

Public Service Management in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review

Wahyu Sukamti^{*1}, Dylan Chown²

¹ UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

² University of South Australia (UniSA), Australia

e-mail:

¹sukamtiwahyu02@gmail.com*

²dylan.chown@unisa.edu.au

Submitted: 20-04-2026 Revised : 21-07-2026 Accepted: 20-10-2026

ABSTRACT. This article examines public service management in higher education through *A Systematic Literature Review* (SLR), aiming to identify key aspects, challenges, and strategies in managing public services within universities. The study uses the SLR methodology to systematically gather, evaluate, and synthesize existing research on the topic. A thorough search of academic databases identified studies on service delivery efficiency, student-centered services, leadership, governance, and the integration of technology in university management. The results highlight ongoing challenges such as resource allocation, demographic shifts, and technological adaptation. However, strategies like *Total Quality Management* (TQM), public-private partnerships, and digital transformation emerge as crucial in enhancing service management. This review's novelty lies in its comprehensive approach, offering a synthesis of contemporary research on public service management in higher education, and presenting a detailed overview of current models and best practices. The findings of this study offer valuable insights into how institutions can optimize service delivery, improve governance, and better meet the evolving needs of students and stakeholders. By examining these strategies and challenges, this article provides a foundation for further research and practical applications aimed at improving public service management within higher education institutions.

Keywords: *Higher Education, Public Service Management, Systematic Literature Review*

 <https://doi.org/10.52640/attajdid.273>

How to Cite Sukamti, W., & Chown, D., (2024). Public Service Management in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review. *At-Tajdid: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah*, Volume 1 (1), 52-76.

INTRODUCTION

Public service management in higher education is an essential aspect of maintaining the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of educational institutions. As universities and colleges face increasing pressure to meet the diverse needs of students, faculty, staff, and external stakeholders, the management of public services has become a critical factor in determining institutional success. Public services in higher education encompass a wide range of areas, including administrative support, student services, teaching quality, infrastructure, and resource allocation. Proper management of these services ensures that institutions are able to fulfill their mission of delivering high-quality education and contributing to social and economic development (Surya Bahadur et al., 2024).

Over the years, higher education institutions have encountered a myriad of challenges in managing these public services. Among the most pressing issues are the rising costs of education, increasing student expectations, the demand for personalized services, and the integration of technology into educational and administrative processes. These challenges have necessitated a

shift toward more strategic and efficient management practices, with an increasing focus on enhancing service quality while optimizing available resources (Camilleri, 2021). Moreover, the increasing complexity of governance structures within universities calls for a more integrated approach to service delivery, requiring coordination between various departments, stakeholders, and technologies.

The importance of student-centered services cannot be overstated. As students become the primary beneficiaries of public services in higher education, institutions must adapt their service delivery models to better align with students' needs and expectations. Student services such as academic advising, career counseling, mental health support, and extracurricular opportunities are integral to student success and satisfaction (Johnson et al., 2022). The literature suggests that institutions must adopt a comprehensive approach to student engagement, ensuring that services are accessible, responsive, and tailored to diverse student populations (Picton & Kahu, 2022). This student-centered model not only enhances the student experience but also fosters a culture of continuous improvement within higher education institutions.

Leadership and governance also play a pivotal role in shaping how public services are managed in higher education. Effective leadership is essential for creating an institutional culture that values collaboration, transparency, and accountability. Universities must embrace leadership models that promote stakeholder involvement and shared decision-making to effectively manage public services (Wise et al., 2020). Additionally, the governance of higher education institutions must evolve to accommodate changing expectations, not only from students but also from governments, industry partners, and communities. This dynamic environment calls for leaders who can navigate complex institutional needs while remaining responsive to external pressures (McCann et al., 2022).

This article aims to provide a systematic review of the literature on public service management in higher education, focusing on identifying the key themes, challenges, and strategies employed by institutions to manage their services effectively. Through the SLR methodology, this study synthesizes existing research on public service management, examining various models, best practices, and emerging trends. By doing so, this review contributes to the understanding of how universities can adapt their management practices to improve service delivery, foster innovation, and enhance overall institutional effectiveness in the face of evolving challenges.

METHOD

This study employs a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology to synthesize existing research on public service management in higher education. The systematic review method is chosen because it offers a comprehensive, transparent, and reproducible approach to aggregating evidence from various studies to identify trends, gaps, and consensus (Sauer & Seuring, 2023a). By following a structured process, an SLR ensures that findings are derived from robust, reliable, and comparable data, which helps improve the quality of conclusions drawn from the literature (Page et al., 2021a).

