assist clients (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). According to recent studies, timely assistance shows attention and reduces annoyance during service transactions, thereby increasing students' trust and happiness (Aga & Safakli, 2023).

Table 4. *Level of Expectation in Terms of Responsiveness*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The staff provides timely assistance when I need help.	3.30	High	0.65
2. I am kept informed about the status of my requests.	3.17	High	0.71
3. The staff at the Registrar's Office assists me promptly when I have a question or concern.	3.32	High	0.66
4. The Registrar's Office responds to email or online inquiries within 48 hours.	3.15	High	0.77
5. My concerns or complaints are resolved quickly, efficiently, and to my satisfaction.	3.22	High	0.72
6. The office staff efficiently addresses urgent or time-sensitive requests.	3.24	High	0.67
As a Whole	3.24	High	0.61

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

On the other hand, the lowest mean score within the responsiveness dimension was observed for the item "The Registrar's Office responds to email or online inquiries within 48 hours" ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 0.77$). However, this is still within the "High" band. This relatively lower rating suggests that students perceive a slight lag in digital responsiveness compared to in-person or direct contact. With increasing reliance on online and electronic channels for administrative services, delays or perceived delays in email responses may diminish the sense of promptness and attentiveness, thereby weakening the responsiveness dimension (Seitova, M., 2024). Therefore, to move closer

to the “Very High” range ($M = 3.50\text{--}4.00$), the Registrar’s Office should focus on strengthening its digital responsiveness—ensuring timely email replies, online status updates, and consistent follow-up, thereby enhancing student perceptions of the office’s readiness and willingness to assist.

3.5 Level of Expectation in Terms of Assurance

Table 5 presents the level of assurance expectations. The item indicating that staff members are knowledgeable about the step-by-step process obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.60$), indicating high knowledge. This result implies that students highly expect the Registrar’s Office staff to possess comprehensive knowledge of procedures and provide accurate, detailed guidance throughout administrative transactions. According to Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), assurance is a core dimension of service quality that encompasses competence, courtesy, and employees’ ability to convey trust and confidence to customers. In higher education settings, this element is crucial because students rely heavily on administrative staff to handle records and transactions accurately and efficiently. Recent research supports this finding, indicating that staff competency and procedural knowledge are essential for enhancing student satisfaction and trust in institutional processes. Dugenio-Nadela et al. (2023) emphasized that when administrative staff demonstrate confidence and mastery of university procedures, it reduces confusion, fosters smoother transactions, and builds stronger trust between students and service offices. This suggests that the Registrar’s Office can strengthen its assurance dimension by continuously training staff to maintain expertise and procedural accuracy.

Table 5. *Level of Expectation in Terms of Assurance*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The staff is knowledgeable and confident in handling my inquiries or addressing my needs.	3.35	High	0.62
2. Personal data is handled securely and confidentially.	3.38	High	0.61
3. The Registrar’s staff explains the requirements and procedures clearly.	3.35	High	0.63
4. The staff demonstrates professionalism when handling my requests.	3.36	High	0.65
5. The staff are courteous when assisting me.	3.33	High	0.66
6. The staff members are knowledgeable about the step-by-step process.	3.39	High	0.60
As a Whole	3.36	High	0.55

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

On the other hand, the item indicating that the staff members are polite when helping me received the lowest score ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.66$), interpreted as high. While professionalism and knowledge are appreciated, students could anticipate a greater emphasis on courteous, sympathetic relationships, even though this is still considered “high.” Accordingly, Trisnarningsih (2022) noted that students’ perceptions of fairness and overall happiness in service encounters remain strongly influenced by politeness and interpersonal sensitivity. Therefore, even though the Registrar’s Office exhibits competence, assurance-related expectations could be raised with further civility and interpersonal approach improvements.

3.6 Level of Expectation in Terms of Empathy

The results in Table 6 reveal that the highest level of expectation was observed for Item 2, “The staff provides personalized support and makes customers feel valued during interaction” ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 0.66$), which was interpreted as high. This suggests that students expect individualized assistance during their transactions and place a high value on feeling acknowledged and appreciated by registrar staff. These results align with those of Tan, Muskat, and Johns (2019), who highlighted that empathy improves customer experiences by helping people feel valued and understood. Seitova et al. (2024) have demonstrated that empathy has a substantial impact on student satisfaction and enhances trust in institutional services in educational contexts. This has implications for improving registrar service technology and influencing student satisfaction and sustained usage of online platforms.

Table 6. *Level of Expectation in Terms of Empathy*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The staff shows genuine concerns for my individual needs.	3.30	High	0.65
2. The staff provides personalized support and makes customers feel valued during interaction.	3.31	High	0.66
3. The Registrar’s Office considers the unique circumstances of students when enforcing policies.	3.30	High	0.65
4. The staff is patient and understanding when assisting with complicated issues.	3.26	High	0.67
5. The staff maintains a respectful demeanor even with many requests and waiting customers.	3.29	High	0.63
6. There were no issues or scenes of confrontations involving the registrar’s office staff and the clients.	3.26	High	0.66
As a Whole	3.30	High	0.57

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

On the other hand, the lowest expectations were found in Item 4, "The staff is patient and understanding when assisting with complicated issues" ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.67$), and Item 6, "There were no issues or scenes of confrontations involving the registrar's office staff and the clients" ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.66$). Although still ranked high, these comparatively lower means imply that students have less confidence that registrar staff would always be patient in difficult situations or would avoid conflict. According to Cheng, Meng, and Shen (2023), even when other service aspects are evaluated favorably, satisfaction may be weakened by unfulfilled relational expectations, such as patience and conflict resolution. Similarly, Umar et al. (2024) noted that sympathetic staff contacts are essential for preventing discontent, especially in diverse, high-pressure academic settings.

