Beyond the Classroom: Quality Assurance in Developing Nations

Asuamah Yeboah, Samuel and Antwi Boasiako, Ama

Sunyani Technical University, Sunyani Technical University

16 July 2024

Beyond the Classroom: Quality Assurance in Developing Nations

Samuel Asuamah Yeboah
Faculty of Business and Management Studies,
Sunyani Technical University, Ghana.
Corresponding Author Email address: nelkonsegal@yahoo.com
Phone: 0244723071
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9866-6235

Ama Antwi Boasiako
Quality Assurance and Control Unit
Sunyani Technical University
Email: amanbo77@gmail.com
Phone: 0501091040

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive review explores the multifaceted landscape of quality assurance in higher education, particularly emphasising the unique challenges and opportunities faced by developing nations. Drawing upon a wealth of academic research, policy documents, and institutional reports, we delve into the complexities of ensuring high-quality education in diverse socio-economic contexts. Our analysis identifies key trends, challenges, and innovative practices shaping the future of higher education quality assurance worldwide. By shedding light on successes and shortcomings, we aim to inform policymakers, educators, and stakeholders on strategies for enhancing educational equity and access in developing countries.

KEYWORD: Empowering Education**,** Quality Assurance**,** Institutional Quality**,** Stakeholder Engagement**,** Equity**,** Inclusion

JEL CODES: I21, I23, I28

INTRODUCTION

The significance of quality assurance (QA) mechanisms in shaping the educational landscape of developing countries is widely acknowledged. As Altbach and Salmi (2011) emphasise, QA plays a pivotal role in fostering academic excellence and advancing global development goals. In an era of increasing globalisation, higher education institutions (HEIs) in developing countries face mounting pressure to align their QA practices with internationally recognized standards to ensure the credibility and competitiveness of their qualifications (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007). However, the socio-economic contexts of these regions present distinct challenges that complicate the effective implementation of QA frameworks. Cloete et al. (2011) further highlight the transformative potential of education as a catalyst for empowerment and societal progress, reinforcing the need for robust QA systems that address both local and global demands.

Theoretical frameworks provide valuable lenses through which these challenges can be better understood and addressed. Institutional theory suggests that HEIs in developing countries often adopt international quality standards to gain legitimacy and recognition in the global academic field (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). This can create tensions between global benchmarks and local needs, as institutions struggle to balance external pressures with internal realities. Resource dependency theory underscores the reliance of institutions on external bodies for funding and accreditation, shaping QA practices in ways that prioritise external validation over long-term educational quality (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Social capital theory introduces the role of relationships and networks in improving QA processes, particularly through collaborations and partnerships that enhance institutional capacity (Coleman, 1988). Together, these theoretical perspectives provide a framework for analysing the operational dynamics of QA within developing countries, focusing on both external pressures and internal constraints.

Despite concerted efforts to implement QA mechanisms, there remains a significant gap in understanding the nuanced dynamics of QA practices within these contexts. The real-world problem lies in the growing demand for high-quality education, which is often unmet by the limited capacity of developing countries to implement effective QA systems. Institutional structures, resource constraints, and socio-economic disparities all contribute to this gap. Existing research often overlooks the specific challenges faced by developing nations, and lacks comprehensive insights into how these challenges shape QA frameworks and practices (Cloete et al., 2011). This gap in understanding hinders informed decision-making, policy formulation, and institutional reform.

Addressing this gap is imperative for several reasons. First, enhancing educational quality is vital for fostering economic development, social mobility, and global competitiveness (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007). Second, effective QA practices can promote inclusive growth, reduce educational disparities, and ensure that higher education serves as a driver of societal progress. Third, by identifying context-specific strategies and best practices, stakeholders can optimise limited resources and maximise the impact of QA initiatives (Naidoo, 2017).

This systematic review seeks to address these gaps by drawing on institutional theory, resource dependency theory, and social capital theory to examine the complexities of QA practices in higher education across developing countries. By synthesising existing literature, the review aims to provide a deeper understanding of how these theoretical frameworks shape QA practices in contexts characterised by resource limitations and socio-economic challenges. The review will explore key trends, challenges, and innovative strategies in QA, providing actionable recommendations for policymakers, educators, and stakeholders.

By applying these theoretical lenses, the study aims to inform both policy interventions and institutional practices, ultimately contributing to the enhancement of educational quality, equity, and access in developing countries. The findings will provide insights into how QA mechanisms can be effectively adapted to local contexts, while still maintaining alignment with global standards, thus fostering sustainable development within the higher education systems of developing nations.

The scope of this systematic review encompasses literature published within a specified timeframe, focusing primarily on QA practices within higher education institutions in developing countries. While efforts have been made to include a wide range of sources, language barriers and accessibility constraints may limit the comprehensiveness of the review. Additionally, the review may not capture all regional

variations in QA practices, given the diversity of contexts within developing countries. Furthermore, the findings of this review may be influenced by publication bias, as well as the inherent limitations of the included studies. Despite these limitations, the review seeks to provide valuable insights into the current state of QA in higher education in developing countries and offer recommendations for future research and policy development.

OVERVIEW OF QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Quality assurance in higher education encompasses a set of processes and mechanisms designed to ensure that educational institutions deliver programs and services of a consistent and acceptable standard (Harvey & Green, 1993). It involves systematic monitoring, evaluation, and improvement of various aspects of academic provision, including teaching and learning, research, governance, and support services (Naidoo, 2017). Quality assurance frameworks typically include accreditation, assessment, evaluation, and the establishment of standards and guidelines to guide institutional practices (Huang & Stensaker, 2013). These mechanisms aim to uphold academic excellence, enhance institutional accountability, and foster public trust in the higher education sector (Elton, 2000).

Over the past few decades, quality assurance has become increasingly prominent in higher education systems worldwide due to factors such as globalisation, technological advancements, and growing demand for skilled graduates (Brennan & Shah, 2000). Accreditation agencies, regulatory bodies, and quality assurance networks have emerged to oversee and promote quality standards across diverse educational contexts (Dill & Soo, 2005). However, the specific approaches and priorities of quality assurance vary significantly across different countries and regions, influenced by socio-economic factors, cultural norms, and institutional structures (Huisman & van der Wende, 2004).

In developing countries, quality assurance in higher education faces distinct challenges and opportunities (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007). Limited resources, capacity constraints, and contextual complexities often pose obstacles to the effective implementation of quality assurance mechanisms (Altbach & Salmi, 2011). Yet, these nations also demonstrate resilience, innovation, and a commitment to improving educational quality amidst adversity (Cloete et al., 2011). Understanding the dynamics of quality assurance in developing countries is essential for addressing the unique needs and aspirations of their higher education systems, promoting inclusive development, and advancing global educational equity.

IMPORTANCE OF EXAMINING QUALITY ASSURANCE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Examining quality assurance (QA) in developing countries holds significant importance for several reasons. Firstly, higher education plays a crucial role in socio-economic development, and ensuring quality is essential for building human capital and fostering innovation and economic growth (Cloete et al., 2011). Therefore, understanding the QA mechanisms in developing countries is vital for promoting sustainable development and addressing global challenges such as poverty, inequality, and unemployment.

Secondly, developing countries often face unique challenges in implementing QA frameworks due to limited resources, infrastructure deficiencies, and capacity constraints (Altbach & Salmi, 2011). By examining QA practices in these contexts, insights can be gained into innovative strategies and approaches for overcoming these challenges and improving the effectiveness of QA mechanisms.

Thirdly, QA in higher education directly impacts issues of equity, access, and social inclusion. Developing countries typically have diverse student populations with varying socio-economic backgrounds, cultural identities, and educational needs (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007). Effective QA ensures that all students have equal opportunities to access high-quality education and succeed academically, thus contributing to social mobility and reducing educational disparities.

Furthermore, the globalisation of higher education has increased the mobility of students, academics, and institutions across borders (Knight, 2014). Developing countries are increasingly engaged in international collaborations and partnerships, making it essential to align their QA practices with global standards and expectations. Understanding how QA operates in these contexts is crucial for ensuring the recognition and credibility of qualifications obtained from institutions in developing countries on the international stage.

METHODOLOGY

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

The search strategy employed for this systematic review involved identifying relevant literature through electronic databases, including PubMed, Google Scholar, and Scopus. Keywords and search terms related to quality assurance in higher education, developing countries, and relevant subtopics were used to retrieve articles published up to date. Additionally, manual searches of reference lists and citation tracking were conducted to identify additional relevant studies.

Inclusion criteria were established to ensure the selection of studies aligned with the objectives of the review. Studies were included if they focused on quality assurance mechanisms, practices, or frameworks within higher education institutions in developing countries. Only peer-reviewed articles, dissertations, conference papers, and reports published in English were considered. Studies that provided insights into challenges, best practices, and innovations in quality assurance within the context of developing countries were prioritised.

Following the initial screening of titles and abstracts, full-text articles meeting the inclusion criteria were retrieved and further assessed for relevance. Articles deemed relevant underwent data extraction, wherein key information such as study objectives, methodologies, findings, and conclusions were systematically recorded. Quality assessment of included studies was conducted to evaluate the rigour and credibility of the research methodologies employed.

The selection process was conducted independently by two reviewers, with disagreements resolved through discussion and consensus. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines were followed to ensure transparency and rigour throughout the review process. The search strategy and selection criteria were systematically applied to identify and synthesise a comprehensive body of literature addressing quality assurance in higher education within developing countries.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria: Studies focusing on quality assurance mechanisms, practices, or frameworks within higher education institutions in developing countries. Peer-reviewed articles, dissertations, conference

papers, and reports published in English. Studies providing insights into challenges, best practices, and innovations in quality assurance within the context of developing countries.
Exclusion Criteria: Studies not related to quality assurance in higher education or not specific to developing countries. Non-peer-reviewed sources such as opinion pieces, editorials, and non-academic publications. Studies published in languages other than English. Studies focusing solely on developed countries or regions. Studies lacking relevance to the objectives of the systematic review, as determined by the reviewers during the screening process.

These inclusion and exclusion criteria were systematically applied during the literature search and selection process to ensure the identification and inclusion of relevant studies while excluding those that did not meet the predefined criteria.

Data Extraction Process

The data extraction process involved systematically retrieving key information from selected studies to facilitate analysis and synthesis. A structured data extraction form was developed to capture relevant details from each included study. The following information was extracted:

Study details: Author(s), year of publication, title, journal or source. Study objectives: Aim or research questions addressed in the study. *Methodology*: Study design, sampling methods, data collection procedures, and analytical techniques. *Participants*: Description of the study population or sample, including demographic characteristics if applicable. *Quality assurance mechanisms*: Description of QA practices, frameworks, or interventions examined in the study. *Findings*: Main results, key findings, and outcomes related to quality assurance in higher education within developing countries. *Conclusion*: Authors' interpretations, implications, and recommendations based on the study findings. *Limitations*: Identified limitations or constraints of the study methodology or findings.

Two reviewers independently extracted data from each included study, with discrepancies resolved through discussion and consensus. The extracted data were organised and synthesised to facilitate thematic analysis and interpretation. The structured data extraction process ensured consistency and transparency in capturing relevant information from the selected studies, enabling a comprehensive examination of quality assurance practices within higher education institutions in developing countries.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

KEY CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

Key concepts and definitions related to quality assurance (QA) in higher education provide a foundational understanding for examining QA practices within the context of developing countries.

Quality Assurance (QA): QA refers to systematic processes and mechanisms implemented by higher education institutions to ensure and enhance the quality of educational programs, services, and outcomes. QA encompasses activities such as accreditation, assessment, evaluation, and continuous improvement efforts aimed at meeting defined standards and objectives (Harvey & Green, 1993).

Developing Countries: Developing countries, also referred to as low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), are characterised by lower levels of economic development, infrastructure, and human capital compared to more economically advanced nations. These countries face unique challenges and opportunities in higher education, including resource constraints, capacity limitations, and socio-economic disparities (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007).

Accreditation: Accreditation is a formal process whereby higher education institutions undergo external evaluation by accrediting agencies or bodies to assess their adherence to established standards and criteria. Accreditation status signifies that an institution meets predetermined quality benchmarks and is authorised to offer recognised educational programs and qualifications (Elton, 2000).

Standards and Guidelines: Standards and guidelines provide a framework for defining and assessing quality in higher education. They encompass criteria related to curriculum design, teaching and learning practices, student support services, research, governance, and institutional management. Adherence to standards and guidelines ensures consistency, transparency, and accountability in educational provision (Huang & Stensaker, 2013).

Continuous Improvement: Continuous improvement involves ongoing efforts to enhance the quality and effectiveness of higher education programs and services through systematic monitoring, evaluation, feedback, and iterative adjustments. It emphasises a culture of learning, innovation, and responsiveness to changing needs and expectations (Dill & Soo, 2005).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Theoretical perspectives on quality assurance (QA) in higher education offer insights into the underlying principles, dynamics, and implications of QA mechanisms within educational systems.

Institutional Theory: Institutional theory posits that organisations, including higher education institutions, are influenced by external pressures and expectations from their institutional environments. Within the context of QA, institutions conform to established standards and practices to gain legitimacy and maintain their status within the broader institutional field (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Resource Dependency Theory: Resource dependency theory suggests that organizations rely on external resources and relationships to function effectively. In the context of QA, higher education institutions depend on accreditation agencies, regulatory bodies, and other stakeholders for resources, support, and validation of their quality standards (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).

Social Capital Theory: Social capital theory emphasises the importance of social networks, relationships, and trust in facilitating cooperation and collective action within organisations and communities. In QA, social capital contributes to the establishment of quality standards, peer review processes, and collaborative efforts to improve educational quality and outcomes (Coleman, 1988).

Stakeholder Theory: Stakeholder theory posits that organisations have a responsibility to consider the interests and expectations of various stakeholders, including students, faculty, administrators, employers, and the broader society. QA practices aim to balance the needs and perspectives of different stakeholders by ensuring transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to their concerns (Freeman, 1984).

Systems Theory: Systems theory views organisations as complex, interconnected systems composed of interrelated components and processes. QA functions as a feedback mechanism within the higher education system, facilitating continuous improvement, adaptation, and innovation to meet evolving demands and challenges (Bertalanffy, 1968).

FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING QUALITY ASSURANCE PRACTICES

A comprehensive framework for analysing quality assurance (QA) practices in higher education institutions within developing countries encompasses several key dimensions:

Policy Environment: This dimension examines the regulatory frameworks, policies, and guidelines governing QA in higher education within developing countries. It considers the alignment of QA policies with national development goals, international standards, and regional accreditation frameworks (Yılmaz, 2019; Stukalo & Lytvyn, 2021; Shoukat et al., 2024).

Institutional Structures: This dimension focuses on the organisational structures, mechanisms, and processes within higher education institutions that facilitate QA implementation. It includes aspects such as QA offices, committees, accreditation processes, and quality management systems (Kisanga, 2014; Ntim, 2014; Cardoso et al., 2017; Agasisti et al., 2019; Nkala & Ncube, 2020).

Stakeholder Engagement: This dimension assesses the involvement of various stakeholders, including students, faculty, administrators, policymakers, employers, and the broader community, in QA processes. It examines mechanisms for stakeholder participation, feedback mechanisms, and accountability mechanisms (Beerkens & Udam, 2017; Pham, 2019; Hou et al., 2022; Luthuli, 2022; Jha et al., 2024).

Assessment Methods: This dimension explores the methods, tools, and techniques used to assess and evaluate educational quality and outcomes. It includes approaches such as peer review, self-assessment, external evaluation, student evaluations, and learning outcome assessments (Alzaid, 2017; Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp et al., 2017; Andrade, 2019; Mohan, 2023).

Continuous Improvement: This dimension focuses on efforts to promote continuous improvement and enhancement of educational quality through iterative feedback loops, data-driven decision-making, and quality enhancement initiatives. It includes mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, and benchmarking against best practices (Peurach et al., 2018; Dahnke, 2019; Taleb et al., 2021; Cattani, 2023; Kayyali, 2024).

