

# Deployment of Administrative Officers on Ancillary Services in the Department of Education Schools Division Office of Laguna: A Service Quality Analysis

Ericka Anne F. Ual

*erickaannefelipe16@gmail.com*

*Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz, Laguna 4009 Philippines*

---

## Abstract

This study was done to determine the effect of the deployment of administrative officers as non-teaching personnel on managing ancillary services that include Financial Management, Property Custodianship, Human Resource Management, and Other general administrative-related functions in elementary schools in the Department of Education SDO Laguna based on service quality analysis. The descriptive research approach was used to collect the data and information required for the investigation. Based on the online survey results, the respondents proved that admin officers performed outstandingly on ancillary services based on service quality analysis. Also, the study will contribute to measuring the improvement of administrative-related functions and provide an improved understanding of the significance of having the appropriate personnel for each role or function.

*Keywords: Service Quality Analysis; Ancillary Services; Administrative Officers; Level of Performance*

---

## Introduction

Work overload is a long-standing issue among public school teachers in today's organizational environment. That is, they are required to execute tasks wholly unrelated to their jobs, resulting in weariness and burnout, affecting the quality of their teaching. According to DepEd Memorandum 291, s.2008, a teacher of public schools must have a 6-hour direct teaching contract. It shall also render the remaining 2 hours of work by engaging in teaching-related activities or, in other terms - ancillary services.

The researcher focuses mainly on administrative and clerical tasks, including Financial Management, Property Custodianship, Human Resource Management, and other general administrative-related functions best suited to non-teaching personnel. Unfortunately, these administrative duties are loaded as ancillary services to teachers. Given the requirements, teachers must be upskilled to perform Accounting, Supply, Human Resources, and other administrative -related functions. Hence, they should focus on giving their best effort in teaching. Furthermore, teachers need to be more capable of effectively managing the reports above in terms of completeness, correctness, and effectiveness, as well as failing to meet deadlines.

In addition, President Bongbong Marcos Jr. promised to add more non-teaching personnel to the Department of Education before his presidency. He mentioned in one of his interviews with the Philippine News Agency (2022) that "We need to hire more non-teaching personnel who are qualified for the job. In that case, we can ease the work of the teachers," thus, last year, on July 2022, the Department of Education has conducted recruitments and hiring of non -teaching personnel such as a. Administrative Assistant II (Disbursing Officer), b. Administrative Assistant III (Senior Bookkeeper), c. Registrars, d. Administrative Officer II and other administrative personnel will be deployed in medium - to large-sized field offices or schools.

The study aims to investigate the effect of the deployment of administrative officers on managing said ancillary services of elementary schools in the Department of Education SDO Sta —Cruz, Laguna, based on service quality analysis.

## Theoretical Framework

Service-Quality Theory. A consumer perception known as "service quality" is produced by interactions between clients and service providers. (Lehtinen & Lehtinen, 1982); based on the service process, it encompasses customer perception and experience (Al-Hubaishi et al., 2017; Chan et al., 2022). Gronroos (1982) separated the two components of service quality: the functional quality of the attitudes of the service workers as perceived by the customers and the technical quality of the service performance. Rust and Oliver (1993) added that the environment in which customers receive services is one of the

dimensions of environmental quality. Parasuraman et al. (1988) divided service quality into five categories: tangibles, assurance, responsiveness, consistency, and empathy.

Goal Setting Theory. Edwin Locke developed the goal-setting theory in 1968 to describe how people behave in particular work environments. According to this notion, achieving goals is fundamentally related to being happy at work. Setting clear, challenging, and employee-accepted goals and providing appropriate feedback will improve performance. (Locke and Latham, 1979; Locke and Latham, 2006). Because performance appraisals entail employees setting goals to be fulfilled by the conclusion of the appraisal period, this may have something to do with employee participation in the process. It also shows where there is a performance gap and gives staff members feedback on their areas of weakness.

This study is anchored on the theories mentioned above since it also deals with assessing work performance and service quality among ancillary services of Administrative Officers in DepEd SDO Laguna.