Overall, the composite mean score of 3.36 ($SD = 0.55$), interpreted as high, indicates that students have strong expectations of the Registrar's Office's ability to convey assurance through professionalism, procedural knowledge, and courteous service. Continuous staff development focusing on both competence and empathy would help sustain and exceed these expectations.

3.7 Level of Perception in Terms of Tangibility

Table 7 presents students' perceptions of the registrar's office concerning tangibility, encompassing physical facilities, office equipment, staff appearance, and the quality of printed materials. The overall mean ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 0.55$), interpreted as high, indicates that students generally view the registrar's office as satisfactory in tangible aspects. This suggests that the office meets students' expectations in providing a professional, organized, and functional environment.

Table 7. *Level of Perception in Terms of Tangibility*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The Registrar's Office physical facilities are clean, organized, and professional-looking.	3.30	High	0.60
2. Easy accessibility and clearness of the forms, signage, and brochures.	3.32	High	0.62
3. Has modern and functional equipment (computers & printers) to handle the tasks efficiently.	3.35	High	0.64
4. Adequacy and comfort of the waiting area.	3.21	High	0.66
5. The office staff present themselves professionally and are neatly dressed.	3.36	High	0.63
6. The office provides high-quality printed materials with accurate information.	3.33	High	0.63
As a Whole	3.31	High	0.55

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

The highest-rated item is "The office staff present themselves professionally and are neatly dressed" ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 0.63$). This indicates that staff appearance and professionalism are highly valued by students, which enhances the office's legitimacy and dependability. According to earlier studies, students' trust in institutional services and general satisfaction are positively impacted by the professional image of the faculty (Sohail & Hasan, 2021; Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001). Furthermore, tangibles—in particular, staff presentation—play a significant role in influencing how students see the quality of services in higher education, according to Al-Kilidar, Rahman, and Khan (2022).

On the other hand, "Adequacy and comfortableness of the waiting area" had the lowest rating ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.66$), interpreted as high. Even if the rating is currently High, it shows that students think the waiting area's accessibility and comfort might be improved. Studies reveal that students' overall assessment of service quality and satisfaction can be significantly influenced by the physical environment, including waiting room design and seating comfort (Stankovska et al., 2024; Dugenio-Nadela et al., 2023). Students' experiences and satisfaction with registrar services could be further enhanced by improving the waiting area.

Overall, the results suggest that the registrar's office is positively perceived in terms of tangibility, with staff professionalism emerging as the strongest component and waiting area comfort identified as an area for potential improvement. By focusing on enhancing the comfort and accessibility of the waiting area, the office can further elevate service quality and students' satisfaction.

3.8 Level of Perception in Terms of Reliability

Table 8 presents students' perceptions of the registrar's office's reliability, reflecting the office's ability to perform services accurately, consistently, and dependably. The overall mean of ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.56$), interpreted as high, indicates that students generally perceive the registrar's office as reliable in handling requests and managing documents. This demonstrates that the office meets students' expectations for accurate, timely service.

Table 8. *Level of Perception in Terms of Reliability*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The Registrar's Office handles my request and documents accurately without errors every time.	3.26	High	0.62
2. The Registrar's Office fulfills my request within the promised time frame.	3.24	High	0.64
3. The Registrars' Office adheres to scheduled office hours without unannounced closures.	3.25	High	0.64
4. Academic records (e.g., grades, certification) are accurate, free of errors, and delivered on time.	3.29	High	0.64
5. The office has maintained a dependable system of managing requests.	3.28	High	0.65
As a Whole	3.26	High	0.56

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

Among the items, the highest-rated indicator is "Academic records (e.g., grades, certification) are accurate, free of errors, and delivered on time" ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 0.64$). According to research, reliability – especially in providing academic records free of errors—has a significant impact on student satisfaction and institutional credibility (Sohail & Hasan, 2021; Al-Kilidar, Rahman, & Khan, 2022). This implies that students place a high value on the timeliness and accuracy of official documents, which is essential to preserving trust and providing satisfaction with institutional services.

The lowest-rated item is "The registrar's office fulfills my request within the promised time frame" ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.64$). Although still considered high, this indicates minor areas for improvement in the prompt processing of requests. Studies have shown that timely service delivery is a key aspect of reliability in higher education institutions, impacting students' perceptions of service quality and their overall satisfaction (Stankovska et al., 2024; Dugenio-Nadela et al., 2023). Overall, the results indicate that the registrar's office is perceived positively for reliability, with the accuracy and timely delivery of academic records as its strongest aspect. Continuous efforts to enhance timeliness in fulfilling requests could further improve students' confidence and satisfaction with registrar services.

