Journal of
Higher Education Policy
And
Leadership Studies

JHEPALS (E-ISSN: 2717-1426)

https://johepal.com



A Pragmatic Lens on Quality: Shifting Paradigms in Higher Education

Balqees Rashid Suleiman AL Mandhari
Doctoral School of Education & Institute of Education,
ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, HUNGARY
&
University of Technology and Applied Sciences (UTAS), SULTANATE OF OMAN

Email: Balqees@student.elte.hu
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6814-0541

Article Received **2024/09/29** | Article Accepted **2024/12/14** | Published Online **2024/12/31**

Cite article as:

Al Mandhari, B. R. S. (2024). A pragmatic lens on quality: Shifting paradigms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Leadership Studies*, *5*(4), 27-46. https://dx.doi.org/10.61186/johepal.5.4.27

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

A Pragmatic Lens on Quality: Shifting Paradigms in Higher Education

Journal of Higher Education Policy And Leadership Studies (JHEPALS)

E-ISSN: 2717-1426
Volume: 5 Issue: 4
pp. 27-46
DOI:
10.61186/johepal.5.4.27

Balqees Rashid Suleiman AL Mandhari *

Abstract

This paper explores the intersection of pragmatism and quality assurance in higher education, adopting an exploratory approach to understand how pragmatist principles can inspire more adaptive, inclusive, and context-sensitive educational practices. By delving into the historical roots of pragmatism, particularly through the works of Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey, the study examines how this philosophical tradition critiques and reimagines traditional metrics and models of educational quality. The analysis focuses on key themes, including the decentralization of governance, the creation of responsive and adaptive learning environments, and the broader implications of fostering continuous reflection and improvement within institutions. Pragmatism's dynamic and evolving framework challenges conventional notions of quality assurance by emphasizing critical thinking, problem-solving, and adaptability as core tenets of educational excellence. However, the paper also critically addresses significant challenges, such as balancing local relevance with global competitiveness, avoiding an overemphasis on immediate practical outcomes at the expense of long-term educational goals, and ensuring that equity and rigor remain central to quality assurance practices. By embracing pragmatism, this study argues, higher education institutions can cultivate a more holistic, student-centered learning environment that responds effectively to the complex and evolving demands of contemporary society and the global workforce.

Keywords: Higher Education; Pragmatism; Quality Assurance; Adaptability; Decentralization; Innovation

* **Corresponding author's email:** Balqees@student.elte.hu

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Introduction

Quality assurance in higher education has gained critical importance as institutions strive to meet the evolving demands of students, society, and the global workforce (Welzant et al., 2011). The concept of quality in higher education is inherently complex and contested, reflecting the diverse priorities and expectations of stakeholders, including students, faculty, policymakers, and employers (Elassy, 2015; Harvey & Green, 1993). This multiplicity of perspectives has made it challenging to establish a universally accepted definition of quality, highlighting the need for more nuanced and adaptive approaches to quality assurance (Biesta, 2010; Schwartz, 2014).

In recent years, there has been increasing interest in alternative frameworks that address the complexities of contemporary higher education landscapes. Pragmatism, a philosophical tradition emphasizing practical consequences and real-world impact, emerges as a compelling lens through which to explore and evaluate quality assurance processes (Mey, 2012). Grounded in the works of Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey, pragmatism advocates for the evaluation of ideas and actions based on their practical outcomes and capacity to solve real-world problems (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Fesmire, 2014). Central to this perspective is the notion that the value of ideas lies in their ability to address pressing challenges and produce tangible benefits (Talisse & Aikin, 2008; Dewey, 1938).

The pragmatist approach fundamentally challenges traditional notions of quality assurance, which often prioritize static benchmarks and quantitative metrics that fail to capture the dynamic and evolving nature of education (Newton, 2010; Yorke, 2011). Instead, pragmatism emphasizes a dynamic and adaptive process of quality enhancement that responds to the changing needs of learners and society (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Garrison, 1994). This perspective aligns with contemporary calls for higher education institutions to foster meaningful and impactful learning experiences that prepare students for the complexities of the 21st century (Noddings, 2018; Siemens, 2005). By prioritizing context-specific solutions and stakeholder engagement, pragmatism offers a framework for creating quality assurance practices that are both relevant and effective.

However, the application of pragmatism to quality assurance is not without its challenges. Implementing pragmatic principles requires a fundamental shift in institutional culture, necessitating openness to continuous reflection and improvement (Elassy, 2015; Kezar, 2018). Additionally, the emphasis on context-specific approaches raises concerns about maintaining comparability and consistency across institutions, particularly in globalized educational environments (Marginson, 2007). These challenges underscore the need for thoughtful strategies to balance local responsiveness with global standards. Despite these hurdles, the potential benefits of a pragmatist approach are significant. By embracing principles such as continuous improvement, stakeholder responsiveness, and a focus on practical outcomes, higher education institutions can cultivate a more dynamic and effective quality assurance culture (Harvey & Stensaker, 2008; Elken & Stensaker, 2018). This shift can enhance student learning experiences, strengthen institutional relevance, and foster alignment between higher education and societal needs (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Schwartz, 2014).This study takes an exploratory approach to examine the intersection of pragmatism and quality assurance in higher education. Specifically, it seeks to (1) investigate

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

how pragmatic principles can challenge and reshape current conceptions of quality assurance, and (2) explore the potential of pragmatism as a framework for fostering a more adaptive, context-sensitive understanding of quality. By focusing on exploration and critical inquiry, this study aspires to contribute to ongoing discussions about quality culture and the dynamic nature of quality assurance practices.

Methodology

The paper adopts a conceptual analysis approach, rooted in the tradition of philosophical inquiry and theoretical analysis within educational research. Guided by the foundational work of Soltis (1984) and further developed by Tight (2019a), this framework emphasizes the need to critically engage with theoretical foundations and explore their practical implications for educational practices. The chosen methodology allows for a deeper investigation into how pragmatic principles can inform and improve quality assurance in higher education. The research process followed several key steps, each aimed at exploring the role of pragmatism in reshaping quality assurance practices within higher education:

Conceptual Exploration

This phase involved an examination of pragmatism as a philosophical tradition, focusing on its foundational principles and how they have been applied historically in educational contexts. Key texts by prominent pragmatist thinkers such as Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey were reviewed to understand their perspectives on pragmatism and its practical implications.

