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The study presents an overview of the characteristics of the research sample, a general description of the sample's response results, and the results of testing the measurement scales, the research sample has reflected the characteristics of the research. The results of the scale test using Cronbach's Alpha and the EFA factor analysis help us extract the components of the leadership style affecting student satisfaction: (1) Design of OHAOSMART, (2) OHAO SMART responsiveness, (3) OHAO SMART support service quality, (4) Food quality/reliability, (5) OHAO SMART price. The scale of the research concepts has reached convergent and discriminant validity through satisfying the conditions of EFA factor analysis and Pearson correlation analysis. The test results of the linear regression show that all 5 components have a leadership style that positively impacts student satisfaction at a significant value of < 0.05 (95% significance level). The model test results show that the model is suitable, there is no violation of the test assumptions, and the results of testing the hypotheses are accepted.
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Introduction

The characteristic of the commodity economy is that there must be competition and comparison, in which the customer is the one who decides on the success or failure of the business, so service quality is increasingly considered in and more concerned about businesses and customers. Service quality is one of the leading factors creating a competitive advantage.
Therefore, businesses often try to provide higher quality services than their competitors. It is important to meet or exceed the service quality expectations of the target customer. Service quality has been identified as a determining factor for the market share if businesses do not fully recognize and evaluate themselves to try to develop in terms of management capacity, investment strategy, and reasonable business improving the quality of products and services, partnerships and marketing cannot survive and develop.

Therefore, regular assessment of service quality is essential for every business because this will help businesses identify how customers feel, thereby getting the right solution in their business strategy. The assessment of service quality is not only conducted with large enterprises, but also small business units need to pay attention to.

Thus, OHAO SMART Van Hien University is only designed to meet the needs of food, study and recreation required by customers, especially students and faculty of Van Hien University, but OHAO SMART has also been a type of business, with many different challenges to achieve certain markets. In the future, OHAO SMART is aiming to develop into a chain of stores like famous brands: KFC, Lotteria, Jollibee. Customer feedback is essential to help OHAO SMART succeed.

Distribution methods include food and drink for Van Hien's staff and some outside office customers. OHAO SMART focuses on fast food products and services such as fast food chains: KFC, Lotteria, Jollibee. OHAO SMART service was established in 2018 and officially operated in 613 Au Co, Phu Trung Ward, Tan Phu District, Ho Chi Minh city.

Since 2019 the number of customers has increased, but customers are still not satisfied with the existing service. From the above fact, combined with the need to find out the students' evaluation of the quality of the catering service, the group decided to choose the topic: "Assess the satisfaction of Van Hien university students with Ohao Smart service” as a research topic.

Research Objectives

**General objective**

The main objective of this study is to review the satisfaction of the service quality of OHAO SMART at Van Hien University, period 2021-2022, based on the evaluations of students, thereby to propose solutions to improve the quality and efficiency of services at OHAO SMART Van Hien University. At the same time, this study proposes some measures to the management of OHAO SMART to expand the scale of serving students and customers outside the University. It should be noted that the OHAO SMART brand at Van Hien University is in sustainable development, creates a suitable image in the minds of students and introduces user-friendly services.

**Detail objective**

- to assess the level of student satisfaction with the quality of each service option;
- to measure the influence of the brand on students at Van Hien University;
- to learn more about the brand image of OHAO SMART from the student's perspective;
- to evaluate the brand image of OHAO SMART from the student's perspective;
- to review some evaluation opinions and propose some marketing measures to OHAO SMART management based on the research and analysis results on sustainable development
of OHAO SMART brand and the opinion expressed by the Van Hien University on creating a
and other customers.

**Literature Review**

*The concept of service quality*

Garvin (1984) identified five ways to understand the concept of "quality" as follows:
(1) Transcendent way: Quality is intrinsic superiority; it reflects what is "best";
(2) Production-based approach: service quality is the assurance of service delivery
according to specifications or designs in accordance with the professional skills of
the supply staff and management staff. A quality service will not fall short of
specifications;
(3) User-based approach: a service or a product that meets user requirements is a
quality service;
(4) Product-based approach: quality is based on quantity and considers only
measurable characteristics. In most cases, more equals better and thus higher
quality;
(5) Value-based approach: service quality is a category of value and price, by
considering the proportional relationship between service features and value
creation and price.