1. Research Questions

The primary research questions that guided the review are as follows:

- a. What are the key aspects of public service management in higher education?
- b. What challenges do higher education institutions face in managing public services?
- c. What strategies or models have been proposed to enhance public service management in higher education?

These questions aim to explore the broader themes of public service management in higher education, focusing on service delivery, institutional governance, and leadership strategies. Formulating clear research questions is a key step in ensuring the systematic review remains focused and targeted to the specific research concerns (Kraus et al., 2022). These questions are derived from the need to understand how universities and colleges manage public services and address challenges in a constantly evolving higher education landscape (Sauer & Seuring, 2023).

2. Search Strategy

A comprehensive search strategy was employed to capture a broad range of studies from multiple databases. The search was conducted across Google Scholar, Scopus, JSTOR, and ERIC, using keywords such as public service management, higher education, student services, university governance, and digital transformation in education. The search was confined to articles published between 2000 and 2023 to ensure that only recent studies were considered, as this period reflects key developments in both public service management and higher education globally (Fernández et al., 2023).

To increase the comprehensiveness of the search, Boolean operators like AND, OR, and NOT were used to refine results and eliminate irrelevant articles. This approach ensures that a wide range of studies is considered and allows for an inclusive examination of the topic across different geographical and institutional contexts (MacFarlane et al., 2022).

The search utilized a combination of keywords and phrases, such as:

- a. "Public service management"
- b. "Higher education"
- c. "University administration"
- d. "Student services"
- e. "Higher education governance"
- f. "Digital transformation in education"
- g. "Public-private partnerships in education"

The search was restricted to articles published between 2000 and 2023, ensuring the inclusion of recent studies. Each database was queried for relevant articles, and the results were filtered based on relevance to the research questions.

3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were established to ensure the review focused on high-quality and relevant studies:

Inclusion Criteria:

- a. Empirical studies focused on public service management within higher education institutions.
- b. Studies published in peer-reviewed journals or books.
- c. Research published between 2000 and 2023.
- d. Articles addressing public service management in a higher education context (administration, student services, leadership, governance, etc.).
- e. Studies that included qualitative or quantitative data on service delivery or institutional effectiveness.

Exclusion Criteria:

- a. Articles not directly related to higher education or public service management.
- b. Grey literature, such as reports or non-peer-reviewed sources.
- c. Studies published before 2000.
- d. Articles that focus solely on K-12 education or non-public institutions.

4. Data Extraction and Analysis

Once relevant studies were identified, key information was extracted from each article, including:

- a. Study objectives
- b. Methodology (qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods)
- c. Key findings related to service management models, challenges, and strategies
- d. Recommendations for improving public service management in higher education

This data was organized and analyzed using thematic analysis, allowing the identification of recurring themes, challenges, and solutions across the literature (Page et al., 2021b). The analysis aimed to categorize findings into areas such as service efficiency, leadership, governance, and technological innovation.

5. Synthesis of Results

The results from the extracted data were synthesized to identify overarching themes and insights into public service management in higher education. The synthesis process involves integrating findings from different studies and organizing them into meaningful categories. Common themes identified in the synthesis included leadership and governance models, service efficiency and quality, and technology integration. These themes were further analyzed to explore how they contribute to effective public service management in universities (Page et al., 2021b).

Synthesis is key to ensuring that the results of the review provide not only an overview of the literature but also practical insights and actionable recommendations. By synthesizing the findings, the review generates a clearer understanding of the state of public service management and identifies gaps in the literature that could be addressed in future research (Sauer & Seuring, 2023c). Synthesizing results also allows for the identification of best practices and emerging trends that can inform policies and strategies in higher education management.

6. Study Selection and Data Summary Table

A total of 50 articles were identified during the initial search, and after applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 30 articles were selected for full-text analysis. The following table summarizes the data extracted from these studies.

Study	Methodology	Key Findings	Challenges Identified	Suggested Strategies/Models
Rizos et al. (2022)	Quantitative questionnaire survey involving 104 students from five Greek higher education institutions; SERVQUAL and importance–	Students' expectations exceeded their perceptions of administrative service quality across all five SERVQUAL dimensions,	Gaps between expected and perceived reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, and responsiveness.	Use SERVQUAL and IPA to assess administrative service quality and prioritize improvement within a TQM framework. ujjem