Literature Review

A targeted review of literature on quality assurance in higher education was conducted to identify how these principles have been, or could be, applied to enhance educational quality. This review selectively included works that have shaped current understanding and discourse on educational quality, allowing for the extraction of relevant arguments and theories pertinent to the application of pragmatism in educational settings. The literature review was conducted by accessing major academic databases and digital libraries, including JSTOR, Google Scholar, and the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). A targeted selection of keywords guided the search, focusing on terms such as "pragmatism in education," "quality assurance in higher education," "adaptive educational frameworks," and "practical outcomes in learning." These keywords were chosen to capture the broad scope of pragmatism as it applies to educational theory and practice, as well as specific insights into quality assurance methodologies that prioritize adaptability and practical relevance. Once relevant literature was gathered, each source was systematically evaluated based on its relevance to the core topics of pragmatism and quality assurance in higher education, its citation frequency in the academic community, and its contribution to the field. This process ensured a balanced representation of foundational theories and cutting-edge research. Only peer-reviewed articles, seminal books, and authoritative reviews were primarily considered to maintain a high scholarly standard and reliability of the information synthesized.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Critical Analysis

The collected data from the conceptual exploration and literature review were subjected to rigorous critical analysis. This step assessed the feasibility and potential impacts of incorporating pragmatist approaches into quality assurance practices. The analysis scrutinized both the benefits—such as increased adaptability and the relevance of educational outcomes—and the challenges, including institutional readiness, resistance to change, and the complexity of implementing pragmatic reforms in various educational settings.

Synthesis and Implication Development

Insights gained from the preceding steps were synthesized to formulate a coherent set of implications for policy and practice in higher education quality assurance. This synthesis aimed to outline practical steps and strategic directions for educators and policymakers to incorporate pragmatist philosophies effectively. The synthesis particularly focuses on curriculum design, assessment strategies, and stakeholder involvement frameworks, where pragmatism can directly influence improvements in educational quality. By outlining these areas, the study aimed to enhance the responsiveness and effectiveness of quality assurance frameworks in higher education.

Roots of Pragmatism: Its Evolution and Impact on Higher Education

In exploring the concept of quality in higher education, it is crucial to investigate the historical and philosophical roots of pragmatism, a movement that has profoundly shaped educational paradigms by emphasizing practical outcomes and real-world applications of ideas. While multiple philosophical traditions have influenced educational theory, pragmatism stands out for its distinctive emphasis on experiential learning and practical consequences (Hickman, 2007). Originating in the late 19th century as a uniquely American intellectual movement, pragmatism was first articulated by Charles Sanders Peirce, who introduced the concept of "fallibilism", positing that all knowledge is provisional and open to revision in light of new evidence (as cited in Hookway, 2012).This revolutionary concept not only laid the groundwork for modern educational assessment practices but inspired a more adaptive and flexible approach to knowledge, challenging the absolutist and foundationalist philosophies of its time

William James, another central figure in the pragmatist tradition, expanded upon Peirce's ideas by emphasizing the practical utility of beliefs and theories. James argued that the true value of an idea lies in its ability to solve practical problems and produce tangible benefits, advocating for an approach to knowledge that tests ideas through their practical applications rather than through theoretical soundness alone (as cited in Talisse & Aikin, 2008). James's emphasis on the functional outcomes of education aligns closely with current discourses on higher education's role in addressing societal challenges.

John Dewey’s contributions to pragmatism, particularly his emphasis on experiential learning and democratic education, have left an indelible mark on modern educational theory and practice. Central to Dewey’s philosophy is the idea that education is not merely a preparation for life but a fundamental part of life itself, intrinsically linked to the social and experiential realities of learners. Dewey’s seminal work, Democracy and Education (1916),

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

positioned education as an inherently social process that should foster active participation, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills, preparing individuals for both personal growth and civic engagement (as cited in Dewey, 2018). This perspective was groundbreaking in its assertion that education must bridge individual development with societal progress.

Dewey argued that students must be "active participants" in their education, engaging dynamically with both the material and their social environments. This engagement, he posited, facilitates a deeper understanding of the subject matter while ensuring its relevance to students' lives beyond the classroom. The notion of schools as "miniature societies" underscores this philosophy, where theoretical knowledge is continuously tested against real-world challenges, bridging the gap between abstract concepts and practical applications (Dewey, 1938). Dewey's experiential approach to education insists that learning emerges from the interaction between the learner and their environment, emphasizing that education should be continuous and responsive to the evolving needs of society. Furthermore, Dewey's advocacy for democratic values in education reflects his belief that schools play a pivotal role in fostering a just and equitable society. He argued that education should promote collaboration, open-mindedness, and respect for diversity, equipping learners with the skills and dispositions necessary to function effectively in a democratic community. This perspective aligns with his broader body of work, which includes significant contributions to understanding the role of experience in learning and the relationship between education and social reform (Dewey, 1938; Dewey, 2018). Dewey's vision of education as a transformative force extended beyond the classroom, envisioning its impact on broader societal reform.

The enduring relevance of Dewey's ideas is evident in contemporary educational discourse. However, Dewey's contributions are best understood in conjunction with broader pragmatic principles and their applications in modern contexts. Scholars like Laurillard (2013) have expanded pragmatist views to digital learning environments, emphasizing the integration of technology and adaptive pedagogies. Similarly, the principles of lifelong learning and real-world application championed by Biesta and Burbules (2003) and Laal and Salamati (2012) build upon Dewey's foundations to address contemporary challenges in higher education. These developments reflect the pragmatic emphasis on adaptability, which is particularly crucial in higher education quality assurance, where institutions must foster flexible and responsive learning environments (Cendon, 2018).