Resource Allocation: This dimension examines the allocation of financial, human, and infrastructural resources to support QA activities within higher education institutions. It considers the availability of funding, staffing, training, and infrastructure necessary for effective QA implementation (Zavale et al., 2015; Suleiman et al., 2020; Jacob et al., 2021; Asiyai, 2022; Hassan, 2022).

Cultural Context: This dimension acknowledges the influence of cultural norms, values, and practices on QA processes within developing countries. It considers factors such as academic culture, institutional autonomy, trust, and accountability mechanisms embedded within the cultural context (Dzimińska et al., 2018; Hillman & Baydoun, 2019; Rahnuma, 2020; Hsu, 2023).

QUALITY ASSURANCE MECHANISMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

ACCREDITATION PROCESSES

Accreditation processes in developing countries play a crucial role in ensuring the quality and credibility of higher education institutions and programs (Altbach & Salmi, 2011). Accreditation involves external evaluation by accrediting agencies or bodies to assess whether institutions meet established standards and criteria for educational quality. Key features of accreditation processes in developing countries include:

External Evaluation: Accreditation processes typically involve external evaluators, often comprising experts from academia, industry, and regulatory bodies. These evaluators assess various aspects of institutional quality, including curriculum design, faculty qualifications, student support services, infrastructure, and governance structures (Chinta et al., 2016; Frank et al., 2020; Kayyali, 2024).

Standards and Criteria: Accreditation standards and criteria serve as benchmarks against which institutions are evaluated. These standards may encompass aspects such as academic rigour, relevance to societal needs, student learning outcomes, research productivity, and institutional governance. Standards are often developed in consultation with stakeholders and are periodically reviewed and updated to reflect changing educational priorities and contexts (Airey & Benckendorff, 2017; Degn et al., 2023; Haddad-Adaimi, 2023; Gaston, 2023; Kayyali, 2024).

Self-Assessment: Accreditation processes often include a self-assessment component, wherein institutions conduct internal evaluations of their performance against accreditation standards. Self-assessment enables institutions to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement, thereby facilitating continuous quality enhancement efforts (Phillips & Kinser, 2018; Manimala et al. 2020; Mkuzangwe, 2020; Fernandes, & Singh, 2022; Singh et al., 2023).

Peer Review: Peer review is a central component of accreditation processes, whereby institutions undergo evaluation by peer institutions or subject matter experts. Peer reviewers provide feedback, recommendations, and commendations based on their assessment of institutional performance against accreditation standards (Hillman & Baydoun, 2019; King & Ayoo, 2020; Manimala et al., 2020).

Periodic Review: Accreditation is typically granted for a specific period, after which institutions undergo periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status. Periodic review ensures that institutions continue to meet evolving quality standards and remain responsive to changing educational contexts and priorities. (Chidindi, 2016; Do et al., 2021; Bouchard & Hamel, 2023)

Quality Improvement Plans: Accreditation processes often require institutions to develop and implement quality improvement plans based on feedback received during the accreditation review (Clinch & Violato, 2016; McElgunn & Weiner, 2020; Kfuri et al., 2021). These plans outline specific actions, goals, and timelines for addressing identified areas for improvement and enhancing overall institutional quality.

Accreditation processes in developing countries face unique challenges, including resource constraints, capacity limitations, and variability in regulatory frameworks and standards across regions (Cloete et al., 2011; Hou et al., 2018; Manimala et al., 2020; Fernandes & Singh, 2022). Despite these challenges,

accreditation serves as a valuable mechanism for promoting educational quality, accountability, and continuous improvement in higher education institutions within developing countries.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCIES

Quality assurance agencies in developing countries play a pivotal role in overseeing and regulating the quality of higher education institutions and programs (Mok & Sawn Khai, 2024). These agencies are responsible for implementing accreditation processes, conducting evaluations, and establishing quality standards. Key characteristics of quality assurance agencies in developing countries include:

Regulatory Oversight: Quality assurance agencies serve as regulatory bodies responsible for monitoring and overseeing the quality of higher education institutions within their respective jurisdictions (Lacey & Murray, 2015; Seniwoliba & Yakubu, 2015; Gaston, 2023). They establish policies, guidelines, and standards to ensure compliance with quality benchmarks and regulatory requirements.

Accreditation Functions: Quality assurance agencies conduct accreditation processes to assess the quality and effectiveness of higher education institutions and programs (Verma, 2016; Dei, 2019; Makhoul, 2019; Yelezhanova et al., 2020; Aburizaizah, 2022). Accreditation evaluations may encompass institutional accreditation, programmatic accreditation, and specialised accreditation in fields such as medicine, engineering, and business.

Independent Evaluation: Quality assurance agencies operate independently of higher education institutions to maintain objectivity and impartiality in their evaluation processes (Hoyle, 2017; Kristoffersen, 2023; Vanari & Kaçaniku, 2023). They employ qualified assessors and evaluators with expertise in various academic disciplines and institutional management areas.

Stakeholder Engagement: Quality assurance agencies engage with a diverse range of stakeholders, including government agencies, higher education institutions, students, employers, and professional bodies (Beerkens & Udam, 2017; Ferrero-Ferrero et al., 2018; Hou et al., 2022). Stakeholder involvement ensures transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to the needs and expectations of the broader community.

Capacity Building: Quality assurance agencies provide support, guidance, and capacity-building initiatives to higher education institutions to enhance their quality assurance systems and practices (Rahnuma, 2020; Greere, 2023; van de Mortel et al., 2023). Capacity-building efforts may include training programs, workshops, and technical assistance to improve institutional governance, data management, and quality enhancement strategies.

International Collaboration: Quality assurance agencies often collaborate with regional and international organisations, such as the UNESCO-UNEVOC Network and the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE), to exchange best practices, benchmark standards, and promote quality assurance initiatives at the global level (Sirat, 2017; Hou et al., 2021; DeLaquil et al., 2022; Carvalho et al., 2023).

Continuous Improvement: Quality assurance agencies engage in ongoing evaluation and review processes to continuously improve their own performance and effectiveness (McIntosh et al., 2018; Makhoul, 2019;

Lucander & Christersson, 2020). They solicit feedback from stakeholders, conduct self-assessments, and implement quality improvement measures to enhance their regulatory functions and service delivery.

Despite their critical role, quality assurance agencies in developing countries face challenges such as limited financial resources, staffing constraints, and capacity gaps (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007; Kagondu, 2015; Garwe, 2021; Mgaiwa, 2021). Addressing these challenges is essential to strengthening the quality assurance infrastructure and promoting excellence in higher education within developing countries.

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PRACTICES

Institutional quality assurance practices within developing countries are integral to ensuring the delivery of high-quality education and fostering continuous improvement within higher education institutions (Cloete et al., 2011; Panda, 2017; Kayyali, 2024). Key components of institutional quality assurance practices include:

Quality Policies and Procedures: Higher education institutions develop and implement quality policies and procedures to guide their quality assurance efforts (Manatos et al., 2017; Kooli, 2019; Aburizaizah, 2022). These policies outline institutional commitments to educational excellence, define quality objectives, and establish processes for monitoring, evaluating, and enhancing educational quality.

Internal Quality Assurance Mechanisms: Institutions employ internal quality assurance mechanisms to monitor and assess the effectiveness of their educational programs, teaching methodologies, and support services (Tsevi, 2015; Mkuzangwe, 2020; Rawabdeh et al., 2021; Ng'hoboko, 2024). These mechanisms may include curriculum reviews, faculty evaluations, student feedback mechanisms, and program evaluations conducted by internal committees or quality assurance units.

Institutional Research and Assessment: Institutions engage in institutional research and assessment activities to collect and analyse data on various aspects of institutional performance and student outcomes (De Lisle, 2014; Emil & Cress, 2014; Wilson & Wilson, 2018; Hoessler et al., 2023). This may include assessing student learning outcomes, tracking graduation rates, conducting alumni surveys, and analysing institutional effectiveness measures.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives: Institutions prioritise continuous improvement initiatives aimed at addressing identified areas for enhancement and optimising educational quality (Singh & Singh, 2015; McLean et al., 2017; Sunder & Antony, 2018; Budihardjo et al., 2021). This may involve implementing action plans based on data-driven decision-making, fostering a culture of innovation and experimentation, and promoting faculty development and training programs.

External Benchmarking and Collaboration: Institutions engage in external benchmarking and collaboration initiatives to benchmark their performance against peer institutions, industry standards, and best practices. (Chinta et al., 2016; Tasopoulou & Tsiotras, 2017; Caeiro et al., 2020) This may involve participating in national and international benchmarking exercises, collaborating with industry partners, and engaging in academic networks and consortia.

Accreditation and External Review: Institutions undergo accreditation processes and external reviews conducted by quality assurance agencies to validate the quality and credibility of their educational programs and services (Martin, 2016; Bagdasarian et al., 2019; Gaston, 2023). Accreditation provides external validation of institutional quality and demonstrates compliance with established standards and criteria.

Stakeholder Engagement and Accountability: Institutions actively engage with stakeholders, including students, faculty, employers, policymakers, and the broader community, to solicit feedback, address concerns, and promote transparency and accountability in their quality assurance practices (Benneworth et al., 2018; Stosich & Bae, 2018; Hou et al., 2022).

By implementing robust institutional quality assurance practices, higher education institutions in developing countries can enhance their educational quality, foster innovation and excellence, and contribute to national development goals and societal needs.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

Government policies and regulations play a crucial role in shaping the quality assurance landscape in higher education within developing countries (Altbach & Salmi, 2011). Key aspects of government policies and regulations related to quality assurance include:

Regulatory Frameworks: Governments establish regulatory frameworks to govern higher education institutions and ensure compliance with quality standards and requirements (Koebel, 2018; Lescrauwaet et al., 2022; Mashaya, 2023; Dudar et al. 2024). These frameworks may include laws, regulations, and guidelines governing institutional governance, academic standards, accreditation processes, and quality assurance mechanisms.

Accreditation and Licensing: Governments mandate accreditation and licensing processes for higher education institutions to ensure that they meet predetermined quality benchmarks and regulatory requirements (Delva et al., 2019; Hou et al., 2021; Aburizaizah, 2022). Accreditation and licensing procedures may involve external evaluations, peer reviews, and periodic assessments conducted by designated quality assurance agencies or governmental bodies.

Quality Standards and Criteria: Governments set quality standards and criteria to guide the evaluation and assessment of educational programs, teaching methodologies, and institutional performance (Yorke & Vidovich, 2016; Lazić et al., 2021; Molina et al., 2021; Duarte & Vardasca, 2023). These standards may encompass aspects such as curriculum design, faculty qualifications, infrastructure, student support services, and learning outcomes.

Funding and Resource Allocation: Governments allocate financial resources and funding mechanisms to support quality assurance initiatives and enhance the capacity of higher education institutions (Alshamy, 2012; Ziderman, 2013; de Boer et al., 2015; Zavale et al., 2015). Funding may be tied to compliance with accreditation standards, performance indicators, and quality improvement targets, incentivising institutions to prioritise educational quality and accountability.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Governments establish mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of quality assurance practices and regulatory compliance within higher education institutions (Yorke & Vidovich, 2016; Lazić et al., 2021; Duarte & Vardasca, 2023). This may involve conducting periodic audits, inspections, and reviews of institutional performance, as well as collecting data on key quality indicators and outcomes.

Policy Coordination and Collaboration: Governments collaborate with relevant stakeholders, including quality assurance agencies, higher education institutions, employers, and civil society organisations, to coordinate policy efforts and promote coherence in quality assurance practices (Hou et al., 2016; Menashy, 2016; Nwajiuba et al., 2020; Baporikar, 2021). Policy coordination ensures alignment with national development goals, educational priorities, and international standards.

Capacity Building and Support: Governments provide capacity-building support, technical assistance, and training programs to strengthen the institutional capacity of quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions (Hou, 2014; Boeren, 2018; Nguyen, 2019). Capacity-building initiatives aim to enhance regulatory enforcement, accreditation processes, data management, and quality enhancement strategies.

Effective government policies and regulations are essential for creating an enabling environment for quality assurance in higher education, promoting institutional accountability, and safeguarding educational quality and relevance within developing countries.

CHALLENGES AND ISSUES

RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS

Resource constraints pose significant challenges to implementing effective quality assurance mechanisms in higher education institutions within developing countries (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007; Khalil, 2017; Hillman & Baydoun, 2019; Zuhairi et al., 2020). Key issues related to resource constraints include:

Financial Limitations: Higher education institutions in developing countries often face inadequate funding and budgetary constraints, limiting their ability to invest in quality assurance infrastructure, staff development, and technological resources (Obwogi, 2013; Atuahene, 2014; Sarkar, 2014; Cardoso et al., 2016; Arnhold & Bassett, 2021; Kadikilo et al., 2024). Insufficient financial resources hinder institutions' capacity to implement robust quality assurance mechanisms and address emerging challenges.

Staffing Shortages: Many higher education institutions in developing countries experience staffing shortages, particularly in specialised areas such as accreditation, assessment, and data analysis (Mohamedbhai, 2014; Lim, 2018; Altbach et al., 2019; Ogunode & Musa, 2020). The lack of qualified personnel with expertise in quality assurance processes and methodologies undermines the effectiveness of quality assurance efforts and compromises the reliability of evaluation outcomes.

Infrastructure Deficiencies: Inadequate infrastructure, including outdated facilities, limited access to technology, and insufficient laboratory equipment, impairs institutions' ability to deliver high-quality education and support effective quality assurance practices (Khumalo & Mji, 2014; Horton et al., 2018;

Jacob et al., 2020; Ogunode et al., 2022). Infrastructure deficiencies hinder institutions' capacity to meet accreditation standards, conduct assessments, and provide quality learning environments for students.

Training and Capacity Building Needs: Higher education institutions and quality assurance agencies in developing countries face challenges in providing training and capacity-building opportunities to staff involved in quality assurance activities (Power et al., 2015; Arthur & Arthur, 2016; Okoche, 2017; Hou et al., 2018; Nguyen, 2019; Garwe, 2021). The lack of professional development programs, workshops, and training resources inhibits the development of essential skills and competencies required for effective quality assurance implementation.

Data Management Challenges: Data management poses challenges for higher education institutions in developing countries, including limited access to reliable data systems, inadequate data collection and analysis tools, and data privacy concerns (Murumba & Micheni, 2017; Mukred, 2019; Alnafrah & Mouselli, 2021; Dodman et al., 2021; Mukred et al., 2021; Mohammad & Vargas, 2022). Poor data management practices undermine institutions' ability to monitor and evaluate educational quality, track student outcomes, and generate evidence-based insights for quality improvement.

Coordination and Collaboration Barriers: Fragmentation and lack of coordination among stakeholders, including government agencies, quality assurance agencies, and higher education institutions, hinder collaborative efforts to address resource constraints and enhance quality assurance practices (Awasthy et al., 2020; Penuel et al., 2020; Adhikari, & Shrestha, 2023; Rossoni et al., 2024). The absence of cohesive national policies, coordination mechanisms, and collaborative initiatives exacerbates challenges related to resource allocation and utilisation.

Addressing resource constraints requires concerted efforts from government authorities, higher education institutions, and international partners to mobilise financial resources, strengthen institutional capacity, and promote collaboration and knowledge sharing. By investing in quality assurance infrastructure, staff development, and technological resources, stakeholders can mitigate the impact of resource constraints and enhance the quality and relevance of higher education in developing countries.

CULTURAL AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

Cultural and contextual factors significantly influence the design, implementation, and effectiveness of quality assurance mechanisms in higher education institutions within developing countries (De Wit, 2002; Hsu, 2017; Greere, 2023). Key considerations regarding cultural and contextual factors include:

Diversity of Educational Systems: Developing countries encompass a wide range of educational systems, each shaped by unique cultural, historical, and socio-economic contexts (Mitchell, 2016; Fainshmidt et al., 2018; Watkins & Noble, 2021; Alam, & Mohanty, 2023). The diversity of educational systems influences the design and implementation of quality assurance mechanisms, as well as the interpretation and application of quality standards and criteria across different institutional contexts.

