The Service Excellence Performance of Public Universities in Malaysian - an internal client's experiences

Hasfizani Ariffin [1], Sany Sanuri Ahmad Mokhtar [2] & Yusmani Mohd Yusoff [3]
[1] Universiti Sains Malaysia, [2, 3] Universiti Utara Malaysia

Article Info

Abstract

This study focuses on the implementation of service excellence performance in the public universities in Malaysia. The service excellence performance certainly was recommended to be implemented in the non-academic units/departments of the Malaysian public higher education institutions. Precisely, this study was intended in looking for the Malaysian's public university internal clients towards the implementation of the service excellence performance and to examine the validity and reliability of the measurement scale employed in this study. The structured questionnaire was carefully designed with various validity and reliability procedures such as an extensive literature review, expert review, pre-test and pilot test. The developed measurement scale was empirically tested for reliability and validity through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. This study's data were collected from the internal clients of the non-academic units/departments at various public universities in Malaysia. The quantitative study was applied on a total of 348 data. The analyses under this study employed the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24 and the Partial Least Square Structural Equation Model. The study's findings show that the measurement scale developed has fulfilled the validity and reliability requirement. The service excellence performance was not up to delighting the client's expectation, which needed to be improved.

Keywords : service excellence, public university, higher education industry, internal client, Malaysia.
_____

Introduction

In this age of advancement where the world was uniting with a competitive global marketplace, service excellence is an important criterion in achieving competitive advantage, yet the study on it is limited (Shek, Chung, & Leung, 2015; Al-Eisawi, 2014; Gouthier, 2012; Dobni, 2002).

According to Sekhon, Al-Eisawi, Kumar, & Pritchard, (2015) pursuing service excellence is an important organisational agenda in the uncertainty of the business environment. This is because, service excellence was practically and empirically proven as a business strategy, in many of huge organisations such as Disneyworld and Marriott Corporation which proven competitively leading in the marketplace (Aziz & Wahiddin, 2010). Furthermore, according to Chuwiruch, Jhundar-Indra, and Boonlua (2015), many other researchers also recommended service excellence as an effective strategy to enhance client's satisfaction which proven in increasing the organisation's profit. Therefore, service excellence cannot be denied as an important factor in prompting an organisation's grows (Ken Bates, et al., 2003).

Thus, improving the organisation's reputation by providing service excellence is a primary objective of service providers regardless of any businesses including the higher education industry. In other words, developing and gaining client's trust by providing the service excellence is the best long-term strategy. Since the higher education industry is considered as the service industry, therefore, satisfying client's needs is the goal of the service marketer.

Certainly, in the case of the higher education industry, their complex competition called for a high reputation for attention from internal, external and future clients. A reputation that translated into rankings was among the push factor that pressure all higher education institutions in the globe to be more adorable. The university ranking programme has gained popularity and becoming a primary reference to the existing and expected customers (Mills, Weatherbee, & Colwell, 2006). Indeed, Mills, et al. (2006) stated that, in this highly competitive higher education market, being ranked at top is the best strategy which will affect the university's prestige in attracting new clients and increasing the organisation's income.

However, a similar study reported that, ranking assessments was normally based on an academic matter to capture the higher education performance. However, in the reality, the performance of the higher institution counts on the entire quality of services provided (Mills, et al., 2006). Therefore, this study empirically examines the internal client's perceptions regarding service excellence performance at non-academic units/departments in Malaysian public universities. This paper proceeds with the reviews from previous studies, research method, analysis, results, discussion, conclusion and the implications of the study.

Literature Review

Introduction to the Higher Education Industry
The higher education industry is a service industry and the organisation in the industry was classified as not for profit organisation (Naidoo & Wu, 2014). The organisation which is known as the higher education institution as a part of the industry was classified into three major roles; (i) teaching, (ii) research activities and (iii) strengthening the economic and social development of each country (Tee, 2016). Furthermore, in running the aforementioned missions above, there are two main categories of services provided in the higher education institution namely, (i) academic matters that engaged in teaching and research and; (ii) non-academic matters related to administrative and support staff (Davis, 1996). Thus, both academic and non-academic matters in the industry were equally weighted in gaining the competitive advantage (Jain, Sinha, & Sahney, 2011; Davis, 1996). These two divisions are distinguished in terms of job structure and supervision which are contradicted in management approaches (Davis, 1996).

