DETERMINE GOOD UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE IN SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE COMPETITION AT STATE UNIVERSITIES IN SURABAYA

Famia Septa Dinda Alfia[1], Indrawati Yuhertiana[2], Rida Perwita Sari[3]
[1,2,3] Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jawa Timur, Indonesia
Email: famiasepta07@gmail.com, yuhertiana@upnjatim.ac.id

ABSTRACT
This research aims to test the influence of Reputation, Legitimacy, Transparency on Good University Governance. In this research, reputation is proxied by performance, innovation, social responsibility, service, governance and workplace climate. Legitimacy is proxied by pragmatic legitimacy, moral legitimacy and cognitive legitimacy. Transparency is proxied by openness, clarity, open access and availability. Good University Governance proxied by independence, accountability, responsibility and fairness. The research method used in this research is a quantitative approach. The data used in this research came from the results of a questionnaire from undergraduate accounting students at state universities in Surabaya. This research uses the SmartPLS statistical test tool.The results of this research influence the variables reputation, legitimacy and transparency Good University Governance. The reputation variable influences good university governance at state universities in Surabaya. Legitimacy influences good university governanace at state universities in Surabaya. Transparency influences good university governance at state universities in Surabaya.

KEYWORDS	*Reputation, Legitimacy, Transparency, Good University Governance*

INTRODUCTION

Good and professional management is needed to strengthen and improve the performance of higher education (Khan, 2022). A phenomenon characterized by the development of the use of information, communication and technology in all aspects of human life. This era's developments are both opportunities and challenges for educational institutions. Good information flow through technological means can advance higher education institutions (Mills & Robinson, 2022). Universities have an important role in the development sector and in efforts to improve the economy in a nation, but on the other hand, economic conditions will influence the development of the world of higher education in that country (Miotto et al., 2020). The development of a nation cannot be separated from the role

of resources, especially human resources (HR) in that country, therefore the role in managing higher education will have an impact on the formation of qualified human resources that have high competitiveness (Romanowski, 2022).

The existence of higher education institutions is achieved by gaining trust from prospective new students which increases every year (Archer, 2023). Improving higher education performance is able to make stakeholders the main goal in service to refer to the satisfaction of new students with the hope that later if satisfaction is obtained then socialization and promotion will run naturally and be informed to relatives and other colleagues (Melin et al., 2020) The description of the quality of higher education can be seen from the accreditation of the higher education institution. Accreditation helps identify a college's strengths and weaknesses, as well as providing guidance for continuous improvement. Higher education accreditation is not only for assessing compliance with standards (compliance) universities but also to assess performance (performance) higher education (BAN-PT, 2021). Good university governance has become a concept that emerged because of the awareness that the administration of higher education and higher education institutions cannot be equated with the administration of a state or corporation, what makes the difference is the noble values of education that must be maintained in its implementation (Romanowski, 2022).

The importance of achieving and maintaining a good reputation is still unclear in its management, and this is still a challenge for universities in implementing Good university governance so that the university's reputation has a good reputation and is maintained (Edokpolor & Imafidon, 2019). Role Good university governance In higher education institutions with good and organized management, it will also create a good reputation for the higher education institution (Collet-Sabé & Adrián, 2023). The importance of sustainable strategies to maintain the reputation of universities by implementing Good university governance so that universities are able to compete with other universities while relying on a good reputation. The success of an educational institution can be supported by legitimacy which helps build reputation and increase public trust (Dessy et al., 2021). Legitimacy has a strong influence, a complementary and reciprocal relationship in organizational management. Universities need to develop sustainable competitive advantages. The main factors that help maintain this sustainable competitive advantage are reputation and legitimacy. A positive reputation and legitimacy can increase competitive advantages in higher education. Universities that lack or do not have competitive advantages will experience difficulties in maintaining their presence in the education industry, especially because the number of universities is increasing from year to year, resulting in an increasingly tight and complex level of competition, and also because society is increasingly selective. higher education users in choosing a university to enter (Cahyana et al., 2023).

To compete competitively, universities must be able to follow implementation Good university governance with mature management and structure to be able to compete with other high school universities (Carson, 2020). This research focuses on students because State Universities in Surabaya determine which campus to study at. This research focuses on State University students in Surabaya because students look at the reputation of the campus they

have chosen by looking at the reputation of the campus. A good reputation means the campus can attract more prospective students. The increasingly fierce competition in universities requires improving quality to compete for students' trust. Students pay for UKT with the hope that they will be provided with complete facilities for students, but sometimes there are still several deficiencies that must continue to be corrected, such as the condition of toilet water which often turns off and closes, Wi-Fi which is not accessible to all classes, lack of facilities for printing course assignments, lecturers who only tell them to make a summary without explaining and there is no career center service. Students can assess some of the shortcomings above for the campus they choose by looking at whether good university governanace has been implemented well or vice versa. Students also need transparency provided by the campus, such as KIP acceptance for underprivileged students and other scholarship budgets which should be submitted by the campus. So with this, students can assess whether the campus is implementing it good university governance.