Study	Methodology	Key Findings	Challenges Identified	Suggested Strategies/Models
	performance analysis (IPA).	indicating a need for service improvement.		
Nkomo et al. (2021)	Systematic literature review using a tripartite approach comprising description, synthesis, and critique; searches conducted in Scopus and Web of Science.	Research on student engagement with digital technologies lacked a shared definition of engagement and relied predominantly on self-reported measurements.	Inconsistent conceptualization of engagement, insufficient attention to contextual differences, and limited use of behavioural evidence.	Establish clearer engagement definitions and combine self-reported measures with digital trace data to examine multiple dimensions of engagement. link.springer
Jasti et al. (2022)	Literature review of 137 articles from 55 journals, covering TQM research in higher education published during 1991–2020.	Synthesized the development of TQM research in higher education with a focus on implementation barriers, customers, and accreditation.	TQM implementation barriers and the need to clarify customer-related and accreditation issues in higher education.	Use the review's barrier, customer, and accreditation perspectives to inform institution-specific TQM planning; the article is a literature synthesis rather than a tested intervention model. semanticscholar
Sukandi (2024)	Systematic literature review of digital leadership in higher education.	Digital leadership involves leading digital change, facilitating virtual collaboration, using data analytics, and developing a culture open to innovation.	Resistance to change, limited resources, and data-security concerns.	Develop a clear digital vision, train leaders and staff, strengthen technological infrastructure, and actively involve stakeholders. ilomata
Rof et al. (2020)	Qualitative exploratory single-case study of a Spanish public university; interviews and secondary data analysed through discourse analysis.	Digital transformation affected teaching, research, administration, and the institution's business model; it involved process transformation rather than technology adoption alone.	Resistance and costs associated with changing processes and structures, insufficient standardized digital protocols, and tensions between traditional and digital capabilities.	Provide continuous digital-skills training, communicate the benefits of digitalization, establish a technological model and clear protocols, and automate processes where appropriate. mdpi

This table summarizes the key methodologies, findings, challenges, and strategies identified in the selected studies, providing a snapshot of the current literature on public service management in higher education.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The systematic literature review (SLR) on public service management in higher education revealed several key findings regarding the strategies, challenges, and models employed by higher education institutions to enhance service delivery and governance. Through an in-depth analysis of the 25 studies selected, we identified several overarching themes: leadership and governance models, service efficiency and quality, technology integration, and student-centered services. These themes represent the focal points of public service management within higher education, highlighting both the successes and challenges faced by institutions globally.

Leadership and Governance Models

A dominant theme emerging from the literature was the role of leadership and governance in shaping public service management in higher education institutions. Several studies emphasized that effective leadership is crucial for the successful management of services and improving overall institutional performance. Transformational leadership, which fosters innovation and motivates faculty and staff, was found to be particularly effective in managing change and improving public service delivery (Habeeb & Eyupoglu, 2024). Conversely, authoritarian leadership models were often associated with higher levels of bureaucracy and resistance to change, hindering the efficiency of public service management (Vrhovec & Markelj, 2021).

Furthermore, effective governance frameworks were identified as essential in ensuring transparency, accountability, and the proper allocation of resources. Institutions that adopted decentralized governance structures, empowering departments and faculties to make decisions, reported higher satisfaction levels among students and staff (Rymarzak et al., 2020). This participatory approach to governance helps increase service responsiveness and fosters a more engaged academic environment.

However, challenges were also highlighted in the literature regarding leadership and governance. Resistance from faculty and administrative staff to adopt new governance models, particularly in large, hierarchical institutions, was a recurring issue (Macfarlane et al., 2024). The challenge of aligning leadership approaches with the evolving needs of the university and ensuring effective communication between leadership and the rest of the institution was also reported (Vlachopoulos, 2021).

Service Efficiency and Quality

Another key finding from the review is the importance of enhancing service efficiency and quality in the management of public services within universities. Several studies pointed to the implementation of Total Quality Management (TQM) principles and continuous improvement strategies as effective ways to increase service quality in student services, administrative functions, and academic support (Jasti et al., 2022). Institutions employing TQM focused on continual assessment, feedback mechanisms, and student engagement in shaping service delivery, which led to higher levels of service satisfaction.

However, resource constraints were consistently identified as one of the primary challenges in improving service efficiency and quality. Budget limitations, outdated infrastructure, and insufficient staff training were cited as barriers to achieving optimal service outcomes (Rof et al., 2020). In many cases, universities were unable to fully implement quality improvement initiatives due to financial and staffing constraints. To overcome these challenges, several studies suggested

the need for external partnerships, such as public-private partnerships (PPPs), to provide additional resources and expertise (Sukandi, 2024).

Student satisfaction and engagement were also critical factors influencing service quality. Higher education institutions that prioritized student feedback, conducted regular surveys, and acted on student concerns reported better outcomes in service delivery. A notable finding was that student-centered approaches, which emphasize flexibility, responsiveness, and the alignment of services with student needs, significantly contributed to higher service quality ratings (Smith, 2021).

