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ABSTRACT

The role that Quality Assurance (QA) plays in the Higher Education Governance (HEG) and Learning Outcome (LO) relationship requires attention in research, particularly from a developing country environment. We argue that the HEG-LO relationship needs to shift the focus from a traditional to an entrepreneurial university setting that has QA as a mediator, resulting in a HEG-QA-LO relationship with a greater impact on employment and the socio-economic development of a country. To investigate this claim, we employed a qualitative research approach. Specifically, using a case study involving interviews of major stakeholders with 4-16 years of experience in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in a developing economy. The data collected included using open-ended questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, and phone discussions. Relating the ‘institutional effectiveness gap’ to the conceptual model adds significant value to this study. Stakeholder expectations/requirements from the interviewees confirm a ‘mystery’ (i.e., a conflicting expectation) and an ‘institutional effectiveness gap’. Findings indicate that the HEG-LO relationships are inadequate without the role of QA to achieve institutional effectiveness. Furthermore, our study gives an unequivocal understanding of the HEG-QA-LO relationship and the factors that help achieve institutional effectiveness. Our analytical contribution includes Six (6) propositions that have practical implications for leadership and management’s work in HEG and their training.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the Higher Education Governance (HEG) and Learning Outcomes (LOs) relationship and the role that Quality Assurance (QA) plays to achieve an impact on the social, environmental, and economic development of a country. HEG is understood in this
study as the constitutional decision-making process to distribute authority, resolve conflicts, and realize the objectives and missions of university education (Ramírez and Tejada 2018).

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have experienced major challenges within the economic, political, and social fields due to demands from diverse stakeholders. Against the traditional belief that HEG inherently applies QA to achieve the LO, we take a neutral view of the HEG-LO relationship in this study. Hence, we reject the assumption that HEG is aware of all stakeholder’s expectations/requirements. Following the classical Taylorism theory, past studies emphasize QA as the single most critical success factor in achieving and improving production outcomes in the manufacturing sector since all stakeholders have a common goal, however the same cannot be said in higher education (HE) (Brika, et al. 2021; Taylor, 1964).

The unemployment rate of graduating students has been of great concern for all countries. When students are employed, it reduces the unemployment rate with a positive impact on society and helps achieve the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 (Ayisi 2018; Nabaho et al. 2020; UN 2015). In this regard, university education must lead to institutional effectiveness that will reduce unemployment rates, thereby reducing poverty (SDSN Australia/Pacific, 2017). Head, (2011, 10) defined institutional effectiveness as “the process and structure used by a HEIs to determine the quality of its students, academic programs, administrative functions, and support services”. From an employer’s standpoint, the expected LOs (of graduates that allow them to take up responsible jobs) can be divided into two categories: (1) Professional Competencies (for example, must have knowledge of the field and the ability to create results) and (2) Personal and Social Competencies (such as adaptability and managerial skills) (Machumu and Kisanga, 2014). These competencies that form the expectation of an employer differ from that of other stakeholders such as the governing council, parents, employers, and non-governmental organizations (Qadir et al. 2020). Therefore, unlike other studies (for example, Naliakamukhale and Hong, 2017) that focus mainly on only one or two stakeholders, there is a need for a holistic assessment of the desired LOs of all the stakeholders’ expectations/requirements from the HE system (Taylor 1964).

The extant literature indicates that “HE has a positive outcome which then results in economic, social and environmental performance” in both developed and developing countries (Žalėnienė and Pereira 2021). Reviewing the literature, there are considerable
studies on HEGs, QA, and LO, however, there are gaps that the current study seeks to fill. Firstly, existing studies are mostly conceptual papers (Machumu and Kisanga, 2014; Nabaho et al., 2020; Žalėnienė and Pereira, 2021) that use secondary data such as public reports, official statistics, published and unpublished papers, for content analysis (Ayisi 2018). Terms such as quality university governance, governance quality, and outcome-based quality are used to suggest the possible link between governance, quality assurance, and outcomes. However, empirical studies to establish the relationship between HEG and LO, and the mediating role of QA have not been studied extensively. We argue that for effective HEG to have the desired LO, QA must mediate the relationship, to ensure that all the expectations/requirements of the stakeholders are achieved.