According to data from the East Java Province Central Statistics Agency, it is clear that in 2021 there will be 24,160 PTN students in Surabaya and in 2022 there will be 28,638 and in 2023 there will be 38,265. This shows that interest in PTN in Surabaya has increased every year. Good university governance This is very important when students enter society or enter the world of work. Applying the values of integrity, understanding the rules, following the rules, students will be accepted in the work environment. The East Java Province Central Statistics Agency explains that in 2021 there will be 24,160 PTN students in Surabaya and in 2022 there will be 28,638 and in 2023 there will be 38,265. This shows that interest in PTN in Surabaya has increased every year.

Literature Review
Agency Theory
Agency theory was first put forward by Jensen and Meckling (1976) as a theory that examines the relationship between principal and agent where those who act as principals are the shareholders of a company and the management party acts as an agent who works for the principal in carrying out company operations. Information asymmetry is unbalanced information caused by unequal distribution of information between principals and agents (Eliyani & Susanto, 2020). To avoid this asymmetric relationship, a good management system is needed in higher education, namely concepts Good university governance which aims to make higher education better (Ramírez & Tejada, 2019). Application Good university governance based on agency theory, namely agency theory can be explained by the relationship between management and higher education. Agency theory can make that happen Good university governance serves as a guideline so that there is always transparency in the data provided by universities so that there is no information asymmetry between universities and data readers or students. The implementation of university governance based on agency theory can be explained by the relationship between management and universities (Muhsin et al., 2020).

Stewardship Theory

This theory was put forward by Donaldson and Davis (1991) explaining that good governance works collectively rather than individually and is not materially motivated, as is the case with agents who adhere to agency theory. The role of stewardship theory in this research is that university management will work well with what has been entrusted to them to gain trust, appreciation and increase reputation from stakeholders (government and society). Stewardship theory explains that there is a strong relationship between management and achieving company performance and therefore management will protect the organization and also maximize performance (Archer, 2023). This is in line with Agency Theory, Stewardship theory states that governance in an organization is very necessary to ensure the sustainability of the organization and the interests of stakeholders (Lieharyani et al., 2020). Management will try to optimize organizational goals, so that management behavior does not deviate from the interests of the organization. Maximizing the usefulness of management, because organizational success is very important to achieve the management mission (Martini, Sari, et al., 2020).

Good university governance (GUG)

Good university governance is a budget management activity that cannot be separated from governance activities (governance) an organization. Draft good governance, good higher education governance (Good university governance) relevant to the principle Good Corporate Governance (GCG). Good governance also provides a structure that can facilitate the determination of organizational goals, as well as a means for determining managerial performance monitoring techniques (Khan, 2022). Good Governance which is defined as good governance, is generally used in state administration. Good Governance which comes from the term governance, is a new paradigm in the field of state administration and is used by several contemporary scholars as a substitute for the term state administration (Saputro, 2019). Research (Miotto et al., 2020a) explains that university governance is a constitutional form and process when a university regulates its own affairs. Governance itself will involve the existence of policies and procedures in terms of decision-making and control actions to provide direction in effective organizational management (Mills & Robinson, 2022). This will require an organization to always carry out supervision, control, disclosure and openness regarding the practices carried out by its organization.

Good Corporate Governance maupun Good university governance is a derivative of the concept of government more generally. Of course, the administration of higher education cannot be equated with the administration of corporations or the government. Good governance in higher education is needed to encourage the creation of governance principles issued by the National Committee Corporate Governance (KNCG: 2006), namely: (1) transparency (2) accountability (3) responsibility (4) independence (5) justice and equality. Universities have different characteristics from corporations. Even though universities have a level of intense competition, universities must continue to realize good governance as a system that is inherent in the dynamics and governance of universities in the field of human resource management. (Yodianti & Nugraheni, 2023). The government's

first goal is to implement the concept Good university governance (GUG), namely by creating a work unit that applies the financial governance pattern of public service agencies.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a quantitative approach to test the influence of Reputation, Legitimacy, Transparency on Good university governance. Quantitative data analysis is statistical in nature with the aim of describing and testing predetermined hypotheses. Quantitative research is methods for testing certain theories by examining the relationships between variables. Comprehensive analysis, this research uses methods Partial Least Squares (PLS) as a statistical analysis model that can reveal and measure complex relationships between these variables. PLS was chosen because it is able to handle a variety of independent and dependent variables in the framework of this research. The PLS method does not require data that meets assumptions such as regression, so there is no requirement that the data must meet classical assumptions, there is no limit to the number of samples used, and PLS can process data at different scales in one model, thus allowing a more detailed assessment of Reputation. , Legitimacy, and Transparency have an influence on Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya.