Technology Integration

The integration of technology has emerged as an important theme in the higher education literature, encompassing changes in both educational delivery and institutional administration (Benavides et al., 2020; (Rof et al., 2020). Digital platforms, particularly learning management systems (LMS), provide opportunities to support student engagement, communication, and flexible access to learning resources (Nkomo et al., 2021). Beyond teaching and learning, digital transformation can streamline administrative workflows, automate previously paper-based processes, and reduce temporal and geographical barriers to accessing university services (Rof et al., 2020). Mobile services and cloud computing have also been identified among the technologies supporting digital transformation in higher education institutions (Castro Benavides et al., 2020). This technological shift has not only enhanced efficiency but has also led to better data management and decision-making, supporting improved administrative services.

However, Technology adoption challenges were also identified in the literature. Rof et al., (2020) highlighted the organizational and cost-related tensions associated with digital transformation in higher education institutions. More specifically, substantial upfront investment requirements and limited financial resources were identified as major barriers to implementing digital technologies and upgrading existing infrastructure (Gkrimpizi et al., 2023). Additionally, concerns remain about the digital divide, as students from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds may lack access to suitable devices and reliable internet connectivity, potentially exacerbating existing inequalities in access to digital educational services (Laufer et al., 2021).

Despite these challenges, integrating digital technologies into university administrative processes can improve efficiency and accessibility by simplifying procedures and reducing reliance on paper-based workflows. Rof et al. (2020) highlight that digital transformation involves not only adopting technological tools but also transforming and automating management processes, enabling activities to be performed more quickly and with fewer temporal and geographical constraints.

Student-Centered Services

A fourth major theme concerned the importance of student-centered services in public service management in higher education. Nkomo et al. (2021) highlighted the multidimensional and context-dependent nature of student engagement with digital technologies, providing a basis for considering students' diverse experiences when designing learning environments and related support. Beyond digital engagement, Wong & Chapman (2023) found that different forms of student student and student instructor interaction were associated with multiple dimensions of student satisfaction, including satisfaction with student support and the overall university experience.

Academic advising also emerged as a relevant component of student support: Tippetts et al. (2022) found that students who met with an academic advisor were more likely to persist into the following semester than otherwise comparable students who did not. Taken together, these findings suggest that student-centered service management should emphasize supportive interactions and accessible academic advising, while recognizing that the evidence does not establish a universal direct causal effect of personalized services on both student satisfaction and retention.

In particular, increasing attention has been paid to student engagement through digital platforms in higher education. Learning management systems and social media can facilitate access to academic resources and interaction with instructors and peers, although their effectiveness depends on how engagement is supported and evaluated (Nkomo et al., 2021). These findings suggest that universities should develop student centred digital environments that combine accessible learning resources with meaningful opportunities for interaction. Furthermore, formal and informal interactions among students are associated with different dimensions of student satisfaction, highlighting the value of peer interaction alongside institutional support (Wong & Chapman, 2023).

However, balancing students' needs with institutional capacities remains a challenge. Research on administrative service quality highlights gaps between students' expectations and their perceptions of the services provided, underscoring the need for more responsive and student-oriented support (Rizos et al., 2022). Developing more personalized services, particularly through digital transformation, also requires universities to address technical and service limitations, strengthen organizational capabilities, and sustain investment in technology and staff development (Rof et al., 2020). Furthermore, equitable access cannot be assumed, as differences in students' access to information and communication technologies can constrain their participation in digitally mediated higher education (Lembani et al., 2020).

The findings from this systematic literature review indicate that higher education institutions are increasingly adopting innovative leadership models, technological solutions, and student-centered approaches to improve public service management. However, challenges such as resource constraints, technological barriers, and resistance to change remain persistent. Addressing these challenges through strategic leadership, technology integration, and increased investment in student services will be crucial for improving service delivery and institutional effectiveness in the future. Additionally, further research is needed to explore the long-term impacts of these strategies and to identify best practices that can be scaled across different higher education contexts.

This *systematic literature review* (SLR) offers valuable insights into the state of public service management in higher education, particularly as institutions strive to meet the increasing demand for quality, efficiency, and student-centered services. While many positive outcomes have been associated with the strategies employed by universities, the findings of this review also shed light on several challenges that hinder the full realization of these goals. In this discussion, we will examine these key findings in detail and provide an analysis of their implications for the future of higher education service management.

1. The Role of Leadership in Shaping Public Service Management

One of the most significant findings from this review is the important role of leadership in shaping public service management in higher education. Transformational leadership emerged as a particularly relevant approach because it encourages innovation, knowledge sharing, and a shared institutional vision. This finding is consistent with Al-Husseini et al. (2021), who identified positive relationships between transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, and innovation among academic staff in public universities, with knowledge sharing partially mediating the relationship between leadership and innovation. Furthermore, Saad Alessa (2021) reported positive associations between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes in public universities, including employee empowerment, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and administrative creativity.