## Literature Review

Service quality and administrative functions are among the critical factors from the related literature that contribute to the present study, which seeks to find out the relationship between and give emphasis to each variable. The disconfirmation paradigm, which holds that customer satisfaction with services or perception of service quality can be viewed as confirmation or disconfirmation of customer expectation of offered service, is the basis of the SERVQUAL model put forth by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985, 1988). (Churchill & Surprenant, 1982; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985). The 22 elements that make up the SERVQUAL instrument are categorized into five service quality categories, including tangibles, assurance, responsiveness, empathy, and consistency. Researchers (Rizos et al., 2022) have utilized it to look into the administrative service quality of higher education institutions.

These model-based theories are notable for treating the quality of higher education holistically. One model is utilized to describe both education and administration, the two different service units. Teaching and administrative support services are complementary but are provided by two distinct groups of persons who might need to be adequately trained for their roles. It follows that the requirement for a different model to characterize models of higher education administration cannot be disputed.

This study's proposed model incorporates all the characteristics used in previous research, making it more complete for evaluating administrative quality service delivery in a higher education setting. The distinctiveness of this current model serves as its starting point. It is administration-specific and concentrates on quality concerns about housing services, student government affairs, student welfare services, teaching and learning support services, records management, and recreational activities. (Yidana et.al, 2023)

As stated by Ocampo et al. (2019), a study was carried out in the Philippines to determine the critical dimensions assigned to the modified SERVQUAL model that was examined and covered five government entities. It is discovered that, in terms of providing high-quality services, the responsiveness dimension requires the most significant development, with the promptness of services being seen as the most crucial sub-dimension. Moreover, government administrators can direct their resources and efforts toward raising service quality to critical dimensions and sub-dimensions with the help of the suggested approach.

## Materials and Methods

This research used a descriptive correlation design to analyze the variables under study. It is intended to demonstrate that the critical distinguishing qualities demonstrate relationship as opposed to simple description and to assist in determining the degree to which various variables are related to one another in the population of interest. The descriptive survey method was utilized in this study, and the primary objective was to assess the work performance of the administrative officers in various elementary schools in SDO Laguna. Also, this method is intended for the researcher to gather information about the existing situation at the time of study and to explore its phenomena. Through this method, the researcher can get data on the present work performance of the institution's administrative officers.

Since the investigation is concerned with the work performance of personnel, the descriptive research method is the most appropriate. According to Sevilla (2008), descriptive survey research describes and interprets the needed information to meet the study's objectives. The process of descriptive survey research goes beyond mere gathering and tabulating data. It involves an element of interpretation of the meaning or significance of what is being described.

## Results and Discussions

The age distribution of the respondents in the Department of Education – SDO Laguna, as reflected in the table, out of 250 employees, were mainly in the range of 41 – 50 years old or 34% of the respondents. Second were in 31 – 40 years old or 29.20%. However, 61 years old and above, or 3.60%, are the lowest number of respondents who fall this age. This information is essential as age can be a factor that affects the service quality of administrative officers on ancillary services. The previously mentioned information highlighted that the respondents were mature individuals who carried out and managed their roles and responsibilities as Department of Education - SDO Laguna employees.

In addition, most of the respondents are female, with 216 representing 86.40% of the total sample size. It implies that it was the dominant sex among the employees under the Division of Laguna. The remaining 13.60% were male. As for gender distribution, according to Alcera et al. (2022), as far as the teaching-related job is concerned, females always outnumbered males in terms of quantity which further indicates that women now form part of the more significant share of educators which is also coherent to DepEd's regional distribution of teachers who are active in the service from school year 2019-2020 to 2021-2022 indicating that the distribution of population between genders was dominated by females, with the same case as to non-teaching personnel.

Respondents were classified according to their designation. Most respondents were Teachers, representing 76.80% of the total sample size. They have the most significant employee population under the DepEd SDO- Laguna. On the other hand, division and district personnel were represented by only six personnel or 2.40% of the total sample size. Most likely, they have the least number of respondents under said designation.

The total sample size is mainly represented by 21 and above years in service, with 70 respondents representing 28% of the total sample size. In contrast, those 0 to 5 years in service have the least respondents. Aligned with the distribution of respondents according to age, the number of respondents falls in the 41 -50 age group, which also has the highest number of respondents.

