

The Relationship between University Governance and the Higher Education Services Quality.

Tran Hoang Minh
(Lac Hong University, Vietnam)

ABSTRACT: *For universities and training institutions today, striving to improve the quality of education is always considered one of the core tasks. Almost all universities are interested in the quality of education and ensure and improve their education quality. In the trend of globalization and international integration and the country's industrialization and modernization, one of the most critical tasks of universities in our country today is efforts to improve quality. Education, approaching the standardization of quality according to developed countries' education in the region and the world. However, the current situation in mining facilities still has several limitations. The teaching staff does not ensure to meet the capacity according to the State's regulations entirely. When the university governance is low, it will significantly affect the quality of service in university education. Therefore, this study clarifies the relationship between university governance and the higher education service quality.*

KEYWORDS - *University governance, service quality, higher education,*

I. INTRODUCTION

With the current university governance situation, very few higher education institutions can ensure that the faculty of lecturers can fully meet the state regulations (according to the Circular). Joint venture no. 36/2014/TTLT-BGDĐT-BNV of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Education and Training regulating codes and standards for professional titles of teaching staff in public tertiary institutions. Career title of teaching staff in higher education institutions), not only for private universities but also for public higher education institutions (MOET, 2014). According to the Ministry of Education and Training (2019), there are 235 universities nationwide. The total number of lecturers is 74,991, of which 20,198 are lecturers with doctorate degrees, 44,634 lecturers with master degrees. The quality of lecturers tends to improve; however, the faculty's qualifications and capacities have not met the regulations of state agencies and have caught up with the socio-economic development (Duong Thi Thanh Xuan, 2017). Therefore, it significantly influences service quality in university education and the target audience - students.

II. THE CONCEPT

1. University Governance

Regardless of the method of collective management in the traditional education sector's traditional style, especially for the universities in Vietnam. Nowadays, universities in Vietnam have gradually shifted to applying a management approach to corporate Governance (Middlehurst, 2004; Reed 2002; Shattock 2008a). Corporate Governance in general and its application in the undergraduate field have been a subject of extensive academic research for a long time (Dawkins, JS 1988; Edwards 2003; Nelson 2003a; Reed 2002; Steane 2001). Applying the corporate governance model to university governance in the context of the education sector is essential to building a university that is well-functioning and internationally competitive (Marginson and Considine, 2000). In turn, this issue has increased competition from domestic and international higher education providers (Leontiades 2007; Tierney 2004). Therefore, Governance in universities is the core issue and a very concerning topic of many sectors in society.

In the undergraduate field, Robert Birnbaum (2004) defined Governance (rigidity, rationality) as "referring to the structures, rules/rules, and reward/discipline systems in the organization. To define the relationships of the organization's authority, processes, and regulations and to encourage compliance with issued

policies and procedures". Governance (soft) "is the social connection and interaction systems within an organization that helps develop and maintain certain individual or group standards".

Considine (2001) argues that university governance is "referring to university structure, delegation, decision making, planning, organizational cohesion, and direction".

The research team Bernard Bekuni Boawei Bingab et al. (2017) argued that university governance has many definitions, which can be understood as: "structures, systems, policies, processes and procedures. custom adopted in the mission of the university" is intended to guide everyone in the university to perform their duties to achieve the goal of the university's vision and mission. Consequently, university governance is concerned with the cooperation between the governing board, administrators, and stakeholders to build and provide the structures, systems, and sometimes universities that colleges or universities can use to achieve their set goals.

For Jürgen Kohler and Josef Huber (eds.) (2006), university governance is understood as "a set of laws, regulations, structures, norms, and practices that form the framework. for a university to closely and consistently pursue its goals and policies".

It must be defined that Administration in higher education is a complex and multidimensional field, but Eurydice (2008) sees university governance as "the exercise of rights formally and informally under the law, policies and established rules that different actors' rights and responsibilities, including the rules with which they interact. In other words, Governance is comprised of "the framework in which an institution pursues its goals, objectives, and policies consistently and collectively to answer questions." Who is responsible, and what are the sources of legality for the various actors' executive decision-making?

