

Lessons learned from two decades of *Quality in Higher Education* **DRAFT**

Lee Harvey

Quality in Higher Education was established in the early years of the quality revolution and has published 529 articles in the 21 annual volumes up to and including 2015. The journal was entitled quality in higher education to enable a focus on all aspects of higher education quality rather than just quality assurance. However, quality assurance issues loom large in the pages of the journal and about a quarter of all articles addressed external quality assurance. Nonetheless, throughout its history, *Quality in Higher Education* has avoided articles that primarily set out national quality assurance processes, preferring instead studies that explore the nature, impact of quality assurance or comparative studies. In similar vein, the journal tends not to publish studies based on a single institution unless they act as case study illustrations of wider internationally relevant concerns. From the outset the journal has been an international forum and contributions have come from North and South America, Australasia, Central and South-East Asia, Western Europe, Scandinavia, Central and Eastern Europe, the Middle East and Gulf States, Africa and the Asian sub-continent. Naturally, many articles give a perspective from the authors' own countries but they are selected on the basis of their generalisability.

The articles have ranged from conceptual and pragmatic enquiries into the nature of quality in higher education through explorations of quality assurance systems to the impact of they have on student learning. This paper explores what has been learned from these three million words.

Four things stand out: the monolithic approach to quality assurance; the failure to adequately explore impact of quality assurance; the dissonance between bureaucratic assurance processes and student learning; the cynicism of academics about the efficacy and value of assurance processes.

In addition, two other recurrent issues are not explored here. They are, first, the perennial debate about accountability and improvement, which has been analysed widely not just in the journal but elsewhere and the issues are well rehearsed and need no repeating except to say that in quality assurance processes accountability has rather overwhelmed improvement. Second, is the highjacking of the conceptualisation of quality education by quality assurance: the notion of intrinsic quality has been engulfed by quality assurance to the extent that quality has come to mean the processes by which quality is assured rather than the essential quality of the higher education provision.

The monolithic approach to quality assurance

Broadly speaking there are four ways of undertaking quality assurance: audit, accreditation, assessment/inspection and external examination/national examination. The journal has attracted very little by way of commentary on assessment or inspection (Cook, Butcher and Raeside, 2006), nor external examination (Warren Piper, 1995; Gaunt, 1999;

Gynnild, Myrhaug and Lian, 2004) or national examinations by which to evaluate quality. Most contributions on broad processes have addressed audit or accreditation.

In his early study, Dill (2000) argued that audits served to aid senior managers to initiate quality assurance systems within institutions and provided system-wide information on best practices. It also provided accountability to the public while also putting improvement of teaching and learning on institutional agendas. A view from inside an agency (Woodhouse, 2003), argued that audit checks effectiveness in achieving institutional goals and its ability to improve. Accreditation gained momentum at the start of the millennium aided by the emphasis placed on harmonisation in the European Higher Education Area, which led Haakstad (2001) to express concerns about the shift from enhancement to control that accreditation heralded. Fearing for the future of constructive and development-oriented evaluations that are dynamic and relative rather than fixed and static he counselled for accreditation at the institutional not programme level. Westerheijden (2001) noted that the Bologna Declaration of 1999 was interpreted, particularly in Eastern Europe, as requiring robust accreditation processes. It seems that governments and agencies ignore problems in other countries when implementing accreditation systems: Faber and Huisman (2003), for example, showed how accreditation became unworkable in the Netherlands and Denmark failed to learn from the experiences of others and adopted an unnecessarily cumbersome controlling approach to programme accreditation.

The journal contributions illustrate how conceptions of quality assurance that originated in North West Europe and the United States (US) have been the basis of similar developments around the world (for example, Udom (1996) on Nigeria, Billing and Thomas (2000) on Turkey, and Nguyen, Oliver and Priddy (2009) on Viet Nam). This convergence occurs despite concerns about the appropriateness for countries with small higher education systems, such as the Maldives (Houston and Maniku, 2005) and Botswana (Hopkin and Lee, 2001) or lacking resources, such as Ghana (Ansah, 2015).

Irrespective of the label attached to the process, quality assurance has evolved a dominant 'peer-evaluation' methodology (Scheele, 2004). The use of self-assessment, peer review by visiting panel, a written (public) report and a response from the institution is ubiquitous (Heusser, 2006).

Various quality assurance codes of practice and guidelines introduced and reviewed in the journal (Stella, 2006; Hopbach, 2006; Blackmur 2007) further illustrated the convergence of approaches, as Aelterman (2006) illustrated in his analysis of six different codes of the major international networks that exhibited considerable transparency and comparability. Mutual recognition agreements (Kristoffersen and Lindeberg, 2004) and university networks (Hinaga, 2004; Umemiya, 2008) had a similar impact on uniformity. Recently, Kallo and Semchenko (2016) showed how international guidelines tend to assume a dominant accreditation-based approach, which, when not the case in a country, causes problems in, for example, mutual recognition of degrees.

Performance indicators are also sometimes used as part of the standardised methodology although their composition and application was the subject of scrutiny and authors warned about appropriateness (Yorke, 1995, 1998; Busch, Fallan and Pettersen, 1998; Ewell, 1999; Little, 2001; Morley, 2001; Barrie and Ginns, 2007; Lee and Buckthorpe; 2008). Overall, national performance indicators were treated with suspicion, especially when they simply measured the readily measurable, rather than being carefully designed to evaluate the underlying issue. This concern with indicators has tended to switch its focus to rankings of institutions (Bowden, 2000; Cook, Butcher and Raeside, 2006; Harvey, 2008).

The problems with this monolithic approach persist. There are concerns about the selection, training and professionalism of peer evaluators (Arden, 1996; Dill, 2000; Gerbic and Kranenburg, 2003; Szanto, 2004; Silva-Trivio and Ramirez-Gatica, 2004; Harris-Huemmert, 2008; Minelli, Rebora and Turri, 2008; Kaghed and Dezaye, 2009; Cheung, 2015) and of quality work in general (Nilsson and Wahlén, 2000) with the resultant potential for bias or preconceived judgements (Ottewill and Macfarlane, 2004); the conduct and confrontational nature of panel visits (Dill, 2000); the rehearsed nature of engagements and the inevitability of concealment (Barrow, 1999); the nature of reporting and adequacy of follow-ups (Dill, 2000; Jeliaskova, 2002; Scheele, 2004; Leeuw, 2002; Gynnild, 2007; Quinn and Boughey, 2009). Leeuw, for example, argued for transparency and reciprocity between institution and those undertaking the follow-up. Such reciprocity reduced the potential for dissembling and game playing. However, he warned that too much reciprocity could lead to ‘negotiating the truth’.