**Table 1: Level of Performance of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Personnel Administration (Recruitment and Selection)**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Selection and recruitment of applicants at the designated school	4.23	0.67	O
2. Engage and coordinate with the applicants regarding any updates to their application.	4.25	0.65	O
3. Promotion and staff deployment in the designated school are carried out by verifying the paperwork that must be turned in to the HRMO to prepare or issue an appointment.	4.28	0.66	O
4. Prepare the ERF for qualified teachers and submit it to the SDO for processing.	4.28	0.70	O
5. Assist teachers in providing necessary documents for their application for promotion.	4.36	0.65	O
Overall for Recruitment and Selection	4.28	0.59	O

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21 –5.00= Outstanding (O), 3.40–4.19=Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.60–3.39=Satisfactory (S), 1.80–2.59=Unsatisfactory (U.S.), 1.00–1.79=Poor (P)

Based on the results presented in Table 1, it can be interpreted that the respondents rated the admin officers in Personnel Administration (Recruitment and Selection) as outstanding in assisting teachers in providing necessary documents for their application for promotion, which obtained the highest mean score of 4.36. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is 4.23, which includes the selection and recruitment of applicants at the designated school.

Overall, the admin officers in Personnel Administration obtained a total mean of 4.28, indicating that the admin officers have an outstanding level of performance in recruitment and selection.

**Table 2: Level of Performance of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Personnel Administration (Personnel Records)**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
-----------	---	----	------

1. Update 201 files regularly and keep a database of faculty members' data.	4.31	0.65	O
2. Keep track of staff absences and attendance and create a monthly report of services (Form 7).	4.41	0.60	O
3. Assist other offices and agencies, including BIR, GSIS, PhilHealth, PagIBIG, CSC, and others, in coordinating personnel-related policies and guidelines.	4.26	0.64	O
4. Perform or support the field's assigned Agency Authorized Officer (AAO) by confirming/approving GSIS loans and agency remittance advice (ARA) as needed.	4.23	0.68	O
5. Perform other functions and prepare necessary documents related to personnel records.	4.28	0.65	O
Overall for Personnel Records	4.30	0.56	O

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21 –5:00= Outstanding (O), 3.40–4.19=Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.60–3.39=Satisfactory (S), 1.80–2.59=Unsatisfactory (U.S.), 1.00–1.79=Poor (P).

According to the result presented in Table 2, it can be interpreted that the respondents rated the admin officers in Personnel Administration (Personnel Records) OUTSTANDING in terms of monitoring and recording of attendance/absence of school personnel and preparing monthly reports of service (Form 7), which obtained a highest mean score of 4.41. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is 4.23, which includes performing or supporting the assigned Agency Authorized Officer (AAO) in the field by confirming/approving GSIS loans and agency remittance advice (ARA) as needed. Overall, the admin officers in Personnel Administration (Personnel Records) obtained a total mean of 4.30, indicating that the admin officers have an outstanding level of performance in personnel records.

**Table 3: Level of Performance of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Personnel Administration (Compensation Benefits)**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. For preparation, funding, and release, compute and submit to SDO any appropriate personnel benefits (maternity benefits, step increments, salary differentials, overtime pay, proportionate vacation compensation, etc.).	4.30	0.67	O
2. Keep track of and prepare notices for staff adjustments and step increments at the school, then forward them to the HRMO for review and validation.	4.31	0.67	O
3. Process employee retirement or separation benefits for the school head's endorsement to the SDO.	4.28	0.66	O
4. If necessary, prepare the paperwork to adjust teachers' service leave credits.	4.26	0.72	O
5. Prepare payrolls and reports needed by the Division Office.	4.36	0.63	O
Overall Compensation Benefits	4.30	0.61	O

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21 –5:00= Outstanding (O), 3.40–4.19=Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.60–3.39=Satisfactory (S), 1.80–2.59=Unsatisfactory (U.S.), 1.00–1.79=Poor (P).