According to Babakus & Boller (1992), service quality is seen as “an umbrella
structure with distinct scales”, opposite, although there is no real consensus on what
these scales are. Various scholars have proposed several scales of service quality.

Sasser et al. (1978) list seven service attributes, namely: (1) security; (2) consistency;
(3) attitude; (4) completeness; (5) conditions; (6) availability, and (7) training.

Gronroos (1984) suggested that service quality includes three dimensions, that is,
technical quality, functional quality of the process itself, and company image.

*Characteristics of service quality*

- Transcendent: For customers, quality service is a service that shows its superiority in
comparison to other services. It is this preeminence that makes service quality a competitive
strength of service providers.
- Product specificity (Product led): Service quality is the sum of the core aspects
crystallized in products and services that create the characteristics of products and services.
Therefore, high-quality service products will contain more "superior features" than low-level
service products.
- Process or supply led: Service quality is associated with the process of
performing/delivering services to customers. Service implementation, service style, and
service delivery will determine the good or bad service quality.
- Customer satisfaction (Customer led): Services created to meet customer needs.
Service quality must necessarily satisfy customer needs and take customer requirements as
the basis to improve service quality.
- Value creation (Value led): Service quality is associated with the values created to
serve customers. It is futile and worthless to provide services that customers consider to be of
poor quality.
Satisfaction concept

There are many different definitions of student satisfaction as well as quite a lot of debate about this definition. Many researchers think that satisfaction is the difference between students' expectations and the actual perception received:

- According to Finn & Lamb (1991), satisfaction or disappointment after consumption, is defined as the student's response to the perceived difference between pre-consumption expectation and actual perception about the product after consuming it.

- Hoyer & Mac Innis (2001) suggested that satisfaction can be associated with feelings of acceptance, happiness, help, excitement, and joy.

According to Hansemark & Albinsson (2004), “Student satisfaction is an overall student attitude towards a service provider, or an emotional response to the difference between what students expect, anticipation and what they receive, for the fulfillment of some need, goal or desire”.

The concept of leadership style

Leadership is a process by which one person influences others to achieve a certain goal and at the same time directs the organization towards cohesion. In addition, leadership is often defined as a process by which one individual influences a group of other individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2007: 3; Ivanova et al., 2019).

The results revealed that transformational leadership positively influences employees' perception of organizational reputation, not only directly but also indirectly, through empowering employees. Leadership behaviors, such as communicating a shared vision and high-performance expectations, providing an appropriate role model, fostering collaboration among employees to achieve collective goals, stimulating new perspectives and ideas, emphasizing the quality of relationships with employees, and showing concern about employees’ individual feelings and welfare, directly cultivate employees’ favorable overall attitudes toward the organization (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).

Overview of previous research models

Research by Wilson et al. (2012) on “the relationship between service quality and satisfaction”. Regarding the relationship between student satisfaction and service quality, it was initially recommended that service quality is a precursor to student satisfaction, with little attention being paid to these works’ wholes or specific exchange.

Several experts have found observational support for the perspective of the aforementioned point (Fomel et al., 1996; Rubinskaya, 2017, Ivanova et al., 2018); where student satisfaction comes after service quality. With regards to student satisfaction and service quality, scientists have been more precise about the importance and estimation of service satisfaction and quality.

Satisfaction and service quality have certain things in a similar way; however, satisfaction is a more far-reaching idea, although service quality focuses specifically on service measurements (Wilson et al., 2012).
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Parasuraman et al. (1985) were pioneers in service quality research. The success of research creates a breakthrough means for businesses to get results for the quality of their service through research into customer reviews-service users. The SERVQUAL model is a combination of 2 words Service and Quality, which is considered by many researchers to be quite comprehensive. After that, the Servqual Model continued to improve by focusing on the concept of “Perceived Quality” of consumers. Customer perception of quality is the most objective assessment of service quality.