Secondly, Hamish, Xie, and Hong (2020) recommended a fully explored study of ‘how’ HEG will employ QA to achieve institutional effectiveness and meet stakeholders’ expectations (Medne, Lapina, and Zeps 2020).

Hence, we further argue that the basic ideas about the HEG-LO relationship need to be rethought, especially where the QA system practiced by most developing countries has failed to achieve institutional effectiveness. It is asserted that HEG is in crisis and manifests in the massification of HE, and high graduate unemployment in developing countries (Mok and Neubauer, 2016). For example, in the year 2019, the world economy experienced an average unemployment rate of 8% in developed countries and 30% in developing countries (World Bank 2022). Employers in developing countries often complain about the burden of retraining recruits from HEIs to fit into the workplace (Cutter 2019). As suggested by Siddique, Shehzadi, and Shaheen (2016: 1431) poor HEG and weak institutional structure “remained the pressing issue of developing economies”. Learning Outcomes based on stakeholders’ expectations/requirements has been suggested as the key issue that needs to be addressed to ensure the sustainability of HEIs in recent years (Žalėnienė and Pereira 2021; Nabaho et al. 2020). Therefore, the current study is to empirically investigate using primary data from the stakeholders’ perspectives on the HEG-QA-LO relationship. The contribution of this current study may improve the institutional effectiveness of management and leadership and curtail the challenges associated with current HEIs, such as graduate unemployment.
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE (HEG)

PAIB (2004) explains enterprise governance with two dimensions consisting of corporate governance (also called conformance dimension) and business governance (also called performance dimension). These two dimensions of governance should be in balance for an effective governance system. There are well-established agencies at the national and international levels, with oversight mechanisms for HEIs to ensure that good corporate governance processes are effective [e.g., audit committees or accreditation agencies] (PAIB, 2004). In Ghana, for example, the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission (GTEC), is responsible for developing standards, regulations, supervision, and accreditation of HE programs and institutions (Machumu and Kisanga 2014).

On the other hand, business governance in HEIs is a performance dimension that focuses on strategy, value creation, and resource utilization. Business governance serves as a key driver of performance. Carnegie and Tuck (2010) extended the work of PAIB (2004) by classifying governance into three, namely, (1) academic governance (i.e., scholarship); (2) business governance (i.e., performance)” and (3) corporate governance (i.e., conformance). Academic governance concerns assessment and its broad-scope evaluations that tend to “focus on both the quality of outputs and the identification of the impacts of scholarly work” (Carnegie and Tuck, 2010, 437).

2.2 QUALITY ASSURANCE

The fragmented literature on QA interventions at universities makes it difficult to identify and apply QA principles based on scientific evidence. Some of the reasons given for failed QA interventions in universities include: (i) the unsettling use of the term “customer” for students (Sunder 2016, 163); (ii) QA is seen as a threat to academic freedom (Costandi et al 2019); and (iii) the HEI system seen differently when compared with manufacturing (i.e., the expected outcome for students is a lifetime experience other than an income for a product or a service) (Leslie 1975). The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance for the European Higher Education Area (ESG), for example, have encouraged a change in management strategy and leadership to secure maximum prosperity (value) and excellence for all stakeholders by complying with the SDG 4 (ESG, 2015; UN 2015).
A stakeholder’s expectations of LOs must be the focus of developing a QA policy. HEG should therefore aim at meeting all stakeholders’ expectations/requirements (Kundu 2020). QA systems can be conceived as:

“A system of making sure that education output (graduate) meets the stakeholders’ intended expectations” (Machumu and Kisanga 2014, 152)

Kundu (2020) argues that educational services are often intangible and difficult to measure since it relates to the transformation of an individual’s behavior, knowledge, and characteristics. In that regard, this study argues that the best way to define the desired LOs is to obtain a holistic view of shareholders’ expectations/requirements and incorporate them to achieve institutional effectiveness. Nabaho et al. (2020) examined HEG from the perspective of the African Union Commission (AUC) and through content analysis of the African Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ASG-QA). Although a conceptual paper, Nabaho et al.’s (2020) findings suggest a direct relationship between HEG and QA. Therefore, the current study postulates that for HEG to have LOs with a sustainable impact on individuals and society, HEG-LO must be mediated by adherence to QA.