According to the result presented in Table 3, it can be interpreted that the respondents rated the admin officers in Personnel Administration (Compensation Benefits) as OUTSTANDING in terms of monitoring and preparing notices for step increments and adjustments of school personnel and submitting to HRMO for checking and verification, which obtained the highest mean score of 4.31. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is 4.26, which includes the preparation of necessary documents to update the service leave credits of teachers. The admin officers in Personnel Administration (Compensation

Benefits) obtained a total mean of 4.30, indicating that the admin officers have an outstanding level of performance in compensation benefits.

Table 4 shows the A.O.'s performance level in ancillary services as to Personnel Administration outstanding.

**Table 4: Level of Performance of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Personnel Administration**

Subscale	M	SD	V.I.
Recruitment and Selection	4.28	0.59	O
Personnel Records	4.30	0.56	O
Compensation Benefits	4.30	0.61	O
Overall for Personnel Administration	4.29	0.55	O

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21 –5:00= Outstanding (O), 3.40–4.19=Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.60–3.39=Satisfactory (S), 1.80–2.59=Unsatisfactory (U.S.), 1.00–1.79=Poor (P).

According to the result presented, it can be interpreted that the respondents rated the admin officers in Personnel Administration equally OUTSTANDING in terms of Personnel Records and Compensation Benefits, which obtained the highest mean score of 4.30. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is 4.28, which includes Recruitment and Selection. Overall, the admin officers in Personnel Administration obtained a total mean of 4.29, indicating that the admin officers have an outstanding level of performance in personnel administration, suggesting that administrative officers play a high importance in personnel administration or human resource management.

**Table 5: Level of Performance of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Property Custodianship**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Purchase materials, equipment, supplies, and other items for the school as ordered by the head of the institution or by authorized SIPs and AIPs.	4.37	0.68	O
2. Ensure that all necessary supplies, equipment, materials, textbooks, and other educational resources are kept securely.	4.28	0.68	O
3. Provide the school's teaching and non-teaching staff with supplies, materials, equipment, textbooks, and other learning resources upon request.	4.31	0.67	O
4. Maintain an updated inventory of all the tools, supplies, machinery, textbooks, and additional educational resources.	4.30	0.64	O
5. Prepare necessary reports/requirements needed by the division office.	4.38	0.63	O
Overall, Property Custodianship	4.33	0.60	O

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21 –5:00= Outstanding (O), 3.40–4.19=Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.60–3.39=Satisfactory (S), 1.80–2.59=Unsatisfactory (U.S.), 1.00–1.79=Poor (P).

According to the result presented in Table 5, it can be interpreted that the respondents rated the admin officers in Property Custodianship OUTSTANDING in terms of preparation of necessary reports/requirements needed by the division office, which obtained the highest mean scores of 4.38. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is 4.28, which ensures that all necessary supplies, equipment, materials, textbooks, and other educational resources are kept in a secure location. Overall, the admin officers in Property Custodianship obtained a total mean of 4.33, indicating that the admin officers have an outstanding level of performance in property custodianship, thus pointing out the effectiveness of having administrative officers as non-teaching personnel in schools in SDO Laguna, handling property custodianship rather than teachers nor principals.

**Table 6: Level of Performance of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Financial Management**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Assist the school's principal in preparing the following documents, including but not limited to the authority to debit and credit accounts, the liquidation reports, and the cash disbursement register.	4.33	0.66	O
2. Monthly preparation of Bank Recon and transaction with the bank for the monthly Statement of Account of the school.	4.29	0.66	O
3. Manage payment to the suppliers, if necessary.	4.34	0.65	O
4. Provide other documents the accounting department needs for the liquidation of MOOE.	4.36	0.64	O
5. If needed, Assist in obtaining all financial records submitted to the bank or SDO.	4.37	0.64	O
Overall, for Financial Management	4.34	0.60	O

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00= Outstanding (O), 3.40–4.19=Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.60–3.39=Satisfactory (S), 1.80–2.59=Unsatisfactory (U.S.), 1.00–1.79=Poor (P).