Not only is the methodology ubiquitous but the quality assurance experience is much the same. In South Africa, for example, three public higher education institutions approached the audit in different, context-specific ways, yet the institutional experience of the process and its initial outcomes were remarkably similar (Botha, Favish and Stephenson, 2008).

As the monolithic approach has become embedded in higher education quality assurance, so the interest in importing industrial models has declined. Most articles that explored such possibilities were in the early years and included the potential of such procedures as ISO9000 (Mizikaci, 2003) and Baldrige Awards (Lundquist, 1996). Total quality management as a concept has hung on in one form or another after being mooted (Winchip, 1996; Hansen and Jackson, 1996) and decried (Harvey, 1995; Barrett, 1996; Moon and Geall, 1996), in earlier articles and more recently its potential has been resurrected (De Jager and Nieuwenhuis, 2005) and disparaged (Houston, 2007), although Houston, Robertson and Prebble (2008) examined the potential of critical systems thinking enacted through total systems intervention to explore quality and to promote improvement in a university academic department.

Inevitably, there are continuing concerns about bureaucracy, cost and administrative overload (e.g., Newton, 1997; Cheng 2009; Pompili, 2010; Melin, Astvik and Bernhard-Oettel, 2014; French *et al.*, 2014), although the self-assessment usually emerges as the most valuable element of the process (e.g., Weusthof, 1995; Saarinen, 1995; McGettrick, Dunnett and Harvey, 1997; Stensaker, 2003; Botha, Favish and Stephenson, 2008),

mainly because this is seen as the more autonomous phase (Veiga, Rosa and Amaral, 2011). Nonetheless, Coyle (2003) suggested that the potential rewards of a self-evaluative approach requires honest and open self-criticism, which conflicts with the use of those self-assessments in a potentially critical public report.

What is evident from the contributions is the increasingly political role of quality assurance (Thune, 1996; Tomusk, 1997, 2000; Lemaitre, 2002; Sjölund, 2002; Lycke, 2004; Singh, Lange and Naidoo, 2004; Stensaker and Leiber, 2015) and the use of it as a vehicle to ensure compliance and, in some countries, control of a (privatised) systems (Temple and Billing, 2003). The converse is a lessening of central control in countries where autonomy of higher education was formerly limited (Hawthorne, 1996; Jacobs, 1998; Tomusk, 2000; Rozsnyai, 2004). Quality assurance also offers a mechanism by which to 'modernise' systems, as, for example, in Germany where the implementation of accreditation procedures marked a fundamental shift in the relationship between higher education institutions and the state (Berner and Richter, 2001). At a micro level, Stensaker's (1997) early study showed how quality was used by Norwegian university departments in the competition for resources.

The impact of quality assurance

Only recently has there been a significant focus on impact assessments in the journal. There were few studies of the impact of quality assurance in the first decade of *Quality in Higher Education* reflecting a general failure in the literature to adequately explore impact of quality assurance.

Some early articles were cautiously optimistic about the potential for improvement of quality assurance. Newton (1997) argued that the Welsh methodology encouraged team-based action planning and increased dissemination of good practice resulting in improvement of the student experience and positive outcomes for staff at the North East Wales Institute. Baldwin's (1997) analysis of how the Australian quality assurance system of the early 1990s impacted on Monash University indicated resentment at the lack of transparency of the resultant ranking system. To this was added excessive bureaucratisation of procedures, increased administrative workload for academic staff, stifling of creativity and individuality and a lack of trust and de-professionalisation of academic staff. On the plus side, a combination of external and internal processes had resulted in more rigorous course approval procedures, increased awareness of students' perspectives on teaching and an intensification of debate about effective learning.

Askling (1997) reflected on her experiences at Linköping University and argued that external quality monitoring in Sweden had an indirect impact and must be seen in relation to other substantial changes. The improvement-oriented approach to external monitoring being pioneered in Sweden at the time by the National Agency provided an important means to encourage quality enhancement and strategic management within the changed Swedish system. Sweden subsequently developed an accountability-oriented approach and the potential of the improvement process was lost. Indeed, Wahlén (2004), subsequently assessed the impact of national quality audit of Swedish institutions

between 1995 and 2002 and found that the audits resulted in policies and structures for institutional quality work but that cultural change at the departmental level was modest.

Smith (1997) in reviewing 'assessment programs' in the US state of Virginia showed that effectiveness was correlated with the involvement of the most senior academic managers. Generally, though, there was still little link between assessment and strategic planning and restructuring. Silva, Reich and Gallegos (1997), in their review of the procedures in Chile, argued that there were positive effects on institutional culture in both the private and public sectors. Similarly, Lemaitre (2004) analysis of the compulsory licensing processes for new higher education institutions and voluntary process of institutional accreditation in Chile showed evidence of a cultural change. From her agency perspective she claimed that the system was accepted by the majority of higher education institutions and endorsed by most stakeholders in Chile. A meeting of quality assurance agency delegates at The Hague in 2006 agreed that external quality monitoring had an impact on higher education provision, despite agreeing that impact is difficult to measure (Harvey, 2006). Their evidence was that periodic reviews and follow-ups demonstrate changes over time, with a high degree of compliance with the recommended changes. Performance indicators, such as retention rates, graduation rates, the level of final award, graduate employment and course entry requirements all suggest improvements followed external quality assurance processes. Further, the agencies also referred to widespread developments evident within institutions, including the setting up of internal quality processes and specialist quality units. No consideration was given to sector concerns about follow-up or performance indicators.

Gift and Bell Hutchinson (2007) found that the academic staff of the University of the West Indies increasingly implemented the recommendations of review teams, facilitated by the university's monitoring mechanism. Responses to these recommendations contributed to the enhancement of teaching and learning, although they suggested sustainability would depend on resources.