In the age of a global business wave, all businesses in all industries have been impacted from the hard push of technological advancement including the higher education industry. Indeed, the HEI

transformation agenda has long being discussed in the literature and it was reported that the European higher education industry has been subjected to major reforms in the 1990s (Decramer, Smolders, Vanderstraeten, Christiaens, & Desmidt, 2012). Precisely, many changes have been passed by the HEI such as the budget cuts policy which has been implemented gradually in the higher education institutions all over the world.

The budget cut policy has affected universities around the world, which encourages many universities to increase tuition fees as well as aggressively pursuing international students' enrollment for income generating purposes (Naidoo & Wu, 2014). The study mentioned that, a hunting process indirectly changed a position of each of the higher education institutions from local to global marketplace. Thus, it led many universities to go venturing abroad for economic purposes. The situation has increased competition among the intuitions in the HEI which forces every institution to distinguish themselves from their competitors. In distinguishing themselves to be in front of their competitors, the needs of global customers must be met, innovation of products and processes was called in putting themselves in the international marketplace (Naidoo & Wu, 2014).

Furthermore, nowadays higher education businesses show rapid growth. Universities such as Harvard, Princeton and Stanford are named as part of the world's most influential research universities operating around the world (M., 2016). The findings of the study were supported by recent economic reports by the United States Economic Trade which indicated that the education service was listed as a first industry in the non-manufacturing industry with increased growth in the Purchasing Managers Index (PMI) (Tradingeconomics.com 2018).

Introduction to the higher education industry in Malaysia
The higher education industry in Malaysia was under jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MoEM) and previously funded by federal government (Ahmad, Ng, & Kek, 2016). Malaysia's HEI was divided into two main categories, namely, Public Higher Learning Institutions and Private Higher Education Institutions, which consists of various types and functions of higher institutions such as public universities, private higher educational institutions, polytechnics and community colleges that place more than a million of local and international students from more than 100 countries. A formal information web page on Malaysian HEIs, studyMalaysia.com reported about 579 higher education institutions in Malaysia in 2011 (Services 2018). Those institutions were comprised of several categories as follows; 20 public universities, 53 private universities, 403 active private colleges, 30 polytechnics and 73 public community colleges (Reza, 2016). The growth of public and private institutions in the country is seen as a positive impact on the government's agenda to become one of the education hubs in the Asian region. The conditions have offered various educational products, which offers better choices to future customers of the higher education industry (Azizan, Dimon, Ismail, & Abu Bakar, 2015).

Indeed, the growth of educational sectors was highly prioritised by the Malaysian government. Thus, the transformational agendas of higher education institutions were long started in Malaysia such as the formation of the Ministry of Higher Education in 2004 that took over all higher education matters from the MoEM as one of the holistic transformational agenda (Bajunid, 2011). Besides that, many studies have reported on the variety of efforts by Malaysian government in stipulating policies and strategies to strengthen the higher education industry in this country, such as the research universities (RU) initiative, the launch of National Higher Education Strategic Plan (PSPTN in Malay language) both in 2007, the launch of National Educational Blueprint (NEB) in 2012, and the launch of the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2015-2025 (MoEM 2018). Those efforts were specifically established in driving the high quality of Malaysian HEI that will "propel new avenues in social and economic progress" (Ahmad, Farley, & Kim Soon, 2014,

p.58). Furthermore, the blueprint on Higher Education Development Plan 2015-2025 launched in 2015 is a continuous transformation agenda which listed 22 Critical Agenda Project (CAP), detailing the processes towards achieving the mission and vision of Malaysian HEI (EPU, 2015; MoEM, 2010). However, this study area was focused on public universities (PUs) in Malaysia as briefly described below.

The Public University in Malaysia
The Malaysian public universities comprised of twenty institutions since 1962 by formation of University Malaya, under jurisdiction of the Ministry of Higher Education (Ahmad et al., 2016). Malaysian PUs was classified into three categories based on their specific focus, those categories are Research Universities (RUs), Comprehensive Universities (CUs), and Focus Universities (FUs)(MoEM 2015). Furthermore, the higher education industry in Malaysia was regulated by various legislation under provision of The Education Act 1996, The Private Higher Educational Institutions Act 1996 (amended 2009), The National Council of Higher Education Act 1996, Malaysian Qualifications Agency Act 2007, The Universities and University Colleges Act 1996 (amended 2009) and The National Higher Education Fund Corporation Act, 1997 (Amendment 2000) (Services, 2018). The details of regulation related to education bodies are robust in action to ensure integrity and harmony of the HEI in this country.

