Chapter 27: Quality assurance in higher education FINAL PRE-PROOF

James Williams (Birmingham City University)

Lee Harvey (Emeritus, Copenhagen Business School)

1 Introduction

Since the 1980s, quality assurance in higher education has grown dramatically, has come to affect every level of the sector and has become an accepted and integral part of academic life. Saarinen (2010:55) has observed that 'quality has turned from a debatable and controversial concept to an everyday issue in higher education'. Concomitantly, quality assurance has become, as Rosa and Amaral (2014: 9) describe it, a 'professionalised' and internationally networked activity. However, as higher education faces increasingly difficult challenges of globalisation and marketization, so too quality assurance becomes increasingly complex. At the same time, the literature on quality assurance has also increased in scale and complexity. How are we to make sense of it all?

This chapter reviews the key research relating to quality assurance in higher education. The focus of the chapter will be research conducted since the early 1990s, when quality became a key concern of the sector, what Newton has referred to (2002) as the 'quality revolution'. However, earlier work, will be cited where relevant. The chapter will inevitably range widely but build on work by Harvey and Williams (2010a; 2010b) that explored key themes of research published in the journal *Quality in Higher Education*. This was the first time that such a broad range of research on aspects of quality and quality assurance had been thematised. Much of it focused on external and internal quality assurance.

Key to understanding quality assurance is definition. The chapter begins with an analysis of the ways in which commentators have defined quality with a view to identifying the extent to which quality assurance and enhancement are dichotomized. The section builds on the seminal 1993 definition of quality in higher education by Harvey and Green and explore the extent to which the notions in this work have influenced following definitions and understanding of quality. The notion of quality as transformation is clearly important here and will inform analysis of the literature on quality processes at every level from module evaluation to institutional development.

The chapter then explores how such definitions play out in practice through identification and analysis of existing research into different external and internal mechanisms to assure and improve quality. The majority of research in this area focuses on external quality assurance processes and frequently concerns the tension between accountability and improvement. The section takes account of work in different countries, work that crosses international boundaries and explore how quality models cross cultural boundaries.

Whilst there is a huge amount of material relating to quality assurance procedures, researchers seem reticent to question their wider impact. This chapter identifies and analyzes research that explores the impact of quality assurance regimes. It explores literature about how evaluations themselves have in changing and developing agency practice. It identifies the different ways in which commentators measure the impact of quality assurance. It explores whether commentators believe that the huge expansion and investment in quality assurance has been worthwhile.

Finally, the chapter explores the extent to which commentators believe a 'quality culture' has been developed in contemporary higher education. It identifies different understandings of the term and

whether this is useful as a way of monitoring and improving what we do in higher education. It explores the extent to which existing research indicates that academic staff and students themselves actually engage with quality assurance processes in a meaningful way and whether quality is in any way regarded as a tool for transformation of the sector.

2 Defining quality

Underpinning any understanding of quality assurance is our chosen understanding of quality itself and so we must start with definitions. For Harvey (2006), defining quality is integral to understanding quality assurance: he observes that quality assurance is 'about checking the quality of a process or outcomes. Purposes of quality assurance include compliance, control, accountability and improvement' whereas 'quality is the conceptual tool through which these purposes are implemented.' It is therefore vital to underpin any discussion of quality assurance with a definition of quality in higher education and much space has, unsurprisingly, been given to it. Defining quality in higher education is, of course, fraught with difficulties: the discourse of quality tends to associate quality with assessment and produces and reproduces received ideas of quality (Saarinen 2005).

Early attempts to define quality explicitly largely appear to have failed, following Pirsig, who famously stated in *Zen and Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*, which largely focused on quality in higher education, 'even though quality cannot be defined, you know what it is' (Pirsig, 1974). For many years, academic commentators were content to accept this implicit understanding of quality. Indeed, Vroejenstijn, for example, argued (1991), that 'it is so hard to define quality in higher education that we should stop bothering'. However, defining quality in a way that was both explicit and operationalisable was vital in the early 1990s because quality assurance was developing rapidly.

Harvey and Green (1993) were the first to reach a workable definition of quality in higher education. They argued that quality in higher education can be categorised as exception, perfection, value for money, fitness for purpose and transformation. Harvey further developed this notion in later work (2006). This definition has proved influential and many articles that deal specifically with issues around defining quality in the context of higher education all build on it. In some cases, these categories are tested against contemporary perceptions and remain. Even where new definitions are posited, the Harvey and Green (1993) definition remains the central reference point for many researchers.

However, several authors, whilst positive about the Harvey and Green (1993) definition, have argued that quality remains a contested concept in the context of higher education: for Tam (2001), the split was between production models versus total quality experience approach. Van Kamenade et al. (2008), attempted to draw key themes from all the many definitions of quality in higher education, including those of Harvey and Green. Some researchers on quality in higher education contexts even fail to mention Harvey and Green at all, suggesting either, at best, lack of familiarity with their work or at worse pure dismissal of a social science approach.

A key issue that the Harvey and Green definition highlights is the different perspectives that different stakeholders have on quality. Harvey's early research in the field (Harvey et al. 1992) explored student's perceptions of quality and this principle that all stakeholders should contribute to the quality assurance process underpinned much further work on student satisfaction surveys. A large amount of research ahs since been conducted by a range of scholars that explores the perceptions of students on various aspects of the quality of their higher education experience. Attention has also turned to academic staff and their

perceptions of the quality process. For example, Newton (2000; 2002) undertook work on academic resistance to quality processes that has been influential ever since.

Research has indicated that stakeholders tend to identify three particular categories as dominant: value for money, fitness for purpose and transformation (Melrose 1998; Cheng 2014). Interestingly, very little research, if any, has been conducted into the extent that the Harvey and Green categorization has actually affected quality assurance policy at institutional, national or even supra-national levels.