Institutional Autonomy and Governance Structures: Cultural norms, values, and governance structures influence the degree of institutional autonomy and academic freedom within higher education institutions (Nokkala & Bladh, 2014; Maassen et al., 2017; Chattopadhyay, 2020; Sancheti & Pillai, 2020). Variations

in institutional autonomy impact the implementation of quality assurance practices, as institutions navigate cultural expectations, regulatory requirements, and internal governance mechanisms.

Academic Culture and Pedagogical Approaches: Cultural factors shape academic culture, teaching methodologies, and learning preferences within higher education institutions (Urdan & Bruchmann, 2018; Kumpulainen et al., 2019; Adom et al., 2024). Variations in academic culture and pedagogical approaches impact the assessment and evaluation of educational quality, as quality assurance mechanisms must accommodate diverse teaching and learning practices and cultural norms.

Trust and Accountability Mechanisms: Cultural norms regarding trust, transparency, and accountability influence the effectiveness of quality assurance mechanisms and stakeholder engagement within higher education institutions (Beerkens & Udam, 2017; Dzimińska et al., 2018; Smith & Benavot, 2019; Abebe, 2021). Building trust among stakeholders, including students, faculty, administrators, and policymakers, is essential for fostering collaboration, accountability, and shared responsibility for quality assurance.

Socio-Economic Contexts and Resource Constraints: Socio-economic factors, including poverty, inequality, and resource constraints, pose challenges to implementing quality assurance mechanisms in developing countries (Kingdon et al., 2014; Mohamedbhai, 2014; Leibowitz et al., 2015; Kromydas, 2017; Abad-Segura & González-Zamar, 2021). Limited financial resources, infrastructure deficiencies, and competing priorities hinder institutions' capacity to invest in quality enhancement initiatives and address systemic inequities in educational access and outcomes.

Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Local Relevance: Indigenous knowledge systems, cultural traditions, and local contexts shape the content, delivery, and relevance of higher education curricula and programs (Mawere, 2015; Pidgeon, 2016; Ronoh, 2018; Gainsford, 2021; Adom et al., 2024). Quality assurance mechanisms must recognise and respect the value of indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage, ensuring that educational offerings are responsive to local needs, contexts, and aspirations.

Globalisation and Internationalisation Dynamics: Globalization and internationalisation trends impact higher education systems in developing countries, influencing quality assurance practices, academic mobility, and collaboration with international partners (de Wit et al., 2017; Teichler, 2017; Smith, 2022; Woldegiorgis, 2023). Cultural factors intersect with global dynamics, shaping institutions' responses to external pressures, market demands, and quality assurance standards.

Navigating cultural and contextual factors requires sensitivity to local contexts, cultural diversity, and the dynamic interplay between global and local influences. Quality assurance mechanisms must be adaptive, inclusive, and responsive to cultural nuances, ensuring that educational quality is equitable, relevant, and meaningful within diverse higher education settings.

CAPACITY BUILDING AND TRAINING

Capacity building and training initiatives are essential for strengthening quality assurance mechanisms and enhancing institutional effectiveness within higher education institutions in developing countries (Cloete et al., 2011; Garwe, 2021). Key challenges and considerations regarding capacity building and training include:

Staff Competencies and Skills Gaps: Higher education institutions and quality assurance agencies in developing countries face challenges related to staff competencies and skills gaps in quality assurance processes, methodologies, and tools (Kagondu, 2015; Kalua, 2020; Rahnuma, 2020; Wangai, 2022; Bamusi, 2023). Many institutions lack trained personnel with expertise in accreditation, assessment, data analysis, and quality enhancement strategies, hindering the effective implementation of quality assurance mechanisms.

Professional Development Opportunities: Limited access to professional development opportunities, workshops, and training programs inhibits the continuous learning and skill development of staff involved in quality assurance activities (Steinert et al., 2016; Wijewantha, 2017; Johns, 2018; Phillips, S. D., & Kinser, 2018; Seedat, 2021). The absence of formal training programs and mentorship opportunities impedes staff capacity-building efforts, limiting the depth and breadth of expertise in quality assurance practices.

Financial Constraints: Financial constraints pose barriers to investing in capacity-building initiatives and training programs within higher education institutions (Veer Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017; Mbithi et al., 2021; Shah Bukhari et al., 2022). Limited funding for staff development, travel expenses, and training materials constrains institutions' ability to provide comprehensive and sustained capacity-building support to staff engaged in quality assurance activities.

Institutional Support and Recognition: Higher education institutions may lack institutional support and recognition for staff engagement in quality assurance activities, diminishing incentives for staff participation in training and capacity-building initiatives (Power et al., 2015; Nguyen, 2016; McCowan, 2018; Prakash, 2018; Kanwar et al., 2019; Wangai, 2022). The absence of formal recognition mechanisms, career advancement opportunities, and performance incentives undermines staff motivation and commitment to quality assurance efforts.

Access to Training Resources: Access to training resources, including educational materials, online courses, and best practice guides, may be limited in developing countries, particularly in remote or underserved regions (Power et al., 2015; Ouma, 2019; Anyim, 2021; Mathrani et al., 2022; Zarei & Mohammadi, 2022). Inadequate access to training resources inhibits staff's ability to acquire knowledge, develop skills, and stay abreast of emerging trends and innovations in quality assurance practices.

Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing: Collaboration and knowledge sharing among higher education institutions, quality assurance agencies, and international partners are essential for leveraging expertise, resources, and best practices in quality assurance capacity building (Dhamdhere, 2015; Menon et al., 2022; Maiya, & Aithal, 2023). However, barriers such as language barriers, institutional rivalries, and information asymmetries may impede effective collaboration and hinder the dissemination of knowledge and expertise.

Addressing capacity building and training challenges requires a multi-faceted approach involving government support, institutional leadership, and collaboration among stakeholders. Investing in staff development, providing access to training resources, fostering collaboration, and incentivizing staff engagement are critical steps toward building a skilled and competent workforce capable of implementing effective quality assurance mechanisms in higher education institutions.

EQUITY AND ACCESS

Equity and access issues present significant challenges to implementing effective quality assurance mechanisms and ensuring inclusive higher education environments within developing countries (Altbach & Salmi, 2011; Salmi & D'Addio, 2021; Matsieli & Mutula, 2024). Key considerations regarding equity and access include:

Socio-Economic Disparities: Socio-economic disparities, including poverty, inequality, and marginalised communities, contribute to unequal access to higher education opportunities in developing countries (Ramrathan, 2018; Tyagi et al., 2021; Mishra & Pettala, 2023; Makhanya, 2024). Students from disadvantaged backgrounds face barriers such as financial constraints, lack of access to quality schooling, and socio-cultural factors that limit their participation in higher education.

Geographic Inequities: Geographic disparities in educational infrastructure, resources, and opportunities exacerbate inequities in access to higher education (Cullinan et al., 2021; Zahnd et al., 2022; Mishra et al., 2023). Rural and remote areas often lack adequate higher education institutions, facilities, and support services, forcing students to relocate or travel long distances to access educational opportunities, further marginalising underserved communities.

Gender Disparities: Gender inequities persist in higher education access and participation rates, particularly in patriarchal societies where cultural norms and discriminatory practices limit women's educational opportunities (Walker et al., 2019; O'Connor, 2020; De Welde & Stepnick, 2023). Women face barriers such as early marriage, domestic responsibilities, and societal expectations that prioritise male education, hindering their access to higher education and career advancement opportunities.

Disability Inclusion: Persons with disabilities often encounter barriers to accessing higher education due to physical, sensory, or cognitive impairments, as well as institutional barriers such as inaccessible infrastructure, limited support services, and negative attitudes (Matonya, 2016; Abubakar, 2017; Ahmed, 2017; Sarkar, 2023; Malinovskiy et al., 2024). Ensuring disability-inclusive higher education environments requires proactive measures to remove barriers, provide accommodations, and promote inclusive policies and practices.

Ethnic and Linguistic Diversity: Ethnic and linguistic diversity within developing countries pose challenges to ensuring equitable access to higher education for minority and indigenous communities (Hays et al., 2019; Cucio et al., 2020; Dhokare & Jadhav, 2023; Akintayo et al., 2024; Smith, 2024). Language barriers, cultural biases, and discrimination limit minority students' access to educational opportunities and contribute to disparities in educational attainment and outcomes.

Affordability and Financial Aid: Affordability remains a significant barrier to higher education access for many students in developing countries, particularly those from low-income households (Schendel & McCowan, 2016; Mitchell et al., 2019; Heleta & Bagus, 2021; Salmi & D'Addio, 2021). High tuition fees, limited availability of financial aid, and inadequate scholarship opportunities constrain students' ability to pursue higher education, perpetuating socio-economic inequalities and limiting social mobility.

Quality of Education: Disparities in the quality of education between urban and rural areas, public and private institutions, and elite and non-elite schools contribute to inequities in higher education access and

outcomes (Marginson, 2016; Malish, 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Ding et al., 2021; Saule & Kurmanov, 2024). Ensuring equitable access to quality education requires addressing systemic inequalities in educational resources, infrastructure, and teaching quality across diverse educational settings.

Addressing equity and access challenges requires comprehensive strategies that prioritise social inclusion, address systemic inequalities, and promote diversity and inclusion in higher education. Policy interventions, targeted support programs, affirmative action measures, and community engagement initiatives are essential for expanding access to higher education and fostering inclusive learning environments within developing countries.

BEST PRACTICES AND INNOVATIONS

CASE STUDIES OF SUCCESSFUL QUALITY ASSURANCE INITIATIVES

Case studies of successful quality assurance initiatives within developing countries highlight innovative approaches, strategies, and practices that have contributed to enhancing educational quality and institutional effectiveness. Some examples include:

Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) in India: The ACGME India consortium, a collaboration between medical education institutions, regulatory bodies, and professional associations, has implemented a competency-based accreditation framework for postgraduate medical education programs. The framework emphasises outcomes-based assessment, faculty development, and continuous quality improvement, leading to enhanced training outcomes and improved patient care (Singh et al., 2015).

Quality Assurance and Accreditation System in Malaysia: Malaysia's Quality Assurance and Accreditation System (SETARA) and Discipline-Based Rating System (D-SETARA) evaluate the quality and performance of higher education institutions and programs based on established criteria and standards. The systems employ peer review, self-assessment, and external evaluation mechanisms to assess institutional effectiveness, teaching quality, research productivity, and graduate employability, fostering a culture of quality enhancement and accountability (Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, 2019).

Institutional Quality Assurance Systems in South Africa: South Africa's Council on Higher Education (CHE) has implemented institutional quality assurance systems to promote excellence, equity, and transformation in higher education. The systems include institutional audits, program reviews, and quality enhancement initiatives aimed at ensuring compliance with national standards, promoting diversity and inclusivity, and addressing systemic challenges such as historical inequalities and underrepresentation of marginalised groups (Council on Higher Education, 2019).

Quality Assurance Framework for Open and Distance Learning in Nigeria: Nigeria's National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN) has developed a quality assurance framework for open and distance learning (ODL) programs, emphasising learner support, course materials development, assessment practices, and technology-enhanced learning modalities. The framework incorporates stakeholder engagement, feedback mechanisms, and quality improvement processes to enhance the accessibility, flexibility, and effectiveness of ODL delivery (National Open University of Nigeria, 2020).

Regional Quality Assurance Networks in Latin America: Regional quality assurance networks, such as the Latin American and Caribbean Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (RECLA) and the Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE), facilitate collaboration, knowledge sharing, and capacity building among higher education institutions across Latin America. The networks promote regional harmonisation of quality assurance standards, mutual recognition of qualifications, and quality enhancement initiatives, contributing to the internationalisation and quality improvement of higher education in the region (RECLA, n.d.).

These case studies demonstrate the diverse approaches, innovative practices, and collaborative efforts that have contributed to strengthening quality assurance mechanisms and promoting educational excellence within developing countries. By drawing on lessons learned from successful initiatives, policymakers, educators, and quality assurance practitioners can identify strategies for overcoming challenges, fostering innovation, and advancing quality assurance agendas in higher education.

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO OVERCOMING CHALLENGES

Innovative approaches to overcoming challenges in quality assurance within developing countries demonstrate creative solutions and adaptive strategies that address systemic issues and promote continuous improvement. Some innovative approaches include:

Mobile Technology for Quality Monitoring: Leveraging mobile technology and digital platforms for quality monitoring and assessment enables real-time data collection, analysis, and feedback mechanisms (King & South, 2017; Murumba & Micheni, 2017; Shorfuzzaman et al., 2019; Aithal et al., 2024). Initiatives such as mobile-based assessment tools, electronic learning portfolios, and virtual quality audits facilitate remote monitoring of educational quality, engagement with stakeholders, and timely intervention in response to emerging issues (UNESCO, 2019).

Community-Engaged Quality Assurance: Adopting community-engaged approaches to quality assurance involves collaborating with local communities, employers, and civil society organisations to co-create quality standards, assess educational relevance, and align programs with societal needs (Grewell, 2019; Sweatman, 2019; Sengupta et al., 2020; Chessa et al., 2022; Sedlacek, 2024). Engaging stakeholders in quality assurance processes enhances transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to community expectations, fostering a culture of mutual trust and partnership (Marginson, 2017).

Open Educational Resources (OER) for Quality Enhancement: Open educational resources (OER), including open textbooks, multimedia materials, and digital learning resources, offer cost-effective solutions for enhancing educational quality, accessibility, and relevance (Miao et al., 2019; Mahendraprabu et al., 2022; Adil et al., 2024). Integrating OER into curriculum design, teaching practices, and assessment strategies enables institutions to expand access to educational materials, promote learner-centred approaches, and support continuous professional development for educators (UNESCO, 2020).

Peer Learning and Collaboration Networks: Establishing peer learning and collaboration networks among higher education institutions fosters knowledge sharing, capacity building, and quality improvement initiatives (Saaida, 2023; Saroyan & Frenay, 2023; Pelser, 2024). Collaborative platforms, consortia, and communities of practice enable institutions to exchange best practices, benchmark standards, and

collaborate on joint projects, enhancing institutional effectiveness and promoting a culture of continuous learning and innovation (OECD, 2018).

Flexible Accreditation Models: Developing flexible accreditation models that accommodate diverse institutional contexts, missions, and educational approaches promotes inclusivity, innovation, and quality enhancement (Fernandes & Singh, 2022; Gaston, 2023; Jaafar et al., 2024; Kayyali, 2024). Accreditation frameworks that recognise non-traditional forms of learning, such as competency-based education, prior learning assessment, and experiential learning, enable institutions to demonstrate educational quality and outcomes in ways that align with their unique strengths and priorities (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2020).

These innovative approaches demonstrate the potential for creative problem-solving, collaboration, and adaptation to overcome challenges and advance quality assurance agendas in higher education within developing countries. By embracing innovation and leveraging emerging technologies, methodologies, and partnerships, stakeholders can address systemic issues, promote educational excellence, and ensure equitable access to quality higher education opportunities.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES' EXPERIENCES

Lessons learned from developing countries' experiences in quality assurance highlight valuable insights, strategies, and recommendations for addressing common challenges and promoting effective quality assurance practices. Some key lessons include:

Contextualised Approaches: Developing countries have demonstrated the importance of adopting contextualised approaches to quality assurance that consider local needs, priorities, and socio-cultural contexts (Chidindi, 2016; Rangou, 2017). Tailoring quality assurance mechanisms to fit the diverse institutional landscapes, educational systems, and socio-economic realities within developing countries enhances the relevance, ownership, and sustainability of quality assurance initiatives (Altbach & Salmi, 2011).

Stakeholder Engagement and Ownership: Engaging stakeholders, including government authorities, higher education institutions, students, employers, and civil society organisations, is essential for building consensus, generating buy-in, and fostering collective ownership of quality assurance processes (Greere & Riley, 2014; Garcia & Jamias, 2023; Jingura et al. 2018; Lucander & Christersson, 2020; Dewi et al., 2021Jha et al., 2024). Meaningful stakeholder involvement ensures transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to diverse perspectives and interests, enhancing the credibility and effectiveness of quality assurance mechanisms (Cloete et al., 2011).