Besides that, PUs in Malaysia are now given autonomy gradually, the autonomy will be granted to PUs in stages according to their capabilities (MoEM 2017). Furthermore, the Ministry through the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2015-2025 has stated that it is important for PUs to be mandated in making their own decision in several areas such as finance and human resource. The increase in PUs achievement such as being ranked in the top 50 in QS Asia University Ranking Programme served as an attribute to the autonomy grant, which is one of the continuous effort of the government in transforming and strengthening the governance of Malaysian PUs (Malaysiakini, 2017). Despite the uneven ranking achievement being reported and discussed, the transformation agenda of Malaysian HEI has shown a positive sign.

Introduction to Service Industry
Basic understanding of service features is important prior to the introduction of service excellence. Generally, there are three main economic activities in nature which is agriculture, manufacturing and services that run in a business process (Agya Yalley & Singh Sekhon, 2014). Since this study is concerned on service industry, thus the explanation will be emphasised on the aforementioned instead of the other two activities. Moreover, in between those three business activities, service industry was told to be the most important business activity in the economy recently (Zeithaml, Bitner & Gremler, 2013). In addition, the service industry was also referred to as knowledge or information economy in the literature because of the nature the business that based on intensive knowledge as compared to the manufacturing economy that was based on mass production (Shek, et al., 2015).

Furthermore, services in nature was defined as deeds, processes and performances produced by a person or an entity to serve a person or an entity. In other words, 'services product' is another type of product that is a heterogeneous range of intangible products and activities (Zeithaml, et al., 2013; Junarsin, 2010). Indeed, service characteristic is intangible in nature and the uniqueness of service characteristics consists of intangibility, heterogeneity, perishability and inseparability that differ from goods which is tangible in nature (Agya Yalley & Singh Sekhon, 2014). Precisely, the service product is contrary to the tangible product in term of characteristic, production and delivery of it, hence managing and marketing services was very challenging (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). Therefore, production products can be adjusted and refined from time to time by manufacturers before they are presented to consumers as production and user are

separate. However, the production and use of services occur simultaneously leading to unconformity. As a conclusion, the dimensions that contradict between service and product are; (i) inputs and outputs, (ii) variability of production process and (iii) production and consumption process (Shek et al., 2015). Thus, the quality of service production is also called for rapid improvement (Agya Yalley & Singh Sekhon, 2014).

The above scenario discussed the differentiation between the production of service and manufacturing of product, which highlighted the importance of services to be excellently delivered since the production happen concurrently. Additionally, in this era of digital economy, the service sector is moving forward in producing new service products, the advancement of services in economic activities was a call for many studies in improving its conceptual and theoretical in academic literature to enhancing service activities in various industries for the purpose of competitive advantage (Junarsin, 2010). Similarly, the excellent services provided by the higher education institution yesterday may no longer relevant today.

Service Excellence
The service excellence was said as rapidly receiving good customer's feedback when the services provided was beyond their expectations (Cina, 1990; Dobni, 2002). According to Dobni (2002) the service excellence is to ensure the clients is getting what they want timely with satisfying internal and external customers. In addition, the organisation with service excellence will gain service culture and competitive advantage (Dobni, 2002). Another work on service excellence emphasised that the 'provision of excellent service quality' must go through management systems to achieve more than clients' satisfaction but also delighting them in gaining their loyalty (Bartl, 2012). The theoretical definitions mostly are similar, service excellence was defined as 'concerned with the creation and sustainability of standards that go beyond meeting expectations' (Cina, 1990; Dobni, 2002; Pritchard, 2013). The above-mentioned explanation seemed similar to service quality but proven otherwise. Indeed, the quality of service can be based on customer judgment, where service quality is achieved when services meet customer expectations, but service excellence is beyond it and moreover service excellence is a part of marketing strategy (Pritchard, 2013).

In addition, a conference paper that critically examined previous work on service excellence has determined it as a value-added service, which relates to 'the ability to provide an excellent service in order to attract and retain customers', the quality of service that is said to be achieved when the actual experience fulfilling expected experience, and service excellence occurs when experience exceeds the customer expectations (Umar, Kasim, & Martin, 2013).