Dinh Van Toan (2019) said that university governance is "a system set up and implemented in universities following contemporary socio-economic development". university governance is based on principles and practices that aim for the university to fulfill its mission and continually improve its operational aspects to meet its stakeholders' requirements best. These governance principles may be process-based or outcome-based with specific criteria so that stakeholders can oversee university activities.

In Shattock (2006), university governance is defined as "the forms and processes through which universities manage and control their affairs, ...". By extension, university governance is powers across levels, and academic councils for faculty and department meetings, and Governance is effective when these levels of Governance work closely together tight and synchronous.

The European Center for Strategic Management of Universities (ESMU, 2009) considers that university governance is "an external and internal coordination of higher education and research". These combinations can have both formal and informal components. Eurydice (2008) identifies so, and there have been many comparative studies on higher education governance that share such assertions (Braun and Merrien, 1999; Clark, 1983; Currie et al., 2003; de Boer et al., 2006; Eurydice, 2008; Goedegebuure et al., 1994; Kehm and Lanzendorf, 2006; Kogan and Hanney, 2000; Kohler and Huber, 2006; Leisyte, 2007; OECD, 2008).

A recent definition has been defined by the research team Nguyen Quy Thanh et al. (2019) quite appropriately with the current Vietnamese higher education context, and University governance is "a system of components, structure and decision-making process about higher education." University governance can occur mainly within the institution of a higher education institution concerned with university decision-making in activities such as enrollment, recruitment, and organizing of educational activities and training, scientific research activities, and other activities. University governance also includes the division of functions, duties, powers, and accountability of the parties involved in the decision-making process.

University governance is the process of making decisions, implementing, and monitoring the implementation of the policies and goals that the institution has set. According to the stakeholder theory, the context is that universities will include stakeholders such as the state, investors, universities, faculty, students; however, while Kanperin (2004) then stresses the importance of student participation in university governance treats student participation in university governance as when students feel responsible for their studies. Participation and leadership, informal settings such as on-campus students and on-campus volunteer associations, are indicators of active citizenship, Saha (2000). Akomolafe and Ibijola (2012) have demonstrated the rationale for student participation in university governance, among others, the higher student commitment, the easier it is to achieve the goals set. Create or implement a more effective policy, uninterrupted learning pathway programs, and leadership and reduced rates of stability in student crime or behavior fight against the

government. Studies have shown that students have great respect for union executives and even more than university administrators, perhaps because they believe in leaders' path. Therefore, it will be easier for students to participate in university governance by implementing the democratic representation process, participating in the university's faculty and decision-making bodies. Students who are officially participating in university governance have been and are serving as training platforms for future leaders in society because of the skills and competencies acquired in the context. Universities can be immediately converted to social use when participating in organizations. Therefore, this study only focuses on evaluating university governance based on students' policies and goals, such as policies related to food services, housing services, career services, recreational activities, and other support services related to student life (Brown, 2001).

2. Higher Education Service Quality

With the current development of higher education in Vietnam and worldwide, the dynamic regional, national, and global developments have forced higher education institutions to transform rapidly. Moreover, these transitions have received increasing attention over the past two decades (de Jager and Gbadamosi, 2013). The globalization of education forces higher education institutions to improve their education services (Kristoffersen and Woodhouse, 2005). Therefore, higher education institutions' motivation to participate in more competitive educational activities is based on education quality. The essential because the competitiveness of unique products and services ultimately relies on branding to help attract a larger market share to increase profits (Yeo, 2008). In higher education, there is a need to build a brand to attract customers and help achieve profits. The quality of service in higher education service quality differs from the manufacturing sector's service quality related to tangible products.