3.9 Level of Perception in Terms of Responsiveness

Table 9 presents students' perceptions of the Registrar's Office's responsiveness. The overall perception indicates a high level of responsiveness, with ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.58$), suggesting that students generally feel the staff are attentive and provide timely assistance. Among the items, the highest-rated was "The staff at the registrar's office assists me promptly when I have a question or concern," with ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.62$). This demonstrates that students consistently perceive the staff as prompt and reliable when addressing their questions or concerns. On the other hand, the lowest-rated item was "The registrar's office responds to email or online inquiries within 48 hours," with ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.70$). Although still within a high rating, this suggests that some students experience occasional delays or inconsistent timeliness in email or online responses. The higher standard deviation indicates a broader range of perceptions among students.

Table 9. *Level of Perception in Terms of Responsiveness*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The staff provides timely assistance when I need help.	3.28	High	0.63
2. I am kept informed about the status of my requests.	3.22	High	0.70
3. The staff at the Registrar's Office assists me promptly when I have a question or concern.	3.30	High	0.62
4. The Registrar's Office responds to email or online inquiries within 48 hours.	3.22	High	0.70
5. My concerns or complaints are resolved quickly, efficiently, and to my satisfaction.	3.28	High	0.64
6. The office staff efficiently addresses urgent or time-sensitive requests.	3.26	High	0.62
As a Whole	3.26	High	0.58

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

The importance of responsiveness as a key dimension of service quality has been emphasized in previous studies. Using the SERVQUAL model, Alemu (2023) investigated service quality in a university context and discovered that student satisfaction was significantly impacted by responsiveness. The study's high mean ratings and low variability suggested that, overall, pupils received timely and reliable service. According to Alamirew (2024), responsiveness with lower mean scores and bigger standard deviations reveals regions of uneven service delivery and points to areas that could need improvement. These results support the notion that students' overall satisfaction with administrative services is significantly influenced by responsiveness.

These observations show that both the mean and the standard deviation are crucial for analyzing survey data. While the standard deviation indicates the consistency or diversity of various perceptions, the mean represents the overall perception of students. According to Table 13's data, the Registrar's Office is generally responsive; however, enhancements to online and email contact could help ensure a more consistent and fulfilling experience

for every student.

3.10 Level of Perception in Terms of Assurance

Table 10 presents students' perceptions of the assurance dimension of service quality in the Registrar's Office. The overall perception indicates a high level of assurance, with ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.54$), suggesting that students generally feel confident in the staff's knowledge, professionalism, and ability to handle inquiries and requests. The highest-rated items, each with $M=3.38$, $SD=0.60$, are interpreted as high. The staff members are knowledgeable with the step-by-step process," with standard deviations ranging from. These findings show that students consistently believe staff members are knowledgeable and skilled, with high agreement with these qualities, as indicated by the comparatively low standard deviations. The lowest-rated item was "The staff are courteous when assisting me," with ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 0.62$). While still rated high, this indicates a slightly lower perception than for other items, suggesting that students generally experience courteous service but that minor inconsistencies in interpersonal interactions may occur.

Table 10. *Level of Perception in Terms of Assurance*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The staff is knowledgeable and confident in handling my inquiries or addressing my needs.	3.38	High	0.59
2. Personal data is handled securely and confidentially.	3.34	High	0.63
3. The Registrar's staff explains the requirements and procedures clearly.	3.38	High	0.60
4. The staff demonstrates professionalism when handling my requests.	3.34	High	0.62
5. The staff are courteous when assisting me.	3.32	High	0.62
6. The staff members are knowledgeable about the step-by-step process.	3.38	High	0.60
As a Whole	3.35	High	0.54

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

According to Alemu (2023), students view staff competence and clear communication as essential to positive service experiences, while Alamirew (2024) noted that variability in perceptions indicates areas for improvement, even when overall satisfaction is high. These findings are consistent with earlier research on service quality in higher education, which highlighted the importance of assurance—which includes staff knowledge and courtesy, as well as their ability to instill confidence—as a key dimension of service quality that significantly influences customer satisfaction (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry, 1988). In conclusion, students express confidence in the staff's professionalism, expertise, and ability to clearly explain procedures, making the Registrar's Office typically seen as very reassuring. Student happiness and trust can be further increased by upholding these norms and concentrating on improving polite interactions.

3.11 Level of Perception in Terms of Empathy

Table 11 presents students' perceptions of the registrar's office's empathy, reflecting the office staff's ability to provide individualized attention, understanding, and respect for students' unique needs. The overall mean of ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 0.54$), interpreted as high, indicates that students generally perceive the registrar's office as empathetic and attentive to their concerns. The item with the highest rating is "The staff makes customers feel valued during interaction and provides personalized support" ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.61$). This implies that students value the staff's individualized attention and assistance, thereby increasing their overall satisfaction. Empathy in service delivery has been shown to have a significant positive impact on student happiness and experiences in higher education settings (Al-Kilidar, Rahman, & Khan, 2022; Ziberi, Dimitrovski, & Stankovska, 2024).

Table 11. *Level of Perception in Terms of Empathy*

Items	M	Interpretation	SD
1. The staff shows genuine concerns for my individual needs.	3.32	High	0.62
2. The staff provides personalized support and makes customers feel valued during interaction.	3.34	High	0.61
3. The Registrar's Office considers the unique circumstances of students when enforcing policies.	3.33	High	0.59
4. The staff is patient and understanding when assisting with complicated issues.	3.32	High	0.62
5. The staff maintains a respectful demeanour even with many requests and waiting customers.	3.31	High	0.59
6 There were no issues or confrontations involving the Registrar's Office staff and clients.	3.32	High	0.62
As a Whole	3.32	High	0.54

Note: 3.50 - 4.00 (Very High); 2.50-3.49 (High); 1.50 -2.49 (Low); 1.00 - 1.49 (Very Low)

The staff maintains a respectful demeanor even with many requests and waiting customers," received the lowest rating ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 0.59$), interpreted as high. This suggests a small room for improvement in consistently maintaining polite relationships during periods of heavy demand, even though the rating is currently high. According to studies, maintaining trust and a positive institutional image requires empathy, especially when

handling students with dignity under duress (Amoako, 2023; Seitova et al., 2024).