The greater effectiveness of internal over external processes is another perspective that has endured for more than a decade. It is enshrined, in effect, in the *European Standards and Guidelines* (ENQA, 2005), which emphasised the responsibility of institutions for ensuring their own quality. Internal processes are what go on routinely in institutions and it is they that ultimately impact on quality. Alean-Kirkpatrick, Hänni and Lutz (1997) argued that the internal quality assessment of teaching that has been undertaken at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich following a change in the law had considerable impact on the didactic quality at the institute. In similar vein, Kristensen (1997) explored the impact of national activities on quality improvement at Copenhagen Business School and concluded that external quality monitoring is not as effective as internal quality monitoring in producing continuous improvement. Horsburgh (1997) argued that, in the case of New Zealand, despite tensions between the accountability-led requirements and teaching and learning enhancement, some positive impact of external quality monitoring on teaching programmes is evident. However, two years later, Horsburgh (1999) having undertaken a detailed analysis of the determinants of improvement in learning and teaching, produced a seminal paper that showed the tenuous

link between external quality processes and student learning and instead highlighted social, economic, political and personal contexts with a consequent need for quality assurance to focus on curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment. Gerbic and Kranenburg (2003), though, argued that the New Zealand external process impacted positively on new programme development resulting in more cohesive, student-centred programmes. De Miguel, Escudero and Rodriguez (1998) also reported that the Spanish National Plan of Evaluation of the Universities' Quality during the 1980s, focused particularly on teaching, research and management, and led to some encouraging effects.

Ratcliff (2003) pointed out that over the last two decades and across the globe, quality assurance processes have been implemented, then modified, replaced or augmented with more stringent policies and procedures. While the pace and intensity of quality assurance and enhancement activities has accelerated greatly, its impact on the improvement of programmes and student learning remains less clear. Equally unclear is whether the current investments in quality reviews have delivered the political and social assurances that reputedly promulgated them, or whether the time and resources devoted to them are warranted given their uncertain benefits. Harvey and Newton (2004) argued that impact research is difficult because it is impossible to control all relevant factors but that available studies reinforce the view that quality assurance is about compliance and accountability and has contributed little to any effective transformation of the student learning experience. Kajaste, Prades Nebot & Scheuthle (2015) suggested that it is almost impossible to tell what caused the changes in the higher education institution. This does not mean impact analysis should not be attempted because attention to impact keeps the agency focused on undertaking useful credible external evaluations. However, even in the rather homogeneous European higher education area no single method of assessing impacts will fit all quality assurance procedures. Stensaker (2003, 2008) contended that the evidence on changes attributed to external quality monitoring is ambiguous and that the lack of effects directly attributable to quality assurance represents a misconception of how organisational change actually takes place.

Carr, Hamilton and Meade (2005) were similarly sceptical of whether independent effects could be isolated and concluded that there is an array of influences for change within higher education in addition to those generated by external quality assurance. However, at the University of Otago external quality assurance had a powerful initial role as a catalyst, which led them to the view that external processes are a necessary prerequisite of internal improvement. A similar view emerged from a Dutch-Italian comparative study that posited that external national processes become a relevant resource that academic management can use to legitimise cultural and organisational change (Minelli, Rebora, Turri and Huisman, 2006). Rosa, Tavares and Amaral (2006) agreed about the impact on management, though institutional leadership (in Portugal) paid more attention to internal procedures and services, strategic management and institutional management structures than to actual improvements in the student learning experience. Beerkens (2015) examined the value of external quality assurance as a catalyst for institutional development and suggested impact evaluation can address some of the difficulties.

There is an increasing interest in impact and recently Bejan, Janatuinen, Jurvelin, Klöpping, Malinen, Minke and Vacareanu (2015) found that their three sample institutions, in different countries, undertook impact analysis of quality assurance, using the results to help improve the institution. However, impact evaluation of quality assurance tends not to be implemented systematically by agencies (Damian, Grifoll and Rigbers, 2015). Leiber, Stensaker and Harvey (2015) explored the theoretical basis of impact analysis and argued that in future quality assurance agencies should strive to explore effectiveness preferably through comparative and longitudinal studies. Indeed, greater systematisation of how impact is measured is needed for a better understanding of how external quality assurance can be used as a policy instrument (Stensaker and Leiber, 2015).

Quality assurance and student learning

From the first issue of the journal, there has been a consistent concern about quality of teaching and learning, not least the relationship between quality assurance and pedagogic development. Saarinen (1995) explored the Finnish situation and concluded that irrespective of the purpose of quality assessments, the overriding concern with teaching and research meant that in practice academics ‘translated’ the assessments to suit their own needs.

Quality assurance, especially external quality assurance, is rarely linked to any improvements in student learning. In almost all cases, any reference to assurance, when exploring the quality of learning, is to internal processes. Authors considered a process that prioritised self-regulation and innovation (Horsburgh, 1998), constructive alignment (Sridharan, Leitch and Watty, 2015); caring environments (Imrie, 1998; Karpiak, 2000); collegiality and mutual appreciation (Cryer, 1998; Rodrigues, Lehmann and Fleith, 2005; Holmberg, 2006) individual responsibility rather than systems compliance (Barrow and Curzon-Hobson, 2003) and evaluation by members of the teaching team rather than external assessors (Jordens and Zepke, 2009). The exceptions included discussion of the external Teaching and Learning Quality Process Review in Hong Kong (Massy, 1997; Massy and French, 2001; Jones and De Saram, 2005), with its strong focus on pedagogy.

Various suggestions for improving teacher were mooted in the journal including: encouraging student feedback on pedagogy (Shabani, 1995; Hansen and Jackson, 1996); engaging students and developing mutual trust (Hansen and Jackson, 1996; Foo and Ng, 1996); improving curricula (Shabani, 1995; Munasinghe and Jayawardena, 1999; Harris and Bretag, 2003; Bolander, Josephson, Mann and Lonka, 2006); focusing on learning outcomes (Hansen and Jackson, 1996), utilising active and experiential learning (but being aware of student learning styles) (Ralph and Konchak, 1996; Fallan, 2006; Hamdhaidari, Agahi and Papzan, 2007); reducing emphasis on lectures (Vengris, 1997); improving the quality of graduate training (Shabani, 1995); involving other stakeholders (Ralph and Konchak, 1996); and professionalising teaching (Imrie, 1998; Knight, 2006).