According to the result presented in Table 6, it can be interpreted that the respondents rated the admin officers in Financial Management **OUTSTANDING** in terms of facilitating the submission of all financial documents to the SDO and bank, which obtained the highest mean score of 4.37. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is 4.29, which includes the monthly preparation of Bank Recon and transact with the bank for the monthly Statement of Account of the school. Overall, the admin officers in Financial Management obtained a total mean of 4.34, indicating that the admin officers have an outstanding level of performance in financial management.

**Table 7: Level of Performance of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of General Administrative Support**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Assist the school principal in loading teachers and preparing School Form 7.	4.34	0.66	O
2. Assist the planning team at the school with SIP/AIP preparation.	4.32	0.65	O
3. Assist teachers in complying with requirements needed by the division office.	4.40	0.62	O
4. Assist the school principal and instructors with general administrative tasks such as creating documents, generating reports, and reproducing instructional materials.	4.31	0.67	O
5. Deliver documents to the District Office, Division Office and other schools as needed.	4.37	0.65	O
Overall for General Administrative Support	4.35	0.60	O

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00= Outstanding (O), 3.40–4.19=Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.60–3.39=Satisfactory (S), 1.80–2.59=Unsatisfactory (U.S.), 1.00–1.79=Poor (P).

According to the result presented in Table 7, it can be interpreted that the respondents rated the admin officers in General Administrative Support very **OUTSTANDING** high in terms of assisting teachers in complying with requirements needed by the division office, which obtained the highest mean scores of 4.40. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is 4.31, which assists the school principal and instructors with general administrative tasks such as creating documents, generating reports, and reproducing instructional materials. Overall, the admin officers in General Administrative Support obtained a total mean of 4.35, indicating that the admin officers have an outstanding level of performance in General

Administrative Support; it also suggests the importance of having a permanent position to comply with general administrative support and to help and manage the school.

**Table 8: Level of Service Quality of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Responsiveness**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Listen and respond to people's concerns in a helpful manner.	4.38	0.67	HR
2. The personnel are polite and friendly.	4.43	0.63	HR
3. Service is responsive and meets the needs of teachers/personnel/school head	4.37	0.61	HR
4. Willingly assist others to promote timeliness of the service	4.42	0.60	HR
5. Ask questions for clarification from appropriate sources to provide adequate service.	4.37	0.61	HR
Overall for Responsiveness	4.39	0.57	HR

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00=Highly Responsive (H.R.), 3.41–4.20= Responsive (R), 2.61–3.40=Somewhat Responsive (S.R.), 1.81–2.60=Not Responsive (N.R.), 1.00–1.80=Very Not Responsive (VNR).

The total mean of 4.39 signifies that admin officers have a HIGHLY RESPONSIVE service quality in ancillary services regarding responsiveness. The statement "the personnel are polite and friendly" had the maximum mean of 4.43. Conversely, the statements "service is responsive and meets the needs of teachers/personnel/school head" and "ask questions for clarification from appropriate source to provide adequate service" had a minimum mean of 4.37 equally.

**Table 9: Level of Service Quality of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Reliability**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Query and requests are handled fast.	4.31	0.64	HR
2. Ensure that the reports and other information follow the rules and guidelines of the SDO.	4.40	0.60	HR
3. Provides necessary reports on time.	4.35	0.62	HR
4. Maintaining error-free records.	4.21	0.66	HR
5. Dependability in handling queries.	4.32	0.61	HR
Overall for Reliability	4.32	0.56	HR

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00=Highly Reliable (H.R.), 3.41–4.20= Reliable (R), 2.61–3.40=Somewhat Reliable (S.R.), 1.81–2.60=Not Reliable (N.R.), 1.00–1.80=Very Not Reliable (VNR).

The total mean of 4.32 signifies that admin officers have a very high service quality regarding ancillary service reliability. The statement "make sure that the reports and other information are following the rules and guidelines from the SDO" had a maximum mean of 4.40. Conversely, the statement "maintaining error-free records" had a minimum mean of 4.21.