The research used as subjects undergraduate students majoring in accounting from 5 state universities in Surabaya. The reason for this research is taking studies at State Universities in Surabaya because according to data from the East Java Province Central Statistics Agency, it is clear that in 2021 there will be 24,160 PTN students in Surabaya and in 2022 there will be 28,638 and in 2023 there will be 38,265. This shows that PTN enthusiasts in Surabaya experience this experience every year. enhancement. The minimum sample for distributing the Surabaya State University questionnaire is 30 samples. Sunan Ampel Surabaya State Islamic University (UINSA) had a sample of 23. UPN Veteran East Java had a sample of 29 and Airlangga University had a sample spread of at least 20 samples. Data collection in this research is in the form of a questionnaire containing statements that have been prepared based on the indicators of each research variable. In this study, the Likert scale uses five answers in the form of numbers or values, where number 1 is used as the lowest value and number 5 is used as the highest value which reflects a positive response.

The analysis technique in this research uses the PLS technique by carrying out a structural model test which aims to determine whether there is an influence between variables/correlation between constructs which is measured using the t test from PLS itself (Hamid & Anwar, 2019).

Outer Model
Indicator validity
An indicator is said to be good if it has a loading factor > 0.7, although a loading value between 0.5 – 0.6 is considered sufficient (Ghozali and Laten, 2020:75)

Discriminant validity

Determine Good University Governance In Sustainable Competitive Competition At State Universities In Surabaya

If the value of the internal factor loading in a construct is greater than the cross loading with another construct, then the discriminant validity is considered good (Ghozali and Laten, 2020: 75).

Composite reliability

To evaluate composite reliability, there are two measuring tools, namely internal consistency and Cronbach's alpha. In this measurement, the composite reliability value is still accepted if it is still in the range of 0.6 to 0.7, then it can be said that the construct has high reliability (Ghozali and Laten, 2020:75).

Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Convergent validity can also be seen from the AVE (Average Variance Extracted) value which must be more than 0.5. However, for research in the initial stages of developing a measurement scale, a factor loading value of 0.5-0.6 can still be considered sufficient (Ghozali and Laten, 2020: 75).

Cronbach alpha

Reliability testing is carried out using Cronbach's alpha, a variable can be declared reliable if it has a Cronbach's alpha value > 0.7 (Ghozali and Laten, 2020:75).

Inner Model

Coefficient of Determination (R-Square or R2)

R-Square (R2) values of 0.75, 0.50 and 0.25 can be concluded that the model is strong, moderate and weak (Ghozali and Latan, 2020: 78). The coefficient of determination (R2) aims to find out and measure how much influence each independent variable (variable X) can explain variations in the dependent variable (variable Y).

Predictive Relevance (Q-Square atau Q2)

Predictive Relevance (Q-Square or Q2) is used to measure how well the resulting observation values and parameter estimates are in a structural model. The value Q2 > 0 proves that the model has predictive relevance, if Q2 <0 indicates the model lacks predictive relevance (Ghozali and Laten, 2020:75).

Hypothesis Testing

Mark path coefficient or inner model shows the level of significance in hypothesis testing. The basis for decision making in this research is if t-statistic over 1.96 and value probability less than 0.05 then hypothesis H1 accepted.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Measurement Model Analysis (Outer Model)

Indicator Validity

Loading factor value for X1 (Reputation) consists of X1.3 with a loading factor value of 0.715. X1.4 with a value of 0.748. X1.5 with a loading factor value

of 0.717, X1.6 0.746, X1.8 0.736, X1.9 0.796, X1.10 0.774, Of the 9 indicators, it shows that the loading factor value exceeds 0.7 so it is said to be good. Meanwhile, for X1.1, X1.2 and

For variable X2 (Legitimacy) it shows that the loading factor value for X2.1 is 0.789, X2.2 is 0.86, X2.3 is 0.866, 6 is 0.855. The data above shows that the indicator variable X2 (Legitimacy) is said to be good because it exceeds 0.7.