3.0 A CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

The conceptual model of the HEI system in this study draws from the works of the Education Policy Outlook Analytical Framework by OECD (2015), outcome-based engineering education (Qadir et al. 2020), and the QA model by (Machumu and Kisanga 2014). The internal stakeholders in university education include the administrators, governing council, teaching and non-teaching staff, and students. The external stakeholders are alumni, competitors, development agencies, employers of labor, governments, parents, and the broader society.
Qadir et al. (2020) indicate that the higher education results chain starts with inputs (students), who pass through the transformation process (i.e., instructions and assessments), outputs (i.e., graduates with certain Skills, Knowledge, Experiences, and Behaviors [SKEB]), and then outcomes (taking up responsible employments in the society). The proposed model, as indicated in Figures 1 and 2, argues that there is a relationship between HEG and LO. However, this relationship is not direct but mediated by QA.

**Figure 1 Simplified Conceptual framework**

![Simplified Conceptual framework](image1)

**Figure 2 Elaborate Conceptual framework**

*Source Adapted from OECD, 2015; Machumu and Kisanga, 2014; Qadir et al. 2020.*
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From Figure 2, the HEG construct is measured or assessed by formal structures, setting objectives, and stakeholder engagement (OECD 2015). For an effective governance system,
there should also be a clear description of objectives and priorities for the education system, an outline of roles and responsibilities, and engagement of stakeholders in the process. HEG should lead to desirable LOs, which meet stakeholders’ expectations (Qadir, et al., 2020). The QA of the HEI is a mediating variable with both external and internal quality assurance systems, as shown in the QA framework by Machumu and Kisanga (2014) and also corroborated by other scholars (for example, Nabaho et al. 2020, Kundu 2020). Hence, we propose that the HEG-QA-LO is ‘how’ HEG may achieve institutional effectiveness.

4.0 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
4.1 BASIC THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF GOVERNANCE

In examining governance issues, prior studies have drawn on stakeholder theory and expectancy theory to consider an institution’s interactions with society and with stakeholders (Chan, Watson, and Woodliff 2014;). Expectancy theory proposes that the final results of any behavior are subject to the prior expectations one has of it (Unda and Ramos 2016).

According to Fudge and Schlacter (1999), expectancy theory suggests that stakeholder motivation is a function of three constructs: first, effort to innovate (instrumentality or I); a second, effort to achieve institutional effectiveness (expectancy or E); and third, the rewards that follow achieving institutional effectiveness (valence or V). This emphasizes stakeholders’ assessments of the HEG’s actions as a consequence of their requirements (Purvis, Zagenczyk, and McCray 2015). We, thus, argue that LOs should meet all stakeholder expectations, which are inherently different from that of the HEG. The QA system should play a vital role in the governing process (Costandi et al. 2019; Martono et al. 2020; Nabaho et al. 2020). QA should not be assumed to be present in HEG (Martono et al. 2020), but empirically examined to identify its role in HEG and LO.

Stakeholder theory suggests that HEG must create value for the stakeholders affected by the governing process to achieve institutional effectiveness (Walsh, 2005). Van der Laan Smith et al. (2005, 126) indicate that the long-term survival of the HEI “requires the support of all its stakeholders” (Clarkson, 1995). There is an expectation from all stakeholders that the benefits of HE to society should exceed their costs of operations - which is a QA construct (Mathews, 1993).
Both the expectancy and stakeholder theories provide potentially useful theoretical frameworks for investigating the HEG-QA-LO relationship to improve our understanding of ‘how’ to achieve institutional effectiveness in the HEI system. Thus, we proceed with a broad research question:

How is Quality Assurance (QA) an effective variable in explaining the relationship between Higher Education Governance (HEG) and Learning Outcomes (LO), particularly in developing country environments?