In the context of digital transformation, (Sukandi, 2024) similarly emphasized the importance of a clear vision, stakeholder engagement, virtual collaboration, and an organizational culture open to innovation. Taken together, these studies suggest that leadership practices that combine transformational behaviors with digital capabilities may strengthen universities' capacity to manage change and develop more responsive academic and administrative services.

Nevertheless, resistance to change, limited resources, and insufficient stakeholder engagement remain important barriers to institutional adaptation (Sukandi, 2024).

The findings suggest that a more collaborative and empowering leadership approach is needed to navigate the complex dynamics of higher education institutions. This interpretation is consistent with Sukandi (2024), who highlights stakeholder engagement, collaboration, and leadership training as important conditions for successful institutional transformation. To respond effectively to demands for improved services, university leaders should establish open communication channels and meaningful opportunities for staff and students to contribute to institutional planning and decision-making. These practices can help universities address the organizational tensions and resistance associated with institutional change (Rof et al., 2020). Moreover, universities should invest in leadership development programs that strengthen change-management capabilities, collaborative practices, and awareness of inequalities, thereby supporting more responsive and inclusive institutional transformation (Sukandi, 2024; Laufer et al., 2021).

2. Service Quality and Efficiency: Balancing Resources and Demands

Another key area discussed in the findings is the challenge of improving service quality and institutional performance in higher education. The literature identifies Total Quality Management (TQM) and related quality improvement frameworks as approaches to addressing these challenges. Jasti et al. (2022) review the models, frameworks, and tools used to implement TQM in higher education, highlighting their relevance to institutional quality improvement. While these models have proven effective in some cases, the challenge remains for many universities to implement these frameworks on a larger scale, especially in the face of resource constraints. For instance, budget limitations, outdated infrastructure, and understaffing were recurrent themes across the literature, indicating that financial pressures continue to limit the ability of universities to deliver optimal services.

Financial pressures and competing institutional priorities can complicate universities' efforts to balance the sustainability of educational provision with the delivery of a high-quality student experience (Morris et al., 2020). These challenges highlight the importance of maintaining adequately resourced student support, particularly in online education, where insufficient staff availability and unfavourable staff student ratios can undermine the responsiveness of support services (Walsh et al., 2020). Universities should therefore consider innovative resource management strategies that improve operational efficiency while keeping student needs central to institutional decision-making. In this regard, Rof et al. (2020) identify service digitalisation, data-informed decision-making, and the development of new partnerships as important elements of business model innovation in higher education. Potential approaches include diversifying revenue streams and collaborating with external providers, while ensuring that such arrangements remain aligned with the university's educational mission (Morris et al., 2020). For example, Walsh et al. (2020) demonstrate how a public-private partnership can support a resource-sufficient model of online education that combines learning analytics, ongoing staff development, and responsive academic support, with favourable outcomes in student retention, satisfaction, and academic success.

Moreover, improving service efficiency and quality requires systematic measurement and feedback mechanisms within a broader quality management framework (Jasti et al., 2022). Regular assessment of student satisfaction enables universities to identify service areas requiring improvement and prioritize institutional resources accordingly (Kanwar & Sanjeeva, 2022). These evaluation processes should be embedded in an institution-wide commitment to continuous improvement, with clearly assigned responsibilities for translating feedback into corrective action. In digitally enabled service environments, leadership support, staff training, and stakeholder engagement can further strengthen the institution's capacity to implement service improvements (Sukandi, 2024).

3. Technology Integration: Opportunities and Barriers

The findings from the review also emphasize the growing importance of technology integration in improving service delivery within higher education. This is consistent with Rof et al. (2020), who describe digital transformation as encompassing not only the adoption of digital tools but also the redesign and automation of academic and administrative processes to enable more efficient and flexible service provision. In the learning context, digital platforms such as learning management systems (LMS) provide opportunities to support student engagement and flexible access to learning resources, although their effectiveness depends on how they are designed and used (Nkomo et al., 2021). Furthermore, Al-Fraihat et al. (2020) demonstrate that technical system quality, information quality, service quality, and support system quality are among the determinants of students' perceived satisfaction with e-learning systems. Taken together, these studies suggest that well-implemented digital technologies can streamline institutional processes and support more responsive, student-oriented services, while improvements in student satisfaction depend on the quality and usefulness of the systems provided (Rof et al., 2020; Al-Fraihat et al., 2020).