**Table 10: Level of Service Quality of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Empathy**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. The personnel give individual attention to queries and questions.	4.35	0.60	HS
2. Act towards the benefit of the teacher, personnel, and other clients.	4.33	0.62	HS
3. Respond to people's concerns about convenient office hours.	4.36	0.63	HS

4. Deals with the queries on caring fashion.	4.36	0.60	HS
5. Having the customer's best interest at heart.	4.35	0.60	HS
Overall for Empathy	4.35	0.56	HS

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00=Highly Satisfied (H.S.), 3.41–4.20= Satisfied (S), 2.61–3.40=Somewhat Satisfied (S.S.), 1.81–2.60=Not Satisfied (N.S.), 1.00–1.80=Very Not Satisfied (VNS).

The total mean of 4.35 signifies that admin officers have a very high service quality in ancillary services in terms of empathy. The statements "responds to people's concern on convenient office hours" and "deals with the queries on caring fashion" have the maximum mean of 4.36 equally. Conversely, the statement "act towards the benefit of the teacher, personnel, and other clients" had a minimum mean of 4.33.

**Table 11: Level of Service Quality of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Tangibility**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Wear official uniforms from Monday to Thursday.	4.56	0.59	VH
2. Professionally dressed during wash day.	4.54	0.57	VH
3. Reports and documents are neatly submitted.	4.50	0.56	VH
4. Stockrooms and other office under custodianship are organized.	4.25	0.66	VH
5. Requirements and reports are arranged according to the checklist.	4.36	0.61	VH
Overall for Tangibility	4.44	0.52	VH

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00=Always True (AT), 3.41–4.20=Often True (O.T.), 2.61–3.40=True (T), 1.81–2.60=Not True (N.T.), 1.00–1.80=Very Not True (VNT).

The total mean of 4.44 signifies that admin officers have a very high service quality in ancillary services in terms of tangibility. The statement "wears official uniforms on Monday to Thursday" had a maximum mean of 4.56, whereas "stockrooms and other offices under custodianship are organized" had a minimum of 4.25.

**Table 12: Level of Service Quality of Administrative Officers in Ancillary Services in Terms of Assurance**

Indicator	M	SD	V.I.
1. Follows relevant policies and procedures when discussing sensitive topics.	4.40	0.59	VH
2. Engage in open and honest communication while being mindful of what information is appropriate to share.	4.41	0.58	VH
3. Personnel are consistently courteous.	4.46	0.61	VH
4. Instill confidence in customers.	4.41	0.62	VH
5. Personnel can be trusted with confidential information.	4.44	0.59	VH
Overall for Assurance	4.42	0.55	VH

Note. N=250. V.I.=Verbal interpretation. The mean is interpreted as follows: 4.21–5.00=Strongly Provided (S.P.), 3.41–4.20= Provided (P), 2.61–3.40=Somewhat Provided (S.P.), 1.81–2.60=Not Provided (N.P.), 1.00–1.80=Very Not Provided (VNP).

The total mean of 4.42 signifies that admin officers have a very high service quality in ancillary services in terms of assurance. The statement "personnel are consistently courteous" had a maximum mean of 4.46. Conversely, the statement "follows relevant policies and procedures when discussing sensitive topics" had a minimum mean of 4.40.

**Table 13: Relationships Between Four Profile Variables and Four Performance Variables**

Profile variable	Performance variable			
	Personnel management	Property custodianship	Financial management	Administrative support
Age	$r_s = -.045$ Slight corr. $p = .474$	$r_s = .056$ Slight corr. $p = .377$	$r_s = .026$ Slight corr. $p = .685$	$r_s = .017$ Slight corr. $p = .789$
Sex	$t = 0.187$ $p = .852$	$t = 0.015$ $p = .988$	$t = 0.204$ $p = .839$	$t = -0.080$ $p = .936$
Designation	$F(4,23.22) = 1.66$ $p = .194$	$F(4,23.07) = 0.68$ $p = .615$	$F(4,25.86) = 4.68$ $p = .006$	$F(4,25.44) = 0.95$ $p = .450$
Years in service	$r_s = -.053$ Slight corr. $p = .401$	$r_s = .066$ Slight corr. $p = .300$	$r_s = .006$ Slight corr. $p = .927$	$r_s = -.033$ Slight corr. $p = .604$

Note. The cell contains the test statistic and its corresponding p-value. An interpretation of its strength is reported for Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. The t statistic refers to the result of the independent samples t-test. The degree of freedom for  $r_s$  and t is 248. For the F statistic, Welch's ANOVA was used due to the violation of homogeneity of variance.