Parasuraman's research suggests that Service Quality is the gap between customers' expectations about the service they are using and the actual perception of the service they
enjoy. The author has established the Gap Model in service quality as a basis for service standardization and service quality assessment.

From there, as a basis for proposing measures to overcome poor quality in services. The model with 7 quality loopholes is shown in the Fig.2.

**Research model and hypothesis**

Based on the theoretical models of Wilson et al. (2012) and Finn & Lamb (1991) research works of previous scholars. The proposed research model assessment of student satisfaction with service quality of OHAO SMART at Van Hien University includes:

![Research model](compiled by the author)

**Table 1 - Summary of inheritance scales of researchers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Service Competency (ASC)</td>
<td>Brogowicz et al. (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of OHAO SMART (DOS)</td>
<td>Wilson et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of OHAO SMART service supports (QSS)</td>
<td>Brogowicz et al. (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHAO SMART responsiveness (OSR)</td>
<td>Wilson et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of OHAO SMART (POS)</td>
<td>Brogowicz et al. (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested research hypothesis**

The literature review on service quality scales shows a wide diversity in the number of scales, the study applies the Brogowicz et al., (1990) model was developed and Wilson et al (2012) to measure the OHAO SMART service quality at Van Hien University. This model includes 6 components as follows:

1. Food quality/reliability,
2. Employee Service Competency,
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(3) Design of OHAO SMART,
(4) Quality of OHAO SMART service supports,
(5) OHAO SMART supporting service quality, (6) Price of OHAO SMART.

Based on the above, the hypotheses are stated as follows:
H1: Food quality/reliability positively affects students' satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality.
H2: Employee Service Competency quality positively affects students' satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality.
H3: Design of OHAO SMART positively affect students' satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality.
H4: Quality of service supports OHAO SMART positively affects students' satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality.
H5: OHAO SMART's responsiveness positively affects students' satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality.
H6: Price of OHAO SMART affects students' satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality.

Methodology

Qualitative research
- Qualitative research is used to explore, adjust models, add observed variables, and measure research concepts. This study was conducted through interview techniques, and group discussions to find out the most common opinions on the factors affecting student satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality.
- Preliminary research is a qualitative discussion among group members which answer preliminary questionnaires, descriptive statistical methods are used to collect opinions of students from the faculties of Van Hien University on the quality service of OHAO SMART. Then, they are asked to consult with faculty guidance and complete a formal research questionnaire.

Quantitative research
- Research is done through quantitative research techniques
  Interview with:
  + Direct survey form on 18-25/3 2022: 173 suitable samples
  + Online survey on 3/2022: 250 suitable samples
  - Forming a questionnaire designed based on a 5-level Likert scale to assess student satisfaction with the service quality of OHAO SMART at Van Hien University.
  - From the official research questionnaire to collect and analyze survey data, descriptive statistics and draw conclusions and discussions.

Research tools
In the study, there are 31 questions that are quantitative questions, according to Bollen (1989), the minimum sample size is 155 (31x5).
However, to ensure a sufficiently large sample size and reliable results in T-test and ANOVA analyses, the study sample should be around 200.
With the output of 450 questionnaires, 440 questionnaires were entered into SPSS 24 software. Using SPSS tools such as checking the validity of data and checking blank data. After data cleaning 17 questionnaires were invalid and of poor quality, 423 questionnaires were used for analysis and testing, reaching 96.13%.

Finally, we tested the reliability of the scale using Cronbach’s Alpha, EFA. The results of the linear regression analysis show the relationship between the factors constituting service quality impact on customer satisfaction.

**Results**

**Preliminary quantitative research results**

The results of the reliability analysis show that the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of the scales is above 0.70. The lowest is the Process scale (ASC = 0.780), and the highest is the Design scale (DOS = 0.881).

Considering the total correlation coefficient, it shows that the observed variables have quite a close correlation coefficient between the observed variables (the lowest is the observed variable QSS5 with a total correlation of 0.472 and the highest is OSR5 has a total variable correlation of 0.808). The results are presented in Tab. 2.