Capacity Building and Professional Development: Investing in capacity building and professional development for staff involved in quality assurance activities is critical for enhancing institutional capacity, promoting innovation, and ensuring the sustainability of quality assurance initiatives (Shabbir et al., 2016; Tezcan-Unal, 2018; Nguyen, 2022; Ansari & Jonathan, 2024). Training programs, workshops, and collaborative learning opportunities enable staff to acquire essential competencies, stay abreast of emerging trends, and develop leadership skills needed to drive quality enhancement efforts (UNESCO, 2020).

Institutional Autonomy and Academic Freedom: Preserving institutional autonomy and academic freedom is essential for fostering a culture of innovation, creativity, and academic excellence within higher education institutions (Hofstadter, 2017; Alibašić et al., 2024; Trivedi, 2024). Quality assurance mechanisms should respect institutional diversity, encourage experimentation, and support institutional initiatives aimed at continuous improvement and quality enhancement (Marginson, 2017).

Continuous Improvement and Adaptation: Embracing a culture of continuous improvement and adaptation is essential for responding to evolving challenges, leveraging opportunities, and advancing quality assurance agendas (Tyler & Glasgow, 2021; Kayyali, 2024; Yurkofsky et al., 2024). Institutions and quality assurance agencies should adopt a dynamic, iterative approach to quality assurance that emphasises reflective practice, evidence-based decision-making, and ongoing evaluation of effectiveness (UNESCO, 2019).

Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing: Developing countries have recognised the importance of collaboration and knowledge sharing among higher education institutions, quality assurance agencies, and international partners in advancing quality assurance agendas (Aulak, 2019; Maiya & Aithal, 2023; Shaffi & Mohamed, 2023). Building collaborative networks, sharing best practices, and fostering South-South and North-South partnerships enable stakeholders to leverage expertise, resources, and innovations to address common challenges and promote educational excellence (OECD, 2018).

By drawing on these lessons learned, developing countries can strengthen their quality assurance systems, promote institutional effectiveness, and contribute to the broader goals of quality, relevance, and equity in higher education.

DISCUSSIONS

INTERCONNECTED CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A THEORETICAL AND CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS

The challenges of quality assurance (QA) in higher education within developing countries are multi-faceted, with significant interplays between resource constraints, cultural and contextual factors, capacity building and training, and equity and access. This complexity can be understood within theoretical frameworks such as resource dependency theory and institutional theory, which provide insights into how external pressures, internal constraints, and socio-cultural factors shape higher education quality assurance mechanisms.

Theoretical Framework: Resource Dependency Theory and Institutional Theory

Resource Dependency Theory (RDT) posits that organisations, including higher education institutions, are constrained by their dependence on external resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). This theory is particularly relevant to developing countries, where institutions are heavily reliant on government funding, international donors, and private investors. The scarcity of resources such as finances, qualified staff, infrastructure, and technology impacts institutions' ability to implement effective quality assurance processes.

Institutional Theory emphasises the role of cultural, regulatory, and cognitive factors in shaping organisational behaviour (Scott, 2004). Higher education institutions are influenced not only by formal rules and standards but also by cultural norms, societal expectations, and governance structures, which vary widely across developing countries. This theory helps explain why quality assurance practices may differ in their design and implementation across various national and institutional contexts.

INTERACTION OF RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS, CULTURAL FACTORS, AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Financial Limitations and Staffing Shortages

The interplay between financial limitations and staffing shortages is crucial. Institutions struggling with funding are less able to attract and retain qualified personnel for quality assurance roles (Obwogi, 2013; Atuahene, 2014). This shortage undermines the ability to effectively manage accreditation processes, assessments, and data collection, which are essential for quality assurance. RDT highlights that institutions heavily dependent on external funding may face challenges in controlling their internal processes, as external entities often dictate how resources are allocated.

Infrastructure Deficiencies and Cultural Contexts

Infrastructure deficiencies, including limited access to technology and inadequate facilities, affect quality assurance outcomes. At the same time, cultural factors such as the diversity of educational systems and institutional autonomy compound these challenges. For instance, institutions in rural areas may lack basic infrastructure, but cultural factors such as governance structures also determine how institutions navigate these limitations. According to institutional theory, these institutions are embedded within broader social and political contexts that shape their approach to quality assurance (Scott, 2004).

Training Needs and Socio-Economic Contexts

There is an evident link between training needs and the broader socio-economic contexts in which institutions operate. For example, financial constraints hinder access to professional development opportunities for staff, which is compounded by socio-economic challenges such as poverty and inequality. Institutions with limited resources are less likely to offer training programs that would equip staff with the necessary skills to implement robust quality assurance mechanisms (Kagondu, 2015; Garwe, 2021). This again aligns with RDT, as the availability of resources dictates the ability to invest in capacity-building.

HOW EQUITY AND ACCESS ARE SHAPED BY KEY FACTORS: FROM SOCIOECONOMICS TO POLICY AND POWER

Geographic and Socio-Economic Inequities: Geographic inequities, particularly in rural or remote areas, lead to disparities in the quality of education and access to higher education opportunities (Cullinan et al., 2021). These inequities are tied to resource constraints such as insufficient funding for infrastructure in remote regions. Moreover, socio-economic disparities result in unequal access to higher education for marginalised communities, creating additional barriers to implementing quality assurance mechanisms that are inclusive and equitable (Makhanya, 2024).

Gender Disparities and Cultural Norms: Gender disparities are deeply influenced by cultural factors in many developing countries. Patriarchal norms and societal expectations often limit women's access to higher education, further exacerbating inequities in quality assurance and educational outcomes (Walker et al., 2019). These cultural factors also intersect with institutional governance structures, where institutional autonomy may either support or hinder efforts to address gender inequities (Nokkala & Bladh, 2014).

Capacity Building, Collaboration, and Knowledge Sharing: Collaboration and knowledge sharing play a critical role in overcoming resource constraints and addressing capacity-building needs. However, barriers to collaboration-such as language barriers and institutional rivalries-limit the ability to disseminate best practices and enhance staff competencies (Dhamdhere, 2015). Capacity-building efforts require strong government support and collaboration between higher education institutions and international partners, aligning with institutional theory, which highlights the importance of norms, values, and collaborative frameworks in shaping organisational outcomes (Scott, 2004).

Addressing Equity and Access in Quality Assurance: Equity and access issues are at the heart of quality assurance challenges in developing countries. Quality assurance mechanisms must be designed to ensure that students from diverse socio-economic, gender, and geographic backgrounds have equal access to higher education opportunities. This requires targeted interventions such as affirmative action, scholarships, and community outreach programs (Salmi & D'Addio, 2021). Institutions must also develop disability-inclusive policies and practices to ensure that higher education is accessible to persons with disabilities (Matonya, 2016).

SYNTHESISING THE INTERPLAY OF FACTORS

The success of quality assurance mechanisms in developing countries is contingent upon addressing the interconnectedness of resource constraints, cultural and contextual factors, capacity building, and equity and access.

Resource dependency theory highlights that institutions must navigate external resource dependencies while managing internal processes, creating a balancing act between financial limitations and quality assurance needs.

Institutional theory explains how cultural norms, governance structures, and societal expectations influence the design and implementation of quality assurance mechanisms. Institutions must adapt these mechanisms to local contexts, ensuring they are relevant and responsive to diverse educational systems and cultural dynamics.

In summary, addressing the challenges of quality assurance in higher education in developing countries requires a holistic approach that integrates resource management, cultural sensitivity, capacity building, and a commitment to equity and access. Theoretical frameworks like resource dependency theory and institutional theory provide valuable insights into how institutions can navigate these challenges and create sustainable, inclusive, and effective quality assurance systems.

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: INTEGRATING SYSTEMS, STAKEHOLDERS, CULTURE, TECHNOLOGY, AND EQUITY

In discussing the best practices and innovations in quality assurance (QA) in higher education within developing countries, it is essential to understand the interplay between various contextual factors and theoretical frameworks that shape the success of these initiatives. The effectiveness of QA mechanisms is not only driven by isolated strategies but by how they interact with broader socio-economic, cultural, technological, and policy dynamics.

Systems Theory and Holistic Approaches: The success of QA initiatives can be better understood through the lens of systems theory. Higher education institutions (HEIs) operate as complex systems where multiple components-financial resources, staff capabilities, governance structures, and external accreditation bodies-interact. A systemic approach views QA not as a standalone process but as integrated with other institutional activities, as seen in South Africa's institutional audits. These audits focus on equity and transformation, acknowledging that historical inequalities affect the quality and outcomes of higher education (Council on Higher Education, 2019). By embedding QA into the institution's broader system, outcomes such as equity and inclusivity are better addressed.

Stakeholder Theory and Community Engagement: Community-engaged quality assurance, highlighted in successful case studies such as Malaysia's SETARA system, aligns with stakeholder theory, which asserts that institutions must consider the needs and interests of all stakeholders. Malaysia's success stems from its commitment to peer reviews, external evaluations, and stakeholder engagement, ensuring that programs remain relevant to the labour market and society (Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, 2019). This engagement fosters accountability and transparency, essential elements in developing trust and aligning educational outcomes with societal expectations.

Cultural and Contextual Sensitivity in QA Implementation: The influence of cultural and contextual factors in QA processes is a recurring theme, emphasising the need for culturally adaptive frameworks. For instance, the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) in India, which emphasises competency-based outcomes, reflects the adaptation of global best practices to local contexts (Singh et al., 2015). Successful QA systems account for local pedagogical traditions, societal needs, and governance structures, as institutions cannot adopt a one-size-fits-all approach. This aligns with cultural adaptation theory, which posits that educational systems must adjust to their cultural contexts to be effective.

Technology Adoption and Innovation Diffusion: The role of technology in overcoming QA challenges is increasingly prominent, particularly in resource-constrained environments. Initiatives such as mobile technology for quality monitoring in remote areas align with innovation diffusion theory (Rogers, 2003). These technologies allow HEIs to gather data in real time, provide flexible learning options, and assess performance across geographically diverse regions. By integrating open educational resources (OER), institutions can also address equity challenges, expanding access to educational materials for underserved populations (UNESCO, 2020). This demonstrates how technological innovations can be diffused across institutions, improving both access and quality.

Capacity Building and Professional Development: Addressing the challenge of staff competencies requires frameworks that emphasise continuous learning and professional development, such as human

capital theory (Becker, 1964). Effective QA systems rely on staff who are trained in current methodologies, as seen in Nigeria's National Open University, which developed a QA framework for open and distance learning. Investing in staff capacity ensures that QA processes are sustainable and adaptive to emerging educational trends, including the increasing use of technology in assessments and evaluations.

Equity and Access in QA Systems: Social justice theory provides a useful lens through which to analyse QA initiatives focused on equity and access. HEIs in developing countries face significant challenges related to socio-economic, geographic, and gender inequities. Flexible accreditation models, such as those in Latin America, and open educational resources, offer innovative solutions to these issues by making higher education more accessible to marginalised groups (Miao et al., 2019). By promoting inclusive and flexible learning pathways, these initiatives contribute to social equity, aligning with the principles of fairness and justice in educational access.

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF FACTORS

The case studies and innovations reveal that these factors- cultural sensitivity, stakeholder engagement, technological adoption, and equity considerations-are interdependent. For instance, capacity-building efforts enhance institutional effectiveness, which in turn supports the successful adoption of technology and innovative teaching methods. At the same time, addressing socio-economic and cultural disparities improves the effectiveness of QA systems, as institutions can better respond to local needs and priorities. In conclusion, applying these theoretical frameworks to the case studies of successful QA initiatives highlights the interconnectedness of different factors. The most effective approaches are those that recognise the complexity of educational systems and address these factors in an integrated, adaptive manner. By fostering collaboration, embracing cultural contexts, investing in capacity building, and leveraging technology, HEIs in developing countries can overcome challenges and ensure that quality assurance mechanisms lead to sustainable educational improvement.

INTERCONNECTED FACTORS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK IN LESSONS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) EXPERIENCES

The experiences of developing countries in quality assurance offer valuable lessons on how various factors collectively contribute to educational quality. These lessons underscore the importance of contextualised approaches, stakeholder engagement, institutional autonomy, capacity building, and continuous improvement. The success of quality assurance mechanisms can be better understood through the application of several theoretical frameworks that highlight the relationships among these factors.

Contextualised Approaches: Relevance and Cultural Adaptation

The adoption of contextualised approaches in quality assurance aligns with cultural adaptation theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which emphasizes the need to tailor practices to local realities. Developing countries have diverse socio-economic, cultural, and political environments that directly influence how QA processes are received and implemented. For example, Chidindi (2016) and Rangou (2017) highlight the importance of aligning quality assurance mechanisms with local priorities and educational systems to ensure sustainability. This approach fosters institutional ownership and relevance, improving the long-term success of QA initiatives.

Contextualisation also plays a role in making QA processes more equitable, as they can better address specific challenges such as resource constraints, regional disparities, and varying levels of educational infrastructure. By incorporating local cultural and social norms, institutions increase the effectiveness and legitimacy of their QA systems.

Stakeholder Engagement: Stakeholder Theory and Collective Ownership

The stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) emphasises the importance of engaging all relevant parties in decision-making processes to foster shared ownership and responsibility. In the context of QA, the involvement of students, employers, academic staff, civil society, and government bodies ensures that quality assurance systems are aligned with societal needs and expectations. Studies like Garcia & Jamias (2023) and Jingura et al. (2018) illustrate how such engagement leads to more credible and effective QA processes, where transparency and accountability are key outcomes.

Collaboration among stakeholders promotes a balanced approach to quality assurance, where diverse perspectives help shape standards and strategies. This ensures that the educational system remains flexible, adaptable, and responsive to both market demands and the broader socio-cultural context, ultimately enhancing institutional credibility.

Capacity Building and Human Capital Development

The need for capacity building and professional development aligns with human capital theory (Becker, 1964), which posits that investing in the skills and competencies of individuals leads to increased productivity and innovation. In quality assurance, institutional staff who are trained in the latest QA trends and practices can drive continuous improvement, innovation, and sustainable QA processes.

Capacity building, as highlighted by Shabbir et al. (2016) and Tezcan-Unal (2018), ensures that HEIs have the internal expertise required to maintain and adapt their QA systems over time. Furthermore, continuous professional development enables institutions to stay competitive in a global educational landscape, ensuring that the competencies of educators and administrators evolve alongside emerging technologies and pedagogical innovations.

Institutional Autonomy and Academic Freedom

The balance between **institutional autonomy** and quality assurance mechanisms is rooted in institutional theory (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), which emphasises how organisations respond to external pressures while maintaining internal flexibility. In the context of QA, institutional autonomy allows universities and colleges to innovate and experiment, contributing to educational quality and academic excellence (Hofstadter, 2017).

However, maintaining this autonomy requires a careful balance with accountability. Quality assurance frameworks must ensure that institutions meet national and international standards while respecting the diversity of institutional missions and educational approaches. This balance supports creativity and responsiveness to local needs, making QA more adaptable and institution-specific.

Continuous Improvement and Adaptation: Organizational Learning Theory

The concept of continuous improvement aligns with organisational learning theory (Argyris & Schön, 1978), which suggests that institutions learn and improve through iterative processes of reflection, evaluation, and adaptation. Institutions that embrace a culture of continuous improvement are better positioned to respond to challenges and leverage opportunities for quality enhancement, as emphasised by Tyler & Glasgow (2021) and Yurkofsky et al. (2024).

This iterative process fosters innovation and ensures that QA mechanisms are dynamic rather than static. It allows institutions to integrate feedback, adjust strategies, and adopt new technologies or methodologies that improve educational outcomes. Furthermore, the ability to reflect and adapt makes these systems more resilient in the face of changing educational landscapes.

Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing: Network Theory

The importance of collaboration and knowledge sharing in quality assurance is underpinned by network theory (Burt, 1992), which highlights the value of interconnectedness in driving innovation and capacity building. Developing countries have found success in building collaborative networks, and engaging in South-South and North-South partnerships to share best practices, resources, and expertise (Maiya & Aithal, 2023).

These networks enhance the flow of knowledge and innovation, allowing institutions to benefit from shared resources, benchmark against international standards, and implement successful QA practices from other contexts. Collaborative efforts help institutions overcome resource limitations by pooling knowledge and enabling peer learning, which is crucial for developing more robust and innovative quality assurance systems.

In summary, the experiences of developing countries in quality assurance offer important lessons about the significance of integrating stakeholder engagement, capacity building, contextual adaptation, and institutional autonomy. Theoretical frameworks such as stakeholder theory, human capital theory, and organisational learning theory help explain the success of these initiatives by highlighting the interconnectedness of the factors that drive quality assurance. Through collaboration, innovation, and a focus on continuous improvement, developing countries can continue to strengthen their quality assurance systems and ensure that they meet the challenges and opportunities of an evolving global educational landscape.

CONCLUSIONS

This review of quality assurance (QA) practices in higher education within developing countries highlights the complex interplay of theoretical perspectives and practical challenges. Key conclusions can be drawn from the discussions on institutional capacity, stakeholder engagement, resource constraints, and the influence of local and global standards:

Balancing Global Standards with Local Contexts: Higher education institutions (HEIs) in developing countries face significant challenges in meeting international QA standards due to resource limitations and socio-economic disparities. While international accreditation enhances institutional legitimacy, it

must be adapted to local needs. Tailoring global QA models to fit the unique contexts of these countries is crucial for sustainable improvement.

Institutional Capacity and Continuous Improvement: Developing countries often lack the internal structures and resources to fully support effective QA systems. This review underscores the importance of building institutional capacity-establishing dedicated QA offices, improving staff expertise, and leveraging internal feedback mechanisms to foster a culture of continuous improvement. Long-term capacity-building strategies are needed to ensure the sustainability of QA practices.

Importance of Stakeholder Engagement: Effective QA practices rely heavily on the involvement of diverse stakeholders, including students, faculty, employers, and policymakers. However, stakeholder engagement in developing countries is often minimal due to a lack of awareness and weak institutional structures. Strengthening stakeholder participation through more inclusive feedback loops is critical to ensuring transparency, accountability, and relevance of QA processes.

Resource Allocation and Strategic Planning: Resource dependency is a significant factor influencing QA practices in developing countries. With limited financial and human resources, institutions must strategically allocate resources to prioritise areas that have the highest potential to impact educational quality. International collaborations and partnerships can be leveraged to alleviate resource shortages, but local institutional autonomy is essential to adapt these resources to specific contexts.

Cultural Sensitivity in QA Implementation: The successful implementation of QA systems in developing countries depends on understanding and incorporating the local cultural context. Traditional academic hierarchies, societal norms, and institutional trust can either support or hinder the adoption of modern QA practices. QA frameworks must be designed to respect these cultural factors while introducing accountability mechanisms that align with both local and global expectations.

Collaborative Networks and Social Capital: The review emphasises the value of social capital-building networks and relationships among institutions, accrediting bodies, and governmental agencies as a key factor in enhancing QA processes. Collaborative peer reviews, mentorship programs, and partnerships can help resource-constrained institutions develop robust QA systems, fostering both short-term improvements and long-term sustainability.

In summary, the review highlights the need for context-specific strategies that balance global QA standards with the realities of developing countries. By fostering institutional capacity, engaging stakeholders, strategically allocating resources, and leveraging social capital, HEIs in developing countries can overcome the unique challenges they face in implementing effective QA systems and improving educational quality.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the discussions and conclusions drawn from the review of quality assurance (QA) practices in higher education within developing countries, the following policy recommendations are proposed to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of QA systems:

Develop Context-Specific QA Frameworks: Governments and higher education institutions (HEIs) in developing countries should avoid a wholesale adoption of QA models from economically advanced nations. Instead, they should develop context-specific frameworks that balance international standards with local realities. This would involve adapting global benchmarks to account for resource limitations, socio-economic challenges, and cultural factors. Policymakers should create flexible QA policies that allow institutions to tailor global standards to local needs, focusing on practical, achievable quality improvements rather than rigid adherence to external benchmarks.

Strengthen Institutional Autonomy and Capacity-Building: Increasing the institutional autonomy of HEIs is crucial for allowing them to implement and manage QA systems that align with their specific goals and challenges. Alongside autonomy, capacity-building initiatives should be prioritized, focusing on establishing dedicated QA units, enhancing staff training, and providing technical support for quality management. Governments should offer grants and technical assistance programs to build the internal capacities of HEIs, including the establishment of QA offices and the training of quality assurance professionals.

Ensure Sustainable Resource Allocation: Given the resource constraints that many HEIs in developing countries face, strategic resource allocation is critical. National governments, in partnership with international organizations, should prioritize funding for key areas that have the highest impact on educational quality, such as infrastructure development, staff recruitment, and technological advancements. Policymakers should allocate budgetary support specifically for QA activities, ensuring that resources are channelled into building and sustaining long-term quality improvement mechanisms, including accreditation, regular evaluations, and internal monitoring systems.

Enhance Stakeholder Engagement: QA practices must involve a wide range of stakeholders, including students, faculty, employers, and government agencies, to ensure that they reflect the needs and expectations of all parties involved. This can be achieved by creating formal platforms for stakeholder participation, such as advisory boards, feedback committees, and consultation forums. Policies should mandate the establishment of stakeholder engagement mechanisms within HEIs, ensuring regular and structured input from students, faculty, and other relevant groups in shaping and evaluating QA processes.

Promote International Partnerships and Collaborations: International collaborations with established universities and accrediting bodies can help HEIs in developing countries strengthen their QA systems. Governments should encourage partnerships that facilitate peer reviews, mentorship programs, and knowledge exchange to build capacity and improve the quality of education. National policies should incentivize cross-border collaborations by providing funding or regulatory support for institutions seeking partnerships with international accrediting bodies, universities, and educational organizations.

Foster a Culture of Continuous Improvement: A reactive approach to QA, where improvements are only made when accreditation audits are due, is insufficient for long-term educational quality. Institutions need to foster a culture of continuous improvement, where regular self-assessments, data-driven decision-making, and feedback mechanisms are integrated into their daily operations. Governments should implement policies that encourage ongoing monitoring and evaluation practices within HEIs, offering rewards or incentives for institutions that demonstrate sustained quality improvements through continuous self-evaluation and external peer reviews.

Integrate QA with National Development Goals: QA policies should be aligned with broader national development goals to ensure that higher education institutions contribute to the socio-economic progress of the country. This includes linking QA standards to workforce development, innovation, and social equity objectives. Policymakers should align QA frameworks with national priorities, ensuring that higher education quality contributes to the achievement of broader development goals such as poverty reduction, technological advancement, and increased access to education.

Address the Digital Divide: Many developing countries face technological limitations that impede the effective implementation of QA systems, particularly in areas like data collection and analysis, online learning platforms, and virtual assessments. Governments should address the digital divide by investing in ICT infrastructure and digital literacy programs for both faculty and students. Governments should invest in technology to support QA processes, including the digitization of quality management systems, online evaluation tools, and e-learning platforms, especially in rural and under-resourced areas.

Promote Regional QA Networks: In addition to international collaborations, regional QA networks should be promoted to foster knowledge exchange and best practices between HEIs within developing regions. These networks can help build local capacity, reduce reliance on external accrediting bodies, and create regionally appropriate QA standards. Policymakers should establish or support regional QA bodies or associations that encourage collaboration among institutions within the same region, helping them to develop standards that reflect regional educational and socio-economic contexts.

By adopting these policy recommendations, governments and institutions in developing countries can build stronger, more sustainable QA systems that are better suited to local needs while still meeting international benchmarks. This will not only improve the quality of higher education but also enhance the global competitiveness and socio-economic impact of their institutions.

AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

While this review provides a comprehensive analysis of quality assurance (QA) practices in higher education within developing countries, there remain several gaps and opportunities for future research. Addressing these gaps will deepen our understanding of how to enhance QA systems and adapt them to the unique challenges of these regions. The following directions for future research are proposed:

Local Adaptation of Global QA Standards: Future research should explore how global QA standards can be better adapted to local contexts in developing countries. While many institutions adopt international models, there is limited research on how these standards can be customized to fit the socio-economic, cultural, and institutional realities of specific countries. Empirical studies are needed to investigate how different developing countries modify and integrate global benchmarks in a way that addresses local challenges without compromising quality. *Research Direction:* Comparative studies across different developing regions on the effectiveness of localised QA frameworks, exploring the best practices and lessons learned in adapting global standards.

Impact of Resource Allocation on QA Outcomes: There is limited empirical evidence on the specific relationship between resource allocation and QA outcomes in developing countries. Future research should examine how varying levels of financial, technological, and human resources influence the effectiveness and sustainability of QA practices. Understanding which areas of resource investment yield

the most significant quality improvements will be valuable for policymakers and institutions facing resource constraints. *Research Direction:* Longitudinal studies assessing how different types of resource allocation (e.g., funding for staff training, infrastructure development, or technology) affect the quality of education and QA performance over time.

Role of Stakeholder Engagement in Enhancing QA: Although the importance of stakeholder engagement is well-documented, there is a need for research to investigate effective models of stakeholder involvement in QA processes, particularly in developing countries. Studies can explore how students, faculty, employers, and policymakers can be better integrated into QA mechanisms and the impact of their involvement on the outcomes of quality assurance efforts. *Research Direction:* Case studies on successful stakeholder engagement strategies, focusing on how active participation influences decision-making, transparency, and accountability in QA processes.

Cultural Influence on QA Practices: The role of cultural factors in shaping QA practices in developing countries remains underexplored. Future research should delve into how cultural values, academic hierarchies, and societal expectations influence the acceptance and implementation of QA frameworks. Understanding the role of culture can inform the design of QA systems that are more culturally sensitive and contextually appropriate. *Research Direction:* Ethnographic studies or surveys examining how cultural norms and values in specific regions affect QA practices, with a focus on reconciling traditional educational models with modern QA mechanisms.

Technological Integration in QA Systems: As higher education moves toward greater digitalisation, future research should investigate how technological tools can be integrated into QA processes in resource-constrained settings. Research can explore the use of data analytics, digital platforms for assessments, and online feedback systems to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of QA in developing countries while addressing the challenges of the digital divide. *Research Direction:* Action research or experimental studies testing the impact of ICT solutions on improving QA systems in under-resourced institutions, with an emphasis on scalability and sustainability.

Longitudinal Impact of QA on Educational Outcomes: There is a need for more longitudinal research to assess the long-term effects of QA initiatives on educational outcomes in developing countries. Future studies should investigate whether QA mechanisms lead to sustained improvements in teaching quality, student learning, graduate employability, and institutional reputation over time. Such research can also explore the unintended consequences of QA systems, such as compliance-focused behaviour or short-termism. *Research Direction:* Long-term impact assessments comparing institutions that have successfully implemented QA systems with those that have not, measuring educational outcomes such as student performance, employability, and institutional prestige.

QA in Non-Traditional Learning Environments: As online education and other non-traditional learning models gain traction in developing countries, future research should explore how QA frameworks can be adapted to these emerging educational formats. Research is needed to understand how QA processes can evaluate the quality of online courses, blended learning, and alternative educational pathways in environments with limited digital infrastructure. *Research Direction:* Exploratory studies on QA mechanisms for online and distance learning in developing countries, investigating how to ensure quality and equity in access to these non-traditional educational models.

Role of Social Capital and Networks in QA: The role of social capital in enhancing QA systems, especially in resource-constrained settings, warrants further investigation. Future research should explore how networks, collaborations, and partnerships between institutions, accrediting bodies, and international agencies can be leveraged to build capacity and improve QA outcomes. Understanding how social capital can facilitate knowledge-sharing and mutual support among HEIs will be critical in addressing the challenges of limited resources. *Research Direction:* Social network analysis of collaborations between developing country institutions and international partners, with a focus on the role of social capital in enhancing institutional QA capacity.

Policy Coherence and National QA Frameworks: More research is needed on how national policies align with institutional QA frameworks and the broader development goals of countries. Investigating the coherence between national education policies, regulatory frameworks, and QA systems can provide insights into how to improve policy design and implementation for better educational outcomes. *Research Direction:* Policy analysis studies assessing the alignment between national development objectives and QA frameworks, identifying gaps and opportunities for policy improvement.

Comparative Studies of Regional QA Networks: Research on the effectiveness of regional QA networks and accreditation bodies in developing countries is limited. Future studies should compare different regional QA systems to determine how they can best support institutions in improving quality while addressing shared challenges such as funding, capacity, and cultural differences. *Research Direction:* Comparative research on regional QA networks in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, evaluating their role in promoting regional quality standards and facilitating peer learning among institutions.

By pursuing these future research directions, scholars and policymakers can gain a deeper understanding of the complexities of QA in developing countries and develop innovative strategies to improve the quality of higher education in these regions.

CLOSING REMARKS

The review underscores the critical importance of quality assurance in higher education within developing countries. As these nations strive to expand access, improve educational outcomes, and promote socio-economic development, robust quality assurance mechanisms are indispensable for ensuring that higher education institutions meet established standards of excellence, relevance, and accountability.

While significant progress has been made in recent years, challenges remain in enhancing the effectiveness, inclusivity, and sustainability of quality assurance systems. Addressing these challenges requires concerted efforts from policymakers, educators, quality assurance agencies, and other stakeholders to innovate, collaborate, and adapt to evolving educational landscapes and needs.

As we move forward, it is essential to prioritise evidence-based policies, stakeholder engagement, capacity building, and continuous improvement in quality assurance practices. By doing so, we can strengthen the foundations of higher education, empower learners, and contribute to the advancement of societies and economies in developing countries and beyond. We should reaffirm our commitment to quality assurance in higher education as a cornerstone of progress, equity, and opportunity for all.

REFERENCES

1. Abad-Segura, E., & González-Zamar, M. D. (2021). Sustainable economic development in higher education institutions: A global analysis within the SDGs framework. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *294*, 126133.
2. Abebe, R. T. (2021). Trust Between Quality Assurance Agencies and Higher Education Institutions and its Implications for Quality Management Models.
3. Abubakar, A. (2017). *Overcoming Barriers to Inclusive Mobility: Experience of Disabled People in Tertiary Institutions of Kano, Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya (Malaysia)).
4. Aburizaizah, S. J. (2022). The role of quality assurance in Saudi higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *3*, 100127.
5. Adhikari, D. R., & Shrestha, P. (2023). Knowledge management initiatives for achieving sustainable development goal 4.7: higher education institutions' stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *27*(4), 1109-1139.
6. Adil, H. M., Ali, S., Sultan, M., Ashiq, M., & Rafiq, M. (2024). Open education resources benefits and challenges in the academic world: a systematic review. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, *73*(3), 274-291.
7. Adom, D., Asare-Aboagye, I., Thompson, J., & Kquofi, S. (2024). Integration of Indigenous Knowledge Systems in African Higher Education in Ghana: A Post-CESA (2016-2025) Review. *What Next for Africa's Higher Education? What Should Follow the Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA 2016-2025)*, 161.
8. Adom, D., Thompson, J., Bediako, O. O., & Asare-Aboagye, I. (2024). Revitalisation of Culturally-Sensitive Teaching Methodologies that Prioritizes African Cultural Values in African Higher Education Institutions: A Post-CESA. *What Next for Africa's Higher Education?: What Should Follow the Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA 2016-2025)*, 23.
9. Agasisti, T., Barbato, G., Dal Molin, M., & Turri, M. (2019). Internal quality assurance in universities: does NPM matter?. *Studies in higher education*, *44*(6), 960-977.
10. Ahmed, A. (2017). *Overcoming barriers to inclusive mobility: Experience of disabled people in Tertiary Institutions of Kano, Nigeria/Ahmed Abubakar* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
11. Airey, D., & Benckendorff, P. (2017). Standards, benchmarks and assurance of learning. In *Handbook of teaching and learning in tourism* (pp. 521-536). Edward Elgar Publishing.
12. Aithal, P. S., Prabhu, S., & Aithal, S. (2024). Future of Higher Education through Technology Prediction and Forecasting. *Poornaprajna International Journal of Management, Education, and Social Science (PIJMESS)*, *1*(1), 01-50.
13. Akintayo, O. T., Atobatele, F. A., & Mouboua, P. D. (2024). The dynamics of language shifts in migrant communities: Implications for social integration and cultural preservation. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, *6*(5), 844-860.
14. Alam, A., & Mohanty, A. (2023). Cultural beliefs and equity in educational institutions: exploring the social and philosophical notions of ability groupings in teaching and learning of mathematics. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, *28*(1), 2270662.
15. Alibašić, H., L. Atkinson, C., & Pelcher, J. (2024). The liminal state of academic freedom: navigating corporatization in higher education. *Discover Education*, *3*(1), 7.
16. Alnafrah, I., & Mouselli, S. (2021). Revitalizing blockchain technology potentials for smooth academic records management and verification in low-income countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *85*, 102460.