From the findings above, we can infer that at a 0.05 significance level, the only statistically significant linear relationship detected was between Designation and Financial Management at  $F(4,25.86) = 4.68$ ,  $p = .006$ . Although one variable is tested with a linear relationship with another variable, it is still correct to say there is no significant relationship between demographic profile and performance in ancillary services.

**Table 14: Relationships Between Four Profile Variables and Five Quality of Service Variables**

Profile variable	Quality of service variable				
	Responsiveness	Reliability	Empathy	Tangibility	Assurance
Age	$r_s = -.015$ Slight corr. $p = .816$	$r_s = -.034$ Slight corr. $p = .589$	$r_s = -.014$ Slight corr. $p = .829$	$r_s = -.057$ Slight corr. $p = .366$	$r_s = .006$ Slight corr. $p = .925$
Sex	$t = -0.324$ $p = 0.746$	$t = 0.010$ $p = 0.992$	$t = -0.141$ $p = 0.888$	$t = -1.213$ $p = 0.226$	$t = -0.681$ $p = .496$
Designation	$F(4,245) = 0.19$ $p = .945$	$F(4,22.72) = 1.47$ <sup>a</sup> $p = .244$	$F(4,245) = 0.56$ $p = .693$	$F(4,22.11) = 1.23^a$ $p = .327$	$F(4,21.62) = 0.74$ <sup>a</sup> $p = .572$
Years in service	$r_s = -.027$ Slight corr. $p = .669$	$r_s = -.055$ Slight corr. $p = .386$	$r_s = .009$ Slight corr. $p = .886$	$r_s = -.046$ Slight corr. $p = .470$	$r_s = .013$ Slight corr. $p = .835$

Note. The cell contains the test statistic and its corresponding p-value. An interpretation of its strength is reported for Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. The t statistic refers to the result of the independent samples t -test. The degree of freedom for  $r_s$  and t is 248.

<sup>a</sup>Welch's ANOVA was used due to a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, there is no statistically significant linear relationship was detected between any of the profile variables and any of the quality of service variables with all p values

greater than .05. In contrast with the study of Mahat (2024), the demographic profile does not have a significant relationship with the quality of service in this study.

**Table 15: Relationships Between Four Performance Variables and Five Quality of Service Variables**

Performance variable	Quality of service variable				
	Responsiveness	Reliability	Empathy	Tangibility	Assurance
Personnel management	0.806*** high corr.	0.827*** high corr.	0.789*** high corr.	0.781*** high corr.	0.780*** high corr.
Property custodianship	0.808*** high corr.	0.797*** high corr.	0.780*** high corr.	0.765*** high corr.	0.770*** high corr.
Financial management	0.793*** high corr.	0.799*** high corr.	0.778*** high corr.	0.776*** high corr.	0.798*** high corr.
Administrative support	0.825*** high corr.	0.850*** high corr.	0.821*** high corr.	0.839*** high corr.	0.823*** high corr.

Note. Each cell contains Pearson r statistic and interpretation of its strength. df=248.

\*p<.05. \*\*p<.01. \*\*\*p<.001.

From the findings above, all the Performance variables are statistically significantly correlated with all of the Quality of Service variables with all p values less than .001. In favour of the study of Kryshchanovych et al. (2019), the duties and responsibilities of administrative officers are crucial for developing a highly skilled and competitive workforce that can accomplish long-term objectives and carry out the company's overall plan.