However, the definition of service excellence has evolved, recent study defined service excellence as a strategy in improving business performance that anticipated the customers' needs and their superior expectations continuously (Chuwiruch, Jhundar-Indra, & Boonlua, 2015). Based on the above discussion, it seems that the best definition of service excellence to be matched to this study context is as introduced by Robert Johnston (2004) which defined service excellence as 'easy to do business with', 'it was quick and easy, and they were really helpful". This definition was justified as the best definition of service excellence by stating that, " The definition of service excellence, building on Johnston's work, becomes even more precise ..." (Bartl, 2012, p.56).

Methodology

Sample

Population under this study comprised of eighteen public universities in Malaysia. The respondents involved was the non-academic units or departments at public universities in Malaysia which were represented by the students and staffs, who acted as the internal clients of Malaysian public universities. The questionnaires were distributed randomly via a hardcopy handout, through WhatsApp application, and via email by sending a google form link. There were 384 samples that were randomly collected from the huge number of sample size. Certainly, to determine an appropriate sample size under this study, a popular sample size table as introduced by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) were applied. Therefore, based on this study's total population, the adequate number of samples were 384 (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013; Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).

Most of the respondents were students (75.8 %) and the rest consists of university's staff (24.2 %). They were comprised of male (52.3 %) and female (47.7 %) whereby most of them were attached to the universities for more than two years. Furthermore, in term of the respondent's educational level, 63.5 per cent were bachelor's degree holder, followed by diploma's holder of 21.4 per cent and master's degree at 11.7 per cent. Finally, the rest was either a PhD's holder or secondary school education level.

Questionnaire design

This study employed a part of the UniverSE scales for PUs Service Excellence Measurement which were adapted from previous study. Some modifications were made to the items in order to suit this study context in the higher education industry in Malaysia. The questionnaire designed was uni-dimensions consisting of ten items. The questionnaire was divided into two sections, which contain the demographic details of respondents in the first section. The subsequent sections comprised of ten questions on the client's perception regarding the service excellence performance of non-academic units or departments at public university in Malaysia. The questionnaire employed the seven-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree to 7-strongly agree). The respondents were asked to scale on the service excellence performance of a particular unit or department in which university's they were attached to, based on their experiences. The questionnaire developed has been reviewed by an expert, run for pretesting and employed in a pilot test before applied in actual study (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). Table 1 below presented a summary of the questionnaire layout and Table 2 details the items involved.

Table 1: Summary of the Questionnaire Layout

No.	Title	Scales	Purpose
1	Respondent Profile	Nominal	To obtain demographic information about the respondent
2	Service Excellence	Interval	To examines the degree of client's perception on the performance service excellence of non-academic services provided at public universities in Malaysia

Table 2: The UniverSE scales for PUs Service Excellence Measurement

No.	Items
SE1	This university is committed in providing the services to its clients excellently.
SE2	The services provided by this university are suitable and fulfilling the clients' needs.
SE3	This university provides excellent services to its clients.
SE4	This university solves their clients' problems /complaints as soon as possible.
SE5	This university has enough resources (E.g.: skillful staff) to provide excellent services.
SE6	This university regularly improves their work processes in serving their clients.
SE7	The service process provided in this unit/department is not complicated.
SE8	This university's non-academic units/departments play their roles accordingly.
SE9	The staff of this university are capable of providing excellent services.
SE10	The staff of this university are motivated and friendly to the clients.

Results

There are two major analyses discussed under this topic. The first is Factor Analysis on the UniverSE scales for the Service Excellence Performance measurement at public university to ensure the reliability of the measurement scale used. The assessment on the measurement model is to determine the validity and reliability of the scale measurement used under the study (Ang, Ramayah & Amin, 2015; Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). Secondly, is the analysis on the client's perception on the performance of service excellence at the non-academic units/departments of public universities in Malaysia. Both analyses were based on 348 samples under this study.