Overall, the results show that the registrar's office is viewed favorably for empathy, with individualized support standing out as its best feature. Students' impression of the office's empathy could be further enhanced, and service quality could be improved by consistently reinforcing polite, patient interactions, particularly during peak times.

3.12 Satisfaction with the Service of the Registrar's Office of a Select Higher Education Institution

Table 12 presents students' satisfaction with the registrar's office services, using the SERVQUAL dimensions of tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. The results indicate that all dimensions were interpreted as "Satisfied," suggesting that the registrar's office generally met students' expectations, though some small gaps between expectation and perception were observed. Among the dimensions, tangibility (Expectation = 3.28, Perception = 3.28, Gap = 0.00) showed the strongest outcome, with no discrepancy between expectation and perception. The results of this study demonstrate that students thought the registrar's physical space, furnishings, and equipment met all of their needs. This result is corroborated by Alshammari, Al-Maliki, Al-Shehri, and Al-Hadhrani (2024), who note that physical resources and well-maintained facilities significantly enhance perceptions of service quality in higher education.

Table 12. *Satisfaction with the Service of the Registrar's Office of a Select Higher Education Institution*

Dimension	Expectation Score	Perception Score	Gap	Interpretation
Tangibility	3.28	3.28	0.00	Satisfied
Reliability	3.19	3.24	-0.05	Satisfied
Responsiveness	3.21	3.23	-0.02	Satisfied
Assurance	3.31	3.33	-0.02	Satisfied
Empathy	3.28	3.30	-0.02	Satisfied

Note: (< 0) Highly Satisfied, (= 0) Satisfied, (> zero up to 0.5) Dissatisfied, (> 0.5) Very Dissatisfied

In contrast, the most significant negative discrepancy was seen in dependability (discrepancy = -0.05). The disparity indicates that more precision and consistency in transactions are required, even if students still gave the registrar's services a satisfactory rating. Because unfulfilled expectations in this area might erode trust in academic services, Cheng, Meng, and Shen (2023) found that reliability is a significant determinant of student happiness, consistent with this conclusion. Similarly, there were minor negative gaps (-0.02) in certainty, responsiveness, and empathy. According to these metrics, students said the registrar's ability to offer timely assistance, exhibit professional competence, and offer individualized help had a few minor flaws. This is consistent with Yilmaz's (2020) findings, which highlighted that students' overall satisfaction with university administrative services can be impacted by even little differences in responsiveness and empathy. In summary, the findings show that students are happy with the registrar's office services, with tangible factors being the most significant. However, minor shortcomings in assurance, responsiveness, empathy, and dependability indicate areas that could use improvement. Specific tactics such as employee training, streamlined processes, and improved communication can help reduce these gaps. According to Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry's SERVQUAL model, maintaining student satisfaction and enhancing the institution's reputation depend on bridging expectation-perception gaps (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

3.13 Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Sex

Table 13 examines whether expectations of Registrar Office services differ by sex. Male students (N = 150) reported a significantly higher mean rank (189.97) than female students (N = 199; 163.71). The Mann-Whitney U test result (U = 12679.000, p = .016) indicates that this difference is statistically significant at the 0.05 level, showing that male students generally have higher expectations than their female counterparts.

Table 13. *Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Sex*

Profile Variables	Group	N	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
Sex	Male	150	189.97	12679.000*	.016
	Female	199	163.71		

*Significant at the 0.05 Level

This result is consistent with several recent studies that indicate service expectations in educational settings are influenced by gender. Male students, for instance, frequently report higher perceived service quality than female students, according to studies employing the SERVQUAL model. This is probably because each gender emphasizes different factors, such as tangibility, reliability, and assurance (Alfonso et al., 2020). Male students

scored substantially better across all five aspects in a study assessing the quality of educational services, suggesting a general tendency for men to hold higher expectations or more positive impressions (KFUMC, 2024). In the Philippines, another pertinent study examined gender disparities in students' expectations for academic advising and mentoring procedures. Significant differences between male and female students were found, underscoring the need to account for gender-specific expectations to raise student satisfaction (Mabeza, 2023). Together, these results suggest that male students may have higher expectations for administrative procedures, which could have real-world repercussions for service design. The Registrar's Office should consider gender-responsive approaches to ensure fair satisfaction, such as ensuring that communication is clear and that procedures are effective in meeting the perhaps more complex or important expectations of female students.