Student engagement has been somewhat elusive. Coates (2005) argued that quality assurance needs to take account of student engagement in developing productive learning and Meyer (1999) argued that any consideration of student learning ‘quality’ is

incomplete without knowing *how* and *why* students engage with the context and content of learning. However, Dolnicar (2005) showed how a shift towards pragmatism among (mostly young) students when it comes to attending lectures, resulting in lower attendance but contrarily a higher grade-point average than those who attended regularly. From a different angle, the better the student experience at university the more likely they are to have high levels of achievement (Grayson, 2007).

In essence, however, improving pedagogy and engaging students is fundamentally about empowering learners (Connolly, Jones and O'Shea, 2005) and transforming students Zhao (2003). Vieira's (2002) study at the University of Minho adopted a transformative and emancipatory conception of education and argued that pedagogical practices should aim at transforming and empowering the individual. However, the evidence was that students perceived a lack of reflectivity and more needs to be done to encourage critical reflective transformative learning. Tam (2004) argued that university years are a time of student change on a broad front including values, attitudes, morals as well as cognitive and intellectual skills. As higher education is, thus, about transforming people, not just their knowledge, Bramming (2007) argued that transformative learning is a painful process as well as a state of being that students have to accept and see as not only necessary but desired. Considerations of quality in higher education should therefore proceed from the goal of enhancing transformative learning. A 'transformative learning identity' demands philosophically grounded pedagogies, not only about learning as a process but also about the forces that shape and make learning possible in the first place.

Assessment of student performance is an important element in the learning process. In essence, the contributions critiques assessment methods (Lavelle, 2003) and argued for a shift from traditional method-led examination-oriented systems to motivational and transparent assessment that directly tested specified learning outcomes (Erwin and Knight, 1995; Hinett, 1995). More effort and resources should be directed at staff development enabling and encouraging appropriate assessment practices (Hinett and Weeden, 2000). Knight (2002) further explored the dependability of assessments of student achievement when used as performance indicators for internal and external quality monitoring. Reliable national data about complex student achievements do not exist which undermines the reliance of external quality assurance and he argued for more more attention on internal quality enhancement. A concern linked to assessment is the growing problem of plagiarism (Yeo and Chien, 2007). Procedures for addressing plagiarism incidents are neither precise nor easily implementable, which leads to inequitable treatment that is intrinsically unfair.

The view of academics

There have been repeated concerns in the journal about the artificiality of quality assurance processes in higher education resulting in ritualised compliance by academics to deal with the extra administrative burden. Quality assurance fails to be a part of the everyday activity of academics because they perceive no real link between the quality of their academic work (teaching and research) and the performance embodied in quality

assurance processes. This leads to a degree of cynicism about the efficacy and value of assurance processes and their disengagement from learning.

Early on, Barrow (1999) identified 'dramaturgical compliance' (performance in review events) that failed to lead to an improvement in quality. Newton's (2000) study of academics' perceptions of quality assurance also indicated a degree of ritual feeding of the quality assurance beast with a clear implementation gap between the intentions underpinning quality policy and the actual outcomes. Newton's (2002) follow-up provided evidence that front-line academics do not simply concede to the demands of quality assurance policy or systems. Rather, they respond, adapt to or even resist and are active, not passive, participants in the process of forming policy.

Anderson's (2006) study also showed that academics, although committed to quality in research and teaching, continue to resist quality assurance processes within their universities. This is because quality is a contested concept and, until a mutually-agreed understanding between external monitors, senior managers and academics emerges, academics will continue to resist quality processes, treating them as games to be played and systems to be fed. Similarly, Minelli, Rebora and Turri (2008) expected ritual behaviour in the Italian system, while Watty (2003) had argued that the continued emphasis of quality assurance processes on external monitoring would result in no change to compliance game playing. In a later paper (Watty, 2006), not only was resistance evident but a sample of academics from 39 accounting departments in Australian universities maintained quality in accounting education had declined. Likewise, a South African study showed that after five years most quality committees still viewed quality as 'something that exists out there' (Jacobs and Du Toit, 2006).

Cynicism also extended to the value attributed by academics to student feedback questionnaires and peer review schemes (Lomas and Nicholls, 2005; Douglas and Douglas, 2006). Early contributions emphasised the need for student feedback (Shabani, 1995; Hansen and Jackson, 1996) but enthusiasm diminished as student feedback became widespread and systematised rather than tailored to specific needs.

For some academics, quality assurance was seen to impugn their professionalism (Cheng, 2009), implying, *inter alia*, a lack of trust (Duening and Kadipasaoglu, 1996).

The problem for Gosling and D'Andrea (2001) has been the separation of quality assurance and educational development. They suggested that the quality of students' experience of higher education would be improved by combining not separating them. Other earlier contributions had argued for quality strategies that worked with staff to establish a 'learning culture' (Meade 1995), develop value-added and multi-dimensional strategies to engage academics in educational reforms Lueddeke (1997) and, on the basis of empirical examination, to establish a flexibility-oriented culture not a control-oriented culture to increase staff engagement (Kleijnena, Dolmans, Muijtjens, Willems and Van Hout, 2009). Similarly, Basheka (2009) emphasised academic freedom, claiming that better-managed institutions enhance academic freedom, which impacts positively on the quality of education.

Some contributions from agencies claimed that academics engaged with their processes. For example, Pillai and Srinivas (2006), from the National Assessment and Accreditation Council of India argued that an intensive awareness campaign had made their process acceptable to the institutions and over a decade had earned a lot of goodwill and appreciation from the academic community. Similarly, Meade and Woodhouse (2000) reported the review of the New Zealand Academic Audit Unit, which claimed, among other things that trust and mutual respect has been established and universities were going beyond compliance. However, other papers in the journal suggested the relationship still had elements of suspicion.

Given the scepticism of academics and the compliance of senior managers, there is a strong tendency to a tactical approach to quality assurance. In India, for example, a review of ten years of quality assurance showed that institutions began copying the top-bracket institutions and adopting the generic agency manuals for self-study without question (Stella, 2004). Gordon (2002) argued that while such tactics might reduce workload in the short-term it is unlikely to build a lasting culture of quality assurance and continuous improvement. Fourie and Alt (2000) also argued that academic staff become occupied by building and conforming to formal quality assurance procedures and divert attention from teaching and research, which is harmful to quality.