Different stakeholders have different perceptions of what quality actually means (Iacovidou et al. 2009). Those people responsible for implementing quality assurance may not be aware of an underlying philosophy of quality assurance but they are nonetheless affected by it (Melrose 1998). Whilst there has been much research that explores the perceptions of quality and quality assurance of students and academic staff, there has been remarkably little that looks at those of administrative staff responsible for the implementation of quality processes at institutional level. What is clear is that stakeholder perspectives are recognized as being important but that they are not static: it is important that researchers continue to explore the changing perspectives of different stakeholders in the light of changing socio-political context.

Quality assurance models are well known for being transplanted from one country to another with surprisingly little adaptation. This approach assumes that definitions of quality are generic but very little work has explored the veracity of this assumption. Some of the research already undertaken indicates western cultural dominance. For example, Idrus (2003) highlighted negative reactions in some developing countries to the importation of quality models, whilst noting an assumption that quality assurance models are frequently transplanted from 'developed' countries to 'developing' countries. Others, such as Lemaitre (2002), have argued that the importation of quality assurance models is little more than a facet of cultural imperialism. It is important to reflect, with Singh (2010), on whether dominant quality assurance models are those of the current globally economic powers, whether we should see worldwide quality assurance in terms of 'centers' and 'peripheries'.

2.1 History and development of external quality assurance

Whilst definition of quality has exercised many scholars, the general history and development of quality assurance in higher education has attracted limited attention. The development of the earliest quality assurance system in higher education, which is the external examiner system in the United Kingdom, has been explored by Silver (1996). There has been important work on the development of quality assurance worldwide (for example, Campbell and Rosnayi, 2002) and of quality assurance agencies (Woodhouse, 2004). However, descriptions of the general history and development of quality assurance are largely descriptive and rather limited as historical studies. Much more serious historical study of quality assurance is needed in which documentary sources are fully analysed and critically interpreted.

The theoretical and political origins of external quality assurance has been explored to an even lesser degree. An early work that sought to explain the universities apparent acquiescence in the new quality assurance regime (Harker, 1995) argued that quality assurance (understood as controlling and challenging institutional autonomy) was a result of the prevailing Lyotardian postmodernism that took hold of the contemporary academy. The political origins of quality assurance in the United Kingdom have been identified by Harvey (2005), who placed them firmly in the neo-liberal policies of the governments of the 1980s: for him, the concern of the Thatcher governments was with making universities accountable for public money and reducing the influence of local authorities. These studies are important in making a

serious attempt at critiquing external quality assurance in historical and sociological contexts but only highlight the limited nature of systematic research in this area.

2.2 Dichotomising quality assurance and enhancement

Over the last two decades, some scholars have identified a dichotomy between quality assurance and quality enhancement. Swinglehurst et al. (2008) provides a dichotomized view of quality assurance and enhancement in which quality assurance appears negatively as a top down, teacher-focused system in opposition to a democratic, collaborative, learning-focused process. Arguably, this may be using the term 'quality assurance' as a proxy for a term 'quality compliance'. Whilst it is arguable that it is easy to over emphasise this 'dichotomy', it is clear that such a distinction exists both in the minds of individual academic staff and at institutional level. For example, Filippakou and Tapper (2008) refer to this perceived split but imply its existence by arguing that a transition has been made from a focus on quality assurance to quality enhancement at institutional level.

However, other authors do not agreed that there is a dichotomy between these two activities. Indeed, for authors such as Raban (2007), quality assurance and the quality enhancement are simply two elements in the same process and cannot be disconnected. As we have seen, Harvey (2006) is clear on the matter: quality assurance is a process that includes both accountability and improvement. However, he does not make reference to quality enhancement. The implication here is that quality enhancement cannot take place without assurance. Further research is needed to explore the relationship between the two activities: both the perceptions of stakeholders and the performance of quality assurance itself.

2.2.1 Tension between accountability and improvement

Much clearer is the tension between accountability and improvement and much of the critical work on quality assurance reflects on this tension. Amaral (2007) argues that accountability is traditionally more of a concern for governments whereas universities have been more concerned with improvement. However, it is usually recognized as outlined by Harvey (2006) that quality assurance is a process that includes accountability and improvement. The tension between the two was clearly of concern in the 1990s. Research published early in the life of *Quality in Higher Education* recommended keeping accountability and improvement roles of external quality assurance agencies separate (Harvey and Williams 2010a). The relationship between accountability and improvement has since become more nuanced. For example, Danø and Stensaker (2007) argue that whilst much of the rhetoric has suggested a tug of war between accountability and improvement, they are not two ends of a single dimension but two dimensions that can be developed autonomously.

Whilst the key appears to be balance between accountability and improvement, an essential element of this is the apparent dissolution of trust: an issue that recurs. Some of the work argues that external quality assurance needs to foster 'social capital' in and between academic institutions (Dill, 1995), an idea that has informed further work by Leeuw (2002) which highlights the damage that game-playing amongst auditors can do to the quality assurance process. Arguably, however, the notion of trust is antithetical to quality assurance: Raban (2007) argues that audit culture in higher education, as in other public organisations, has attempted replace a system based on trust between professionals and public with one based on accountability and transparency. Whilst this may be true, the issue has not been resolved and as quality assurance procedures continue to develop, the issue of trust will remain a core concern for further research at every level of the sector.

3 Operationalising definitions of quality

The achievement of Harvey and Green in 1993 was to provide a definition of quality in higher education that could apply to practice. It was no longer possible to hide behind the commonly held assumption that we cannot define quality but we know what it is when we see it. How definitions of quality have been operationalized underpins much of the evaluative research on quality assurance and research in the area can be split into two main areas: external and internal quality assurance processes. Research on external quality assurance processes has tended to focus on external monitoring activities such as accreditation, audit, performance indicators and national qualification frameworks. Research on internal quality assurance has tended to focus on teaching quality and learning enhancement, approaches for collecting data on quality of provision and stakeholder perceptions of quality and quality processes (in particular, those of students and academic staff).