Furthermore, it is also different from the types of services where a one-time interaction can determine its value. Since there are no products that participate in the education sector, the only competitive differentiator will be creating and delivering unique service experiences (Khodayari and Khodayari, 2011). Continual improvement in educational institutions can only be achieved by activating deficiencies through appropriate service quality measurement (Zakariah, Zakariah, and Pyeman, 2016).

The topic of service quality in education has become an essential topic in the academic world. What is interesting is determining the applicability of service quality in the education sector and the relevance of service quality in the higher education sector. Moreover, service quality has become an important research topic because of its apparent relationship with cost (Crosby, 1979), profitability (Rust and Zahorik, 1993), and satisfaction. Clients (Bolton and Drew, 1991; Boulding et al., 1993), customer retention (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990), and a positive word of mouth (Buttle, 1996).

Service quality in education is an ongoing process (Nikel and Lowe, 2010) that evolves with the opportunity in universities' hands to improve serving the same audience continually - As a student, so there is plenty of time for service providers to improve their service delivery. Higher education institutions have the opportunity to learn from their mistakes and exceed students' expectations (Henderson-Smart, Win, Gerzina, King, & Hyde, 2006).

Service quality in education is seen as the distinguishing difference between higher education institutions regarding their dominance in creating unique learning experiences (Yeo, 2008). These experiences can be specific classroom instruction, extracurricular activities, supervision, administrative support, or leadership. Universities have unique and adaptive experiences with quality management concepts and methodologies. A unique experience can be achieved through a quality customer-oriented approach. The customer-centered approach is decisive for service quality because service quality is generally subjective, while product quality can be objectively measured. Therefore, to measure service quality appropriately is consumer/customer perceptions. Management of higher education institutions can design and provide services to enhance customer (student) satisfaction by understanding how consumers form impression and quality (Seymour, 1992).

Furthermore, in the education sector, the university leadership can enhance customer (student) satisfaction by tailoring the academy/ university environment to the client's needs (Jain and partner, 2011). Higher education institutions need to think like corporations continually innovating, diversifying, and redesigning their structures to provide the best services to their customers. Like corporations, if higher education

institutions need to stand out in their customers' minds, they are concerned with return on investment and increasing student numbers and satisfaction. Of the customer and service quality expectations to real perceptions of service quality. When it comes to service quality in higher education, researchers have been interested in aspects including:

When it comes to quality in education, it refers to high-quality education programs in higher education institutions that can compete and attract more students. Education institutions must also consistently serve high-quality customers for long-term survival. Research by Sivanand (2004) shows that private higher education institutions in Malaysia have fierce competition and sometimes even outperform public higher education institutions, especially in supplying provides student satisfaction with the products and services provided, the administration, the faculty-to-student ratio, and the facilities provided.

O'Neill and Palmer (2004) define higher education's quality as "the difference between what a student is expecting to receive and their perception of that reality." However, it is a relative concept for higher education stakeholders, depending on its context (Tam, 2001). There are many stakeholders in the higher education sector: government, sponsoring agencies, staff (staff, faculty, staff), students, employers, and society (Srikanthan and Dalrymple, 2007).

However, Khawaja Fawad Latif et al. (2017) conducted an empirical study with 543 students at seven universities in Pakistan, including three public universities and four private universities, to measure the student's quality of education services' point of view. The study has identified six factors, namely: the quality of lecturers, administrative services, knowledge services, activities, continuous improvement, and leadership quality, that have a substantial impact on the quality of university education services. Research has shown that, although all factors have a particular influence on the quality of universities' education services, leadership has its value and stands out most in creating prices—the quality of university education services. The quality management system is guaranteed, and higher education institutions' success depends on their leadership ability.

According to research by Maria del Carmen Arrieta and Beatrice Avolio (2020), nine factors impact to the higher education service quality, including curriculum plan, professors, and education. Receiving, infrastructure, extracurricular activities, lectures, faculty communication, library services, university positioning, and a few other factors (laboratory is available, service right information technology, good student service, job opportunities - job guidance and assistance, parking lot). The study was conducted with two survey subjects: graduates and students studying administration and finance at a private university in Peru. Both of these groups recognize the factor that professors are the most important factor affecting the quality of higher education services, followed by the factors that have a high frequency of impact on the quality of education that include: curriculum planning, university positioning, infrastructure, and some other factor (service).