The Factor Analysis on the UniverSE Scales for PUs Service Excellence Measurement

All the items applied in the UniverSE Scales for the PUs Service Excellence Measurement were adapted from previous studies. Thus, the Factor Analysis was conducted to ensure the UniverSE Scales used under this study is reliable. This analysis employed the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. Table 3 below shows the results,

Table 3: Factor Analysis on the UniverSE scales for PUs Service Excellence Measurement

No.	Items	Factor Loading
SE1	This university is committed in providing the services to its clients excellently.	0.616
SE2	The services provided by this university are suitable and fulfilling the clients' needs.	0.816
SE3	This university provides excellent services to its clients.	0.715
SE4	This university solves their clients' problems /complaints as soon as possible.	0.686
SE5	This university has enough resources (E.g.: skillful staff) to provide excellent services.	0.679
SE6	This university regularly improves their work processes in serving their clients.	0.800
SE7	The service process provided in this unit/department is not complicated.	0.678
SE8	This university's non-academic units/departments play their roles accordingly.	0.806
SE9	The staff of this university are capable of providing excellent services.	0.755
SE10	The staff of this university are motivated and friendly to the clients.	0.706

The Client's Perception on The Performance of Service Excellence at The Non-Academic Units/Departments of Public Universities in Malaysia

The Frequency Analysis was employed to analyse a total of 384 of the client's data regarding the performance of service excellence at the non-academic units/departments of public universities in Malaysia. The analysis was employed the Scale, Reliability Analysis by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. Table 4 below shows detail on the results,

Table 4: The Result of Frequency Analysis of Service Excellence at PUs – Clients' Experience

Measurement items	Scale/Rate	Frequency	Percent (%)
SE1	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	12	3.4
	AGREE	66	19.0
	IMPROVE	149	42.8
	SATISFIED	107	30.7
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	14	4.0
SE2	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	14	4.0
	AGREE	98	28.2
	IMPROVE	118	33.9
	SATISFIED	102	29.3
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	16	4.6
SE3	EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED	4	1.1
	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	40	11.5
	AGREE	98	28.2
	IMPROVE	125	35.9
	SATISFIED	72	20.7
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	9	2.6
SE4	DO NOT AGREE	2	0.6
	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	18	5.2
	AGREE	73	21.0
	IMPROVE	128	36.8
	SATISFIED	90	25.9
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	37	10.6
SE5	DO NOT AGREE	6	1.7
	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	33	9.5
	AGREE	87	25.0
	IMPROVE	103	29.6
	SATISFIED	88	25.3
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	31	8.9
SE6	EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED	2	0.6
	DO NOT AGREE	10	2.9
	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	21	6.0
	AGREE	100	28.7
	IMPROVE	121	34.8

	SATISFIED	80	23.0
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	14	4.0
SE7	DO NOT AGREE	5	1.4
	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	4	1.1
	AGREE	79	22.7
	IMPROVE	114	32.8
	SATISFIED	111	31.9
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	35	10.1
SE8	DO NOT AGREE	2	0.6
	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	20	5.7
	AGREE	62	17.8
	IMPROVE	134	38.5
	SATISFIED	102	29.3
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	28	8.0
SE9	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	31	8.9
	AGREE	75	21.6
	IMPROVE	106	30.5
	SATISFIED	88	25.3
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	48	13.8
SE10	VERY LITTLE EFFORT	24	6.9
	AGREE	82	23.6
	IMPROVE	129	37.1
	SATISFIED	83	23.9
	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	30	8.6

Based on the above statistical analysis, in total, most of the clients had agreed that service excellence performance practice exists at the non-academic units/departments at Malaysian public universities. The statement was proven by a high percentage range between 29.6 per cent to 42.8 per cent of the rated client's experiences as the service excellence performance had improved. Below discussed detail on the results.

At SE1, most of the respondents rated with 'IMPROVE' (42.8 per cent, which indicated that the service excellence performance by the Malaysian public universities had increased. Only 4 per cent of respondents were delighted by the service excellence provided. Meanwhile response for SE2 shows that, most of the respondents rated as 'IMPROVE' (33.9 per cent) and only a small number of the clients were delighted to the service excellence performance (4.6 per cent). The results indicated that, the service excellence performance provided was not delighting the entire clients.

Furthermore, SE3 indicated that only 1 per cent out of total clients responded with 'extremely disagree' for the statement on the Malaysian public university provided excellent services to its client, therefore, indirectly the service excellence performance practices were acknowledged at the Malaysian public universities.