Stakeholder feedback mechanisms to inform the quality process. Student feedback – national, institutional, modular.

3.1 External quality assurance processes

Much attention has been given to external quality assurance processes. This may not be surprising, as external quality assurance is usually government-backed and as such, institutions are forced to engage with it.

3.1.1 Audit

Not surprisingly, much work focuses on quality audit as a key activity of quality assurance agencies. The work in this area has highlighted positive aspects of the audit process. Dill (2000) argued that, as an accountability mechanism, it has forced institutions to take quality assurance seriously and put teaching and learning at the top of institutional agendas. Similarly, Woodhouse (2003) argued that external quality audit can augment an institution's ability to improve. However, Cheng (2009) is less positive, having found that some academics (in a UK-based study) perceive audit as a symbol of distrust of their professionalism.

3.1.2 Accreditation

Work on quality assurance around the turn of the Millennium noted a concern with accreditation, which is one of the major outcomes of many national quality assurance systems (Van Damme 2000). In the main, research has tended to highlight the cumbersome, controlling effect of accreditation systems (Faber and Huisman, 2003). In particular, early work has highlighted the threat posed by accreditation to improvement-focused quality assurance processes (Haakstad, 2001; Westerheijden, 2001). Indeed, Haakstad (2001) argued that if one must have accreditation it should be at the institutional not programme level, based on a flexible, but reinforced audit method. This wise analysis, however, has subsequently been ignored in much of Europe and there have been costly and unnecessary programme accreditation schemes imposed, primarily by politicians, on the higher education sector in many countries (Harvey and Williams 2010). There is clearly much evaluation to be done to establish the extent to which early fears have been realized.

3.1.3 Performance indicators

The role of performance indicators as quality instruments has been a consistent concern of commentators. It is now well established that performance indicators are tools of accountability and are used for various political ends (Yorke, 1998). The use of un-verifiable 'soft' data as tools for allocating resources was long ago critiqued by Ewell (1999). Over-reliance on single indicators such as students' evaluations of their

experience and graduate employment have been critiqued (Barrie and Ginns, 2007; Little, 2001). The overall view was that national performance indicators are viewed with suspicion, especially when they simply measure the easily measurable, rather than being carefully designed to evaluate the underlying issue.

3.1.4 National qualification frameworks

National qualification frameworks have been one of the foci of commentary over the years, with much attention to cases of the United Kingdom, the European Higher Education Area and the South African experience. Much of the commentary has been critical (Fernie and Pilcher, 2009; Leong and Wong, 2004; Blackmur, 2004).

3.1.5 Industrial models of quality assurance

The origins of quality assurance are largely in the industrial sector and much work has been done to apply industrial models to the higher education sector. Many scholars have been critical of movements such as Total Quality Management as being inappropriate for a higher educational setting (for example, Houston, 2007; Harvey, 1995) although approaches such as 'Six Sigma' are still being applied in places with varying degrees of success (Kumi and Morrow, 2006). The continuing interest in applying industrial and business models of quality assurance to higher education is problematic because there is little effort to make clear what the parallels are between the sectors.

3.1.6 Consumerisation of higher education

As an adjunct to this debate is a concern amongst commentators with the development of marketisation and consumerism in the sector and its impact on quality assurance. There has been a huge amount written that critiques the notion of a higher education market but the focus in the quality assurance debate has tended to be on the role of students as customers or consumers. This debate has been sharply defined over the use of student satisfaction surveys as quality monitoring tools. Popli (2005) discussed the notion of 'customer delight'. At the heart of this debate is the notion of the consumer: much space has been given to discussion whether students (as fee payers) are in fact consumers or not. This focus ignores the possibility that other stakeholders have a claim on the role of consumer: few studies have yet resolved this issue.

However, despite much discussion of 'service quality', Bramming (2007) noted that satisfaction surveys may be an inappropriate way of assessing transformative learning. Development of new approaches to partnership with students. How does this impact on quality assurance? Research needed on the relationship between students engaged as partners to institutions and quality enhancement. Much practical work but little theorisation.

Marketisation implies a range of practical changes to the nature of the university calendar and this has an impact on the lives of the staff. Harris and Fallows (2002) reported how the University of Luton trialled the operation of a summer semester as an integral part of its teaching year. They explored whether a market demand existed for higher education delivered in the summer from students who would not otherwise participate. Teaching over the summer is, potentially, one of the ways in which resources can be released to help meet the government's widening participation target. There was a demand, particularly from mature students, although it is likely to be small. Second, the evidence from assessment grades, and surveys of both staff and students, is that the student experience was different but the performance of students was slightly better, students and staff valued the more personal contact allowed by smaller class sizes, and surveys of student satisfaction revealed a positive disposition towards study in the summer. Finally, the authors had expected resistance from academic staff but a significant an increasing number of

staff were prepared to work during the summer on a voluntary basis, the managerial *quid pro quo* being time off for vacations and scholarly activity at other times. Such flexibility was more problematic for those with school-age children.

The marketing of higher education does not come easily to academic staff and despite the ubiquitous marketing departments in universities that seem to clash with academic values and perspectives. The rhetoric of students as consumers does not sit comfortably. Most marketing efforts appear, rather to be selling what already exists rather than responding in any radical way to market demand, which is just as well given the fickleness of passing fads in higher education.