Faizan Ali et al. (2015) conducted an empirical study with 400 survey samples for international students at three public universities in Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia). The results of higher education service quality have had an impact on international student satisfaction. The study results show all the factors of education service quality, including academic aspects, non-academic aspects, access/access, curriculum issues, and Prestige, have impacted student satisfaction and loyalty.

Pichyada Pheunpha (2019) study was conducted to identify indicators and components of student satisfaction with the quality of higher education services at Ubon Ratchathani University (Thailand). To evaluate and measure higher education's service quality, the author has identified six factors: service quality of program content, service quality of qualitative aspects of the program, faculty, service quality of the guide, service quality of supervision, service quality of measurement, and evaluation, service quality of professional practice preparation. Research results show that the program content's service quality and the quality of services that prepare for professional practice affect student satisfaction with education's service quality.

Viraiyan Teeroovengadum et al. (2019) used the HESQUAL scale to analyze the quality of higher education, and the study has identified six components that affect student satisfaction to measure the quality of higher education. In particular: functional service quality, variable quality, image, perceived value, student satisfaction, and loyalty. The study was conducted with 501 students at various higher education institutions in Mauritius (a country in East Africa). Research has determined that student satisfaction is affected by factors: technical service quality, image, and perceived value - but not the quality of available services.

Thus, in the context of the research work and the practice of Vietnam's current higher education, the concept of higher education service quality can be understood as "the process of improvement. Continual progression of institution activities to meet student (client) satisfaction, in which the role of the university leadership is the deciding factor and is measured by student satisfaction. There are several influencing factors like the infrastructures, the administrative services, and the university".

3. The Relationship between The University Governance and Service Quality

In the early 1980s, a group of French economists formed a scientific movement to construct a new socioeconomic institution and realist approach, laying the foundations for the first arguments of conventional theory. Based on the basic assumption that economic value and value must be explained and constructed according to the specific economic coordination scenarios, Robert Salais, Laurent Thévenot, Franis Eymard-Duvemay, Olivier Favereau, and Andr  Orl an were pioneers and supporters of this theory (Salais and Th venot, 1986; Storper and Salais, 1997; Favereau and Lazega, 2002; Eymard-Duvemay 2006a, 2006b; Diaz-Bone and Th venot; Diaz- Bone and Salais, 2011).

Salais and Th venot (1986) assert that economic actors rely on conventions such as socio-cultural frameworks to enhance their general interpretation of objects, actions, and objectives from the core assumptions. General intentions. These general objects, actions, goals, and intentions are directly related to production, distribution, and consumption situations. This view was quickly accepted and developed into a "conventional theory" or "economics of conventions" ( conomie des Convention - EC).

View according to conventional theory. When examining university governance from the perspective of being an economic actor, education services are also considered consumer products that the university provides. Applying conventional theory in the research context can be conventions to express through policies and regulations on universities' relevant issues. The activities and operations, including education activities, are by the conventions expressed through the policies and regulations above. In other words, when the teaching activities comply with the conventions, services also depend on these conventions. Relevance, qualifying for quality, and quality management tools will depend on a shared set of values and on legalized procedures (social engineering tools) for quality performance measurement or quality convention to claim (Ponte and Gibbon, 2005).

At the same time, conventions are built by aspects of university governance from the governance levels expressed through strategic vision and mission expressed through written regulations, regulations; therefore, teaching activities in particular, as well as all activities in the university in general, are governed and explained by university governance, through the middle of the convention. Customer-oriented governance's success depends on how well the organization can pass relatively intangible information to its suppliers and standardize, systematize, and / obtained reliable external certification of the quality of goods and services (Ponte and Gibbon, 2005).