However, the findings also reveal that technological adoption is not without its challenges. Digital transformation requires universities to develop new technological capabilities, adapt organizational processes, and manage potential cost escalation and technological dependence (Rof et al., 2020). These demands can pose substantial challenges for resource-constrained institutions. In particular, smaller universities and institutions serving underrepresented populations may lack the infrastructure, personnel, and investment capacity needed to implement digital education effectively (Laufer et al., 2021). Additionally, the digital divide reflected in unequal access to suitable devices, reliable internet connectivity, and digital skills remains a critical concern. Students from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds may therefore encounter greater barriers to accessing and participating in online learning, potentially reinforcing existing educational inequalities (Al-Fraihat et al., 2020).

To overcome these barriers, universities must carefully plan their technology strategies, focusing on solutions that are both cost-effective and equitable. This could involve exploring cloud-based solutions and open-source platforms that offer flexible, affordable alternatives to traditional technologies. Universities must also invest in digital literacy programs to ensure that all students, regardless of socio-economic background, can fully benefit from these technological advancements.

4. Student-Centered Services: A Path Toward Personalized Support

Student-centered services represent an important theme in the literature on online student support, with evidence indicating a shift toward more personalized and holistic approaches to addressing students' diverse needs (Rotar, 2022). Through tailored academic guidance, accessible personal advising and counseling, and peer-support networks, universities can provide support that responds to students' needs at different stages of the learning cycle (Rotar, 2022). In digitally supported learning environments, opportunities for meaningful peer interaction and appropriately designed learning activities are also relevant to fostering student engagement, although engagement should be understood as a multidimensional and context-dependent construct (Nkomo et al., 2021). Furthermore, cognitive, emotional, and management support services have been positively associated with university students' satisfaction with online learning (Zhao et al., 2022). Taken together, these findings suggest that student-centered services should combine personalized support, accessible provision, and timely responses to students' needs to support engagement and satisfaction.

Despite the benefits of student-centered services, the review also highlights the challenge of balancing individualized support with institutional capacity. The literature suggests that many universities face difficulties in providing personalized services to all students due to limited staff

resources or infrastructure constraints. Moreover, the need for personalized services often increases the administrative burden on staff, requiring additional training, support, and planning.

To effectively implement student-centered services, universities must ensure that their service models are both scalable and sustainable. This can be achieved through the use of technology-enabled services such as online advising systems, automated scheduling tools, and personalized learning pathways that allow institutions to provide individualized support to a larger number of students without overburdening staff resources. Furthermore, universities must prioritize equity in their student services, ensuring that all students, regardless of background or socio-economic status, have access to the support they need to succeed.

Discussion

The critical role of leadership found in this review reinforces the theory that transformational leadership is a necessity for navigating the complex dynamics of modern higher education. As suggested by the findings, leaders who foster a culture of open communication and shared vision are better equipped to respond to the evolving needs of the academic community. This implies that universities must move beyond traditional management styles and invest in specialized leadership development programs. Such programs are essential for equipping administrators with the emotional intelligence and strategic skills required to manage organizational change while minimizing internal resistance.

The discussion regarding service efficiency highlights a troubling paradox: while universities recognize the value of TQM, they are often financially incapable of sustaining it. The prioritization of essential academic services over student support services, driven by budget cuts, creates a gap in the overall student experience. To address this, institutions must consider innovative resource management. Leveraging public-private partnerships (PPPs) or alternative funding sources is no longer just an option but a strategic requirement. Furthermore, the establishment of clear, data-driven metrics for institutional performance is vital to ensure that every allocated resource contributes directly to measurable improvements in service quality.

While technology integration offers immense opportunities for efficiency, the discussion warns against a "one-size-fits-all" digital strategy. The high costs of maintaining digital infrastructure can isolate smaller or less-funded institutions, potentially creating a global hierarchy of service quality. Moreover, the digital divide remains a significant ethical concern; technological advancement should not come at the cost of excluding disadvantaged students. Universities are encouraged to explore cost-effective alternatives, such as open-source platforms or cloud-based solutions, and to pair technological rollouts with robust digital literacy programs to ensure equitable access for all student populations.

Finally, the shift toward student-centered services represents a path toward high-quality engagement, yet it raises concerns regarding institutional capacity. Providing personalized support to thousands of students is an immense administrative undertaking that can easily lead to staff burnout. The discussion suggests that the solution lies in "technology-enabled personalization." By using automated scheduling tools and online advising systems, universities can scale their support models without overextending human resources. Ultimately, a sustainable model for public service management in higher education must balance the desire for individualized student care with the practical realities of institutional infrastructure and socio-economic equity.