3.14 Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Course

Table 14 shows differences in students' expectations across courses. The results of the Kruskal-Wallis U test revealed a significant difference across the six course clusters, $H(5) = 17.622$, $p = .003$. This indicates that expectations differ across students from different programs. Notably, students from the Bachelor of Science in Criminology (BS-CRIM; $M = 194.54$) and the Bachelor of Elementary Education, Bachelor of Physical Education, and Teacher Certificate Program (BEED/BPED/TCP; $M = 187.84$) reported the highest expectations. In contrast, students from the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering and the Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering (BSME/BSCE; $M = 122.71$) demonstrated the lowest expectations. Meanwhile, students from BSOA, BSAIS, BSA, and BSTM ($M = 150.67$), as well as BS-PSYC and BSSW ($M = 148.41$), reported moderate expectations, while BSIS/BSCS students ($M = 186.27$) showed relatively high expectations.

Table 14. *Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Course*

Course	n	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
BEED, BPED & TCP	45	187.84	17.622*	.003
BS-CRIM	145	194.54		
BSOA, BSAIS, BSA & BSTM	85	150.67		
BS-PSYC & BSSW	34	148.41		
BSIS & BSCS	26	186.27		
BSME & BSCE	14	122.71		

*Significant at the 0.05 Level

This finding is consistent with earlier research highlighting the significance of student expectations in postsecondary education. Expectations have a significant impact on course satisfaction, according to Biles et al. (2022), who also noted that discrepancies between students' expected and actual learning experiences can lead to disengagement. To promote greater satisfaction and engagement, Zadorozhna et al. (2020) emphasized the importance of aligning instructional techniques with students' expectations. Collectively, these findings support the idea that expectations are not merely personal opinions but are closely tied to institutional culture, instructional methods, and curriculum design.

The findings also suggest that to support students across programs, institutions should implement customized approaches tailored to individual needs. To help students create realistic yet inspiring outlooks, courses with lower expectations, such as engineering, may benefit from mentoring, expectation-setting techniques, or orientation seminars. Conversely, courses with high standards should ensure they are met by providing excellent instruction, clear evaluation standards, and timely academic assistance. Reducing these expectation gaps could increase overall learning results, retention rates, and student satisfaction.

3.15 Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Year Level

Table 15 shows that student expectations vary significantly by year level, $H(3) = 13.715$, $p = .003$. First-year students recorded the highest expectation level ($M = 197.31$), followed by third-year ($M = 180.70$) and second-year students ($M = 168.22$). On the other hand, fourth-year students reported the lowest ($M = 126.31$). According to these findings, students enter college with high hopes and excitement. However, as they progress through the levels, their expectations tend to decrease due to increasing workload, academic difficulties, and vocational readiness. Graduates' noticeably lower expectations can be a sign of a shift from idealistic to more pragmatic, realistic viewpoints, influenced by their academic experiences. Recent research supports this tendency. Students frequently overestimate their academic achievement in their early years; however, expectations change as they mature and encounter the realities of academic life, according to a meta-analysis published in the International Journal of Educational Research (2020).

Table 15. *Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Year Level*

Year Level	n	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
First Year	109	197.31		
Second Year	165	168.22		
Third Year	43	180.70		
Fourth Year	32	126.31		
			13.715	.003

*Significant at the 0.05 Level

In a similar vein, Hidalgo-Blanco et al. (2020) found that expectations among nursing students steadily decreased over four academic years, suggesting a discrepancy between initial goals and actual experiences. Timmis et al. (2024) further emphasized that although past educational experiences have a significant impact on early expectations, faculty involvement and institutional support are crucial for sustaining motivation throughout an academic career. These results underscore the importance of colleges providing ongoing educational support, career counselling, and mentorship, particularly to senior students, to maintain high standards and ensure seamless transitions to graduation.

3.16 Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Service

Table 16 presents differences in student expectations across service types. The results show no statistically significant difference, $H(2) = 0.59$, $p = .971$, indicating that expectations remain relatively consistent regardless of whether students accessed enrollment, grades, and transcripts of records, or certification and verification services. Enrollment ($M = 173.00$), Grades and TOR ($M = 175.95$), and Certification/Verification ($M = 175.63$) have fairly similar mean ranks, which supports the idea that students' expectations for various registrar-related services are typically comparable. This implies that, rather than the specific service received, expectations are more influenced by the institution's overall reputation, past academic performance, and general student support systems.

Table 16. *Difference in the Level of Expectation When Grouped According to Service*

Services Available	n	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
Enrollment	104	173.00		
Grades & TOR	167	175.95		
Certification, Verification, etc.	78	175.63		
			0.59	.971

*Significant at the 0.05 Level

This result aligns with current studies that emphasize the importance of consistency in students' expectations for academic and administrative services. According to Hidalgo-Blanco et al. (2020), students' expectations are shaped by their entire academic path and are often influenced by long-term experiences rather than discrete services. According to Timmis et al. (2024), individual interactions with administrative offices have a lesser effect on forming expectations than institutional practices and support networks. Furthermore, Weber et al. (2024) emphasized that retention and satisfaction are influenced by faculty and staff engagement collectively, reaffirming that expectations are shaped by the institution's broader academic and support environment, rather than being service-specific. According to this research, to maintain favourable expectations and student trust, universities should maintain a consistent level of service quality across all departments.

3.17 Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Sex

Table 17 shows that there is a statistically significant difference in students' perceptions when grouped according to sex, $U = 12866.500$, $p = .026$. The perception levels of male students were greater ($M = 188.72$) than those of female students ($M = 164.66$). The result indicates that sex is a significant factor determining how students see the services provided by the registrar's office, as the p-value is below the 0.05 threshold. This suggests that while female students typically evaluate services more critically, male students may hold more optimistic views, perhaps due to higher expectations or different experiential standards throughout their academic careers.