Pragmatism's influence extends beyond Dewey's foundational ideas to contemporary concerns, such as interdisciplinary learning and technological integration (Lattuca & Stark, 2009; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). These advancements demonstrate pragmatism's capacity to evolve and respond to the complexities of modern education. This approach aligns with pragmatism assertion that education must continuously adapt to societal changes, equipping individuals to meet present needs and anticipate future challenges (Dewey, 2018). Garrison (1994) reinforces the importance of this adaptability, advocating for student-centered approaches that emphasize real-world applications and critical engagement.

From this perspective, pragmatism offers a compelling framework for rethinking and redefining quality assurance in higher education. It emphasizes the need for educational systems to transcend static, traditional paradigms and adopt flexible, adaptive structures that respond to societal demands and learner needs (Cendon, 2018). This approach shifts

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

the focus from knowledge acquisition as an isolated goal to the application of knowledge in real-world contexts, equipping students with the critical skills and problem-solving capacities essential for navigating complex, globalized realities (Fesmire, 2014; Noddings, 2018). Pragmatism's alignment with interdisciplinarity and technological integration reinforces its relevance in addressing contemporary challenges, such as bridging disciplinary silos and fostering innovation in educational delivery (Lattuca & Stark, 2009; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011).

Thus, while Dewey's contributions remain central to the pragmatic tradition, their integration with broader pragmatic frameworks underscores the movement's potential to redefine quality assurance in higher education. Pragmatism challenges traditional notions of educational quality by situating it within the broader context of societal and individual needs. By prioritizing the cultivation of adaptable, lifelong learners, it offers a pathway for higher education institutions to enhance their responsiveness and relevance in a rapidly changing world. This perspective not only redefines quality assurance but also reinforces the transformative potential of education in fostering societal progress and innovation.

Defining Quality in Higher Education: A Pragmatic Lens

To build on the philosophical foundations and practical implications of pragmatism discussed above, it is essential to explore how these ideas intersect with contemporary efforts to conceptualize and define quality in higher education. This exploration reveals how pragmatism's adaptive and outcome-oriented philosophy offers valuable insights into addressing the multifaceted challenges of defining and ensuring quality in diverse educational contexts.The conceptualization of quality in higher education is a complex and multifaceted endeavor, with various scholars proposing diverse frameworks and definitions to capture its breadth and depth (Harvey & Green, 1993; Harvey & Williams, 2010; Green, 1994; Welzant et al., 2011). Harvey and Stensaker (2008) provide a detailed typology that categorizes quality into five distinct definitions: "exceptional," "perfection or consistency," "fitness for purpose," "value for money," and "transformation." Similarly, Green (1994) outlines five perspectives, ranging from standard compliance to transformative learning, thereby emphasizing the conceptual diversity and the inherent challenges in defining educational quality. These typologies highlight the diversity of thought in quality assurance but also underscore the limitations of one-size-fits-all approaches. The evolving demands of modern higher education necessitate frameworks that can accommodate institutional diversity and shifting societal needs.

The pragmatic perspective, rooted in Dewey's and James's philosophies, offers an alternative to these fragmented definitions by advocating for a more context-specific and outcome-oriented understanding of quality (Biesta & Burbules, 2003). Pragmatism challenges rigid frameworks, suggesting that each institution should define quality in alignment with its unique strategic direction, resources, and stakeholder needs. This flexibility ensures that quality is not merely an abstract ideal but a practical and actionable concept. Dewey's belief in education as a process of continuous growth and adaptation implies that quality cannot be confined to static metrics but must instead reflect the institution's capacity to foster critical thinking, problem-solving, and lifelong learning in a rapidly evolving world.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

This perspective stands in stark contrast to the growing trend of standardization and globalization in higher education, where global metrics often drive a homogenization of educational experiences. Pragmatism resists this trend by emphasizing the importance of context and practical outcomes, encouraging institutions to adopt definitions of quality that are responsive to their specific missions and societal demands (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007). By challenging standardized approaches, pragmatism underscores the need for higher education to remain relevant, innovative, and aligned with local and global realities.

This approach not only allows for tailored definitions of quality but also fosters continuous reflection, innovation, and adaptation. Pragmatism's strength lies in its ability to bridge theoretical frameworks and practical application, offering a robust mechanism for addressing the dynamic and varied challenges faced by higher education institutions. Through this lens, quality assurance becomes a dynamic process of alignment between institutional goals and societal progress, rather than a static compliance exercise. By prioritizing real-world outcomes and fostering institutional accountability to diverse stakeholders, pragmatism redefines quality assurance as a dynamic process that aligns with the complexities of modern society. It transforms quality from a static benchmark into a living, adaptive framework that drives meaningful educational and societal progress.

Evaluation of Impacts and Challenges

Following the exploration of the roots and evolution of pragmatism, it becomes evident that its core principles have significant implications for quality assurance in higher education, especially when it comes to quality metrics. Pragmatism directly challenges the traditional focus on quantifiable outcomes, advocating instead for a broader, more holistic evaluation system that aligns educational assessments with real-world effectiveness and continuous growth. This paradigm shift raises important questions about how quality metrics can better capture the complexities of learning, moving beyond static measures to embrace adaptive and context-sensitive approaches.

The pragmatist emphasis on experiential learning and adaptability directly contrasts with the rigid and standardized methods often used in contemporary assessment practices. However, the implications of adopting such a perspective extend beyond metrics alone. Pragmatism's focus on adaptability and context also highlights the need to reconsider governance structures, particularly through decentralization and stakeholder engagement, as a way to create more relevant and inclusive educational frameworks. Furthermore, this perspective underscores the importance of designing responsive and adaptive learning environments that prioritize personalization and inclusiveness. In exploring these areas, pragmatism offers insights into fostering innovation and continuous improvement within higher education systems, allowing institutions to align quality assurance processes with the dynamic and evolving needs of learners and society.

As educational systems face increasing pressure to measure and report performance through numerical and standardized metrics, pragmatism offers a compelling alternative that prioritizes critical thinking, adaptability, and problem-solving as essential competencies. Yet, translating these principles into practice is not without challenges, particularly balancing institutional accountability with the flexibility needed to support continuous learning and improvement. The following sections examine these themes in greater detail, addressing

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

specific areas such as holistic quality metrics, decentralized curriculum design, and adaptive learning environments. Together, these discussions illustrate how pragmatism can inform transformative approaches to quality assurance in higher education.