Another concern that has emerged over the last fifteen years, linked to workload is the stress felt by academics and the subsequent health issues (McInnis, 2000; Melin, Astvik and Bernhard-Oettel, 2014). Research by Kinman and Jones (2003, 2006) of almost 800 UK academics showed job stress and demands had increased significantly since the start of the millennium and psychological distress was greater than for academics in other countries, and compared to other professional groups and the general population in the United Kingdom. Furthermore, job satisfaction and levels of support had declined. The authors noted that the quality of higher education relies heavily upon the capabilities and goodwill of its employees. Edwards (2009) study of 2136 workers in four higher education institutions in the UK also showed they were stressed and dissatisfied with their jobs, careers, working conditions and level of control at work.

REFERENCES

- Aelterman, G., 2006, 'Sets of standards for external quality assurance agencies: a comparison', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 227–233.
- Alean-Kirkpatrick, P., Hänni, H. and Lutz, L., 1997, 'Internal quality monitoring of the teaching at the ETH, Zürich: model design and initial impacts', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 63–71.
- Anderson, G., 2006, 'Assuring quality/resisting quality assurance: academics' responses to 'quality' in some Australian universities', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(2), pp. 161–73.
- Ansah, F., 2015, 'A strategic quality assurance framework in an African higher education context', *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(2), pp. 132–50.
- Arden, E., 1996, 'RX for regional accrediting agencies', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(1), pp. 79–80.

- Askling, B., 1997, 'Quality monitoring as an institutional enterprise', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 17–26.
- Baldwin, G., 1997, 'Quality assurance in Australian higher education: the case of Monash University', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 51–61.
- Barrett, R., 1996, '“Quality” and the abolition of standards: arguments against some American prescriptions for the improvement of higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2.3, 201–10.
- Barrie, S. and Ginns, P., 2007, 'The linking of national teaching performance indicators to improvements in teaching and learning in classrooms', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(3), pp. 275–86.
- Barrow, M. and Curzon-Hobson, A., 2003, 'From compliance to care: stimulating change in a New Zealand polytechnic', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(3), pp. 267–72.
- Barrow, M., 1999, 'Quality-management systems and dramaturgical compliance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(1), pp. 27–36.
- Basheka, B., 2009, 'Management and academic freedom in higher educational institutions: implications for quality education in Uganda', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(2), pp. 135–46.
- Beerens, M., 2015, 'Quality assurance in the political context: in the midst of different expectations and conflicting goals', *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(3), pp. 231–50.
- Bejan, S.A., Janatuinen, T., Jurvelin, J., Klöpping, S., Malinen, H., Minke B. and Vacareanu, R., 2015, 'Quality assurance and its impact from higher education institutions' perspectives: methodological approaches, experiences and expectations', *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(3), pp. 343–71.
- Berner, H. and Richter, R., 2001, 'Accreditation of degree programmes in Germany', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(3), pp. 247–57.
- Billing, D. and Thomas, H., 2000, 'The international transferability of quality assessment systems for higher education: the Turkish experience', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(1), pp. 31–40.
- Blackmur, D., 2007, 'A critical analysis of the UNESCO/OECD Guidelines for Quality Provision of Cross-Border Higher Education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(2), pp. 117–130.
- Bolander, K., Josephson, A., Mann, S. and Lonka, K., 2006, 'Teachers promoting expertise in medical education: understanding the role of the core curriculum', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), pp. 41–55.
- Botha, J., Favish, J. and Stephenson, S., 2008, 'Institutional audits: a comparison of the experiences of three South African universities', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(1), pp. 29–53.
- Bowden, R., 2000, 'Fantasy higher education: university and college league tables', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(1), pp. 41–60.
- Bramming, P., 2007, 'An argument for strong learning in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(1), pp. 45–56.
- Busch, T., Fallan, L. and Pettersen, A., 1998, 'Disciplinary differences in job satisfaction, self-efficacy, goal commitment and organisational commitment among faculty employees in Norwegian colleges: an empirical assessment of indicators of performance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(2), pp. 137–157.

- Carr, S., Hamilton, E. and Meade, P., 2005, 'Is it possible? Investigating the influence of external quality audit on university performance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(3), pp. 195–211.
- Cheng, M., 2009, 'Academics' professionalism and quality mechanisms: challenges and tensions', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15.3, 193–205.
- Cheung, P.P.T., 2006, 'Filleting the transnational education steak', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 283–85.
- Coates, H., 2005, 'The value of student engagement for higher education quality assurance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), pp. 25–36.
- Connolly, M., Jones, N. and O'Shea, J., 2005, 'Quality assurance and e-learning: reflections from the front line', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), pp. 59–67.
- Cook, R., Butcher, I. and Raeside, R., 2006, 'Recounting the scores: an analysis of the QAA Subject Review grades 1995-2001', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(2), pp. 135–44.
- Coyle, P., 2003, 'The balance of autonomy and accountability in London Guildhall University's quality-management system', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9.2, 199–205.
- Cryer, P., 1998, 'Beyond codes of practice: dilemmas in supervising postgraduate research students', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(3), pp. 229–34.
- Damian, R., Grifoll, J. and Rigbers, A., 2015, 'On the role of impact evaluation of quality assurance from the strategic perspective of quality assurance agencies in the European higher education area', *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(3), pp. 251–69.
- De Jager, H.J. and Nieuwenhuis, F.J. 2005, 'Linkages between total quality management and the outcomes-based approach in an education environment', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(3), pp. 251–60.
- De Miguel, M., Escudero, T. and Rodriguez, S., 1998, 'Spanish universities' quality: the incentive of external evaluation', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4.2, 199–206.
- Dill, D.D., 2000, 'Designing academic audit: lessons learned in Europe and Asia', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(3), pp. 187–207.
- Dolnicar, S., 2005, 'Should we still lecture or just post examination questions on the web?: the nature of the shift towards pragmatism in undergraduate lecture attendance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(2), pp. 103–15.
- Douglas, J. and Douglas, A., 2006, 'Evaluating teaching quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), pp. 3–13.
- Duening, T. and Kadipasaoglu, S.N., 1996, 'Team-driven change in higher education: the three key principles', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(1), pp. 57–64.
- Edwards, J., 2009, 'The work-related quality of life scale for higher education employees', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), pp. 207–19.
- Erwin, T.D and Knight, P., 1995, 'A transatlantic view of assessment and quality in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), pp. 179–88.
- European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), 2005, *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*, 2005, agreed in Bergen, Norway, published in Helsinki, Finland, ENQA.
- Ewell, P.T., 1999, 'Linking performance measures to resource allocation: exploring unmapped terrain', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5.3, 191–209.