For variable X3 (Transparency), the results show that the loading factor value of X3.1 is 0.883, X3.2 is 0.887, 0.89, X3.8 is 0.85. The data above shows that the indicator variable X3 (Transparency) is said to be good because it exceeds 0.7. Variabel Y (Good university governance) shows the results that the loading factor value of Y1.1 is 0.872, Y1.2 is 0.81, Y1.3 is 0.872, Y1.4 is 0.89, Y1.5 is 0.88, Y1.6 is 0.886, Y1.7 is 0.894, Y1 .8 is 0.854. The data above shows that the indicator variable Y (Good university governance) is said to be good because it exceeds 0.7.

Discriminant validity

Tabel 1 Discriminant validity

	Reputasi (X1)	Legitimasi (X2)	Transparansi (X3)	*Good university governance* (Y)
Reputasi (X1)				
Legitimasi (X2)	0.772			
Transparansi (X3)	0.57	0.624		
Good university governance (Y)	0.614	0.733	0.737	

The discriminant validity value for X1 against X2 shows a value of 0.772. X1 to X3 shows a value of 0.57, X1 to Y shows a value of 0.614. For X2 against X3 it shows a value of 0.624. X2 against Y1 is 0.733. X3 against Y shows 0.737. The discriminant validity value above shows below 0.90 so it can be said to be good. Use of HTMT criteria to assess discriminant validity. According to Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt (2015) If the HTMT value is below 0.90, discriminant validity has been established between the two constructs measured reflectively.

Composite reliability

Tabel 2 Composite Reliability

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
Good university governance (Y)	0.951	0.953	0.959	0.746
Legitimasi (X2)	0.916	0.918	0.935	0.705
Reputasi (X1)	0.917	0.942	0.929	0.530
Transparansi (X3)	0.946	0.946	0.955	0.727

Composite reliability shows that for Composite reliability (rho_a) X1 is 0.942, X2 is 0.918, For Composite reliability (rho_c) X1 is 0.929, x2 is 0.935, X3 is 0.955, Y1 is 0.959. then it can be said that this variable has high reliability because it is more than 0.7

AVE (Average Variance Extracted)

Tabel 3 *Average variance extracted (AVE)*

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
Good university governance (Y)	0.951	0.953	0.959	0.746
Legitimasi (X2)	0.916	0.918	0.935	0.705
Reputasi (X1)	0.917	0.942	0.929	0.530
Transparansi (X3)	0.946	0.946	0.955	0.727

Based on table, it shows that the Average Variance Extract (AVE) value for X1 is 0.530, for X2 it is 0.705, Good.

Cronbach alpha

Tabel 4 CronbachE`s Alpha

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
Good university governance (Y)	0.951	0.953	0.959	0.746
Legitimasi (X2)	0.916	0.918	0.935	0.705
Reputasi (X1)	0.917	0.942	0.929	0.530
Transparansi (X3)	0.946	0.946	0.955	0.727

Cronbach alpa 0.917, 0.916, 0.946 dan 0.951 declared reliable and valid questionnaire.

Coefficient of Determination (R-Square or R2)

R^2 variable *Good university governance* is 0.800. This shows that the variables are variable *Good university governance* is 80%, while the remaining 20% is the variance of the variable *Good university governance* influenced by other factors outside of independence, accountability, responsibility and fairness. This shows the power of the model in influencing *Good university governance* included in the strong category.

Predictive Relevance (Q-Square atau Q2)

The results of the Q Square calculation in this study were 0.787 or 78.7% for the variable *Good university governance*. The result that can be taken is that this research analysis model has relevant predictive value. Through this value, it can be seen that the observation value of this research is good because the Q value is greater than 0.

Hypothesis test

Reputation influences Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya

The test results show that the first hypothesis is accepted. This is because the T-statistic value is 4.584 and the P-Value calculation result is 0.000 < 0.05 so the first hypothesis is accepted. This shows that reputation consists of performance, innovation, social responsibility, service, management, workplace climate. It can be concluded that reputation has an influence on Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya.

Legitimacy influences Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya

The test results show that the second hypothesis is accepted. Because the T-Statistic value is 2.398 and the calculation results prove that apart from that the P-Value calculation results are 0.017 < 0.05 so the second hypothesis is accepted. This shows that Legitimacy which consists of Pragmatic Legitimacy, Moral Legitimacy and Cognitive Legitimacy can influence Good university governance. So it can be concluded that Legitimacy has an influence on Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya.

Transparency has an effect on Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya.