Quality Metrics and Holistic Assessment

The traditional reliance on quantifiable outcomes in education, such as standardized testing and performance metrics, has increasingly come under scrutiny for its inadequacy in preparing students for the complex and evolving challenges of contemporary society. As highlighted in the discussion on the challenges of traditional quality assurance frameworks, such metrics often prioritize simplicity and comparability at the expense of capturing the nuanced and multifaceted nature of learning. Pragmatism challenges this narrow focus by advocating for a more comprehensive and context-sensitive evaluation system that goes beyond traditional metrics, capturing the complexities of learning and skill development in real-world contexts. Instead of prioritizing test scores or rote memorization, pragmatism suggests that educational success should be measured by the extent to which students develop critical thinking, adaptability, and problem-solving skills, all of which are crucial for contributing to a rapidly changing societal landscape. This shift reflects the broader pragmatist principle of aligning educational practices with real-world demands, addressing the gaps identified in rigid, standardized approaches to quality assurance.

Pragmatism, therefore, challenges the very notion of education as a finite process, offering instead a model where learning extends beyond classroom walls and assessment becomes a tool for reflection rather than judgment (Biesta, 2010; Tight, 2019b). Biesta (2010) argues that the current focus on measurable outcomes often leads to a reductive view of education, where broader aims such as personal development and civic engagement are sidelined. This critique echoes the findings of earlier evaluations, underscoring the need for quality metrics to embrace a holistic view that reflects the dynamic and experiential nature of learning. This argument aligns with Dewey's vision of education, where the role of schools is not merely to deliver knowledge but to foster democratic citizenship and social progress. Dewey's insistence on education as an interactive process of growth and experience stands in philosophical opposition to the static nature of standardized testing systems, which often reduce learning to a snapshot of student performance rather than a continuous process of intellectual and personal development. Such a view highlights the tension between pragmatist ideals and the entrenched practices that prioritize efficiency and comparability in educational assessments.

Despite the philosophical appeal of pragmatism, the implementation of more holistic quality metrics in educational systems presents significant challenges. Firstly, developing reliable and valid assessment tools for measuring complex cognitive and behavioural skills, such as critical thinking and adaptability, remains a methodological hurdle. As Newton (2010) points out, ensuring the consistency and fairness of such assessments across diverse student populations and educational contexts is a formidable task. Unlike traditional assessments, which rely on clear-cut numerical outcomes, evaluating skills like critical thinking requires more comprehensive and contextual tools that can capture students' learning processes over time. These tools must also account for the diversity of learner experiences and backgrounds, reflecting the pragmatic commitment to inclusivity and adaptability. Moreover, these sophisticated assessment designs often require longitudinal

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

studies to accurately measure changes over time, making them resource-intensive and logistically challenging for many institutions. The need for continuous observation, formative assessment, and individualized feedback further complicates the implementation of such frameworks in large educational systems, where standardization often serves as a practical necessity.

Secondly, the institutional resistance to overhauling existing assessment systems cannot be ignored. Many universities and educational bodies have built their infrastructures around standardized performance metrics, making a shift towards more holistic assessment methods both financially costly and culturally disruptive. This resistance stems not only from the financial costs associated with implementing new metrics but also from deep-seated cultural and organizational factors that influence how institutions conceptualize success and quality. Kezar (2018) highlights the importance of understanding institutional culture in driving educational reforms, suggesting that the successful implementation of pragmatist-inspired quality metrics requires a fundamental shift in how learning outcomes are valued. Such cultural shifts demand not only institutional leadership but also collaboration among policymakers, educators, and stakeholders to redefine success in terms of broader societal and individual development. Furthermore, the tension between comprehensive evaluation and maintaining a conducive learning environment presents an ongoing challenge for pragmatist approaches to quality assurance.

As Yorke (2011) cautions, the growing reliance on high-stakes assessments can have negative impacts on student well-being and authentic learning experiences. Pragmatism, by contrast, advocates for a system where continuous reflection and real-world engagement take precedence over performance under artificial testing conditions. This perspective reinforces the argument that meaningful quality assurance must prioritize the long-term intellectual and personal growth of students, aligning evaluation practices with the goals of fostering adaptable, lifelong learners. However, balancing this need for reflection with institutional demands for comparability and accountability adds another layer of complexity to the reform of quality assurance systems. The challenges outlined here serve as a critical bridge to exploring how decentralized governance structures and stakeholder engagement, discussed in the subsequent sections, might address these systemic barriers to holistic assessment.

Decentralization and Stakeholder Engagement in Curriculum Design

Building on the discussion of holistic quality metrics, decentralization emerges as a critical mechanism for implementing pragmatist principles in higher education. The move toward decentralization addresses one of the key challenges identified earlier: the rigidity of centralized governance structures that hinder the development of flexible and context-sensitive assessment systems. Pragmatism, with its emphasis on contextual relevance, flexibility, and democratic participation, aligns well with the push toward decentralization. However, this shift presents both opportunities and challenges, particularly in the way it impacts stakeholder engagement in the curriculum design process.

Decentralization promotes institutional autonomy and local relevance, enabling universities to adapt curricula and quality assurance processes to the unique needs of their communities. At the same time, it fosters innovation and responsiveness by distributing decision-making authority across multiple levels. This aligns with the pragmatist philosophy

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

that emphasizes the importance of situating educational practices within real-world contexts and engaging a diverse range of perspectives. Garrison (1994) underscores this connection, arguing that decentralized governance allows for more inclusive and adaptive educational systems.

Stakeholder engagement is a natural extension of decentralization, as it involves leveraging diverse voices—such as students, educators, community members, and employers—in curriculum design to ensure that educational programs remain relevant and equitable. Pragmatism advocates for this participatory approach, seeing it as essential for creating meaningful and responsive educational experiences. However, stakeholder engagement is not without challenges, as power imbalances and conflicting priorities can complicate collaborative efforts. The following sections explore these themes in greater depth, critically evaluating how decentralization and stakeholder engagement, when guided by pragmatist principles, can address systemic barriers to quality assurance while fostering more dynamic and inclusive educational environments.