- Faber, M. and Huisman, J., 2003, 'Same voyage, different routes? The course of the Netherlands and Denmark to a 'European model' of quality assurance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(3), pp. 231–42.
- Fallan, L., 2006, 'Quality reform: personality type, preferred learning style and majors in a business school', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12.2, 193–206.
- Foo, S and Ng, G.S, 1996, 'Improving study methods of computer engineering undergraduates in Singapore', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(2), pp. 131–42.
- Fourie, M. and Alt, H., 2000, 'Challenges to sustaining and enhancing quality of teaching and learning in South African universities', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 115–24.
- French, E., Summers, J., Kinash, S., Lawson, R., Taylor, T., Herbert, J., Fallshaw, E. and Hall, C., 2014, 'The practice of quality in assuring learning in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 20(1), pp. 24–43.
- Gaunt, D., 1999, 'The practitioner as external examiner', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(1), pp. 81–90.
- Gerbic, P. and Kranenburg, I., 2003, 'The impact of external approval processes on programme development', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 169–77.
- Gift, S.I. and Bell-Hutchinson, C., 2007, 'Quality assurance and the imperatives for improved student experiences in higher education: the case of the University of the West Indies', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(2), pp. 145–57.
- Gordon, G., 2002, 'The roles of leadership and ownership in building an effective quality culture', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 97–106.
- Gosling, D. and D'Andrea, V-M., 2001, 'Quality development: a new concept for higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), pp. 7–17.
- Grayson, J.P., 2007, 'Sense of coherence, problem freedom and academic outcomes of Canadian domestic and international students', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(3), pp. 215–236.
- Gynnild, V., 2007, 'Quality assurance reconsidered: a case study', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(3), pp. 263–73.
- Gynnild, V., Myrhaug, D. and Lian, W., 2004, 'External examiners in new roles: a case study at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(3), pp. 243–52.
- Haakstad, J., 2001, 'Accreditation: the new quality assurance formula? Some reflections as Norway is about to reform its quality assurance system', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), pp. 77–82.
- Hamdhaidari, S., Agahi, H., Papzan, A-H., 2007, 'Teaching and learning participation in the College of Agriculture at Razi University, Iran', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(2), pp. 131–43.
- Hansen, W.L. and Jackson, M., 1996, 'Total quality improvement in the classroom', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(3), pp. 211–17.
- Harris-Huermert, S., 2008, 'Evaluators of higher education in Germany: are they 'fit for purpose'?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(1), pp. 55–65.
- Harris, H. and Bretag, T., 2003, 'Reflective and collaborative teaching practice: working towards quality student learning outcomes', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 179–85.
- Harvey, L., 1995, 'Beyond TQM', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), pp. 123–46

- Harvey, L., 2008, 'Rankings of higher education institutions: a critical review', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(3), pp. 187–207.
- Harvey, L. and Newton, J., 2004, 'Transforming quality evaluation', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(2), pp. 149–65.
- Harvey, L., 2003, 'Student Feedback', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 3–20.
- Harvey, L., 2006, 'Impact of quality assurance: Overview of a discussion between representatives of external quality assurance agencies', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 287–290.
- Hawthorne, E.M., 1996, 'Increasing understanding of decision making in higher education: the case of Taiwan', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(1), pp. 65–77.
- Heusser, R., 2006, 'Mutual recognition of accreditation decisions in Europe', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 253–56.
- Hinaga, T., 2004, 'Networking of quality assurance agencies in the Asia-Pacific region and the role of Japan University Accreditation Association', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(1), pp. 37–41.
- Hinett, K. and Weeden, P., 2000, 'How am I doing?: developing critical self-evaluation in trainee teachers', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(3), pp. 245–57.
- Hinett, K., 1995, 'Fighting the assessment war: the idea of assessment-in-learning', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(3), pp. 211–22.
- Holmberg, L., 2006, 'Coach, consultant or mother: supervisors' views on quality in the supervision of bachelor theses', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12.2, 207–16.
- Hopbach, A., 2006, 'The European Standards and Guidelines and the evaluation of agencies in Germany', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 235–42.
- Hopkin, A.G and Lee, M.B., 2001, 'Towards improving quality in 'dependent' institutions in a developing context', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(3), pp. 217–31.
- Horsburgh, M., 1997, 'External quality monitoring in New Zealand tertiary education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3, 1), pp. 5–15.
- Horsburgh, M., 1998, 'Quality monitoring in two institutions: a comparison', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4, 2), pp. 115–35.
- Horsburgh, M., 1999, 'Quality monitoring in higher Education: the impact on student learning', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5, 1), pp. 9–25.
- Houston, D. and Maniku, A.A., 2005, 'Systems perspectives on external quality assurance: implications for micro-states', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(3), pp. 213–26.
- Houston, D., 2007, 'TQM and higher education: a critical systems perspective on fitness for purpose', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(1), pp. 3–17.
- Houston, D., Robertson, T and Prebble, T., 2008, 'Exploring quality in a university department: perspectives and meanings', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(3), pp. 209–23.
- Imrie, B., 1998, 'Professional development is quality assurance: now and Zen', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(3), pp. 215–27.
- Jacobs, D.J., 1998, 'External quality assurance in support of institutional autonomy', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(2), pp. 187–198.
- Jacobs, G.J. and Du Toit, A., 2006, 'Contrasting faculty quality views and practices over a five-year interval', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 303–14.