Interestingly in term of problem solving at SE4, it was indicated that there are quite a big number of clients who rated on, 'IMPROVE', 'AGREE' and 'SATISFIED' (21.0 per cent, 36.8 per cent and 25.9 per cent). Indeed, about 10.6 per cent were delighted on the fast response to the comment or problem at public universities. However, in case of the university having enough resources in providing the service excellence performance, 1.7 per cent rated as 'DO NOT AGREE', while another 9.5 per cent scale on 'VERY LITTLE EFFORT'. Indirectly, the clients justified that the Malaysian public universities do not have enough resources to provide the service excellence performance. Alternatively, the environment in the Malaysian public universities do not support the implementation of the service excellence performance.

Certainly, in term of the Malaysian public universities had improved their work process regularly, only 0.6 per cent rated on 'EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED', while 2.9 per cent rated as 'DO NOT AGREE' and 6 per cent rated on 'VERY LITTLE EFFORT'. Based on the above-mentioned circumstances, the work process of the non-academic units/department at the Malaysian public universities must be revealed and improved regularly. Even though they were not impressed on the work process, they agreed that the service process was not complicated as 96.7 per cent of the total number of clients rated on 'AGREE', 'IMPROVE', 'SATISFIED' and 'EXTREMELY SATISFIED' at SE7.

In terms of the university's non-academic units/departments playing their roles accordingly, the internal clients' experiences shows a positive response, as a high positive response on SE8 as follows; 17.8 per cent on 'AGREE', 38.5 per cent on 'IMPROVE', 29.3 per cent on 'SATISFIED' and 8.0 per cent on 'EXTREMELY SATISFIED'. However, as the university's staff was recommended to be motivated and friendly to the clients, the results indicated a negative response as follows; 6.9 per cent rated on 'VERY LITTLE EFFORT' and 8.6 per cent on 'EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED'.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study attempted to explain the implementation of the service excellence performance at the non-academic units/departments of the Malaysian public universities. Certainly, the study was based on the internal client's experiences on the service excellence performance at the non-academic units/departments of the Malaysian public universities. Indeed, since academic and the non-academic matters in the higher education institutions are weighted equally to achieve the competitive advantage (Jain, et al., 2011; Davis, 1996), thus improving the academic activities, and ignoring the non-academic matters will affect the credibility of the higher education institutions.

Besides, this is an attempt to fill in the gap of lacking on the service excellence study in literature, since most previous studies related to service excellence had been undertaken in high profit-taking organisation (Sekhon et al., 2015; Dobni, 2002). In fact, the results of this study have provided an insight idea on a specific area and matter to be improved regarding the performance of the service excellence performance provided in the Malaysian public universities.

Furthermore, this study also provided the service excellence measurement scale in the public higher education institutions. Based on the above Table 3, the factor loading for all items were above 0.5 which indicated that the UniverSE scales for PUs Service Excellence Measurement employed under this study was reliable (Ramayah, Cheah, Chuah, Ting, & Memon, 2018).

In sum, the findings in this study indicated that the internal clients had acknowledged the existence of service excellence performance practices at the non-academic units/departments at the Malaysian public universities. However, the service excellence performance was not yet up to its task of delighting the client's experience, which is supposed to exceed the clients' expectations.

Suggestions for further studies. A part of the UniverSE Scales Measurement of Service Excellence in Higher Education presented by this study was tested using data from the internal clients of public universities in Malaysia. The aforementioned model could be tested on private higher education institutions or from other countries.

References

Agya Yalley, A., & Singh Sekhon, H. (2014). Service production process: implications for service productivity. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *63*(8), 1012–1030. http://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-10-2012-0113

Ahmad, A. R., Farley, A., & Kim Soon, N. (2014). Categorisation of public universities funding. *Asian Social Science*, *10*(10), 57–67. http://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n10p57

Ahmad, A. R., Ng, K., & Kek, S. Y. (2016). Performance Based Funding Mechanisms : The Applicability Study in the Context of Malaysian Public Universities, (February). http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3175.5600

Al-Eisawi, D. (2014). Modelling service excellence : the case of the UK banking sector, (September). Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/files/169/30617952.pdf

Ang, M. C. H., Ramayah, T., & Amin, H. (2015). Equality , Diversity and Inclusion : An International Journal Article information : *An International Journal*, *Vol. 34*(Iss 3), 186–200. http://doi.org/10.1108/GM-12-2013-0140

Aziz, Y. A., & Wahiddin, K. (2010). Conceptualising the Service Excellence and Its Antecedents : the Development of the. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, (November 2015), 1–14.