The arguments based on these conventional theories show that the universities' education activities and, more specifically, the essential services significantly influenced by the university governance through the intermediaries are the standard conventions expressed through rules and regulations.

III. CONCLUSION

The influence of university governance on the higher education service quality is a positive, positive relationship. University governance refers to a university's structure, delegation, decision making, planning, organizational cohesion, and direction. Educational institutions that have sustainable development orientations and have a clear plan will provide good quality of service to students, so when they receive such services, they will have good reviews, be satisfied with the educational institutions' service quality, and vice versa.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dương Thị Thanh Xuân, (2017), Nâng cao năng lực của đội ngũ giảng viên đại học đáp ứng yêu cầu đào tạo nguồn nhân lực chất lượng cao. <http://tluanchinhtri.vn/home/index.php/dao-tao-boi-duong/item/2054-nang-cao-nang-luc-cua-doi-ngu-giang-vien-dai-hoc-dap-ung-yeu-cau-dao-tao-nguon-nhan-luc-chat-luong-cao.html>

- [2] Middlehurst, R 2004, 'Changing Internal Governance: A Discussion of Leadership Roles and Management Structures in UK Universities', *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 258-79.
- [3] Reed, M 2002, 'New Managerialism, Professional Power and Organisational Governance in UK Universities: A Review and Assessment', in *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht pp. 163-86.
- [4] Steane, P 2001, 'Governance: Convergent Expectations, Divergent Practices', *Corporate Governance*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 15-9.
- [5] Leontiades, M 2007, *Pruning the Ivy: The Overdue Reform of Higher Education*, Information Age Publishing, Charlotte.
- [6] Considine, M, Marginson, S, Sheehan, P & Kumnick, M 2001, *The Comparative Performance of Australia as a Knowledge Nation*. Centre for Strategic Economic Studies, Victoria University, Melbourne.
- [7] Bernard Bekuni Boawei Bingab, Joseph Ato Forson, Anselm Komla Abotsi, Theresa Yabaah Baah-Ennumh (2017), "Strengthening university governance in sub-Sahara Africa: the Ghanaian perspective", *International Journal of Educational Management*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2016-0039>.
- [8] Jürgen Kohler and Josef Huber (eds.) (2006), *Higher education governance between democratic culture, academic aspirations and market forces* (ebook). Council of Europe Publishing/Editions du Conseil de l'Europe.
- [9] Eurydice, *Higher education governance in Europe, Policies, structures, funding and academic staff*, Brussels: Eurydice, European Commission, Education and Culture DG, 2008.
- [10] Đinh Văn Toàn (2019), *The Change in Governance Approach of Universities in The Context of Innovation Start-Up*.
- [11] Shattock 2008b, 'Managing Good Governance in Higher Education', *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 85-9
- [12] ESMU (2009), *European Centre for Strategic Management of Universities (ESMU), Report of Higher Education Governance Reforms Across Europe*.
- [13] Clarke, T 2007, *International Corporate Governance: A Comparative Approach*, Routledge, London.
- [14] Kanperin D. (2004): The Use and Abuse of Student participants, Vol. 17, Part 5, May 2004, Retrieved from www.thepsychologist.org.uk on February 20, 2013.
- [15] Saha, L. (2000): Education and Active Citizenship: Prospects and Issues; Educational Practice and Theory, Vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 9-20.
- [16] Saha, L. (2000): Education and Active Citizenship: Prospects and Issues; Educational Practice and Theory, Vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 9-20.
- [17] Akomolafe, C. O. and Ibijola, E. Y. (2012): *International Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies* Vol. 4(1), pp. 14-18, January 2012. Available online at <http://www.academicjournals.org/IJAPS>.
- [18] Brown, Stephen W. and Teresa A. Swartz. 1989. "A Dyadic Evaluation of the Professional Services Encounter." *Journal of Marketing* 53 (April): 92-98.
- [19] de Jager, J., & Gbadamosi, G. (2013). Predicting students' satisfaction through service quality in higher education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 11(3), 107–118. doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2013.09.001
- [20] Kristoffersen, D., & Woodhouse, D. (2005). *An overview of world issues in quality assurance for higher education*. Retrieved March 6, 2009, from http://auqa.edu.au/files/otherpublications/world_issues_in_qa_for_he.pdf
- [21] Yeo, R. K. (2008). Servicing service quality in higher education: Quest for excellence. *On the Horizon*, 16(3), 152–161. doi:10.1108/10748120810901459.
- [22] Khodayari, F., & Khodayari, B. (2011). Service quality in higher education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(9), 38–46.