3.1.7 The role of management

In all of this, the role of management and leadership in the development of effective quality assurance has been a consistent focus of research. Authors have argued that the response to the demands of external quality assurance requires strong leadership at all levels along with effective strategy rather than simply responding to audit findings (Gordon, 2002; Middlehurst, 1997). However, empowerment of academic staff is a key component in this (Tam, 1999).

3.1.8 Internationalisation of quality assurance

There has been much work on quality assurance within an international context of supra-national networks and globalised higher education. Codes of practice and international networks have attracted critical attention from scholars such as Aelterman (2006) and Umemiya (2008). International rankings are also critiqued as tools of quality assurance (for example, Alperin, 2013; Harvey, 2008; Bowden, 2000). At the same time, there has been a growing concern with ways in which quality of transnational programmes is assured (Blackmur, 2007; Woodhouse, 2006; Walker, 1999).

The development of quality assurance within the context of the Bologna Process in the European Union since the early 2000s has been a focus of much discussion. The impact of the Bologna Process in stimulating quality assurance across the European Union has been shown by scholars such as Van Der Wende and Westerheijden (2001). In their work on the development of ENQA, Crozier *et al*. (2013) have contributed to our understanding of the role of that organisation. Most recently, Westerheijden *et al*. (2014) have sought to create a typology of quality assurance across Europe.

3.2 Internal quality assurance processes

The limited number of papers on internal quality assurance demonstrates how the quality debate has been dominated by the activities of external agencies. Some papers have highlighted the need for systematic, accurate qualitative and quantitative data collection for effective internal quality improvement processes (for example, Gynnild, 2007; Jones, 2003; Stensaker, 2008).

3.2.1 The learning institution and staff engagement

Several commentators have highlighted the role of internal quality assurance processes as methods to develop what Meade (1995) described as 'learning institutions'. Papers have highlighted the ways in which institutions and staff can shift from compliance to developing engagement with quality improvement (Jordens and Zepke, 2009; Barrow and Curzon-Hobson, 2003; Horsburgh, 1998).

3.2.2 Autonomy of academic staff

For some authors, the key is autonomy for academic staff, through self-evaluation and highlighting the need for ownership of quality assurance by academic staff (Bender and Siller, 2006; Coyle, 2003; Duening

and Kadipasaoglu, 1996; Weusthof, 1995). These papers reinforce how important internal processes are and how, ultimately, it is what goes on routinely in institutions that impacts on quality.

Harvey's (2007) analysis of the epistemology of quality is a rare attempt to explore the conceptual nature of quality and how different approaches to quality assurance fragment and compartmentalise elements of quality and fail to link it to quality learning. The only other paper of a similar nature is Mauléon and Bergman's (2009) analysis of quality within service industries.

3.2.3 Academic resistance

A recurrent concern amongst commentators on quality assurance is that the processes do not match the expectations of academics. There have been repeated concerns about the artificiality of quality assurance processes in higher education. Much research indicates that academic staff preference is for flexibility over control culture (for example, Kleijnen *et al*., 2009). There is a need to replace a name and shame approach with continuous quality improvement (for example, Gosling and D'Andrea, 2001).

For many academics, quality assurance is often seen as a burdensome extra, to be responded to through ritualised compliance, famously referred to by Newton (2000) as 'feeding the beast'. Indeed, Barrow (1999) argued that academics perform in ways they feel are required during peer review events.

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. Ownership of quality assurance is a concern here (Jacobs and Du Toit, 2006). Without this, so some commentators suggest, academic staff are likely to resist quality assurance processes within universities (Anderson, 2006; Newton, 2002).

3.2.4 Teaching quality

There has been a consistent concern about the quality of teaching, not least the relationship between quality assurance and the assessment of pedagogy. For many commentators, quality assurance is primarily about student learning and teaching and has been for many years (Gibbs, 2010; Biggs, 1993).

Assessing teaching quality has, therefore, been the subject of many papers over the years (Harvey and Williams, 2010). Several commentators have linked teaching quality improvement with staff development (Knight, 2006; Karpiak, 2000; Imrie, 1998; Lueddeke, 1997). This goes hand in hand with reward and recognition of teaching improvement (Wahlén, 2002; Robertson, 2002).

3.2.5 The quality of the student experience

Assessment of student learning is a major focus of concern, constituting a core element in the quality of the student experience. Commentators have argued for a shift from traditional method-led examination-oriented systems to motivational and transparent assessment that directly tested specified learning outcomes. More effort and resources, it is argued, should be directed at staff development enabling and encouraging appropriate assessment practices (Knight, 2002; Fourie and Alt, 2000;). Of course, it is debateable about how much quality assurance encourages this shift from teaching to learning and to what Biggs calls 'constructive alignment'.

3.2.6 A shift towards transformative and experiential learning?

Several commentators have argued that there is a need for and shift towards transformative and experiential learning (Bramming, 2007; Harvey and Knight, 1996). Authors have explored a range of activity to inform effective improvement processes: engaging students in the improvement process; collecting

student feedback on programmes; and explored potential for student engagement with curriculum design (Johansen, 2007; Bolander *et al*., 2006; Douglas and Douglas, 2006; Coates, 2005). However, these positive developments are overshadowed by increasingly instrumental attitudes of students, teaching overload and increasing class size (Dolnicar, 2005; Menon, 2003; McInnis, 2000; Fearnly, 1995).

3.2.7 Student feedback as a source of data

Student feedback on their own experience has been identified as a significant source of data for quality assurance. Several commentators have reflected on the value of student feedback surveys as a valid source of up-to-date information from students to inform continuous quality improvement (Popli, 2005; Harvey, 2003; Hill, 1995). Many different approaches to gathering student feedback have been identified and tested (Tan and Kek, 2004; Narasimhan, 2001; Welle-Strand, 2000; Rowley, 1996). However, being clear on the purpose of student feedback is essential (Williams and Cappuccini-Ansfield, 2007).