Table 17. *Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Sex*

Profile Variables	Group	n	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
Sex	Male	150	188.72		
	Female	199	164.66		
				12866.500	.026*

*Significant at the 0.05 Level

This finding is supported by studies highlighting gender-based differences in educational expectations and perceptions. For instance, Al-Kumaim et al. (2021) observed that because male and female students have different goals in their academic experiences, they often have different levels of satisfaction and service evaluations. According to Soria and Stebleton (2020), female students also report being more sensitive to institutional support, which could account for their more critical views. More recently, Choi et al. (2023) found that gender moderates students' impressions of the institution and their academic performance, confirming the need for universities to adopt gender-sensitive service delivery practices. These studies attest that the notable disparity observed in this study is indicative of broader trends in higher education, where male and female students have distinct perspectives on and assessments of services.

3.18 Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Course

Table 18 reveals a significant difference in students' perceptions across courses, $H(5) = 12.377$, $p = .030$. The group with the highest perception level was BS Criminology students ($M = 192.20$), closely followed by BEED, BPED, and TCP students ($M = 187.43$). The lowest perception was reported by BSME and BSCE students ($M = 135.71$), followed by BS Psychology and BSSW students ($M = 146.51$). According to these findings, students' perceptions of registrar-related services are greatly influenced by their academic program. Students in professional or service-oriented fields (such as education or criminology) may have a more favourable opinion of institutional services than students in technical or research-oriented programs (such as engineering, psychology, or social work).

Table 18. *Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Course*

Course	n	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
BEED, BPED & TCP	45	187.43		
BS-CRIM	145	192.20		
BSOA, BSAIS, BSA & BSTM	85	158.06		
BS-PSYC & BSSW	34	146.51		
BSIS & BSCS	26	171.35		
BSME & BSCE	14	135.71		
			12.377	.030

*Significant at the 0.05 Level

This finding is consistent with earlier research indicating that perceptions vary across different academic fields. According to Hidalgo-Blanco et al. (2020), students' evaluations of institutional support are influenced by their educational paths, with students in professional tracks frequently displaying higher levels of satisfaction. In a similar vein, Abou-Khalil et al. (2021) found that opinions on institutional services vary depending on how well course requirements and available support systems align. More recently, Timmis et al. (2024) highlighted that students' expectations and perspectives are shaped and modified during their studies by their disciplinary culture and previous educational background. All of these results suggest that the distinct academic, support, and professional requirements embedded in each program may account for variations in perceptions across courses.

3.19 Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Year Level

Table 19 presents differences in students' perceptions across year levels, $H(3) = 17.143$, $p = .001$, indicating a statistically significant difference. First-year students showed the highest perception level ($M = 197.45$), followed by third-year students ($M = 188.64$) and second-year students ($M = 167.39$). Fourth-year students, on the other hand, had the lowest impression ($M = 119.41$). According to these findings, students enter college with high hopes and positive attitudes, but these wane as they progress and reach their lowest point in their senior year. Increased academic stress, heightened awareness of institutional flaws, and a shift from initial enthusiasm to more critical, realistic evaluations of their school experience could all be contributing factors to the steep drop among graduating students.

Table 19. *Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Year Level*

Year Level	n	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
First Year	109	197.45		
Second Year	165	167.39		
Third Year	43	188.64		
Fourth Year	32	119.41		
			17.143*	.001

*Significant at the 0.05 Level

This finding is consistent with recent literature on how perceptions evolve across academic levels. Stokoe, Nordstokke, and Wilcox (2024) emphasized that first-year students often maintain high perceptions due to strong orientation, emotional support, and peer mentoring, which facilitate positive adjustment. Similarly, Burke (2024) found that while early-semester institutional support leads to positive student impressions, this support often fades in subsequent years. Al-Kumaim et al. (2021) found that senior students are more dissatisfied with their workload and career-related worries. In contrast, Hidalgo-Blanco et al. (2020) also indicated that perceptions tend to decrease over time as academic problems increase. Additionally, a Canadian report by Studiosity (2023), published via Newswire Canada, indicated that perceived institutional support differs by gender, with male students more likely than female students to feel “completely or mostly supported.” This suggests that demographic factors may influence how students perceive support. Collectively, these studies show that although formal support helps to promote positivity in the first year, ongoing mentorship, academic coaching, and career preparation programs catered to senior students are necessary to maintain favorable impressions in subsequent years.

3.20 Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Service

Table 20 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in how students perceive registrar-related services by service type, as indicated by $H(2) = 0.670$ and a p-value of .715, which is well above the .05 significance level. This finding indicates that students' evaluations of services such as Enrollment ($M = 177.61$), Grades & TOR ($M = 177.19$), and Certification/Verification ($M = 166.84$) are very similar, suggesting that their overall experience is influenced by consistent institutional factors rather than the specific transaction. Consequently, to improve student satisfaction, the most effective strategy would be to focus on enhancing these overarching elements, such as staff responsiveness, the clarity of procedures, and system reliability, rather than addressing individual service types in isolation.