Azizan, N. I., Dimon, Z., Ismail, N., & Abu Bakar, S. (2015). Faktor-faktor yang mendorong pemilihan institusi pengajian tinggi di kalangan pelajar. *E-Proceeding of the 2nd International Conference on Arabic Studies and Islamic Civilization, 2015*(March), 9–10.

Bajunid, I. A. (2011). Leadership in the reform of Malaysian universities: Analysing the strategic role of the Malaysian Qualifications Agency. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *33*(3), 253–265. http://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2011.564999

Bartl, M. G. A. G. C. (2012). Service excellence models: a critical discussion and comparison. *Managing Service Quality*, *22*(5), 447–464. http://doi.org/10.1108/09604521211281378

Chuwiruch, N., Jhundar-Indra, P., & Boonlua, S. (2015). Marketing innovation strategy and marketing performance: a conceptual framework. *Proceedngs of the Academy of Marketing Studies*, *19*(2), 82–93.

Cina, C. (1990). Five Steps to Service Excellence. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *4*(6), 39–47. http://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000002510

Davis, A. (1996). Employee assistance provision in higher education. *Employee Counselling Today: The The Journal of Workplace Learning*, *8*(5), 4–12. http://doi.org/10.1108/13665629610127735

Decramer, A., Smolders, C., Vanderstraeten, A., Christiaens, J., & Desmidt, S. (2012). External pressures affecting the adoption of employee performance management in higher education institutions. *Personnel Review*, *41*(6), 686–704. http://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211263593

Dobni, B. (2002). A model for implementing service excellence in the financial services industry. *Financial Service S Marketing*, *7*(1), 42.

Gouthier, M. (2012). Service excellence models: a critical discussion and comparison. *Managing*

Service Quality, *22*(5), 447–464. http://doi.org/10.1108/09604521211281378

Jain, R., Sinha, G., & Sahney, S. (2011). Conceptualizing service quality in higher education. *Asian Journal on Quality*, *12*, 296–314. http://doi.org/10.1108/15982681111187128

Junarsin, E. (2010). Issues in the Innovation Service Product Process: A Managerial Perspective. *International Journal of Management*, *27*(3), 616–627. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=55094531&site=ehost-live

Ken Bates, Bates, H., & Robert Johnston. (2003). Linking service to profit: the business case for service excellence. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *14*(2), 173–183. http://doi.org/10.1108/09564230310474165 Hierarchical

Krejcie, R. V, & Morgan, D. (1970). ACTIVITIES, 607–610.

M., V. S. (2016). Constructs of quality in higher education services. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *Vol. 65*(Iss 8), 1091–1111.

Mills, J. H., Weatherbee, T. G., & Colwell, S. R. (2006). Making Sense of University and Business, 491–515.

Naidoo, V., & Wu, T. (2014). Innovations in marketing of higher education: Foreign market entry mode of not-for-profit universities. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *29*(6), 546–558. http://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-07-2013-0153

Pritchard, H. S. S. D. A.-E. S. K. R. A. (2013). International Journal of Bank Marketing Service excellence in UK retail banking: customers' perspectives of the important antecedents. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *Vol. 33*(Iss 7), 904-- 921. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0216

Reza, M. I. H. (2016). Sustainability in Higher Education. *SAGE Open*, *6*(3), 215824401666589. http://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016665890

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2013). Research methods for business. In *Research methods for business* (p. 436).

Sekhon, H. S., Al-Eisawi, D., Kumar, S., & Pritchard, R. A. (2015). Service excellence in UK retail banking: customers' perspectives of the important antecedents. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *Vol. 33*(Iss 7), 904–921. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0216

Shek, D. T. L., Chung, P. P. Y., & Leung, H. (2015). Manufacturing economy vs. service economy: Implications for service leadership. *International Journal on Disability and Human Development*, *14*(3), 205–215. http://doi.org/10.1515/ijdhd-2015-0402

Tee, K. F. (2016). Suitability of performance indicators and benchmarking practices in UK universities. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, *Vol. 23*(Iss 3), 584–600.

Umar, M. A., Kasim, R., & Martin, D. (2013). A Review of Service Excellence Models. *ICTMBE 2013 - 2nd International Confrence on Technology Management, Business and Entrepreneurship*, (December), 158–172.