3.2.8 Employability

The development of discipline knowledge and generic skills is a fundamental focus of quality assurance and much attention has been given to employability. Employment rates of graduates is a core concern of students (Aamodt and Havnes, 2008; Maharasoa and Hay, 2001). However, key to much of the work on employability and its relation to quality assurance is the notion that it should not be simply about students getting a job but something deeper (Gibbs, 2009; Washer, 2007; Little, 2001). Harvey (2001) noted that 'any evaluation of employability needs to indicate areas for internal improvement rather than simply ranking institutions'.

4 Impact of quality assurance

There is surprisingly little work on overall impact of quality assurance. Many studies have focused on national situations rather than taking a general view of the impact of quality assurance. Harvey and Williams (2010b: 102) argue that this 'reflects the general paucity of significant research into the impact of quality assurance processes'. There are some points when reflection on the impact of quality assurance has occurred, particularly in journal special issues or focused books.

Almost twenty years ago, one such special issue of *Quality in Higher Education* identified a number of largely positive trends. The growth of external quality assurance in Scandinavian countries was found to have stimulated much quality enhancement work in institutions (Askling 1997); others noted the development of effective team working within institutions to develop quality enhancement (Newton 1997; Smith 1997) Baldwin (1997) argued that a combination of external and internal processes had resulted in three main areas of gain: more rigorous course approval procedures; increased awareness of students' perspectives on teaching and learning; and a perceptible shift in the climate, with a new attention to teaching issues, and an intensification of debate about effective learning. On the deficit side were four key issues: an excessive bureaucratisation of procedures, with associated pedantry and legalism; a greatly increased administrative workload for academic staff taking them away from their 'core business'; a formalism that can stifle creativity and individuality, the very qualities that universities should foster; a de-professionalisation of academic staff, associated with a policing mentality and a lack of trust. These themes of bureacratisation, administrative burden, stifling of creativity and lack of trust have been recurring concerns ever since.

Much of the research on the impact of external quality assurance since then indicates that implementation of quality assurance systems has had a positive impact on different national sectors by promoting greater concern for quality within institutions (Harvey and Williams 2010a). Quality assurance audits have

contributed to the enhancement of learning and teaching but there is a question of sustainability, which is dependent on effective resourcing (Gift and Bell Hutchinson 2007). There is some debate about the relative effectiveness of external quality monitoring and internal quality processes in encouraging continuous quality improvement (Kristensen 1997). This raises the question of the need for external process and has led to the perpetual claim by external agencies and governments that without the external process there would be no incentive for developing internal processes. This reflects the growing distrust mentioned by Baldwin (1997) and raises the question of how universities maintained such high standards for 800 years!

Less positive is Stensaker's (2003) article in which he identified areas in higher education where changes have taken place. He asked whether quality improvement is actually the result of EQM. He suggested that the data is ambiguous and highlighted typical side effects of current EQM systems. He argued that lack of effects directly attributable to EQM should not be seen as a design error alone but as a misconception of how organisational change actually takes place. He concluded that a more dynamic view on organisational change, highlighting the responsibility of the institutional leadership as 'translators of meaning' would contribute to a more useful process. Harvey and Newton (2004) showed that accountability, compliance and, in some countries, control are much more frequent rationales for external monitoring than improvement. Impact research, they argued, is difficult because it is impossible to control all relevant factors to be able to map causal relationships. However, impact 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. Where changes to the student experience have taken place, this has arguably been the result of factors other than the external quality monitoring: at best the existence of the latter provides a legitimation for internally-driven innovation. They concluded that instead of politically acceptable methods, quality evaluation needs to adopt appropriate research methodologies rather than taken-for-granted assurance approaches.

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. There are many other more significant factors impacting on student learning than external quality monitoring, which she argued was not concerned with the complexity of a whole teaching programme, or issues such as leadership or the culture in which students learn. Social, economic, political and personal contexts are powerful influencers and for quality monitoring to have an impact on student learning, the emphasis must be on curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment.

World-wide, 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 students remains less clear (Ratcliffe, 2003). 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. He raised the issue of the transformation of external quality monitoring so that it might contribute to improving the learning of students.

The development of quality assurance has resulted in clear documentation and transparency, although external processes could be better aligned to everyday academic activity. Internal processes are still developing and the link between external processes, internal processes and improvements in teaching and learning seem to be tenuous and patchy (Harvey, 2006b). What is remarkable is the internationalisation of quality assurance and the standardisation of procedures, even though they leave a lot to be desired.

Attempts to push a consumerist approach to higher education have met with indifference and while there are increasing social demands being placed on higher education there remains a strong commitment to autonomy, independence and academic freedom, which quality assurance procedures sometimes rub up against.

5 Quality Culture

One of the underlying concerns of the work published in *Quality in Higher Education* is the need to develop a broad 'quality culture'. The European University Association has devoted much time to exploring quality culture with an early publication on this issue (European University Association, 2006) and a three-part project on quality culture which ran between 2010 and 2012 (Loukkola *et al*., 2012). These clearly defined and developed the notion of quality culture in the European context Harvey and Stensaker (2008) explored the meaning of quality culture, developing their influential typology within a cultural theory framework.

The definition of quality culture to be found in the European Universities Association project is clear about the need for shared beliefs and expectations of the quality process supported by appropriate structural support. In his reflection on the first European Quality Assurance Forum, Harvey (2007) emphasises the need for academic ownership of the quality process and Naidoo (2013) emphasises the need for a focus on empowerment of academics.

Quality culture is fundamental for so many writers on quality assurance because it is primarily about engaging stakeholders in a continuous quality improvement process.