Table 20. *Difference in the Level of Perception When Grouped According to Service*

Services Available	N	Mean Ranks	Computed Value	P-value
Enrollment	104	177.61	670	.715
Grades & TOR	167	177.19		
Certification, Verification, etc.	78	166.84		

*Significant at the 0.05 level

This conclusion is consistent with recent literature showing that student perceptions of administrative services are driven more by overall service quality and institutional practices than by isolated service encounters. Research using SERVQUAL and related frameworks has repeatedly found gaps between expectations and perceived performance across administrative dimensions (e.g., reliability, responsiveness, assurance, tangibles, empathy), implying that improvements must be systemic rather than service-specific (Rizos, Sfakianaki, & Kakouris, 2022; Hoque et al., 2023). Large-scale studies on campus support likewise show that students' use of and satisfaction with support services are associated with institutional-level factors (communication, access, and coordinated support) that cut across multiple service areas (Johnson et al., 2022). Empirical work further indicates that perceived service quality mediates the relationship between student expectations and satisfaction, underscoring the importance of consistent service delivery across functions (Chen, 2023). Taken together, these studies imply that institutions seeking to raise student perceptions should prioritize cohesive, campus-wide improvements in administrative processes, staff training, and communication rather than focusing narrowly on one type of transaction.

4.0 Conclusion

Overall, the findings of this study reveal that students at a higher education institution in Victoria City generally hold high expectations for the Registrar's Office's service quality, particularly in the dimensions of reliability, responsiveness, and assurance. While overall perceptions of the services were positive, a slight gap between students' expectations and their actual experiences was observed, indicating that although services are being delivered adequately, certain aspects require improvement to meet student expectations fully. A detailed analysis of the data highlights specific areas for enhancement. For instance, minor gaps were noted in the efficiency of waiting times and in the physical comfort of service areas, suggesting opportunities to improve both operational processes and the service environment. Furthermore, differences in expectations and perceptions across demographic groups — including sex, course, and year level — indicate that student needs vary and that a standardized approach may not sufficiently address the diverse requirements of all student populations. Tailoring

services to the unique needs of these subgroups can therefore enhance satisfaction and promote inclusivity. Additionally, the study established a strong positive correlation between students' expectations and their perceptions, emphasizing that aligning service delivery with anticipated standards can lead to higher satisfaction, improved service outcomes, and a more student-centered administrative culture.

In conclusion, the study underscores the critical role of service quality in shaping students' academic experiences. Regular assessment of student expectations and perceptions, combined with targeted improvements in specific service dimensions, can enhance the Registrar's Office's efficiency, responsiveness, and overall effectiveness. These findings provide a foundation for strategic actions to optimize administrative services and meet the evolving needs of the student population.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

Author 1: conceptualization, data gathering, data analysis
Author 2: reviewed and approved the final work

6.0 Funding

This work received no specific grant from any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

8.0 Acknowledgment

This thesis, "Service Quality of the Registrar's Office of a Select Higher Educational Institution," was conducted in Victorias City. Special thanks to the HEI in Victorias City for providing the data needed to conduct the study.