- [22] Zakariah, M. R., Zakariah, S., & Pyeman, J. (2016). IPA vs. SERVQUAL: Service quality measurement for higher education industry. In *Proceedings of the 1st AAGBS International Conference on Business Management 2014 (AiCoBM 2014)* (pp. 139–150). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- [23] Rust, R. T., and Zahorik, A. J. (1993). Customer satisfaction, customer retention and market share. *Journal of Retailing*, 69(2), 193-215.
- [24] Bolton, R.N. and Drew, J. H. (1991). A multistage model of customers' assessment of service quality and value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(March), 375-384.
- [25] Reichheld, F.F. and Sasser, W.E. Jr. (1990). Zero defections: Quality comes to service. *Harvard Business Review* (September-October), 105-111.
- [26] Henderson-Smart, C., Winning, T., Gerzina, T., King, S., & Hyde, S. (2006). Benchmarking learning and teaching: Developing a method. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(2), 143–155. doi:10.1108/09684880610662024
- [27] Seymour, E. (1992). Undergraduate problems with teaching and advising in SME majors- explaining gender differences in attrition rates. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 21(5), 284-292.
- [28] Jain, R., Sinha, G., & Sahney, S. (2011). Conceptualizing service quality in higher education. *Asian Journal on Quality*, 12(3), 296–314. doi:10.1108/15982681111187128.
- [29] Sivanand C. N. (2004). Comparative analysis of students' satisfaction in public and private universities in Malaysia, *Malaysian Management Review*, 39(2).
- [30] O'Neill, M. A., & Palmer, A. (2004). Importance–performance analysis: A useful tool for directing continuous quality improvement in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 12(1), 39-52.
- [31] Tam, M. (2001). Measuring quality and performance in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), 47–54.
- [32] Khawaja Fawad Latif và cộng sự (2017): In search of quality: measuring Higher Education Service Quality (HiEduQual), Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, DOI: 10.1080/14783363.2017.1338133.
- [33] Maria del Carmen Arrieta và Beatrice Avolio (2020), Factors of higher education quality service: the case of a Peruvian university. *Quality Assurance in Education*. DOI 10.1108/QAE-03-2020-0037.
- [34] Faizan Ali, Yuan Zhou, Kashif Hussain, Pradeep Kumar Nair, Neethiahnathan Ari.Ragavan, (2016) "Does higher education service quality effect student satisfaction, image and loyalty?: A study of international students in Malaysian public universities", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 24 Issue: 1, pp.70-94, <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-02-2014-0008>
- [35] Pichyada Pheunpha (2019), A Factor Analysis Of Student' Perceived Service Quality In Higher Education. *ABAC Journal* Vol.39 No.4(October-December, 2019 pp 90-110).
- [36] Viraiyan Teeroovengadum and Robin Nunkoo (2019), Higher education service quality, student satisfaction and loyalty Validating the HESQUAL scale and testing an improved structural model. *Quality Assurance in Education*. © Emerald Publishing Limited 0968-4883. DOI 10.1108/QAE-01-2019-0003.
- [37] Ponte, S., & Gibbon, P. (2005). Quality standards, conventions and the governance of global value chains. *Economy and society*, 34(1), 1-31.