**Table 16: Test of Significance of Differences Among the Four Designations in their Levels of Quality of Service**

Quality of service variable	Designation and mean level of quality of service				F	p
	Administrative officer (n=10)	Division personnel (n=6)	Teacher (n=192)	Principal (n=26)		
Responsiveness	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.34	0.25	.864
Reliability	4.42	4.43	4.34	4.17	1.48 <sup>a</sup>	.256
Empathy	4.54	4.33	4.36	4.25	0.66	.577
Tangibility	4.36	4.33	4.47	4.39	0.40	.752
Assurance	4.46	4.57	4.44	4.36	0.27	.847

<sup>a</sup>Welch's ANOVA was used due to a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

The results of ANOVA indicate that, in any of the five quality of service variables, there are no statistically significant differences among the four groups of respondents (all p values greater than .05).

## Conclusion

Based on the summary and findings, the researchers generalized that no significant relationship exists between the demographic profile and the ancillary services. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. In addition, the "relationship of the profile of the respondents to the level of quality service of admin officers" and the "difference in service quality of admin officers to the ancillary services" were both insignificant. Therefore, the null hypotheses were both accepted. Contrary to the results on the relationship of the level of performance in ancillary services to the level of quality service of admin officers, it was said to be significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

## Recommendation

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations are suggested: The DepEd - SDO Laguna may create and implement workshops and training programs designed to improve the administrative officers' level of knowledge as to personnel management, property custodianship, records management and other general administrative support. Also, the DepEd - SDO Laguna may continue to monitor and periodically assess the level of service provided by their staff. It enables the organization to provide the necessary support and intervention by simplifying and identifying areas that require attention. In addition, the DepEd - SDO Laguna ought to honor and commend workers who perform well on the job and have strong work ethics. This acknowledgment may come in promotions, bonuses, or other rewards. It is possible to conduct more research to examine the connection between performance level and service quality in various sectors and businesses. It may assist in determining the appropriate approaches and strategies to use in various situations. Lastly, the study might be repeated in other division offices to find out if the results hold true in various contexts.

## References:

- Alcera, Rona & Donoga, Danhill & Turla, Margaret & Balag, Cecil. (2022). Personal Factors and Mental Health of Public School Teachers in Lavezares I District, of Northern Samar. *Asian Journal of Medicine and Health*. 125-137.9734/ajmah/2022/v20i930511
- Al-Hubaishi, Hajar & Ahmad, S. & Hussain, M. (2017). Exploring mobile Government from the service quality perspective. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*. 30. 4-16. 10.1108/JEIM-01-2016-0004.
- Chan, A. S. W., Wu, D., Lo, I. P. Y., Ho, J. M. C., & Yan, E. (2022a). Diversity and inclusion: Impacts on psychological wellbeing among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer communities. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13,726343. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.726343>
- Gronroos, C. (1982). An Applied Service Marketing Theory. *European Journal of Marketing*, pp. 16, 30–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EUM00000000004859>
- Kryshtanovych, M., Kapitanets, S., Filina, S., Oleksiuk, N., & Prodius, O. (2019). Assessment of the effectiveness of strategic personnel management of the company.
- Lehtinen, U. and Lehtinen, J.R. (1982). A Study of Quality Dimensions. *Service Management Institute*, 5, 25 -32.
- Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (1979). Goal Setting—A Motivational Technique That Works. *Organizational Dynamics*, 8, 68-80. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(79\)90032-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(79)90032-9)
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New Directions in Goal-Setting Theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(5), 265 -268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00449.x>
- Mahat, D. (2024). Workforce Diversity at Work: Exploring Ethnicity as I was moderating in Age and Performance. *Asian Journal of Management Analytics*. 3. 10.55927/ajma.v3i1.7663.
- Ocampo, L., Alinsub, J., Casul, R. A., Enquig, G., Luar, M., Panuncillon, N., ...& Ocampo, C. O. (2019). Public service quality evaluation with SERVQUAL and AHP-TOPSIS: A case of Philippine government agencies. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 68, 100604.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Rizos, P., Sfakianaki, E., & Kakouris, A. (2022). Quality of administrative services in higher education. *European Journal of Educational Management*, 5(2), 115-126. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.5.2.115>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of Service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Yidana P., Bangase E.A., Bagina R., Billa G. (2023), A Model of Administrative Service Quality in Higher Education. *British Journal of Education, Learning and Development Psychology* 6(3), 52 -75. DOI: 10.52589/BJELDPXX8LIQLC