6 Conclusion

A review of the state and scale of research and reflection on quality assurance is clearly fraught with difficulties and is inevitably going to be incomplete. However, this review indicates above all that quality assurance has developed hugely since the early 1990s as a subject of serious academic study and one that is multifaceted. Research on quality assurance has been important in a range of ways. It has challenged long-held implicit understandings of quality in the sector and has highlighted the important and complex role that quality assurance processes play in higher education. The research has highlighted the need for continuous evaluation as part of a quality improvement process in the sector and has challenged those responsible for quality assurance to be both more explicit about their aims and more transparent in their approaches. The review also indicates that reflection and research go hand in hand with policy and implementation. The relationship between quality assurance practitioners and researchers is not one of subject and researcher but more of a conversation that takes place in academic journals but also through international networks. There is, however, much that still needs to be done.

There is little evidence of how the burgeoning body of research in the field actually influences quality assurance at institutional level. It is not clear how far individuals who are responsible for aspects of the implementation of quality assurance processes are affected or even aware of theoretical underpinnings of what they do. Whilst we understand much more clearly the perceptions of students and academic staff of quality assurance processes, there is almost nothing about the experiences of support staff. This is important because this group of staff are responsible for the implementation of institutional processes.

There is little research into the differences between national quality assurance agencies and their priorities. The notion that quality assurance is a unified concept in practice is clearly incorrect. Only a relatively few studies have critiqued the uncritical import of quality assurance principles from one country or group of

countries to another (mainly UK and US). Research on quality assurance in different national contexts tends to accept the rightness of imported models rather than questioning their appropriateness for their own cultural traditions. This is not helped by the continuing tendency for research into quality assurance to fall into disciplinary silos. Research into quality assurance in higher education is multi-disciplinary but there is little cross-referencing between disciplines. The continuing application of industrial models of quality assurance indicates a long-held belief that higher education is a market.

Whilst there are large numbers of studies of specific processes and approaches, there is little research into the overall impact of quality assurance on the sector. Much still takes a normative approach, projecting perceptions of what should be in place rather than what actually is in place. There is a tendency for research to focus on teaching and learning, whereas research is given much less attention and facilities are given even less. Much more research is required that explores the impact of quality assurance on institutional facilities and the relationship between the quality of facilities and the student experience. Indeed, much work provides descriptions of processes without fully evaluating them. This appears to be part of a continuing problem. As Harvey long ago noted (1999), what is needed is much more critical evaluative approach to quality assurance.

7 References

Aamodt, P.O. & Havnes, A. (2008). Factors affecting professional job mastery: quality of study or work experience? *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(3), pp. 233–248.

Aelterman, G. (2006), 'Sets of standards for external quality assurance agencies: A comparison', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 227–233.

Ala-Vähälä, T. and Saarinen, T., (2009), 'Building European-level quality assurance structures: views from within ENQA', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(2), pp. 89–103.

Alperin, J.P. (2013), Brazil's exception to the world-class moement', *Quality in Higher Education*, 19 (2), pp. 158–172.

Anderson, G., 2006, 'Assuring quality/resisting quality assurance: academics' responses to 'quality' in some Australian universities', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(2), pp. 161–173.

Barnett, R (1992), *Improving Higher Education: Total Quality Care*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

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. 275–286.

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. 267–272.

Barrow, M., 1999, 'Quality-management systems and dramaturgical compliance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(1), pp. 27–36.

Bender, K.K. and Siller, T.J., 2006, 'How an engineering college uses a university's quality enhancement system to generate and manage evidence for multiple accreditation and accountability bodies', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(2), pp. 175–191.

Biggs, J.B. (1999), *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Biggs, J.B. (1993), From theory to practice: a cognitive systems approach, *Higher Education Research and Development.* 12 (1), pp. 73–85.

Billing, D. (2004), 'International comparisons and trends in external quality assurance of higher education: Commonality or diversity?' *Higher Education*, 47 (1), pp. 113–137.

Blackmur, D., 2004, 'A critique of the concept of a national qualifications framework', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(3), pp. 267–284.

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.

Blanco Ramírez, G. (2014), 'Trading Quality across Borders: Colonial Discourse and International Quality Assurance Policies in Higher Education', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20 (2), pp.121–134

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.

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.

Brown, R. (2004), *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: The UK experience since 1992*. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.

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.

Campbell, C. and Rozsnyai, C. (2002), *Quality Assurance and the Development of Course Programmes*. Papers on Higher Education Regional University Network on Governance and Management of Higher Education in South East Europe Bucharest, UNESCO.

Cheng, M. (2014, forthcoming), 'Quality as Transformation: Educational Metamorphosis', *Quality in Higher Education*, 20 (3).

Cheng, M., 2009, 'Academics' professionalism and quality mechanisms: challenges and tensions', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15.3, 193–205.

Coates, H., 2005, 'The value of student engagement for higher education quality assurance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), pp. 25–36.

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.

Crozier, F., Costes, N., Ranne, P. and Stalter, M. (2013), *ENQA: 10 Years (2000-2010): A Decade of European Co-Operation in Quality Assurance in Higher Education*. European Association of Quality Assurance Agencies (ENQA).

Van Damme, D. (2000). Accreditation in global higher education: The need for international information and cooperation. Outline of an IAUP approach. Memo for the Commission on Global Accreditation of the International Association of University Presidents New York.

Danø, T. and Stensaker, B., 2007, 'Still balancing improvement and accountability? Developments in external quality assurance in the Nordic countries 1996-2006', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(1), pp. 81–93.

Dill, D.D., 1995, 'Through Deming's eyes: a cross-national analysis of quality assurance policies in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), pp. 95–110.

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. 103–115.

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.

Ellis, R. (Ed.) (1993), *Quality Assurance for University Teaching*. Buckingham: Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press.

European University Association (2007). *Embedding Quality Culture in European Universities*. Brussels: European Universities Association.