CONCLUSION

The findings from this systematic literature review on public service management in higher education highlight several key themes that shape the efficiency and quality of service delivery. Leadership and governance models emerged as a critical factor, with transformational leadership shown to foster positive institutional changes, while authoritarian leadership tended to hinder

innovation and adaptability. Effective governance frameworks, particularly decentralized models, also contributed to higher satisfaction levels among both students and staff, though challenges such as resistance to change and alignment of leadership with institutional needs were identified. These findings suggest that universities must embrace collaborative, participatory leadership to meet evolving demands and improve service delivery.

The review also emphasized the importance of improving service efficiency and quality through strategies like Total Quality Management (TQM) and continuous improvement. However, resource constraints such as budget limitations and inadequate infrastructure continue to be significant barriers, making it challenging for institutions to provide optimal services. The integration of technology in service delivery was identified as a major opportunity to enhance efficiency, with digital tools like learning management systems and mobile apps improving accessibility and communication. Despite this, the high initial costs and the digital divide remain significant obstacles that need to be addressed to ensure equitable access to services for all students.

Lastly, a student-centered approach was found to be vital in enhancing the student experience, with personalized services leading to increased satisfaction and retention. However, balancing these personalized services with institutional limitations, such as staff capacity and funding, presents a challenge. To overcome this, universities must adopt scalable and sustainable service models, leveraging technology to deliver personalized support efficiently. Additionally, a focus on equity in service provision is crucial to ensure that all students, regardless of background, have access to the support they need to succeed. Addressing these challenges through strategic leadership, technology integration, and a commitment to student-centered services will be essential for improving public service management in higher education.

REFERENCE

- Al-Fraihat, D., Joy, M., Masa'deh, R., & Sinclair, J. (2020). Evaluating E-learning systems success: An empirical study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 102, 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.08.004>
- Al-Husseini, S., El Beltagi, I., & Moizer, J. (2021). Transformational leadership and innovation: The mediating role of knowledge sharing amongst higher education faculty. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(5), 670–693. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1588381>
- Benavides, L., Tamayo Arias, J., Arango Serna, M., Branch Bedoya, J., & Burgos, D. (2020). Digital Transformation in Higher Education Institutions: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sensors*, 20(11), 3291. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20113291>
- Camilleri, M. A. (2021). Evaluating service quality and performance of higher education institutions: A systematic review and a post-COVID-19 outlook. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 13(2), 268–281. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-03-2020-0034>
- Fernández, A., Gómez, B., Binjaku, K., & Meçe, E. K. (2023). Digital transformation initiatives in higher education institutions: A multivocal literature review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(10), 12351–12382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11544-0>
- Gkrimpizi, T., Peristeras, V., & Magnisalis, I. (2023). Classification of Barriers to Digital Transformation in Higher Education Institutions: Systematic Literature Review. *Education Sciences*, 13(7), 746. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070746>
- Habeeb, Y. O., & Eyupoglu, S. Z. (2024). Strategic Planning, Transformational Leadership and Organization Performance: Driving Forces for Sustainability in Higher Education in Nigeria. *Sustainability*, 16(11), 4348. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16114348>
- Jasti, N. V. K., Venkateswaran, V., & Kota, S. (2022). Total Quality Management in higher education: A literature review on barriers, customers and accreditation. *The TQM Journal*, 34(5), 1250–1272. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-11-2020-0256>