17. Alshamy, A. S. A. (2012). *Funding mechanisms and quality assurance systems in higher education in Egypt in comparative perspective* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham).
18. Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (2011). The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities. World Bank Publications.
19. Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2019). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution* (Vol. 22). Brill.
20. Alzaid, J. M. (2017). The Effect of Peer Assessment on the Evaluation Process of Students. *International Education Studies*, *10*(6), 159-173.
21. Andrade, H. L. (2019, August). A critical review of research on student self-assessment. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 4, p. 87). Frontiers Media SA.
22. Ansari, M. S. A., & Jonathan, H. (2024). Significance of Capacity Building Through Professional Development Programs: Pathways to Accreditation in HEIs. In *Evaluating Global Accreditation Standards for Higher Education* (pp. 265-277). IGI Global.
23. Anyim, W. O. (2021). Relevance of electronic resources and improvement of access for effective distance learning and continuing education programme. *International Journal of Asian Education*, *2*(1), 52-63.
24. Arnhold, N., & Bassett, R. M. (2021). Steering Tertiary Education: Toward Resilient Systems That Deliver for All. *World Bank*.
25. Arthur, P., & Arthur, E. (2016). Tertiary institutions and capacity building in Ghana: Challenges and the way forward. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, *54*(3), 387-408.
26. Asiyai, R. I. (2022). Best practices for quality assurance in higher education: implications for educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *25*(5), 843-854.
27. Atuahene, F. (2014). Charting higher education development in Ghana: Growth, transformations, and challenges. In *The development of higher education in Africa: Prospects and challenges* (pp. 215-263). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
28. Aulak, P. (2019). *Examining key quality management issues in transnational higher education: how do global partnerships ensure academic credibility of programmes?* (Doctoral dissertation, Birmingham City University).
29. Awasthy, R., Flint, S., Sankarnarayana, R., & Jones, R. L. (2020). A framework to improve university–industry collaboration. *Journal of Industry-University Collaboration*, *2*(1), 49-62.
30. Bagdasarian, I., Stupina, A., Vasileva, Z., Shmeleva, Z., & Korpacheva, L. (2019). Accreditation of the university education as a guarantee of the competencies quality in the labor market. *19th International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference SGEM*, *19*(5.4), 3-8.
31. Bamusi, S. (2023). *Exploring quality assurance and enhancement practices in Malawi's TEVET institutions: A case of selected Community Skills Development Centers* (Doctoral dissertation, Mzuzu University).
32. Baporikar, N. (2021). Stakeholder approach for quality higher education. In *Research Anthology on Preparing School Administrators to Lead Quality Education Programs* (pp. 1664-1690). IGI Global.
33. Beerkens, M., & Udam, M. (2017). Stakeholders in higher education quality assurance: Richness in diversity? *Higher Education Policy*, *30*, 341-359.
34. Benneworth, P., Kaiser, F., Vossensteyn, H., & Westerheijden, D. (2018). Critical approaches to developing effective accountability tools in higher education. *Mapping and Critical Synthesis of Current State-of-the-Art on*, *39*, 76.
35. Bertalanffy, L. V. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications. George Braziller.

36. Boeren, A. (2018). Relationships between scholarship program and institutional capacity development initiatives. *International scholarships in higher education: Pathways to social change*, 43-63.
37. Bouchard, C., & Hamel, M. C. (2023). The extent to which the recommendations issued after the periodic evaluation of university programs are targeted, specific, measurable and unequivocal: An exploratory analysis. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *101*, 102364.
38. Brennan, J., & Shah, T. (2000). Quality assessment and institutional change: Experiences from 14 countries. *Higher Education Management*, *12*(2), 7-26.
39. Budihardjo, M. A., Ramadan, B. S., Putri, S. A., Wahyuningrum, I. F. S., & Muhammad, F. I. (2021). Towards sustainability in higher-education institutions: analysis of contributing factors and appropriate strategies. *Sustainability*, *13*(12), 6562.
40. Caeiro, S., Sandoval Hamón, L. A., Martins, R., & Bayas Aldaz, C. E. (2020). Sustainability assessment and benchmarking in higher education institutions—A critical reflection. *Sustainability*, *12*(2), 543.
41. Cardoso, S., Rosa, M. J., & Stensaker, B. (2016). Why is quality in higher education not achieved? The view of academics. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education*, *41*(6), 950-965.
42. Cardoso, S., Rosa, M. J., Videira, P., & Amaral, A. (2017). Internal quality assurance systems:"tailor made" or "one size fits all" implementation?. *Quality assurance in education*, *25*(3), 329-342.
43. Carvalho, N., Rosa, M. J., & Amaral, A. (2023). Cross-border higher education and quality assurance. Results from a systematic literature review. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *27*(5), 695-718.
44. Cattani Rentes, V. (2023). *Development of a Maturity Model for Learning Health Systems: A Framework for Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement* (Doctoral dissertation).
45. Chattopadhyay, S. (2020). Academic freedom, institutional autonomy and institutionalising accountability: a reflection on the National Education Policy 2020. *Sci. J. Crit. Pract Theory*, *4*, 1-23.
46. Chessa, S., Antongiovanni, F., Cocco, M., Ghibellini, V., & Vargiu, A. (2022). An engaged curriculum to train community social workers: Main challenges and lessons learned. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, *14*(Italian Journal of Sociology of Education 14/1), 71-92.
47. Chidindi, J. (2016). Discursive constructions of quality assurance: The case of the Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education. *Unpublished doctoral thesis. Rhodes University, South Africa*.
48. Chinta, R., Kebritchi, M., & Ellias, J. (2016). A conceptual framework for evaluating higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *30*(6), 989-1002.
49. Clinch, C. R., & Violato, C. (2016). Continuous Review of Accreditation Standards and Quality Improvement in a Medical Education Program–Practical Recommendations for Implementing a Program. *MedEdPublish*, *5*, 72.
50. Cloete, N., Bailey, T., & Maassen, P. (2011). Universities and economic development in Africa: Pact, academic core and coordination. Springer Science & Business Media.
51. Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, S95-S120.
52. Council on Higher Education. (2019). Higher Education Quality Committee: Framework for Institutional Quality Enhancement in South Africa.
53. Cucio, M. R. R., & Roldan, M. D. G. Z. (2020). Inclusive education for ethnic minorities in the developing world: The case of alternative learning system for indigenous peoples in the Philippines. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, *9*(4), 409-409.

54. Cullinan, J., Flannery, D., Harold, J., Lyons, S., & Palcic, D. (2021). The disconnected: COVID-19 and disparities in access to quality broadband for higher education students. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*, 1-21.
55. Dahnke, C. C. (2019). *Utilizing Strategic Planning and performance metrics to deliver on continuous improvement efforts in large urban school districts* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University).
56. de Boer, H. F., Jongbloed, B. W., Benneworth, P. S., Cremonini, L., Kolster, R., Kottmann, A., ... & Vossensteyn, J. J. (2015). Performance-based funding and performance agreements in fourteen higher education systems.
57. De Lisle, J. (2014). Institutional research as organisational intelligence: Using evidence to inform continuous quality improvement. *Call for Peer Reviewers*, *31*.
58. De Welde, K., & Stepnick, A. (Eds.). (2023). *Disrupting the culture of silence: Confronting gender inequality and making change in higher education*. Taylor & Francis.
59. De Wit, H. (2002). Internationalisation of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis. Greenwood Publishing Group.
60. de Wit, H., Gacel-Avila, J., Jones, E., & Jooste, N. (Eds.). (2017). *The globalization of internationalization: Emerging voices and perspectives*. Taylor & Francis.
61. Degn, L., Madsen, M., & Brøgger, K. (2023). Translating quality criteria in university accreditation. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, *19*(4), 588-602.
62. Dei, D. G. J. (2019). Assessing quality assurance practices in institutions of higher learnings. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *18*(12), 30-45.
63. DeLaquil, T., Gelashvili, M., Altbach, P., Blanco, G., de Wit, H., & Schendel, R. (2022). The future of international higher education and international academic collaboration: Strengthening partnerships for our common goals. *New visions for higher education towards 2030—Part 2: Transitions: Key topics, key voices*, 281-292.
64. Delva, S., Nkimbeng, M., Chow, S., Renda, S., Han, H. R., & D'Aoust, R. (2019). Views of regulatory authorities on standards to assure quality in online nursing education. *Nursing outlook*, *67*(6), 747-759.
65. Dewi, Y. E. P., Sugiharto, D. Y. P., Utami, I., Huruta, A., & Sundari, O. (2021). Challenges of Top-Down Policy as Stakeholder Engagement Strategy in the Implementation of Internal Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions: An Empirical Research. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, *24*, 500.
66. Dhamdhere, S. N. (2015). Importance of knowledge management in the higher educational institutes. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *16*(1), 162-183.
67. Dhokare, S., & Jadhav, S. (2023). Embracing Diversity: The Multilingual Approach to Education in India's NEP 2020. *Remittances Review*, *8*(4).
68. Dill, D. D., & Soo, M. (2005). Academic quality, league tables, and public policy: A cross-national analysis of university ranking systems. *Higher Education*, *49*(4), 495-533.
69. Ding, Y., Wu, Y., Yang, J., & Ye, X. (2021). The elite exclusion: Stratified access and production during the Chinese higher education expansion. *Higher Education*, *82*, 323-347.
70. Do, N. G., Hien, D. T. T., & Huong, N. T. T. (2021). International accreditation impacts on teaching and learning: Case of Vietnam non-public universities. *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science-Social Sciences*, *11*(2), 60-74.
71. Dodman, S. L., Swalwell, K., DeMulder, E. K., & Stribling, S. M. (2021). Critical data-driven decision making: A conceptual model of data use for equity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *99*, 103272.

72. Duarte, N., & Vardasca, R. (2023). Literature review of accreditation systems in higher education. *Education Sciences*, *13*(6), 582.
73. Dudar, V., Nosachenko, V., Vasenko, O., Pochtarov, S., & Yakuba, V. (2024). Legislative regulation of online and remote learning in higher education institutions. *Social and Legal Studios*, *2*(7), 222-223.
74. Dzimińska, M., Fijałkowska, J., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2018). Trust-based quality culture conceptual model for higher education institutions. *Sustainability*, *10*(8), 2599.
75. Elton, L. (2000). Improving the quality of higher education. Quality in Higher Education, 6(1), 5-14.
76. Emil, S., & Cress, C. (2014). Faculty perspectives on programme curricular assessment: individual and institutional characteristics that influence participation engagement. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(5), 531-552.
77. Fainshmidt, S., Judge, W. Q., Aguilera, R. V., & Smith, A. (2018). Varieties of institutional systems: A contextual taxonomy of understudied countries. *Journal of world business*, *53*(3), 307-322.
78. Fernandes, J. O., & Singh, B. (2022). Accreditation and ranking of higher education institutions (HEIs): review, observations and recommendations for the Indian higher education system. *The TQM Journal*, *34*(5), 1013-1038.
79. Ferrero-Ferrero, I., Fernández-Izquierdo, M. Á., Muñoz-Torres, M. J., & Bellés-Colomer, L. (2018). Stakeholder engagement in sustainability reporting in higher education: An analysis of key internal stakeholders' expectations. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *19*(2), 313-336.
80. Frank, J. R., Taber, S., van Zanten, M., Scheele, F., Blouin, D., & International Health Professions Accreditation Outcomes Consortium. (2020). The role of accreditation in 21st century health professions education: report of an International Consensus Group. *BMC medical education*, *20*, 1-9.
81. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management*: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.
82. Gainsford, A. (2021). Embedding Indigenous knowledges in the design of higher education curriculum: An international study in law education.
83. Garcia, V. M., & Jamias, S. (2023). Stakeholders' concept of quality assurance in higher education. *The International Journal of Educational Organization and Leadership*, *30*(1), 29.
84. Garwe, E. C. (2021, April). Evaluation of a quality assurance framework for promoting quality research, innovation and development in higher education institutions in Zimbabwe. British Academy.
85. Gaston, P. L. (2023). *Higher education accreditation: How it's changing, why it must*. Taylor & Francis.
86. Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp, K. J., Joosten-ten Brinke, D., & Kester, L. (2017). Assessment quality in tertiary education: An integrative literature review. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *55*, 94-116.
87. Greere, A. (2023). Training for quality assurance in higher education: practical insights for effective design and successful delivery. *Quality in Higher Education*, *29*(2), 165-191.
88. Greere, A., & Riley, C. E. (2014). Engagement, empowerment, ownership–How to nurture the quality culture in higher education. In *Working together to take quality forward: a selection of papers from the 8th European Quality Assurance Forum* (pp. 38-43). European University Association.