Decentralization in Higher Education Governance

Decentralization, as a governance reform strategy, represents a fundamental shift in power distribution, involving the transfer of decision-making authority, resource allocation, and operational responsibilities from central governments to lower administrative levels (Arnove, 2007; Bray, 2007). This systemic transformation has emerged as a global phenomenon, reshaping governance structures across various sectors, particularly in education (Hanson, 2006; Khanal, 2013). Pragmatism's emphasis on flexibility, context, and responsiveness finds alignment with these trends, suggesting that decentralization offers an opportunity to make education more adaptive to societal needs. However, this shift also introduces significant complexities, as it disrupts established power structures and accountability systems.

In higher education specifically, decentralization manifests as increased institutional autonomy, empowering universities to respond dynamically to local needs, implement flexible curriculum designs, and engage meaningfully with external stakeholders (Whitty, 1997; Leithwood & Menzies, 1998). Such autonomy enables institutions to prioritize innovation and contextual relevance, fostering educational systems that reflect the unique characteristics of their regions. This governance approach aligns with pragmatist educational philosophy, emphasizing context-sensitive and adaptable learning environments. However, the transition creates a fundamental tension between local relevance and global competitiveness that institutions must carefully navigate (Marginson, 2007). Striking this balance requires attentiveness to both localized priorities and international benchmarks, a dual demand that reflects the interconnected nature of modern higher education.

The complexity of balancing decentralization and accountability is evident in several international contexts. In China, the process has granted higher education institutions greater autonomy in curriculum development and local priority-setting, yet their freedom operates within the constraints of state control through funding mechanisms and performance monitoring (Mok, 2001). Such a hybrid model highlights the paradox of decentralization: while universities gain autonomy to innovate and adapt, they remain accountable to central authorities, creating a dynamic interplay between independence and

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

oversight. Similarly, Taiwan's experience demonstrates how increased institutional autonomy coincides with strengthened state oversight through quality assurance measures (Lo, 2010).

Further illustrating these dynamics, Australia's higher education sector provides another instructive example. The introduction of the Unified National System in 1988 paradoxically combined institutional autonomy with increased accountability measures, creating what Marginson and Considine (2000) term "the enterprise university." This model reflects the evolving nature of decentralization, where institutions operate as semi-autonomous entities tasked with balancing financial sustainability, quality assurance, and stakeholder engagement. In the United Kingdom, the Higher Education and Research Act 2017 exemplifies how decentralization can coexist with centralized quality control, as universities gained greater operational freedom while remaining subject to rigorous evaluation through the Teaching Excellence Framework (Brown & Carasso, 2019). These examples underscore the nuanced reality of decentralization in higher education: while granting flexibility, it often imposes new layers of regulation to ensure that institutional practices align with broader national goals.

International cases collectively reveal a crucial pattern: decentralization in higher education rarely represents complete autonomy. Instead, it often introduces new forms of state control and accountability measures, creating what might be termed "controlled autonomy" (Ritzer, 2013). This governance model reflects the inherent contradictions of decentralization, where institutions are tasked with innovating locally while adhering to global standards. The associated tensions are further complicated by competing demands: maintaining global competitiveness (Ritzer, 1983) while addressing local needs, and balancing immediate practical outcomes with long-term educational goals (Burbules & Berk, 1999). Pragmatism's focus on adaptability and stakeholder collaboration offers a potential framework for navigating these challenges, encouraging higher education systems to embrace flexibility while fostering accountability that is sensitive to diverse contexts and evolving societal expectations.

Power Dynamics in Stakeholder Engagement

Decentralization promotes the idea of stakeholder engagement in curriculum design, aligning with pragmatist principles of democratic participation and the social construction of knowledge. By involving a wide range of stakeholders—such as students, faculty, employers, and community members—higher education institutions can ensure that their programs are relevant, equitable, and responsive to the diverse needs of society (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018; Garrison, 1994). Collaborative curriculum development not only promotes contextual relevance but also enhances the adaptability of educational programs to evolving societal needs. Pragmatism's insistence on inclusivity and responsiveness underscores the importance of such engagement as a means to make higher education a more dynamic, transformative force in society.

By fostering stakeholder engagement, institutions can ensure that education remains dynamic and responsive to local concerns while also bridging global trends. However, the ideal of inclusive participation often collides with the realities of unequal power dynamics, exposing tensions that can undermine democratic principles in curriculum design. While pragmatism champions inclusive participation, the reality of power dynamics often means

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

that certain groups—especially industry partners and other influential stakeholders—can dominate the conversation at the expense of students, faculty, or marginalized communities. This imbalance threatens the foundational goals of pragmatism, shifting the focus from broader educational and social outcomes to narrow economic or political interests. As Ball (2012) highlights, power dynamics are inherent in any decision-making process, and without careful management, the voices of corporate stakeholders may overshadow the perspectives of those most directly affected by the curriculum, such as students and local communities.

For example, Cochran-Smith et al. (2018) emphasize that democratic accountability in curriculum development is essential for ensuring that educational programs reflect broader social goals and are equitable across diverse student populations. Yet, achieving this level of accountability requires institutional mechanisms that actively address power imbalances, ensuring that marginalized voices are heard and prioritized. Industry partners, for instance, often push for curricula that prioritize technical skills or immediate job market needs, which may not align with the broader educational goals of critical thinking, social responsibility, or personal growth (Kendall, 2006). This divergence between market-driven priorities and educational ideals poses a significant challenge to institutions striving to implement pragmatist frameworks effectively.

Without robust mechanisms for collaboration and conflict resolution, these power imbalances can lead to a curriculum that disproportionately serves the interests of certain groups at the expense of others, undermining the democratic ideals that pragmatism seeks to promote. Such outcomes not only diminish the transformative potential of education but also exacerbate existing inequalities within and beyond the institution. Additionally, the process of negotiating diverse stakeholder perspectives is often complex and time-consuming. Institutions must develop frameworks that allow for meaningful dialogue and ensure that all voices are heard, while also maintaining the coherence and alignment of the curriculum with overarching educational goals. This balancing act demands sustained institutional effort and a willingness to prioritize long-term educational and societal benefits over short-term gains.