European University Association (EUA) (2006), *Quality Culture in European Universities: a bottom-up approach.* Brussels: EUA.

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. 231–242.

Fearnley, S., 1995, 'Class size: the erosive effect of recruitment numbers on performance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(1), pp. 59–65.

Fernie, S. and Pilcher, N., 2009, 'National qualification frameworks: developing research perspectives', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), pp. 221–232.

Filippakou, O. & Tapper, T. (2008). Quality Assurance and Quality Enhancement in Higher Education: Contested Territories? *Higher Education Quarterly* 62 (1-2), 84–100

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. 115–124.

Gibbs, G. (2010), *Dimensions of Quality*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Gibbs, P., 2009, 'Quality in work-based studies not lost, merely undiscovered', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(2), pp. 167–176.

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.

Gynnild, V., 2007, 'Quality assurance reconsidered: a case study', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(3), pp. 263–273.

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.

Harker, B., 1995, 'Postmodernism and quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(1), pp. 31–39.

Harvey, L. and Green, D., 1993, 'Defining quality', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1), pp. 9–34.

Harvey, L. and Knight, P. (1996), *Transforming Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press and Society for Research into Higher Education

Harvey, L. and Stensaker, L. (2008), 'Quality Culture: understandings, boundaries and linkages', *European Journal of Education*, 43 (4), pp. 427–42.

Harvey, L. and Williams, J. (2010a), 'Fifteen Years of *Quality in Higher Education* (Part One)', *Quality in Higher Education* 16 (2), pp. 3–36.

Harvey, L. and Williams, J. (2010b), 'Fifteen Years of *Quality in Higher Education* (Part Two)', *Quality in Higher Education* 16 (2), pp. 79–113.

Harvey, L., 2008, 'Rankings of higher education institutions: a critical review', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(3), pp. 187–207.

Harvey, L. (2007), 'Epistemology of Quality', Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education, Toronto, April, 2007. Subsequently published as Harvey, L., 2007, 'The epistemology of quality', *Perspectives in Education*, 25(3), pp. 1–13.

Harvey, L. (2007), 'Quality culture, quality assurance and impact

Overview of discussions', in European University Association (Ed.), *Embedding Quality Culture in European Higher Education*. Brussels: European University Association.

Harvey, L. (2006a) 'Understanding quality', Section B 4.1-1 of ' Introducing Bologna objectives and tools' in Purser, L. (Ed.) *EUA Bologna Handbook: Making Bologna work*. Brussels: European University Association and Berlin, Raabe.

Harvey, L. (2006b), 'Impact of quality assurance: Overview of a discussion between representatives of external quality assurance agencies', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 287–290.

Harvey, L. (2005) 'A history and critique of quality evaluation in the UK', *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13 (4), pp. 263–276.

Harvey, L. (2003), 'Student Feedback', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 3–20.

Harvey, L., 2001, 'Defining and measuring employability', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(2), pp. 97–109.

Harvey, L., 1995, 'Beyond TQM', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), pp. 123–146.

Hill, R., 1995, 'A European student perspective on quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(1), pp. 67–75.

Horsburgh, M., 1998, 'Quality monitoring in two institutions: a comparison', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(2), pp. 115–135.

Houston, D., 2007, 'TQM and higher education: a critical systems perspective on fitness for purpose', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(1), pp. 3–17.

Imrie, B., 1998, 'Professional development is quality assurance: now and Zen', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(3), pp. 215–227.

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. 303–314.

Johansen, G., 2007, 'Didaktik and the selection of content as points of departure for studying the quality of teaching and learning', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(3), pp. 249–261.

Jones, S., 2003, 'Measuring the quality of higher education: linking teaching quality measures at the delivery level to administrative measures at the university level', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(3), pp. 223–229.

Jordens, J.Z. and Zepke, N., 2009, 'A network approach to curriculum quality assessment', *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), pp. 279–289.

Karpiak, I., 2000, 'The 'second call': faculty renewal and recommitment at midlife', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 125–134.

Kleijnen, 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. 233–249.

Knight, P.T., 2002, 'The Achilles' heel of quality: the assessment of student learning', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 107–115.

Knight, P.T., 2006, 'Quality enhancement and educational professional development', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), pp. 29–40.

Kristoffersen, D., Sursock, A. & Westerheijden, D. 1998, *Quality assurance in higher education: manual of quality assurance: procedures and practices*. EC/PHARE/European Training Foundation. London, United Kingdom, QSC.

Kumi, S. and Morrow, J. (2006), 'Improving self-service the six sigma way at Newcastle University Library', *Program* 40 (2), pp.123–136

Leeuw, F.L., 2002, 'Reciprocity and educational evaluations by European Inspectorates: assumptions and reality checks', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(2), pp. 137–149.

Leong, J.C.Y. and Wong, W.S., 2004, 'The accreditation and quality assurance of sub-degree/degree qualifications in the establishment of a Hong Kong qualifications framework: local, regional and transnational implications', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(1), pp. 43–49.

Lindsay, G. and Rodgers, T. (1998), 'Market orientation in the UK higher education sector: the influence of the education reform process 1979–1993', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(2), pp. 159–171.

Little, B., 2001, 'Reading between the lines of graduate employment', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(2), pp. 121–129.

Lomas, L., 2002, 'Does the development of mass education necessarily mean the end of quality?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 71–79.

Loukkola, T., Zhang, T., Sursock, A. and Vettori, A. (2012) *Examining Quality Culture in Higher Education Institutions*. Brussels: European Universities Association. Avalable online at: http://www.eua.be/eqc [Accessed 03 December 2014].

Lueddeke, G., 1997, 'Educational development units in higher education: much ado about something?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(2), pp. 155–171.