**Table 2 - Preliminary assessment results of the reliability of the scales**

(compiled by the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Number of variables</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Food quality/reliability (FD)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employee Service Competency (ASC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design of OHAO SMART (DOS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quality of OHAO SMART service supports (QSS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OHAO SMART responsiveness (OSR)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Price of OHAO SMART (POS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction (SS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)**

In this study, the author uses EFA exploratory factor analysis method to extract 27 component variables into a number of component factors (Trong et al., 2008) to measure whether the student satisfaction scale.

As a result of EFA, there are 23 observed variables in 6 components of the impact of the student satisfaction extracted into 6 components with KMO = 0.718 with 23 observed variables so the EFA is suitable. Chi-square statistics of Bartlett’s test reached 8214.874 with a significance level Sig = 0.000.

Therefore, the observed variables are correlated with each other, with an eigenvalue of 1.461 and extracted variances of 68.619%, which proves that the analytical data is suitable for EFA, satisfactory.
The student satisfaction scale includes 4 components with EFA results, 4 component variables were extracted into 01 factor and factor loading coefficients are all greater than 0.5, so these variables are of practical significance. KMO coefficient = 0.721, so the EFA is suitable for the analyzed data, the Chi-Square statistic of Bartlett's test reached the value of 422.430 with a significance level of 0.00. at the eigenvalue, the coefficient is 2.306, so the observed variables are correlated with each other.

The extracted variance is 57.644%, which is expressed by a drawn factor that explains 57.644% of the data variation. Along with the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of .744, the student satisfaction scale meets the requirements.

Table 3 - Analysis of EFA
(compiled by the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>DOS</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>ORS</th>
<th>QSS</th>
<th>FD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS3</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS4</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS1</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS2</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS1</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS2</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS3</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS4</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC3</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC4</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC2</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC1</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS5</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS3</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS4</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS2</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSS4</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSS3</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSS2</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSS1</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD2</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD1</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD3</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigen value | 6.579 | 3.085 | 2.292 | 1.95 | 1.636 | 1.461 |
Variance extract % | 12.739 | 25.421 | 37.125 | 48.795 | 6.399 | 7.850 |
Reliability coefficients | 0.880 | 0.881 | 0.780 | 0.864 | 0.870 | 0.788 |
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Table 4 - Summary of results EFA (compiled by the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Number of observed variables</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Extracted variance (%)</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food quality/reliability (FD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>68.619</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Service Competency (ASC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of OHAO SMART (DOS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of service supports OHAO SMART (QSS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHAO SMART responsiveness (OSR)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of OHAO SMART (POS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction (SS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>57.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluate and test the fit of the model

Thus, in the two-variable regression model R2 measures the relevance of the regression function. It is the ratio of the total variation of the dependent variable y caused by the explanatory variable x. Thus, R2 is an estimator with a coefficient = 0.652 (tab. 5, 6). The adjusted coefficient R2 = 0.646 means that the built linear regression model fits the data set to 64.6%, so the research model is suitable. The results show that adjusted R2<R2, using it to assess the relevance of the research model will be safer.

Table 5 - Model Summary analysis (compiled by the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.726^a</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.33634</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>77.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), FD, ASC, DOS, QSS, OSR, POS
b. Dependent Variable: SS

Table 6 - Results of ANOVA analysis (compiled by the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>52.373</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.729</td>
<td>77.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>47.060</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.433</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SHL
b. Predictors: (Constant), FD, ASC, DOS, QSS, OSR, POS
Table 7 - Linear regression analysis results
(compiled by the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>6.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>7.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>9.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSS</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>4.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>2.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>2.281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SHL

Discussion

It is shown in Tab. 7 that all the factors on the scale have a positive effect (positive Beta coefficient) on Student Satisfaction (SS) with the significance level in all 6 factors having Sig. = 0.000 – 0.023, Subtract ASC scale with Sig. >0.05 (Sig. = 0.372) so there is no statistical significance. Table 5 also shows that the tolerance of variables (acceptance) is high for 0.685 or more and the VIF coefficient of all 6 factors is less than 2, meaning that multicollinearity does not occur between independent factors in the model.