Lastly, the global-local tension further complicates the implementation of decentralized, stakeholder-driven curriculum design. Ritzer (1983) and (2013) discuss the concept of 'glonacalization' in higher education, which refers to the need for institutions to navigate the tensions between local specificity and global standards. To be successful, institutions must not only engage local stakeholders but also ensure that their programs remain globally competitive, preparing students for both local contexts and the broader global economy. This dual demand underscores the need for pragmatist approaches that integrate diverse stakeholder perspectives without sacrificing the coherence or adaptability required to address both local and global challenges. By fostering dialogue and emphasizing reflection, pragmatism offers a potential pathway for navigating these complexities while preserving the transformative potential of higher education.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Responsive and Adaptive Learning Environments

The creation of responsive and adaptive learning environments is a key tenet of pragmatist educational philosophy, aligning closely with Dewey's vision of education as a process of continuous growth through experience (Dewey, 1938). These environments embody the pragmatist commitment to contextual relevance, seeking to meet the diverse needs of students while fostering skills that prepare them for an uncertain and rapidly evolving future. Adaptive learning often incorporates advanced technologies and flexible pathways designed to cater to students' varied backgrounds and career aspirations. As Siemens (2005) argues, adaptive learning systems are essential for preparing students for an ever-changing world, where the ability to adapt is just as critical as specific knowledge acquisition.

However, the implementation of adaptive learning environments presents significant challenges, particularly in maintaining educational equity and rigor. As Sullivan & Solove (2013) highlight, disparities in cultural capital can impact students' ability to navigate flexible learning systems, potentially exacerbating existing inequalities. This disparity creates a fundamental tension between the promise of adaptive learning and its practical implementation, raising questions about how institutions can ensure that such systems benefit all learners equitably. Addressing these challenges requires carefully designed support mechanisms to ensure that all students can benefit from personalized learning opportunities. Furthermore, it necessitates a balance between leveraging technological advancements and preserving the experiential, human-centered learning experiences championed by pragmatist philosophy.

The Role of Technology in Adaptive Learning

Technology plays a pivotal role in facilitating adaptive learning environments, offering tools that enable personalized instruction and real-time feedback. Pragmatism, with its emphasis on contextual relevance and adaptability, aligns with the use of technology to create customized learning experiences that can adapt to individual students' needs and learning styles (Siemens, 2005). Laurillard (2013) notes that the integration of technology in education represents a paradigm shift, enabling educators to create more responsive and flexible learning pathways. This technological shift is particularly relevant for meeting the challenges of a globalized and increasingly digitized society, where learning must be dynamic and continually evolving.

However, there are significant concerns regarding techno-solutionism—a belief in technology as the ultimate solution to educational challenges. Selwyn (2016) warns against over-reliance on technological tools, cautioning that technology alone cannot address the social dimensions of learning that are integral to Dewey's philosophy of education. Dewey emphasized that education must remain deeply human-centered and social, focusing on the interactions between individuals and their communities. Thus, the overuse of technology risks undermining the human relationships and social learning contexts that are essential for deep, meaningful learning. Furthermore, adaptive technologies often prioritize efficiency and standardization, which can conflict with the pragmatist emphasis on experiential learning and critical thinking.While technology can enhance personalized learning, it is crucial that educational environments remain student-centered, promoting engagement and collaboration over passive consumption of information (Boud & Soler, 2016). This

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

pragmatist challenge highlights the need for institutions to integrate technology thoughtfully, ensuring it complements rather than supplants the reflective and collaborative elements of education. Therefore, the task for educators and policymakers is to balance the benefits of technology with the need to preserve human-centered learning experiences that foster reflection and social interaction.

Equity and Diversity in Adaptive Learning

One of the central challenges in creating adaptive learning environments is ensuring equity and access. While adaptive technologies offer opportunities for more personalized learning, they also risk reinforcing existing socioeconomic inequalities. Schwartz (2014) and Sullivan and Solove (2013) argue that differences in cultural capital can impact how students engage with adaptive systems, with students from more privileged backgrounds often better equipped to navigate these platforms than their less advantaged peers. This inequity underscores a critical limitation of adaptive technologies: their ability to empower learners is contingent on existing social and economic conditions.

Pragmatism's commitment to equity and democracy in education underscores the importance of ensuring that adaptive learning environments are designed to "close gaps" in educational access rather than widen them. To achieve this, institutions must invest in support systems and guidance mechanisms that help underrepresented students fully benefit from adaptive learning technologies. This includes addressing both technical challenges and broader systemic inequities, such as access to reliable infrastructure and digital literacy. Tailored academic support and mentorship, particularly for students from marginalized communities, are essential for ensuring equitable engagement with these platforms.

Institutions must also consider the long-term sustainability of adaptive learning systems. As Srikanthan and Dalrymple (2003) argue, fostering a culture of continuous improvement is essential for creating adaptive learning environments capable of evolving in response to societal changes and the needs of learners. Such improvement demands sustained investment not only in technology but also in the professional development of educators, who play a central role in bridging the gap between technological tools and meaningful learning experiences.

Additionally, the shift toward more personalized learning environments necessitates significant changes in pedagogical approaches. As Laurillard (2013) notes, educators require ongoing professional development to effectively support diverse learning experiences and harness the potential of new technologies. However, this transition often encounters resistance from faculty accustomed to traditional teaching methods, and the institutional investment required can be substantial. Another challenge is assessing learning outcomes in adaptive environments. Traditional assessment methods may be ill-suited to capture the range of skills and competencies developed through personalized, flexible learning. Boud and Soler (2016) advocate for sustainable assessment practices that not only measure current learning but also prepare students for future learning challenges. These innovative frameworks must align with the pragmatist focus on practical outcomes and real-world applicability, ensuring that assessments reflect the broader goals of critical thinking, adaptability, and lifelong learning (Biesta, 2010).

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Fostering Innovation and Adaptability

Pragmatism, with its emphasis on adaptability, rejects the notion of a fixed standard for quality. Instead, it advocates for an evolving approach that responds to emerging evidence and shifting contexts. In the dynamic landscape of higher education, this perspective provides a critical framework for reimagining quality assurance as a fluid, context-sensitive process. Pragmatism's focus on flexibility enables institutions to evolve in alignment with real-world changes and stakeholder needs, emphasizing responsiveness over rigidity.