89. Grewell, R. G. (2019). *Legitimacy and Belonging: Community Engagement in Higher Education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota).
90. Haddad-Adaimi, M. (2023). *Proposal of national accreditation standards for lebanese Higher Education and a performance management system for Higher Education* (Doctoral dissertation, Université de Bordeaux).
91. Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18*(1), 9-34.
92. Hassan, F. (2022). *Effectiveness of Quality Assurance Mechanism in Higher Education for Human Resource Development of Bangladesh* (Doctoral dissertation, © University of Dhaka).
93. Hays, J., Ninkova, V., & Dounias, E. (2019). Hunter-gatherers and education: towards a recognition of extreme local diversity and common global challenges. *Hunter Gatherer Research*, *5*(1-2), 13-38.
94. Heleta, S., & Bagus, T. (2021). Sustainable development goals and higher education: leaving many behind. *Higher Education*, *81*(1), 163-177.
95. Herbaut, E., & Geven, K. (2020). What works to reduce inequalities in higher education? A systematic review of the (quasi-) experimental literature on outreach and financial aid. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, *65*, 100442.
96. Hillman, J. R., & Baydoun, E. (2019). Quality assurance and relevance in academia: a review. *Major challenges facing higher education in the Arab world: Quality assurance and relevance*, 13-68.
97. Hillman, J. R., & Baydoun, E. (2019). Quality assurance and relevance in academia: a review. *Major challenges facing higher education in the Arab world: Quality assurance and relevance*, 13-68.
98. Hoessler, C., Hoare, A., Austin, L. A., Dhiman, H., Gibson, S., Huscroft, C., ... & Reid, R. (2023). Faculty in Action: Researching a Community of Practice Approach to Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment. *Journal of Formative Design in Learning*, *7*(2), 171-181.
99. Hofstadter, R. (2017). *Academic Freedom in the Age of the College*. Routledge.
100. Horton, S., Sullivan, R., Flanigan, J., Fleming, K. A., Kuti, M. A., Looi, L. M., ... & Lawler, M. (2018). Delivering modern, high-quality, affordable pathology and laboratory medicine to low-income and middle-income countries: a call to action. *The Lancet*, *391*(10133), 1953-1964.
101. Hou, A. Y. C. (2014). Quality in cross-border higher education and challenges for the internationalization of national quality assurance agencies in the Asia-Pacific region: The Taiwanese experience. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(1), 135-152.
102. Hou, A. Y. C., Hill, C., Chan, S. J., Chen, D. I. R., & Tang, M. (2021). Is quality assurance relevant to overseas qualification recognition in Asian higher education? Examining the regulatory framework and the roles of quality assurance agencies and professional accreditors. *Journal of Education and Work*, *34*(3), 373-387.
103. Hou, A. Y. C., Hill, C., Justiniano, D., Lin, A. F. Y., & Tasi, S. (2022). Is employer engagement effective in external quality assurance of higher education? A paradigm shift or QA disruption from quality assurance perspectives in Asia. *Higher education*, 1-20.
104. Hou, A. Y. C., Kuo, C. Y., Chen, K. H. J., Hill, C., Lin, S. R., Chih, J. C. C., & Chou, H. C. (2018). The implementation of self-accreditation policy in Taiwan higher education and its challenges to university internal quality assurance capacity building. *Quality in Higher Education*, *24*(3), 238-259.
105. Hou, A. Y. C., Kuo, C. Y., Chen, K. H. J., Hill, C., Lin, S. R., Chih, J. C. C., & Chou, H. C. (2018). The implementation of self-accreditation policy in Taiwan higher education and its

challenges to university internal quality assurance capacity building. *Quality in Higher Education*, *24*(3), 238-259.
106. Hou, Y. C., Ince, M., Tsai, S., Wang, W., Hung, V., Lin Jiang, C., & Chen, K. H. J. (2016). Quality assurance of joint degree programs from the perspective of quality assurance agencies: experience in East Asia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *35*(3), 473-487.
107. Hoyle, D. (2017). *ISO 9000 Quality Systems Handbook-updated for the ISO 9001: 2015 standard: Increasing the Quality of an Organization's Outputs*. Routledge.
108. Hsu, Y. P. (2017). *The development and impact of the quality assurance system on higher education in Taiwan* (Doctoral dissertation, UCL (University College London)).
109. Hsu, Y. P. (2023). Developing quality culture in higher education in Taiwan: the changes within quality assurance mechanisms. *Studies in Higher Education*, *48*(11), 1741-1753.
110. Huang, F., & Stensaker, B. (2013). Changing governance and management in higher education: The perspectives of organisational quality assurance. *Quality in Higher Education*, *19*(3), 246-263.
111. Huisman, J., & van der Wende, M. (2004). Fostering excellence in higher education: The quality challenge. Springer Science & Business Media.
112. Jaafar, R., Rogers-Cooper, J., & Lerer, N. (2024). Promoting an Inclusive Self-Study: Lessons Learned and Strategies for Accreditation. *Higher Education Policy*, 1-28.
113. Jacob, O. N., Monsurat, A. O., & Musa, A. (2021). Quality assurance in Nigerian public higher institutions: Challenges AND WAY FORWARD. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, *2*(07), 36-55.
114. Jacob, O. N., Solomon, A. T., & Jegede, D. (2020). University education policies in Nigeria: Challenges preventing the implementation and the ways forward. *Jurnal Sinestesia*, *10*(2), 66-85.
115. Jha, S., Kaur, R., & Saklani, A. (2024). Impact of Stakeholder Involvement in Continuous Quality Improvement in Indian Higher Education Institutions. In *Evaluating Global Accreditation Standards for Higher Education* (pp. 309-328). IGI Global.
116. Jingura, R. M., Muzinda, A., Munikwa, S., & Tapera, J. (2018). A Model for Enhancing Student Engagement Within the Context of Higher Education Quality Assurance. *American Association of University Administrators*, *33*(2), 127-135.
117. Johns, L. A. (2018). *The implementation of continuing professional teacher development policy in the Western Cape: constraints and opportunities* (Doctoral dissertation, Cape Peninsula University of Technology).
118. Kadikilo, A. C., Nayak, P., & Sahay, A. (2024). Barriers to research productivity of academics in Tanzania higher education institutions: the need for policy interventions. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1), 2351285.
119. Kagondu, R. K. (2015). *Quality Assurance In Kenya's Higher Education: Gaps and Opportunities for Improvement* (Doctoral dissertation).
120. Kalua, M. F. K. (2020). *Assessing quality assurance mechanisms for managing competency based education and training in community technical colleges in Malawi* (Doctoral dissertation, Mzuzu University).
121. Kanwar, A., Mohee, R., Carr, A., Ortlieb, K., & Sukon, K. (2019). A neo-institutionalist approach to understanding drivers of quality assurance in ODL: The case of the Open University of Mauritius. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *20*(4), 79-98.

122. Kayyali, M. (2024). Exploring Accreditation Standards and Processes. In *Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education: Issues, Models, and Best Practices* (pp. 1-60). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
123. Kfuri, A., Davis, N. L., & Giardino, A. P. (2021). External quality improvement: accreditation, certification, and education. *Medical Quality Management: Theory and Practice*, 245-281.
124. Khalil, M. M. (2017). *Drivers of quality assurance implementation in higher education: the case of Lebanese private business schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Staffordshire University).
125. Khumalo, B., & Mji, A. (2014). Exploring educators' perceptions of the impact of poor infrastructure on learning and teaching in rural South African schools. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(20), 1521-1532.
126. King, J. A., & Ayoo, S. (2020). What do we know about evaluator education? A review of peer-reviewed publications (1978–2018). *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *79*, 101785.
127. King, J., & South, J. (2017). Reimagining the role of technology in higher education: A supplement to the national education technology plan. *US Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology*, 1-70.
128. Kingdon, G. G., Little, A., Aslam, M., Rawal, S., Moe, T., Patrinos, H., ... & Sharma, S. K. (2014). *A rigorous review of the political economy of education systems in developing countries*. London: Department for International Development.
129. Kisanga, H. J. M. S. H. (2014). Quality assurance practices in higher education institutions: Lesson from Africa. *Quality Assurance*, *5*(16), 267-278.
130. Knight, J. (2014). Internationalisation remodelled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *18*(3), 290-305.
131. Koebel, J. T. (2018). Facilitating university compliance using regulatory policy incentives. *JC & UL*, *44*, 160.
132. Kooli, C. (2019). Governing and managing higher education institutions: The quality audit contributions. *Evaluation and program planning*, *77*, 101713.
133. Kristoffersen, D. (2023). *Governance of quality assurance agencies in higher education-can independence be assured?* (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).
134. Kromydas, T. (2017). Rethinking higher education and its relationship with social inequalities: past knowledge, present state and future potential. *Palgrave communications*, *3*(1), 1-12.
135. Kumpulainen, K., Vierimaa, S. M., & Koskinen-Koivisto, E. (2019). Developing connective pedagogy in cultural research—a case study from the teachers' perspective in adopting a problem-based approach in higher education. *Education sciences*, *9*(4), 252.
136. Lacey, A., & Murray, C. (2015). Rethinking the Regulatory Environment of Competency-Based Education. AEI Series on Competency-Based Higher Education. *American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research*.
137. Lazić, Z., Đorđević, A., & Gazizulina, A. (2021). Improvement of quality of higher education institutions as a basis for improvement of quality of life. *Sustainability*, *13*(8), 4149.
138. Leibowitz, B., Bozalek, V., Van Schalkwyk, S., & Winberg, C. (2015). Institutional context matters: The professional development of academics as teachers in South African higher education. *Higher Education*, *69*, 315-330.
139. Lescrauwaet, L., Wagner, H., Yoon, C., & Shukla, S. (2022). Adaptive legal frameworks and economic dynamics in emerging tech-nologies: Navigating the intersection for responsible innovation. *Law and Economics*, *16*(3), 202-220.

140. Lim, D. (2018). *Quality assurance in higher education: A study of developing countries: A study of developing countries*. Routledge.
141. Lucander, H., & Christersson, C. (2020). Engagement for quality development in higher education: a process for quality assurance of assessment. *Quality in Higher Education*, *26*(2), 135-155.
142. Luthuli, P. G. P. (2022). *Stakeholder management of community engagement: an evaluation of higher education institutions in eThekwini Municipality* (Doctoral dissertation).
143. Maassen, P., Gornitzka, Å., & Fumasoli, T. (2017). University reform and institutional autonomy: A framework for analysing the living autonomy. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *71*(3), 239-250.
144. Mahendraprabu, M., Kumar, K. S., Susanto, E., & Fathurrochman, I. (2022). Exploring the Opportunities and Challenges of Incorporating Open Educational Resources in India. *International Journal of Emerging Knowledge Studies*.
145. Maiya, A. K, & Aithal, P. S, (2023). A Review based Research Topic Identification on How to Improve the Quality Services of Higher Education Institutions in Academic, Administrative, and Research Areas. International *Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences (IJMTS)*, *8*(3), 103-153.
146. Makhanya, M. T. B. (2024). between Intersectionality and Socioeconomic Inequality. *Bridging Social Inequality Gaps-Concepts, Theories, Methods, and Tools: Concepts, Theories, Methods, and Tools*, 51.
147. Makhoul, S. A. (2019). Higher education accreditation, quality assurance and their impact to teaching and learning enhancement. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, *35*(4), 235-250.
148. Malinovskiy, S., Shibanova, E., & Movkebayeva, Z. (2024). Barriers and facilitators of access to higher education in a weakly institutionalised context: perceptions of disabled students. *Disability & Society*, *39*(9), 2258-2280.
149. Malish, C. M. (2020). Measuring Access to Higher Education. *Economic & Political Weekly*, *55*(40), 55.
150. Manatos, M. J., Sarrico, C. S., & Rosa, M. J. (2017). The European standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance: An integrative approach to quality management in higher education?. *The TQM Journal*, *29*(2), 342-356.
151. Manimala, M. J., Wasdani, K. P., & Vijaygopal, A. (2020). Facilitation and regulation of educational institutions: The role of accreditation. *Vikalpa*, *45*(1), 7-24.
152. Marginson, S. (2016). The worldwide trend to high participation higher education: Dynamics of social stratification in inclusive systems. *Higher education*, *72*, 413-434.
153. Marginson, S. (2017). Higher education and the common good. Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education.
154. Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). Globalisation and higher education. OECD Publishing.
155. Martin, M. (2016). External quality assurance in higher education: how can it address corruption and other malpractices?. *Quality in Higher Education*, *22*(1), 49-63.
156. Mashaya, P. B. (2023). *Investigating The Factors Affecting Compliance with The Higher Education Regulations by Private Higher Education Institutions In Eswatini* (Doctoral dissertation, Botho University).

157. Mathrani, A., Sarvesh, T., & Umer, R. (2022). Digital divide framework: online learning in developing countries during the COVID-19 lockdown. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *20*(5), 625-640.
158. Matonya, M. (2016). *Accessibility and participation in Tanzanian higher education from the perspectives of women with disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Jyväskylä).
159. Matsieli, M., & Mutula, S. (2024). COVID-19 and Digital Transformation in Higher Education Institutions: Towards Inclusive and Equitable Access to Quality Education. *Education Sciences*, *14*(8), 819.
160. Mawere, M. (2015). Indigenous knowledge and public education in sub-Saharan Africa. *Africa spectrum*, *50*(2), 57-71.
161. Mbithi, P. M., Mbau, J. S., Muthama, N. J., Inyega, H., & JM, K. (2021). Higher education and skills development in Africa: An analytical paper on the role of higher learning institutions on sustainable development.
162. McCowan, T. (2018). Quality of higher education in Kenya: Addressing the conundrum. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *60*, 128-137.
163. McElgunn, P., & Weiner, B. (2020). 27 The accreditation process drives rapid quality improvement–continued review is critical. *BMJ Open Quality*, *9*(Suppl 1), A28-A28.
164. McIntosh, T., Higgs, C., Mumford, M., Connelly, S., & DuBois, J. (2018). Continuous evaluation in ethics education: A case study. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *24*, 727-754.
165. McLean, R. S., Antony, J., & Dahlgaard, J. J. (2017). Failure of Continuous Improvement initiatives in manufacturing environments: a systematic review of the evidence. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *28*(3-4), 219-237.
166. Menashy, F. (2016). Understanding the roles of non-state actors in global governance: Evidence from the Global Partnership for Education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *31*(1), 98-118.
167. Menon, S., Suresh, M., & Raghu Raman, R. (2022). Enablers facilitating industry-academia, transnational education and university-community partnering agility in higher education. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, *12*(3), 604-626.
168. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalised organisations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340-363.
169. Mgaiwa, S. J. (2021). Leadership initiatives in response to institutional quality assurance challenges in Tanzania's private universities. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *45*(9), 1206-1223.
170. Miao, F., Mishra, S., Orr, D., & Janssen, B. (2019). *Guidelines on the development of open educational resources policies*. UNESCO Publishing.
171. Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2020). Competency-Based Education: A New Model for Measuring Student Success.
172. Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. (2019). Malaysian Qualifications Framework: The National Higher Education Strategic Plan Beyond 2020.
173. Mishra, A., Mishra, A., & Pandey, G. (2023). Spatial Inequality and Education: Unraveling the Geographical Dimensions of Educational Disparities. *Techno Learn*, *13*(1), 29-43.
174. Mishra, M., & Pettala, R. (Eds.). (2023). *Education of socio-economic disadvantaged groups: From marginalisation to inclusion*. Taylor & Francis.
175. Mitchell, D. (2016). *Diversities in education: Effective ways to reach all learners*. Routledge.
176. Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., & Saenz, M. (2019). State higher education funding cuts have pushed costs to students, worsened inequality. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, *24*, 9-15.

177. Mkuzangwe, A. S. (2020). *Interaction between internal and external quality assurance: an institutional case study* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University).
178. Mohamedbhai, G. (2014). Massification in higher education institutions in Africa: Causes, consequences and responses. *International Journal of African Higher Education*, *1*(1).
179. Mohammad, A., & Vargas, S. (2022, August). Barriers affecting higher education institutions' adoption of blockchain technology: A qualitative study. In *Informatics* (Vol. 9, No. 3, p. 64). MDPI.
180. Mohan, R. (2023). *Measurement, evaluation and assessment in education*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.
181. Mok, K. H., & Sawn Khai, T. (2024). Transnationalization of higher education in China and Asia: quality assurance and students' learning experiences. *Asian Education and Development Studies*.
182. Molina, J., Hai, N. V., Cheng, P. H., & Chang, C. Y. (2021). Sdg's quality education approach: Comparative analysis of natural sciences curriculum guidelines between taiwan and colombia. *Sustainability*, *13*(6), 3352.
183. Mukred, M., Yusof, Z. M., & Alotaibi, F. M. (2019). Ensuring the productivity of higher learning institutions through electronic records management system (ERMS). *IEEE Access*, *7*, 97343-97364.
184. Mukred, M., Yusof, Z. M., Mokhtar, U. A., Sadiq, A. S., Hawash, B., & Ahmed, W. A. (2021). Improving the decision-making process in the higher learning institutions via electronic records management system adoption. *KSII Transactions on Internet and Information Systems (TIIS)*, *15*(1), 90-113.
185. Murumba, J., & Micheni, E. (2017). Big data analytics in higher education: a review. *The International Journal of Engineering and Science*, *6*(06), 14-21.
186. Naidoo, V. (2017). Quality assurance in higher education: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *7*(2), 75-84.
187. National Open University of Nigeria. (2020). Quality Assurance in the National Open University of Nigeria: A Handbook.
188. Ng'hoboko, L. D. (2024). *The Contributions of Internal School Quality Assurance on Enhancing Teaching and Learning Process in Public Primary Schools in Tanzania* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).
189. Nguyen, C. H. (2019). Building national capacity for quality assurance. *Quality assurance in Vietnamese higher education: Policy and practice in the 21st century*, 241-260.
190. Nguyen, C. H. (2022). Professional development for educational policy-makers: Relating to university quality assurance in Vietnam. *Issues in Educational Research*, *32*(3), 1045-1066.
191. Nguyen, T. H. (2016). Building human resources management capacity for university research: The case at four leading Vietnamese universities. *Higher Education*, *71*(2), 231-251.
192. Nkala, P., & Ncube, M. (2020). Institutional structures for student-inclusivity in quality assurance promotion in higher education: the case of one university in Zimbabwe. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *34*(5), 92-108.
193. Nokkala, T., & Bladh, A. (2014). Institutional autonomy and academic freedom in the Nordic context-similarities and differences. *Higher Education Policy*, *27*, 1-21.
194. Ntim, S. (2014). Embedding quality culture in higher education in Ghana: quality control and assessment in emerging private universities. *Higher Education*, *68*(6), 837-849.