- Jeliazkova, M., 2002, 'Running the maze: interpreting external review recommendations', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 89–96.
- Jones, J., De Saram, D.D., 2005, 'Academic staff views of quality systems for teaching and learning: a Hong Kong case study', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), pp. 47–58.
- Jordens, J.Z. and Zepke, N., 2009, 'A network approach to curriculum quality assessment', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), pp. 279–89.
- Kaghed, N. and Dezaye, A., 2009, 'Quality assurance strategies of higher education in Iraq and Kurdistan: a case study', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(1), pp. 71–77.
- Kajaste, M., Prades, A. and Scheuthle, H., 2015, 'Impact evaluation from quality assurance agencies' perspectives: methodological approaches, experiences and expectations, *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(3), pp. 270–87.
- Kallo, J. and Semchenko, A., 2016, Translation of the UNESCO/OECD guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education into local policy contexts: a comparative study of Finland and Russia, *Quality in Higher Education*, 22(1), pp. 20–35.
- Karpiak, I., 2000, 'The 'second call': faculty renewal and recommitment at midlife', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 125–34.
- Kinman, G. and Jones, F., 2003, 'Running up the down escalator': stressors and strains in UK academics', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 21–38.
- Kinman, G., Jones, F. and Kinman, R., 2006, 'The well-being of the UK academy, 1998–2004', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), pp. 15–27.
- Kleijna, J., Dolmans, D., Muijtjens, A., Willems, J. and Van Hout, H., 2009, 'Organisational values in higher education: perceptions and preferences of staff', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), pp. 233–49.
- Knight, P.T., 2002, 'The Achilles' heel of quality: the assessment of student learning', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 107–15.
- Knight, P.T., 2006, 'Quality enhancement and educational professional development', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), pp. 29–40.
- Kristensen, B., 1997, 'The impact of quality monitoring on institutions: a Danish experience at the Copenhagen Business School', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 87–94.
- Kristoffersen, D. and Lindeberg, T., 2004, 'Creating quality assurance and international transparency for quality assurance agencies: the case of mutual recognition', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(1), pp. 31–36.
- Lavelle, E., 2003, 'The quality of university writing: a preliminary analysis of undergraduate portfolios', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 87–93.
- Lee, C. and Buckthorpe, S., 2008, 'Robust performance indicators for non-completion in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(1), pp. 67–77.
- Leeuw, F.L., 2002, 'Reciprocity and educational evaluations by European Inspectorates: assumptions and reality checks', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(2), pp. 137–49.
- Leiber, T., Stensaker, B. and Harvey, L., 2015, Impact evaluation of quality assurance in higher education: methodology and causal designs, *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(3), pp. 288–311.
- Lemaitre, M-J., 2002, 'Quality as politics', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 29–37.

- Lemaitre, M.-J., 2004, 'Development of external quality assurance schemes: an answer to the challenges of higher education evolution', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(2), pp. 89–99.
- Lomas, L. and Nicholls, G., 2005, 'Enhancing teaching quality through peer review of teaching', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(2), pp. 137–49.
- Lueddeke, G., 1997, 'Educational development units in higher education: much ado about something?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(2), pp. 155–71.
- Lundquist, R., 1996, 'Using a quality award for self-assessments in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(2), pp. 105–16.
- Lycke, K.H., 2004, 'Perspectives on quality assurance in higher education in Norway', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(3), pp. 219–29.
- Massy, W.F. and French, N.J., 2001, 'Teaching and Learning Quality Process Review: what the programme has achieved in Hong Kong', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), pp. 33–45.
- Massy, W.F., 1997, 'Teaching and Learning Quality-Process Review: the Hong Kong programme', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(3), pp. 249–62.
- McGettrick, A., Dunnett, A. and Harvey, B., 1997, 'Continuous quality improvement in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(3), pp. 235–47.
- McInnis, C., 2000, 'Changing academic work roles: the everyday realities challenging quality in teaching', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 143–52.
- Meade, P. and Woodhouse, D., 2000, 'Evaluating the effectiveness of the New Zealand Academic Audit Unit: review and outcomes', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(1), pp. 19–29.
- Meade, P., 1995, 'Utilising the university as a learning organisation to facilitate quality improvement', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), pp. 111–21.
- Melin, M., Astvik, W. and Bernhard-Oettel, C., 2014, 'New work demands in higher education. A study of the relationship between excessive workload, coping strategies and subsequent health among academic staff', *Quality in Higher Education*, 20(3), pp. 290–308.
- Meyer, J.H.F., 1999, 'Variation and concepts of quality in student learning', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(2), pp. 167–80.
- Minelli, E., Rebori, G. and Turri, M., 2008, 'How can evaluation fail? The case of Italian universities', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(2), pp. 157–73.
- Minelli, E., Rebori, G., Turri, M. and Huisman, J., 2006, 'The impact of research and teaching evaluation in universities: comparing an Italian and a Dutch case', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(2), pp. 109–24.
- Moon, S. and Geall, V., 1996, 'Total quality management: disciples and detractors', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(3), pp. 271–73.
- Morley, L., 2001, 'Producing new workers: quality, equality and employability in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(2), pp. 131–38.
- Munasinghe, L. and Jayawardena, P., 1999, 'Continuous quality improvement in higher education: a model for Sri Lanka', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(1), pp. 69–79.
- Mizikaci, F., 2003, 'Quality systems and accreditation in higher education: an overview of Turkish higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 95–106.