To foster a truly responsive educational environment, institutions must cultivate a culture of innovation and reflection. Dewey's philosophy stresses the importance of reflection in learning (Dewey, 1938), which should extend to how institutions evaluate their educational strategies. This reflective process not only enhances institutional practices but also embeds a continuous cycle of improvement that is central to adaptive learning environments. Regular evaluation cycles that incorporate feedback from students, faculty, and external stakeholders are vital to ensuring educational practices remain relevant and beneficial to society. Such iterative processes encourage the identification of emerging trends and challenges, allowing institutions to adapt proactively rather than reactively.

This approach also requires institutions to be forward-thinking, anticipating change rather than responding passively to external pressures. For example, schools that implement adaptive learning technologies (Siemens, 2005) must not simply introduce these systems but continually reassess and refine them in response to student outcomes, learning experiences, and technological advancements. By treating innovation as an ongoing process rather than a one-time solution, institutions can maintain alignment with both technological progress and the evolving needs of learners. This commitment to innovation mirrors principles found in Total Quality Management (TQM), which highlights the importance of iterative refinement and feedback integration to ensure long-term success (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2003). TQM's emphasis on stakeholder collaboration and iterative improvement resonates deeply with pragmatist ideals, reinforcing the need for quality assurance systems to remain dynamic and inclusive.

For policymakers and educators, the adoption of a pragmatist approach to continuous improvement demands a shift in mindset. Rather than focusing solely on meeting static benchmarks, they must embrace a more dynamic approach that allows for flexibility and contextual responsiveness. This requires moving away from rigid, one-size-fits-all standards and recognizing the diversity of institutional contexts and learner needs. Such a transformation calls for the development of more inclusive assessment tools, structural support for professional development, and a commitment to institutional innovation.

Educators must be empowered to experiment with new teaching methods, technologies, and assessment strategies, ensuring that student learning experiences are continuously refined and improved. This experimentation fosters creativity and innovation within the institution, aligning with pragmatism's emphasis on experiential learning and adaptability. At the same time, policymakers should ensure that regulatory frameworks and accreditation processes allow for institutional experimentation and innovation, rather than imposing rigid standards that limit the potential for growth and improvement (Elken & Stensaker, 2018). By creating enabling environments for innovation, policymakers can

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

bridge the gap between regulatory compliance and the need for adaptive, future-focused practices in higher education.

Conclusion

Pragmatism, with its rejection of fixed standards and its emphasis on adaptability and contextual responsiveness, offers a transformative framework for rethinking quality assurance in higher education. In a rapidly changing world, where societal demands and technological advancements continuously reshape educational landscapes, pragmatism provides a guiding philosophy that prioritizes flexibility, innovation, and the alignment of institutional practices with real-world needs. By moving beyond static benchmarks and rigid compliance models, pragmatism redefines quality as a dynamic, evolving construct that reflects the diversity of educational contexts and the complexities of learning.Central to this transformation is the cultivation of a culture of innovation and reflection within higher education institutions. As Dewey (1938) highlighted, reflection is essential not only for individual learning but also for institutional growth, ensuring that evaluation processes are iterative and responsive. Regular feedback from diverse stakeholders—students, faculty, and external partners—must inform these processes, fostering educational environments that are both equitable and forward-looking.

Moreover, the integration of adaptive technologies and innovative teaching practices underscores the importance of treating quality assurance as a living, iterative process. Schools must continuously refine their strategies, using emerging evidence and stakeholder feedback to remain relevant and impactful. This approach resonates with the principles of Total Quality Management (TQM), emphasizing iterative refinement, collaboration, and the pursuit of long-term success (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2003). Such alignment highlights the practical applicability of pragmatism in addressing the challenges of contemporary higher education.

For this vision to be realized, both policymakers and educators must embrace a mindset shift. Policymakers should establish flexible regulatory frameworks that encourage institutional experimentation and innovation, supporting rather than stifling creativity. Concurrently, educators must be empowered to explore new pedagogies, assessment methods, and adaptive technologies, ensuring that student experiences remain at the core of institutional innovation. These efforts require sustained investment in professional development, infrastructure, and collaboration to bridge the gap between traditional practices and the needs of a rapidly evolving educational landscape.

Ultimately, the adoption of a pragmatist approach to quality assurance is not merely a response to the limitations of existing models but a proactive strategy for preparing institutions and learners for the complexities of the future. By fostering continuous improvement, inclusivity, and adaptability, pragmatism offers a pathway for higher education to fulfill its transformative potential, equipping students with the skills and capacities needed to thrive in an interconnected, globalized world.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

There is no conflinct of interest to be cited here.

Funding

There is no funding support to be cited here.

Human Participants

The paper does not involve any human participants; however, necessary ethical guidelines for writing research papers are observed.

Originality Note

I confirm that this manuscript represents original work and is entirely written by the author. All the key ideas used in the creation of this document have been appropriately cited and acknowledged according to standard academic practices. No part of this manuscript has been plagiarized from any other source, and all research materials integral to this study are disclosed and properly referenced. This manuscript has not been published elsewhere, nor is it under consideration by another publication.

Use of Generative AI/ AI-assisted Technologies Statement

The author claimed that QuillBot and Grammarly are used in this research just for the purpose of improving the language of the manuscript. Scite was also used to help in locating and organizing the references. No further use of these technologies are also confirmed by the author to write different parts of the research. One native speaker of English is also invited to proof-read the text prior to its online publication.

References

Arnove, R. F. (2007). Introduction: Reframing comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local. In R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (3rd ed., pp. 1-20). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global Education Inc.: New policy networks and the neoliberal imaginary*. Routledge.

Basnet, M. (2024). Cultural diversity and curriculum. *Panauti Journal, 2*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.3126/panauti.v2i1.66500

Biesta, G. (2010). Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 95-118). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Biesta, G. J. J., & Burbules, N. C. (2003). *Pragmatism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Boud, D., & Soler, R. (2016). Sustainable assessment revisited. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 41(3)*, 400-413. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1018133

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Bray, M. (2007). Control of education: Issues and tensions in centralization and decentralization. In R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (3rd ed., pp. 175-196). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Brown, R., & Carasso, H. (2013). *Everything for sale? The marketisation of UK higher education*. Routledge.