5.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

5.1 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

A qualitative research approach is employed in this study. It ensures that the rich and contextual lived experiences of research participants are obtained to understand a phenomenon (Crowe et al., 2011; Ponelis 2015). The study, specifically, employed an exploratory multiple-case study method (Yin 2003) because it aims to explore the “how” or “why” in respect of the phenomenon under investigation and generate propositions or hypotheses for further studies.

5.2 SAMPLING AND SAMPLE SIZE

In obtaining participants for the study, we followed Kristensen and Ravn (2015)’s suggestion and adhered to the ICMJE guidelines on the Protection of Research Participants and the Helsinki Declaration. See Kristensen and Ravn (2015) for details. Thirty-one HE stakeholders indicated their willingness to participate in the study and completed a demographic questionnaire and consent form, which were delivered and returned through e-mail. Each participant was subsequently e-mailed to arrange for an interview.

Two universities in Ghana were selected for this study. We refer to one university as “Uni A” and the other as “Uni B”. ‘Uni A’ has four campuses, and four schools - namely Business, Law, Governance and Leadership, and Technology with a student population of 10,000. ‘Uni B’ was established in the year 2000 as a privately funded university with three campuses, namely, Business, Arts and Social Sciences, and Education with a student
population of 2,000. Both ‘Uni A’ and ‘B’ have received the Ghana Tertiary Education Commission (GTEC) accreditation to operate as a university.

Using purposive sampling, thirty-one participants who had an understanding of the entire HEG-QA-LO relationship in both ‘Uni A’ and ‘B’ and with the tendency to ensure “information richness” was selected (Hennink, Hutter, and Bailey 2020). Participants further included alumni, Governing Council Chairman, Lecturers including Deans, President, Rector, Registrars, retired Rector, and students of both ‘Uni A’ and ‘B’; Ghana Government Officials and Chief Executive Officers (employers) as indicated in Table 1.

### Table 1. Functional roles of participants (n=31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni: Former students of Uni A and B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana government officials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Council: chairman of an Executive committee or ruling body of Uni B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers: an academic rank from both Uni A and B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officers: non-governmental employers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President: Chief Executive Officer from Uni B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrars: an academic rank from Uni A and Uni B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistant: an academic rank from Uni B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Rector: former Chief Executive Officer from Uni A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: admitted to both Uni A and B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were knowledgeable, willing to participate, and had between 4 and 16 years of HE experiences.

5.3 **DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

Antony et al. (2012) argue that barriers that hamper the implementation of QA in education include: lack of management commitment; lack of awareness of QA; QA is seen as a quick fix or cutting costs to meet budget deficits; lack of thinking about the process of HEG and ownership; and lack of visionary leadership. Thus, to understand the HEG-LO relationship, interview questions were developed to guide the data-collection process using Klein,
Dansereau, and Hall's (1994) theory development framework. The qualitative research design approach led to questions like “What are your expectations/requirements of the university education system?”; “What is your view of the definition of quality assurance in university education settings?”; “What does such a definition mean in meeting your expectations/requirements as a stakeholder in university education?”; “How does university governance and quality assurance relations influence university education?”; “In your view, what role does quality assurance play in university governance?”

5.4 DATA COLLECTION, RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND ANALYSIS

Interviews were conducted over a period of seven months. Institutional observations of both universities and informal discussions with several academic and administrative staff were used as supplementary information to verify and triangulate the interview information and to test for reliability. Additionally, all the interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed subsequently, and proofread to correct minor errors (Wimpenny and Gass 2000). After collecting the data, we transcribed each recording including every comment made in the discussion. We coded participants’ responses.

Member checking was also implemented by asking participants to comment on the interpretation of the findings to establish the significance of the ‘deep, dense, detailed accounts of problematic experiences’ of the stakeholders in question, thereby achieving a ‘thick description’ and validity (Denzin 2001, 98). The ‘thick description’ built a clear picture of the view of the stakeholders in the context of their culture and was then developed into field notes that drew upon the richness of the recorded interviews for further theoretical and empirical study (Holloway 1997, 154). The field notes were carefully considered in a multitude of ways for interesting themes before being considered as a ‘sign of mystery’ (research themes) relevant for further theoretical and empirical study (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 1271).