- Newton, J., 1997, 'Opportunities for partnership in quality improvement: responding to the challenge of teaching quality assessment in Wales', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 37–50.
- Newton, J., 2000, 'Feeding the beast or improving quality?: academics' perceptions of quality assurance and quality monitoring', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 153–63.
- Newton, J., 2002, 'Views from below: academics coping with quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 39–61.
- Nguyen, K.D., Oliver, D.E. and Priddy, L.E., 2009, 'Criteria for accreditation in Vietnam's higher education: focus on input or outcome?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(2), pp. 123–34.
- Nilsson, K-A. and Wahlén, S., 2000, 'Institutional response to the Swedish model of quality assurance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(1), pp. 7–18.
- Ottewill, R. and Macfarlane, B., 2004, 'Quality and the scholarship of teaching: learning from subject review', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(3), pp. 231–41.
- Peterson, S.L., Kovel-Jarboe, P. and Schwartz, S.A., 1997, 'Quality improvement in higher education: implications for student retention', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(2), pp. 131–41.
- Pillai, K.N.M. and Srinivas, G., 2006, 'A study of the post-accreditation scenario in the North Eastern region of India: a meta-evaluation of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council processes and procedures', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), pp. 95–106.
- Pompili, G., 2010, Quality in search of meanings: the case of Italian universities, *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(3), pp. 235–45.
- Quinn, L. and Boughey, C., 2009, 'A case study of an institutional audit: a social realist account', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), pp. 263–78.
- Ralph, E. and Konchak, P., 1996, 'Implications for improving teaching in the health sciences: some Canadian findings', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(1), pp. 45–55.
- Ratcliff, J.L., 2003, 'Dynamic and communicative aspects of quality assurance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 117–31.
- Rodrigues J.F., Lehmann, A.V.L and Fleith, D.D.S, 2005, 'Factors mediating the interactions between adviser and advisee during the master's thesis project: a quantitative approach', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(2), pp. 117–27.
- Rosa, M.J., Tavares, D. and Amaral, A., 2006, 'Institutional consequences of quality assessment', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(2), pp. 145–59.
- Rozsnyai, C., 2004, 'A decade of accreditation in Hungary: lessons learned and future directions', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(2), pp. 129–38.
- Saarinen, T., 1995, 'Systematic higher education assessment and departmental impacts: translating the effort to meet the need', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(3), pp. 223–34.
- Scheele, K., 2004, 'Licence to kill: about accreditation issues and James Bond', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(3), pp. 285–93.
- Shabani, J., 1995, 'Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: strategies for the improvement of the quality of training', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), pp. 173–178.

- Silva-Trivio, M. and Ramirez-Gatica, S., 2004, 'External review teams training in Central America', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(3), pp. 261–65.
- Silva, M., Reich, R. and Gallegos, G., 1997, 'Effects of external quality evaluation in Chile: a preliminary study', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 27–35.
- Singh, M., Lange, L. and Naidoo, P., 2004, 'Evaluating the MBA in South Africa', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10.3, 197–206.
- Sjölund, M., 2002, 'Politics versus evaluation: the establishment of three new universities in Sweden', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(2), pp. 173–81.
- Smith, E.D., 1997, 'External systems and mandates for change: the Virginia experience', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 73–80.
- Sridharan, B., Leitch, S. and Watty, K., 2015, 'Evidencing learning outcomes: a multi-level, multi-dimensional course alignment model', *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(2), pp. 171–88
- Stella, A., 2004, 'External quality assurance in Indian higher education: developments of a decade', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(2), pp. 115–27.
- Stella, A., 2006, 'Quality assurance of cross-border higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 257–76.
- Stensaker, B. & Leiber, T., 2015, 'Assessing the organizational impact of external quality assurance: hypothesising key dimensions and mechanisms', *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(3), pp. 328–42.
- Stensaker, B., 1999, 'User surveys in external assessments: problems and prospects', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(3), pp. 255–64.
- Stensaker, B., 2003, 'Trance, transparency and transformation: the impact of external quality monitoring on higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 151–59.
- Stensaker, B., 2008, 'Outcomes of quality assurance: a discussion of knowledge, methodology and validity', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(1), pp. 3–13.
- Stensaker, B., 1997, 'From accountability to opportunity: the role of quality assessments in Norway', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(3), pp. 277–84.
- Szanto, T.R., 2004, 'Programme accreditation in Hungary: lessons from the past, plans for the future', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(1), pp. 59–64.
- Tam, M., 2004, 'Using students' self-reported gains as a measure of value-added', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(3), pp. 253–60.
- Temple, P. and Billing, D., 2003, 'Higher education quality assurance organisations in Central and Eastern Europe', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(3), pp. 243–58.
- Thune, C., 1996, 'The alliance of accountability and improvement: the Danish experience', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(1), pp. 21–32.
- Tomusk, V., 1997, 'External quality assurance in Estonian higher education: its glory, take-off and crash', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(2), pp. 173–81.
- Tomusk, V., 2000, 'When East meets West: decontextualizing the quality of East European higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(3), pp. 175–85.
- Udom, U.O., 1996, 'Major features of accreditation in Nigeria', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(2), pp. 143–54.
- Umemiya, N., 2008, 'Regional quality assurance activity in higher education in Southeast Asia: its characteristics and driving forces', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(3), pp. 277–90.

- Veiga, A., Rosa, M.J. and Amaral, A., 2011, 'Understanding the impacts of quality assessment: an exploratory use of cultural theory', *Quality in Higher Education*, 17(1), pp. 53–67
- Vengris, S., 1997, 'External evaluation of studies at Vilnius University, 1994–95', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(1), pp. 81–85.
- Vieira, F., 2002, 'Pedagogic quality at university: what teachers and students think', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(3), pp. 255–72.
- Wahlén, S., 2004, 'Does national quality monitoring make a difference?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(2), pp. 139–47.
- Warren Piper, D., 1995, 'Assuring the quality of awards', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1.3, 199–210.
- Watty, K., 2003, 'When will academics learn about quality?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(3), pp. 213–21.
- Watty, K., 2006, 'Want to know about quality in higher education? Ask an academic', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 291–301.
- Westerheijden, D.F., 2001, 'Ex oriente lux?: national and multiple accreditation in Europe after the fall of the Wall and after Bologna', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), pp. 65–75.
- Weusthof, P.J.M., 1995, 'Internal quality assurance in Dutch universities: an empirical analysis of characteristics and results of self-evaluation', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(3), pp. 235–48.
- Winchip, S.M., 1996, 'Analysis of the adaptability of W. Edwards Deming's management philosophy to institutions of higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(3), pp. 219–36.
- Woodhouse, D., 2003, 'Quality improvement through quality audit', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 133–39.
- Yeo, S. and Chien, R., 2007, 'Evaluation of a process and proforma for making consistent decisions about the seriousness of plagiarism incidents', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(2), pp. 187–204.
- Yorke, M., 1995, 'Siamese twins? Performance indicators in the service of accountability and enhancement', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(1), pp. 13–30.
- Yorke, M., 1998, 'Performance indicators relating to student development: can they be trusted?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(1), pp. 45–61.
- Zhao, F., 2003, 'Transforming quality in research supervision: a knowledge-management approach', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 187–97.