195. Nwajiuba, C. A., Igwe, P. A., Akinsola-Obatolu, A. D., Ituma, A., & Binuomote, M. O. (2020). What can be done to improve higher education quality and graduate employability in Nigeria? A stakeholder approach. *Industry and Higher Education*, *34*(5), 358-367.
196. Obwogi, J. (2013). *Factors that affect quality of teaching staff in universities in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation).
197. O'Connor, P. (2020). Why is it so difficult to reduce gender inequality in male-dominated higher educational organizations? A feminist institutional perspective. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, *45*(2), 207-228.
198. OECD. (2018). Higher Education in Regional and City Development: Eastern Regions of Indonesia.
199. Ogunode, N. J., & Musa, A. (2020). Higher education in Nigeria: Challenges and the ways forward. *Electronic Research Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *3*.
200. Ogunode, N. J., Jegede, D., Olamoyegun, S. O., Akinjobi, F. N., & Olatunde-Aiyedun, T. G. (2022). Effects of project (infrastructure facilities) abandonment in public tertiary education in Nigeria and the way forward.
201. Okoche, J. M. M. (2017). Internal quality assurance in public and private universities in Africa: Dynamics, challenges and strategies. *European Journal of Economic and Financial Research*.
202. Ouma, R. (2019). Transforming university learner support in open and distance education: Staff and students perceived challenges and prospects. *Cogent Education*, *6*(1), 1658934.
203. Panda, P. K. (2017). Role and functions of the institutional head for quality assurance and enhancement in higher education. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *7*(9), 48-64.
204. Pelser, A. M. (2024, January). Synergistic advancements: fostering collaborative excellence in doctoral education. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 8, p. 1289424). Frontiers Media SA.
205. Penuel, W. R., Riedy, R., Barber, M. S., Peurach, D. J., LeBouef, W. A., & Clark, T. (2020). Principles of collaborative education research with stakeholders: Toward requirements for a new research and development infrastructure. *Review of Educational Research*, *90*(5), 627-674.
206. Peurach, D. J., Penuel, W. R., & Russell, J. L. (2018). Beyond ritualized rationality: Organizational dynamics of instructionally-focused continuous improvement. *The Sage handbook of school organization*, 465-488.
207. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations*: A resource dependence perspective. Stanford University Press.
208. Pham, H. T. (2019). Stakeholders' engagement in quality assurance in Vietnam. *Quality assurance in Vietnamese higher education: Policy and practice in the 21st century*, 137-161.
209. Phillips, S. D., & Kinser, K. (Eds.). (2018). *Accreditation on the edge: Challenging quality assurance in higher education*. JHU Press.
210. Pidgeon, M. (2016). More than a checklist: Meaningful Indigenous inclusion in higher education. *Social inclusion*, *4*(1), 77-91.
211. Power, L., Millington, K. A., & Bengtsson, S. (2015). Building capacity in higher education topic guide. *Health and Education Advice and Resources Team. http://www. heart-resources. org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Capacity-Building-in-Higher-Education-Topic-Guide. pdf*.
212. Power, L., Millington, K. A., & Bengtsson, S. (2015). Building capacity in higher education topic guide. *Health and Education Advice and Resources Team. http://www. heart-*

resources. org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Capacity-Building-in-Higher-Education-Topic-Guide. pdf.

213. Prakash, G. (2018). Quality in higher education institutions: insights from the literature. *The TQM Journal*, *30*(6), 732-748.

214. Rahnuma, N. (2020). Evolution of quality culture in an HEI: critical insights from university staff in Bangladesh. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *32*(1), 53-81.

215. Rahnuma, N. (2020). The Bangladeshi higher education quality assurance framework: a pathway for transformation. *Quality in Higher Education*, *26*(1), 14-31.

216. Ramrathan, S. (2018). *Exploring inequality in institutional marketing: access to higher education by marginalised communities* (Doctoral dissertation).

217. Rangou, J. B. (2017). Quality assurance in higher education for flexible open distance education/learning in Papua new guinea.

218. Rawabdeh, A. A. A., Tbaishat, R. M., Abu-Doleh, J. D., & Khassawneh, A. S. (2021). The intersection of national and international quality assurance procedures in higher education in Jordan: a deduced guide for academic programs and curricula at Yarmouk University. *International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management*, *7*(2), 156-191.

219. RECLA. (n.d.). Latin American and Caribbean Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

220. Ronoh, J. C. (2018). *Indigenous knowledge in the school curriculum: Teacher educator perceptions of place and position* (Doctoral dissertation, Nelson Mandela University).

221. Rossoni, A. L., de Vasconcellos, E. P. G., & de Castilho Rossoni, R. L. (2024). Barriers and facilitators of university-industry collaboration for research, development and innovation: a systematic review. *Management Review Quarterly*, *74*(3), 1841-1877.

222. Saaida, M. (2023). Global Catalysts: Empowering Universities for Social Change in Developing Countries. *Edukasiana: Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan*, *2*(4), 318-341.

223. Salmi, J., & D'Addio, A. (2021). Policies for achieving inclusion in higher education. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, *5*(1), 47-72.

224. Sancheti, S., & Pillai, L. (2020). Institutional autonomy in Indian higher education system. *Reimagining Indian Universities*, 189.

225. Sarkar, R. (2023). Exploring Challenges of Women with Disabilities in Accessing Higher Education. *Journal of Disability Studies*, *9*(1), 1-7.

226. Sarkar, S. H. (2014). *Higher Education Budget for Human Resource Development: Bangladesh Perspective* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rajshahi).

227. Saroyan, A., & Frenay, M. (Eds.). (2023). *Building teaching capacities in higher education: A comprehensive international model*. Taylor & Francis.

228. Saule, K., & Kurmanov, B. (2024). Elite schools and educational inequality: Evidence from a private university in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *127*, 102413.

229. Schendel, R., & McCowan, T. (2016). Expanding higher education systems in low-and middle-income countries: the challenges of equity and quality. *Higher education*, *72*(4), 407-411.

230. Sedlacek Lee, R. (2024). *Educating for Social Impact: An Exploration of The Pathways of Public Service And Civic Engagement Framework* (Doctoral dissertation).

231. Seedat, N. C. (2021). *The knowledge, perceptions, compliance and challenges of dental technicians and technologists in KwaZulu-Natal towards Continuing Professional Development* (Doctoral dissertation).

232. Sengupta, E., Blessinger, P., & Mahoney, C. (2020). Introduction to civil society and Social Responsibility in higher education: International Perspectives on University–Community Partnerships. In *University–community partnerships for promoting social responsibility in higher education* (pp. 3-14). Emerald Publishing Limited.
233. Seniwoliba, J. A., & Yakubu, R. N. (2015). An Analysis of the Quality Assurance Policies in a Ghanian University. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *10*(16), 2331-2339.
234. Shabbir, M., Khalid, M. I., Bakhsh, K., Mohsin, M. N., Rasool, S., & Mohsin, M. S. (2016). Improving Professional Development System through Quality Assurance Practices in the Universities of Pakistan. *International Education Studies*, *9*(1), 141-147.
235. Shaffi, M., & Mohamed, S. (2023). *The perceptions of key stakeholder groups on how transnational higher education contributes to building a knowledge-based economy in a developing country* (Doctoral dissertation, Anglia Ruskin Research Online (ARRO)).
236. Shah Bukhari, S. K. U., Said, H., Gul, R., & Ibna Seraj, P. M. (2022). Barriers to sustainability at Pakistan public universities and the way forward. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *23*(4), 865-886.
237. Shorfuzzaman, M., Hossain, M. S., Nazir, A., Muhammad, G., & Alamri, A. (2019). Harnessing the power of big data analytics in the cloud to support learning analytics in mobile learning environment. *Computers in Human behavior*, *92*, 578-588.
238. Shoukat, S., Usman, Z., & Fatima, M. (2024). Quality Assurance Frameworks in Higher Education: A Comparative Approach between Developed and Developing Countries. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, *5*(3), 270-278.
239. Singh, B., Yadav, S., & Aswal, D. K. (2023). Landscape and Status of Global Accreditation Bodies. In *Handbook of Quality System, Accreditation and Conformity Assessment* (pp. 1-45). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
240. Singh, J., & Singh, H. (2015). Continuous improvement philosophy–literature review and directions. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, *22*(1), 75-119.
241. Singh, T., Upadhyaya, S., & Kaur, M. (2015). Accreditation in Indian context: An initiative by MCI. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, *9*(11), JE01-JE03.
242. Sirat, M. (2017). ASEAN's flagship universities and regional integration initiatives. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, *11*(2), 68-80.
243. Smith, D. G. (2024). *Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work*. JHU Press.
244. Smith, J. (2022). International education trends: Shaping the future of higher education. *International Education*, *10*(1).
245. Smith, W. C., & Benavot, A. (2019). Improving accountability in education: the importance of structured democratic voice. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *20*, 193-205.
246. Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Anderson, B., Barnett, B. M., Centeno, A., Naismith, L., ... & Dolmans, D. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update: BEME Guide No. 40. *Medical teacher*, *38*(8), 769-786.
247. Stosich, E. L., & Bae, S. (2018). Engaging diverse stakeholders to strengthen policy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *99*(8), 8-12.
248. Stukalo, N., & Lytvyn, M. (2021). Towards sustainable development through higher education quality assurance. *Education Sciences*, *11*(11), 664.
249. Suleiman, Y., Ishola, M. A., Abubakar, L., & Aliyu, L. A. (2020). Adequate Funding: A Tool for Quality Assurance in Nigerian tertiary Institutions. *Benue State University Journal of Educational Management*, *2*(1), 65-76.

250. Sunder M, V., & Antony, J. (2018). A conceptual Lean Six Sigma framework for quality excellence in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, *35*(4), 857-874.
251. Sweatman, M. M. (2019). *A University's Community Engagement Ethos: Working Towards Reciprocal Processes and Public Purposes Through Community Service-learning* (Doctoral dissertation, Acadia University).
252. Taleb, I., Serhani, M. A., Bouhaddioui, C., & Dssouli, R. (2021). Big data quality framework: a holistic approach to continuous quality management. *Journal of Big Data*, *8*(1), 76.
253. Tasopoulou, K., & Tsiotras, G. (2017). Benchmarking towards excellence in higher education. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, *24*(3), 617-634.
254. Teichler, U. (2017). Internationalisation trends in higher education and the changing role of international student mobility. *Journal of international Mobility*, (4), 177-216.
255. Tezcan-Unal, B., Winston, K., & Qualter, A. (2018). Learning-oriented quality assurance in higher education institutions. *Quality in Higher Education*, *24*(3), 221-237.
256. Trivedi, C. (2024). The Crisis of University Autonomy in India: A Critical Reflection on the Policy Framework. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 00219096241230478.
257. Tsevi, L. (2015). *Quality assurance in private higher education: The case of Ghana*. State University of New York at Albany.
258. Tyagi, R., Vishwakarma, S., Rishi, M., & Rajiah, S. (2021). Reducing inequalities through education and skill development courses. In *Reduced Inequalities* (pp. 746-758). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
259. Tyler, A., & Glasgow, R. E. (2021). Implementing improvements: opportunities to integrate quality improvement and implementation science. *Hospital pediatrics*, *11*(5), 536-545.
260. UNESCO. (2019). Quality Assurance for Open, Distance, and e-Learning: A Toolkit.
261. UNESCO. (2020). UNESCO OER Recommendation.
262. Urdan, T., & Bruchmann, K. (2018). Examining the academic motivation of a diverse student population: A consideration of methodology. *Educational Psychologist*, *53*(2), 114-130.
263. van de Mortel, T., Mitchell, C., Shuker, M. A., Needham, J., Kain, V., Sanger, G., & Pierce, B. (2023). A program quality framework: a collaborative teaching team approach to quality assurance, quality enhancement and staff capacity building. *Frontiers in Medicine*, *10*, 1242408.
264. Vanari, K., & Kaçaniku, F. (2023). Quality assurance policies and practices in Estonian and Kosovan initial teacher education: convergence or different paths? *INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION*, 224.
265. Veer Ramjeawon, P., & Rowley, J. (2017). Knowledge management in higher education institutions: enablers and barriers in Mauritius. *The Learning Organization*, *24*(5), 366-377.
266. Verma, A. (2016). A review of quality assurance in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature (IMPACT: IJRHAL)*, *44*(5), 55-66.
267. Walker, J., Pearce, C., Boe, K., & Lawson, M. (2019). *The Power of Education to Fight Inequality: How increasing educational equality and quality is crucial to fighting economic and gender inequality*. Oxfam.
268. Wangai, M. M. (2022). *The Influence of Quality Assurance Practices on Quality of Academic Programmes in Higher Education Institutions in Kenya: a Case of the Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
269. Watkins, M., & Noble, G. (2021). *Doing diversity differently in a culturally complex world: critical perspectives on multicultural education*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

270. Wijewantha, P. (2017). Continuing professional development of academics in Sri Lankan national universities. *HRMPERSPECTIVES*.

271. Wilson, J., & Wilson, J. (2018). Institutional Research Management from the Inside. Artists in the University: Positioning Artistic Research in Higher Education, 125-145.

272. Woldegiorgis, E. T. (2023). The Dynamics of Globalisation and Internationalisation Processes Shaping the Policies for African Higher Education. In *Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa in the 21st Century: Pedagogy, Research and Community-Engagement* (pp. 87-105). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

273. Wu, L., Yan, K., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Higher education expansion and inequality in educational opportunities in China. *Higher Education*, *80*(3), 549-570.

274. Yelezhanova, S., Myrzasheva, A., Khairzhanova, A., Syrbayeva, S., Shuakbayeva, R., Myrzagereikyzy, G., ... & Tilegenova, T. (2020). Current quality assurance methods for higher education activities. *Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores*, *7*(2).

275. Yılmaz, D. V. (2019). Quality assurance in Turkish higher education in the framework of policy process model. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (46), 37-60.

276. Yorke, J., & Vidovich, L. (2016). *Learning standards and the assessment of quality in higher education: Contested policy trajectories* (Vol. 7). Springer International Publishing.

277. Yurkofsky, M. M., Peterson, A. J., Mehta, J. D., Horwitz-Willis, R., & Frumin, K. M. (2020). Research on continuous improvement: Exploring the complexities of managing educational change. *Review of Research in Education*, *44*(1), 403-433.

278. Zahnd, W. E., Bell, N., & Larson, A. E. (2022). Geographic, racial/ethnic, and socioeconomic inequities in broadband access. *The Journal of Rural Health*, *38*(3), 519-526.

279. Zarei, S., & Mohammadi, S. (2022). Challenges of higher education related to e-learning in developing countries during COVID-19 spread: a review of the perspectives of students, instructors, policymakers, and ICT experts. *Environmental science and pollution research*, *29*(57), 85562-85568.

280. Zavale, N. C., Santos, L. A., & da Conceição Dias, M. (2015). Main features and challenges of implementing internal quality assurance within African higher education institutions: The case of Eduardo Mondlane University. *International Journal of African Higher Education*, *2*.

281. Ziderman, A., & Albrecht, D. (2013). *Financing universities in developing countries*. Routledge.

282. Zuhairi, A., Raymundo, M. R. D. R., & Mir, K. (2020). Implementing quality assurance system for open and distance learning in three Asian open universities: Philippines, Indonesia and Pakistan. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal*, *15*(3), 297-320.