9.0 References

- Aga, M., & Safakli, O. V. (2023). Service quality assessment in higher education: An empirical application of SERVQUAL model. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(3), 469–483.
- Alamirew, G. D. (2024). Investigating quality service and student satisfaction in higher education institutions. *Innovation and Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(3), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-024-00422-3>
- Alshammari, S. H., Al-Maliki, A., Al-Shehri, M., & Al-Hadhrami, A. (2024). Factors affecting continuous intention to use virtual classrooms: Integration of expectation confirmation model and information systems success model. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(4), 3459–3480.
- Alemu, A. (2023). Assessing service quality in tertiary education using adapted SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 13(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2259733>
- Alfonso, S., Diniz, A., Deano, M., Tellado, F., García-Señorán, M., & Conde, Á. (2020). Gender, planning, and academic expectations in first-year higher education students: Testing two alternative mediation models. *Psicología: Reflexão e Crítica*, 33, Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-020-00142-z>
- Al-Kildar, H., Rahman, S., & Khan, M. (2022). Service quality in higher education: The role of tangibles in shaping student satisfaction. *Quality in Higher Education*, 28(2), 156–170.
- Al-Kumaim, N. H., Alhazmi, A., Mohammed, F., Gazem, N., Shabbir, M. S., & Fazea, Y. (2021). Exploring the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on university students' learning life: An integrated conceptual motivational model for sustainable and healthy online learning. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2546. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052546>
- Ban, O. I., Hatos, R., Bugnar, N.-G., Sasu, D., Popa, A. L., & Foră, A.-F. (2024). Evaluation of the quality of higher education services by revised IPA in the perspective of digitization. *Sustainability*, 16(7), 3017. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16073017>
- Biles, J., McAllister, M., Moyle, W., & Scott, A. (2022). Undergraduate nursing students' course expectations versus experiences and satisfaction in a regional Australian university. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 17(1), 102–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2021.10.005>
- Burke, K., & Fanshawe, M. (2024). Student perceptions of support for managing study in higher education according to internal and external locus of control. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 48(6), 785–801. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2024.2362843>
- Chen, Q. (2023). The impact of college students' perceived service quality on satisfaction and loyalty. *Sage Open*, 13(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231197505>
- Cheng, X., Meng, L., & Shen, Y. (2023). Investigating students' satisfaction with online collaborative learning based on expectation confirmation theory. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(12), 12367–12389.
- Choi, J., Lee, J., & Kim, S. (2023). The moderating effect of gender on academic perceptions and engagement in higher education. *Education Sciences*, 13(2), 156. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13020156>
- Dugenio-Nadela, C., Cañeda, D., Tirol, S., Samillano, J., Pantuan, D. J., Piañar, J., Tinapay, A., Casas, H. M., Cometa, R., Conson, S., Urot, M., Ancot, J., Nadela, R., Dugenio-Terol, I., Baluyot, A., Pevida, K., Olivar, J. I., & Decena, E. (2023). Service quality and students' satisfaction in higher education institutions. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 11, 858–870. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2023.114049>
- Gao, H. L. (2020). Understanding the impact of administrative service quality on satisfaction and loyalty toward university students. *Higher Education Research*, 5(1), 25–30. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.her.20200501.15>
- Hidalgo-Blanco, M. A., Puig-Llobet, M., Lluch-Canut, M. T., Guàrdia-Olmos, J., Moreno-Arroyo, C., & Amador-Campos, J. A. (2020). Expectations of nursing degree students: A longitudinal analysis. *Nurse Education Today*, 92, 104474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2020.104474>
- Hoque, U. S., Akhter, N., Absar, N., Khandaker, M. U., & Al-Mamun, A. (2023). Assessing service quality using SERVQUAL model: An empirical study on some private universities in Bangladesh. *Trends in Higher Education*, 2(1), 255–269. <https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu2010013>
- Pinquart, M., & Ebeling, M. (2020). Students' expected and actual academic achievement – A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 100, 101524. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.101524>
- Johnson, C., Gitay, R., Abdel-Salam, A.-S., BenSaid, A., Ismail, R., Al-Tameemi, R. A. N., Romanowski, M., Al Fakih, B. M. K., & Al Hazaa, K. (2022). Student support in higher education: Campus service utilization, impact, and challenges. *Heliyon*, 8(12), e12559. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12559>
- KFUMC [King Fahad University Medical City]. (2024). The measurement of the quality of educational services via the SERVQUAL model: Profiles differ by gender. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 13(40), Article.
- Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. E. (2020). *Practical research: Planning and design* (12th ed.). Pearson.
- Mabeza, M. R. (2023). Students' gendered expectations and evaluation of thesis advising skills and mentoring practices. *Journal of Social Knowledge Education*, 6(1), Article 1172. <https://doi.org/10.37251/jske.v6i1.1172>
- Modern Campus. (2022). How the role of the registrar has evolved: 5 Perspectives. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/4wjhkpqh>
- Nguyen, H. V., Vu, T. D., Saleem, M., & Yaseen, A. (2024). The influence of service quality on student satisfaction and student loyalty in Vietnam: The moderating role of the university image. *Journal of Trade Science*, 12(1), 37–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTS-12-2023-0032>
- Nguyen, N., & LeBlanc, G. (2001). Image and reputation of higher education institutions in students' retention decisions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(6), 303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000050909>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Rizos, S., Sfakianaki, E., & Kakouris, A. (2022). Quality of administrative services in higher education. *European Journal of Education and Management*, 5(2), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.5.2.115>
- Seeram, E. (2019). Research methods: Correlational research. *Radiologic Technology*, 91(2), 176–179.
- Seitova, M., Temirbekova, Z., Kazykhankyzy, L., Khamlatova, Z., & Çelik, H. E. (2024). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction: A case study at Khoja Akhmet Yassawi University,

Kazakhstan. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1492432. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1492432>

Siedlecki, S. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, 34(1), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NUR.0000000000000493>

Sohail, M. S., & Hasan, M. (2021). Students' perceptions of service quality in Saudi universities: The SERVPERF model. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 18(1), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LTHE-08-2020-0016>

Soria, K., & Stebleton, M. (2020). First-generation students' academic engagement and perceptions of institutional support: Differences by gender. *Journal of College Student Development*, 61(6), 731–736. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0067>

Stankovska, G. (2024). Service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 14(2), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0034>

Stokoe, M., Nordstokke, D., & Wilcox, G. (2024). First-year students' perceptions of the transition to university: The role of informational, instrumental, and emotional support. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 10(2), 377–393. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.3392>

Studiosity. (2023). 2023 Report reveals student gender disparities in perceived support from their college/university. *NewsWire Canada*. <https://tinyurl.com/mf6bbbd>

Supriyanto, A., Burhanuddin, B., Sunarni, S., Rochmawati, R., Ratri, D. K., & Bhayangkara, A. N. (2024). Academic service quality, student satisfaction, and loyalty: A study at higher education legal entities in Indonesia. *TQM Journal*. Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-10-2023-0334>

Tan, A., Muskat, B., & Johns, R. (2019). The role of empathy in the service experience. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 142–164. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTP-10-2018-0221>

Umar, M., Hasan, M. (2024). Predicting students' satisfaction with academic services at a multicultural engineering university in Bangladesh: A multiple regression analysis. *PLOS One*, 19(4), e0309223. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0309223>

Yilmaz, R. (2020). Exploring the role of service quality, trust, and satisfaction in student loyalty: The case of higher education. *Social Sciences*, 9(2), 16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9020016>

Zadorozhna, I., Datskiv, O., & Shon, O. (2020). Exploring students' expectations of the university course. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională*, 12(1Sup1), 293–303. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.1sup1/236>

Ziberi, F., Dimitrovski, D., & Stankovska, G. (2024). Service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. *BCES Conference Books*, 22(4), 157–164.