Burbules, N. C., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and limits. In T. S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics* (pp. 45-66). Routledge.

Cendon, E. (2018). Lifelong learning at universities: Future perspectives for teaching and learning. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research, 7*(2), 81-87. https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2018.7.320

Cochran-Smith, M., Carney, M. C., Keefe, E. S., Burton, S., Chang, W.-C., Fernández, M. B., Miller, A. F., Sánchez, J. G., & Baker, M. (2018). *Reclaiming accountability in teacher education*. Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Free Press.

Dewey, J. (2018). *Democracy and education by John Dewey: With a critical introduction by Patricia H. Hinchey*. Myers Education Press.

Elassy, N. (2015). The concepts of quality, quality assurance and quality enhancement. *Quality Assurance in Education, 23*(3), 250-261. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-11-2012-0046

Elken, M., & Stensaker, B. (2018). Conceptualising 'quality work' in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education, 24*(3), 189-202. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2018.1554782

Fesmire, S. (2014). *Dewey*. Routledge.

Garrison, J. (1994). Realism, Deweyan pragmatism, and educational research. *Educational Researcher, 23(1),* 5-14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X023001005

Green, D. (1994). *What is quality in higher education?* Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE).

Hanson, E. (1998). Strategies of educational decentralization: key questions and core issues. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*, 9-25.

Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18(1),* 9-34. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102

Harvey, L., & Stensaker, B. (2008). Quality culture: Understandings, boundaries and linkages. *European Journal of Education, 43*(4), 427-442. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2008.00367.x

Harvey, L., & Williams, J. (2010). Fifteen years of quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education, 16*(1), 3-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538321003679457

Hickman, L. A. (2007). *Pragmatism as post-postmodernism: Lessons from John Dewey*. Fordham University Press.

Hookway, C. (2012). *The pragmatic maxim: Essays on Peirce and pragmatism*. Oxford University Press.

Kendall, N. (2006). Stakeholder collaboration: An imperative for education quality [Working Paper]. U.S. Agency for International Development. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadg024.pdf

Kezar, A. J. (2018). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Khanal, P. (2013). Centralization and decentralization reform in school education in Nepal: Tracing the swing of the pendulum. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management, 2*(2), 53-66. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2013.400

Laal, M., & Salamati, P. (2012). Lifelong learning; why do we need it?. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31*, 399-403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.073

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Lattuca, L. R., & Stark, J. S. (2009). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in context* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Laurillard, D. (2013). *Rethinking university teaching: A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies.* Routledge.

Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school-based management: A review. *Educational Policy, 12*(3), 325-346. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904898012003006

Lo, W. Y. W. (2010). Decentralization of higher education and its implications for educational autonomy in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 30*(2), 127-139. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791003721572

Marginson, S. (2007). Global position and position taking: The case of Australia. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(1), 5-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287530

Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge University Press.

Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). To rank or to be ranked: The impact of global rankings in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 306-329. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303544

Mey, J. L. (2012). Societal pragmatics. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1081

Mok, J. K -h. (2001). From state control to governance: Decentralization and higher education in Guangdong, China. *International Review of Education, 47*(1), 123-149. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017517125663

Newton J. (2010). A tale of two "qualitys": Reflections on the quality revolution in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education, 16*(1), 51-53. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538321003679499

Noddings, N. (2018). *Philosophy of education* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Regmi, K. D. (2015). Lifelong learning: Foundational models, underlying assumptions and critiques. *International Review of Education, 61*(2), 133-151. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-015-9480-2

Ritzer, G. (1983). The "McDonaldization" of society. *Journal of American Culture, 6*(1), 100-107. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-734X.1983.0601_100.x

Ritzer, G. (2013). *The McDonaldization of society: 20th anniversary edition*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Schwartz, R. (2014). *Rethinking pragmatism: From William James to contemporary philosophy*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Selwyn, N. (2016*). Is technology good for education.* John Wiley & Sons.

Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 2*(1). http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm

Soltis, J. F. (1984). On the nature of educational research. *Educational Researcher, 13*(10), 5-10. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X013010005

Srikanthan, G., & Dalrymple, J. (2003). Developing alternative perspectives for quality in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management, 17*(3), 126-136. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540310467804

Sullivan, M., & Solove, D. J. (2013). Radical pragmatism. In A. Malachowski (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to pragmatism* (pp. 324-344). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CCO9781139022132.019

Talisse, R. B., & Aikin, S. F. (2008). *Pragmatism: A guide for the perplexed*. Continuum.

Tight, M. (2019a). *Documentary research in the social sciences*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Tight, M. (2019b). *Higher education research: The developing field*. Bloomsbury Academic.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

Welzant, H., Schindler, L., Puls-Elvidge, S., & Crawford, L. (2015). Definitions of quality in higher education: A synthesis of the literature. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 5*(3), 3-13. https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v5i3.244

Whitty, G. (1997). Creating quasi-markets in education: A review of recent research on parental choice and school autonomy in three countries. *Review of Research in Education, 22*(1), 3-47. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X022001003

Yorke, M. (2011). Summative assessment: dealing with the 'measurement fallacy'. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(3), 251-273. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903545082

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance*. Routledge.

Ms. Balqees Rashid Suleiman AL Mandhari is A faculty member at the University of Technology and Applied Sciences (UTAS) in Oman, with extensive experience in quality management, internal audits, and accreditation processes. She has significant contributions to higher education institutions in advancing quality assurance initiatives. Ms. Al Mandhari is currently pursuing her PhD at the Institute of Education, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest, Hungary, with a research focus on quality assurance and fostering quality culture in higher education. Her academic interests include exploring innovative strategies to enhance institutional effectiveness and promote sustainable quality frameworks that align with global educational standards.

[Downloaded from johepal.com on 2026-10-12]

[DOI: 10.61186/johepal.5.4.27]

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) which allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.