The results F-statistics reached the value of 77,161 from the R2value of 0.527 and the adjusted R-value of 0.520 of the full models, at the significance level Sig = 0.000; Checking the correlation phenomenon by Durbin-Watson coefficient (1 < 1.113 < 3) shows that the results are consistent with the research model.

Based on the standardized Beta coefficient, we can determine the importance of service quality factors affecting student satisfaction. If the absolute value of any Beta coefficient is larger, the stronger the influencing factor in student satisfaction we see that factor (1) Design of OHAO SMART (DOS) has the largest standardized Beta coefficient of 0.372 (Sig. = 0.000). Next, the factors that have strong effects in order of coefficients from high to low are (2) The response of OHAO SMART (OSR) has a standardized Beta coefficient of 0.294; (3) OHAO SMART (QSS) supporting service quality has a standardized Beta coefficient of 0.191; (4) Food Quality/Reliability (FD) and the price of OHAO SMART (POS) with a Normalized Beta of 0.088 and finally (6) Employee Service Competency (ASC) with a Normalized Beta 0.034 is the smallest among the systems the beta number has the weakest effect (see Tab. 7).

Conclusion

The research is carried out on the basis of theories related to fundamental concepts for research, such as service for students, service quality, and constitutive factors of service quality services and student expectations. The research methods used are qualitative research and quantitative research. Based on the theory of service quality and student satisfaction.
The qualitative research results show that the service quality factors affecting student satisfaction include 06 independent variable factors with 27 observed variables. Specifically: (1) Food quality/reliability, (2) Employee Service Competency, (3) Design of OHAO SMART, (4) Quality of OHAO SMART service supports, (5) OHAO SMART’s supporting service quality, (6) Price of OHAO SMART.

and dependent variable Student satisfaction consist of 4 observed variables. The research results show that there are 6 factors of service quality that affect student satisfaction and are significant at the test level (95%), so the hypotheses: H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, and H6 are accepted.

Through practical research, the topic has explored and evaluated the actual situation of factors affecting student satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality at Van Hien University. Through survey data and analysis, it shows that students are satisfied with service quality and choose the OHAO SMART service when using it.

The main reason is that students believe that at OHAO SMART, tangible facilities, quality of facilities and facilities. The quality and space of OHAO SMART are cool and clean. Especially the factor of food safety and hygiene, there is a process of checking the quality of goods, having a clear origin.

At the same time, OHAO SMART's processing process ensures food safety and hygiene, which is a very important factor affecting the health of students and diners. In addition, the service capacity of OHAO SMART is also felt by students and diners with the enthusiastic and cheerful service of the service staff, and the rest of the students.

However, according to the survey and analysis results, students are not satisfied with the prices of OHAO SMART, students think that the prices of products at OHAO SMART are not suitable compared to the quality, and compared to other shops outside the school.

On the other hand, according to students, the current music program is not suitable for students' interests, so the satisfaction level is only average. This shows that the program content and time frame are not really suitable to attract students.

The survey results and analysis of factors affecting student satisfaction with OHAO SMART service quality will help the OHAO SMART management board to have a more holistic view of what factors students are satisfied with continue to develop and promote further what factors students are really not satisfied with to overcome as well as attract students, lecturers, staff, and outside students to use services at OHAO SMART. Thereby, it is possible to propose to the management board to replicate this model in other training institutions of the educational system of Van Hien University in particular and of the Hung Hau education system in general.

**Limitations and suggestions for future research**

The purpose of this study is to explore the influence of factors related to student satisfaction using services at OHAO SMART, so this study also has many limitations:

- Research to select a convenient sample of agent students using services at OHAO SMART. Therefore, in order to improve the generality, further research needs to study with larger sample size.

- The study only focused on 6 factors (1) Food quality/reliability, (2) OHAO SMART's responsiveness, (3) OHAO SMART support service quality (4); Price of OHAO SMART, (5) Design of OHAO SMART, (6) Service capacity Scale Student satisfaction using OHAO
ASSESS THE SATISFACTION OF VAN HIEN UNIVERSITY

SMART services, and other factors related to satisfaction service quality, etc., should also be considered in further studies.
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