The test results show that the third hypothesis is accepted. Because the T-statistic value is 3.783 and the calculation results prove that apart from that the P-Value calculation result is 0.000 so the third hypothesis is accepted. This shows transparency which consists of openness of financial reports, clarity and completeness of information in published financial reports, open access to financial reports and availability of performance information. So it can be concluded that transparency has an effect on Good university governance at Timggi College in Surabaya.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research objectives regarding "determine Good university governance in Sustainable Competitive Competition at State Universities in Surabaya" then the following conclusions can be drawn: 1. Reputation influences Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya. 2. Legitimacy influences Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya. 3. Transparency influence Good university governance at State Universities in Surabaya.

REFERENCES

Alibašić, H., & Crawley, W. (2020). Applying Good Governance through Policy Labs: Sustainable Solutions for Universities and Local Governments. *International Journal of Sustainability in Economic, Social, and Cultural Context*, *17*(1). https://doi.org/10.18848/2325-1115/CGP/v17i01/13-25

Almagtomea, A., Shaker, A., Al-Fatlawi, Q., & Bekheet, H. (2019). The integration between financial sustainability and accountability in higher education institutions: An exploratory case study. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *8*(2).

Amado Mateus, M., & Juarez Acosta, F. (2022). Reputation in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 7). Frontiers Media S.A. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.925117

Archer, E. (2023). Technology-driven proctoring: Validity, social justice and ethics in higher education. *Perspectives in Education*, *41*(1). https://doi.org/10.38140/pie.v41i1.6666

Bird, K. A., Castleman, B. L., Mabel, Z., & Song, Y. (2021b). Bringing Transparency to Predictive Analytics: A Systematic Comparison of Predictive Modeling Methods in Higher Education. *AERA Open*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584211037630

Blanco-González, A., Del-Castillo-Feito, C., & Miotto, G. (2021a). The influence of business ethics and community outreach on faculty engagement: the mediating effect of legitimacy in higher education. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, *30*(3). https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-07-2020-0182

Castro-Gil, R., & Correa, D. (2021). Transparency in previous literature reviews about blended learning in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*, *26*(3), 3399–3426. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10406-x

Collet-Sabé, J., & Adrián, J. C. (2023b). From "mutual instrumental governance" to "common good governance": towards new connections between universities and cities. *Revista de Educación a Distancia*, *23*(74). https://doi.org/10.6018/RED.539891

Del-Castillo-Feito, C., Blanco-González, A., & Delgado-Alemany, R. (2020b). The relationship between image, legitimacy, and reputation as a sustainable strategy: Students' versus professors' perceptions in the higher education sector. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *12*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031189

Edokpolor, J., & Imafidon, A. (2019a). Public-private-civil society partnership: A gateway to ensuring good governance practices of vocational education programme in South-South Nigerian federal universities. *Journal of*

Technical Education and Training, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.30880/jtet.2019.11.03.015

Jumriani, J., Mas'ud, M., & Nurwanah, N. (2022). Analisis Penerapan Good University Governance Bagi Akuntabilitas Publik Pada Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia Makssar. *Journal of Accounting Finance*, *3*(1).

Kakar, A. S., Mansor, N. N. A., & Saufi, R. A. (2021). Does organizational reputation matter in Pakistan's higher education institutions? The mediating role of person-organization fit and person-vocation fit between organizational reputation and turnover intention. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-020-00266-z

Licht, K. de F., & Licht, J. de F. (2020). Artificial intelligence, transparency, and public decision-making: Why explanations are key when trying to produce perceived legitimacy. *AI and Society*, *35*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00960-w

Lieharyani, D. C. U., Hari Ginardi, R. V., Ambarwati, R., & Multazam, M. T. (2019). Assessment for good university governance in higher education focus on align strategy business with it at big data era. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1175*(1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1175/1/012204

Marcinkowski, F., Kieslich, K., Starke, C., & Lünich, M. (2020b). Implications of AI (un-)fairness in higher education admissions: The effects of perceived AI (un-)fairness on exit, voice and organizational reputation. *FAT* 2020 - Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 122–130. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372867

Mills, D., & Robinson, N. (2022). Democratising Monograph Publishing or Preying on Researchers? Scholarly Recognition and Global 'Credibility Economies.' *Science as Culture*, *31*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/09505431.2021.2005562

Miotto, G., Del-Castillo-Feito, C., & Blanco-González, A. (2020a). Reputation and legitimacy: Key factors for Higher Education Institutions' sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Research*, *112*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.076

Moslehpour, M., Chau, K. Y., Zheng, J. J., Hanjani, A. N., & Hoang, M. (2020). The mediating role of international student satisfaction in the influence of higher education service quality on institutional reputation in Taiwan. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1847979020971955