Maharasoa, M. and Hay, D., 2001, 'Higher education and graduate employment in South Africa', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(2), pp. 139–147.

Mauléon, C., Bergman, B., 2009, 'Exploring the epistemological origins of Shewhart's and Deming's theory of quality: Influences from C.I. Lewis' conceptualistic pragmatism', *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences* (1(2), PP. Pp.160 - 171

McInnis, C., 2000, 'Changing academic work roles: the everyday realities challenging quality in teaching', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 143–152.

Meade, P., 1995, 'Utilising the university as a learning organisation to facilitate quality improvement', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), pp. 111–121.

Melrose, M., 1998, 'Exploring paradigms of curriculum evaluation and concepts of quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(1), pp. 37–43.

Menon, M.E., 2003, 'Views of teaching-focused and research-focused academics on the mission of higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 39–54.

Middlehurst, R. and Woodhouse, D., 1995, 'Coherent systems for external quality assurance', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1(3), pp. 257–268.

Middlehurst, R., 1997, 'Reinventing higher education: the leadership challenge', *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(2), pp. 183–198.

Moon, S. and Geall, V., 1996, 'Total quality management: disciples and detractors', *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(3), pp. 271–273.

Naidoo, D. (2013), 'Reconciling Organisational Culture and External Quality Assurance in Higher Education', *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 24 (2), pp. 85–98.

Narasimhan, K., 2001, 'Improving the climate of teaching sessions: the use of evaluations by students and instructors', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(3), pp. 179–190.

Newton, J., 2002, 'Views from below: academics coping with quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 39–61.

Newton, J., 2000, 'Feeding the beast or improving quality?: academics' perceptions of quality assurance and quality monitoring', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 153–163.

Pirsig, R.K. (1974), *Zen and Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*. London: Bodley Head.

Popli, S. (2005), 'Ensuring customer delight: a quality approach to excellence in management education', Quality in Higher Education, 11(1), pp. 17–24.

Raban, C. (2007). Assurance versus enhancement: less is more? *Journal of Further and Higher Education,* 31 (1)*,* 77 - 85

Robertson, M., 2002, 'Quality and university teaching: juggling competing agendas', Quality in Higher Education, 8(3), pp. 273–286.

Rosa, M.J. and Amaral, A. (2014), *Quality Assurance in Higher Education Contemporary Debates*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rowley, J., 1996, 'Measuring, *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(3), pp. 237–255.

Saarinen, T., 2010, 'What I talk about when I talk about quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1), pp. 55–7.

Saarinen, T., 2005, 'From sickness to cure and further: construction of 'quality' in finnish higher education policy from the 1960s to the era of the Bologna process', *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), pp. 3–15.

Silver, H. (1996), 'External examining in higher education: a secret history', in R. Aldrich (Ed.), *History and Education: a tribute to Peter Gordon*. London: The Woburn Press.

Singh, M. (2010). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: which pasts to build on, what futures to contemplate? *Quality in Higher Education*, 16 (2) pp. 189–194

Stensaker, B., 2008, 'Outcomes of quality assurance: a discussion of knowledge, methodology and validity', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(1), pp. 3–13.

Swinglehurst, D., Russell, J. & Greenhalgh, T. (2008). Peer observation of teaching in an online environement: an action research perspective. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 24(5), 383 – 393.

Tam, M., 2001, 'Measuring quality and performance in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), pp. 47–54.

Tam, M., 1999, 'Managing change involves changing management: implications for transforming higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(3), pp. 227–232.

Tan, K.C and Kek, S.W., 2004, 'Service quality in higher education using an enhanced SERVQUAL approach', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(1), pp. 17–24.

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. 277–290.

Van Der Wende, M.C. and Westerheijden, D.F., 2001, 'International aspects of quality assurance with a special focus on European Higher Education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(3), pp. 233–245.

Van Kemenade, E., Pupius, M. and Hardjono, T,W., 2008, 'More value to defining quality', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(2), pp. 175–185.

Vroeijenstijn, A. I., 1991, 'External Quality Assessment: servant of two masters?', paper presented at the Council for Academic Accreditation Conference on '*Quality Assurance in Higher Education*', Hong Kong, 15–17 July 1991.

Wahlén, S., 2002, 'Teaching skills and academic rewards', *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), pp. 81–87.

Walker, P., 1999, 'Buying in and selling out: quality issues in international student contracting arrangements', *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(3), pp. 233–243.

Washer, P., 2007, 'Revisiting key skills: a practical framework for higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(1), pp. 57–67.

Watty, K., 2006, 'Want to know about quality in higher education? Ask an academic', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 291–301.

Welle-Strand, A., 2000, 'Knowledge production, service and quality: higher education tensions in Norway', *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(3), pp. 219–230.

Westerheijden, D.F., Stensaker, B., Rosa, M.J. and Corbett, M. (2014), 'Next Generations, Catwalks, Random Walks and Arms Races: conceptualising the development of quality assurance schemes', *European Journal of* Education, 49 (3), pp. 421–434.

Westerheijden, D.F., Stensaker, B. and Rosa, M.J. (2008) *Quality Assurance in Higher Education*. Rotterdam: Springer.

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. 235–248.

Williams, J. and Cappuccini-Ansfield, G., 2007, 'Fitness for purpose? National and institutional approaches to publicising the student voice', *Quality in Higher Education*, 13(2), pp. 159–172.

Woodhouse, D., 2003, 'Quality Improvement through quality audit', *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(2), pp. 133–139.

Woodhouse, D., 2004, 'The quality of quality assurance agencies', *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(2), pp. 77–87.

Woodhouse, D., 2006, 'The quality of transnational education: A provider view', *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), pp. 277–281.

Yorke, M., 1998, 'Performance indicators relating to student development: can they be trusted?', *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(1), pp. 45–61.