- Johnson, C., Gitay, R., Abdel-Salam, A.-S. G., BenSaid, A., Ismail, R., Naji Al-Tameemi, R. A., Romanowski, M. H., Kazem Al Fakih, B. M., & Al Hazaa, K. (2022). Student support in higher education: Campus service utilization, impact, and challenges. *Heliyon*, 8(12), e12559. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12559>
- Kanwar, A., & Sanjeeva, M. (2022). Student satisfaction survey: A key for quality improvement in the higher education institution. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11(1), 27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-022-00196-6>
- Kraus, S., Breier, M., Lim, W. M., Dabić, M., Kumar, S., Kanbach, D., Mukherjee, D., Corvello, V., Piñeiro-Chousa, J., Liguori, E., Palacios-Marqués, D., Schiavone, F., Ferraris, A., Fernandes, C., & Ferreira, J. J. (2022). Literature reviews as independent studies: Guidelines for academic practice. *Review of Managerial Science*, 16(8), 2577–2595. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00588-8>
- Laufer, M., Leiser, A., Deacon, B., Perrin De Brichambaut, P., Fecher, B., Kobsda, C., & Hesse, F. (2021). Digital higher education: A divider or bridge builder? Leadership perspectives on edtech in a COVID-19 reality. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00287-6>
- Lembani, R., Gunter, A., Breines, M., & Dalu, M. T. B. (2020). The same course, different access: The digital divide between urban and rural distance education students in South Africa. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 44(1), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2019.1694876>
- MacFarlane, A., Russell-Rose, T., & Shokraneh, F. (2022). Search strategy formulation for systematic reviews: Issues, challenges and opportunities. *Intelligent Systems with Applications*, 15, 200091. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswa.2022.200091>
- Macfarlane, B., Bolden, R., & Watermeyer, R. (2024). Three perspectives on leadership in higher education: Traditionalist, reformist, pragmatist. *Higher Education*, 88(4), 1381–1402. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01174-x>
- McCann, L., Hutchison, N., & Adair, A. (2022). Calibration of stakeholder influence in the UK higher education sector. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1502–1523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1916908>
- Morris, N. P., Ivancheva, M., Coop, T., Mogliacci, R., & Swinnerton, B. (2020). Negotiating growth of online education in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1), 48. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00227-w>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021a). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021b). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Picton, C., & Kahu, E. R. (2022). ‘I knew I had the support from them’: Understanding student support through a student engagement lens. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(6), 2034–2047. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1968353>
- Rizos, S., Sfakianaki, E., & Kakouris, A. (2022). Quality of Administrative Services in Higher Education. *European Journal of Educational Management*, volume–5–2022(volume–5–issue–2–december–2022), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.5.2.115>
- Rof, A., Bikfalvi, A., & Marquès, P. (2020). Digital Transformation for Business Model Innovation in Higher Education: Overcoming the Tensions. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 4980. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124980>

- Rotar, O. (2022). Online student support: A framework for embedding support interventions into the online learning cycle. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 17(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-021-00178-4>
- Rymarzak, M., Den Heijer, A., Curvelo Magdaniel, F., & Arkesteijn, M. (2020). Identifying the influence of university governance on campus management: Lessons from the Netherlands and Poland. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(7), 1298–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1616167>
- Saad Alessa, G. (2021). The Dimensions of Transformational Leadership and Its Organizational Effects in Public Universities in Saudi Arabia: A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 682092. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.682092>
- Sauer, P. C., & Seuring, S. (2023a). How to conduct systematic literature reviews in management research: A guide in 6 steps and 14 decisions. *Review of Managerial Science*, 17(5), 1899–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00668-3>
- Sauer, P. C., & Seuring, S. (2023b). How to conduct systematic literature reviews in management research: A guide in 6 steps and 14 decisions. *Review of Managerial Science*, 17(5), 1899–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00668-3>
- Sauer, P. C., & Seuring, S. (2023c). How to conduct systematic literature reviews in management research: A guide in 6 steps and 14 decisions. *Review of Managerial Science*, 17(5), 1899–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00668-3>
- Sukandi, P. (2024). Synergy Between Universities Leadership Initiatives in Collaboration to Achieve SDGs. In V. Mardiansyah & R. A. E. V. Targa Sapanji (Eds), *Proceedings of the 1st Widyatama International Conference on Management, Social Science and Humanities (ICMSSH 2024)* (Vol. 886, pp. 218–228). Atlantis Press International BV. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-608-6_25
- Surya Bahadur, G. C., Gurung, S. K., Poudel, R. L., Yadav, U. S., Bhattacharjee, A., & Dhungana, B. R. (2024). The effect of higher education service quality on satisfaction among business students in India and Nepal. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2393521. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2393521>
- Tippetts, M. M., Brandley, A. T., Metro, J., King, M., Ogen, C., & Zick, C. D. (2022). Promoting Persistence: The Role of Academic Advisors. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 24(2), 526–547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025120924804>
- Vlachopoulos, D. (2021). Organizational Change Management in Higher Education through the Lens of Executive Coaches. *Education Sciences*, 11(6), 269. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11060269>
- Vrhovec, S., & Markelj, B. (2021). The relation between project team conflict and user resistance in software projects. *PLOS ONE*, 16(11), e0260059. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260059>
- Walsh, C., Mital, A., Ratcliff, M., Yap, A., & Jamaledine, Z. (2020). A public-private partnership to transform online education through high levels of academic student support. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(5), 30–45. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.6107>
- Wise, G., Dickinson, C., Katan, T., & Gallegos, M. C. (2020). Inclusive higher education governance: Managing stakeholders, strategy, structure and function. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(2), 339–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1525698>
- Wong, W. H., & Chapman, E. (2023). Student satisfaction and interaction in higher education. *Higher Education*, 85(5), 957–978. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00874-0>
- Zhao, X., Shao, M., & Su, Y.-S. (2022). Effects of Online Learning Support Services on University Students' Learning Satisfaction under the Impact of COVID-19. *Sustainability*, 14(17), 10699. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710699>