The ‘sign of mystery’ (or research themes) is viewed as a good interpretation of the empirical findings for the construction of the stakeholder expectations/requirements, drawing on stakeholders’ theory and expectancy theory. The research themes provide the answers to the “how” (or the research question) and “why” (or the degree to which stakeholders will
participate in the implementation of QA methods) for the achievement of HEG-QA-LO or institutional effectiveness.

6.0 RESULTS

6.1 THEMES FROM THE FINDINGS
The steps to data collection and analysis were simplified into four steps, namely, (1) data collection; (2) coding; (3) theoretical sampling (or revising the data collection method through theoretical sampling), and (4) contribution to theory development (Alvesson and Kärreman 2007; Charmaz 2014; Strauss and Corbin 1998). The data analysis using axial coding (Strauss and Corbin 1998) allowed for the development of key themes relating to stakeholder expectations/requirements of the university education system widely identified by the thirty-one interviewees.

Each stakeholder's expectations/requirements were investigated in an interpretive approach to support theory development. Ponelis (2015, 531) posits that the interpretive research paradigm is characterized by “a need to understand the world as it is from a subjective point of view and seek an explanation within the frame of reference of the participant”. Therefore, the interpretation of findings and establishment of the relationship among HEG-QA-LO were based on the subjective perspective of the stakeholders.

6.2 INADEQUATE HEG – QA RELATIONSHIPS TO ACHIEVE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Governing Council Chairman of ‘Uni B’:
The governing council chairman averred:

I would say that quality assurance should be used by senior management of my university to achieve the mission and vision statements of the institute and the students that graduate would make a social impact on society. Hence, senior management, administration, faculty, and students must ensure whatever they do adds value (i.e., quality) to the university. Unfortunately, my university’s governance and management system are unsystematic and rigid. My faculty members remain passive
to the university’s vision and mission statements. The administrators remain bureaucratic, and ineffective in their duties. Let me tell you about a case that happened a few months ago. Some of our graduating students were sent to a car assembly factory for practical assignments. The factory manager concluded that all our graduating students were not fit for purpose, and they could not apply what they had learned at the university. Even though the governing council met and disagreed with the factory manager’s assessment report of our graduating students, I later concluded that the factory manager’s report was correct. My question is how can quality assurance turn around these situations?

Senior Management: President from ‘Uni B’ and retired Rector from ‘Uni A’:

A retired rector and a president indicated that:

The universities that want to continue to be in business will have to re-strategize and build a strong reputation and credibility based on the quality of the programs and their relevance to the industry.

Ghana government officials:

Some Ghana government official interviewees indicated that:

Due to the government funding of universities, public universities appear to run inefficiently and care less about ‘quality’ and the marketplace. For example, the performance of law students in the Ghana education system has been subjected to extensive debate quite recently. Ninety-three percent of students who sat for the law entrance examination failed to be admitted.

One government official indicated:

Let me state that any attempt to allow the ‘mass production of lawyers without efficient control, checks, and balances will be rejected irrespective of who is
advocating for it. Ghana needs ‘quality lawyers with character’ and not ‘mass-produced lawyers.’

Dean of ‘Uni B’:  
A Dean interviewee reported that:

My challenge with QA process reviews is the tremendous amount of pressure it exerts on deans, lecturers, and management. The documentation could be reduced/eliminated and channeled into research to develop the programs, curricula, and teaching methodologies to serve the students better.

Lecturers: Lecturers from both ‘Uni A’ and B:  
According to some lecturer interviewees, they are not aware of a HEG-QA-LO relationship, and the overall impression is that:

Most students have passed through a deeply defective education system where no one pays attention to critical thinking and writing skills, including students attacking the course outline as being too much demanding and administrators taking sides with the students.

Students, Alumni of both ‘Uni A’ and B:  
A common expectation of students is that a university education will enhance their academic and vocational prospects, but also provide opportunities to become independent and employable. However, several students and alumni interviewed appear to be interested only in the certificates obtained at the end of the study and not in acquiring new knowledge.

Non-governmental employer- Chief Executive Officer (CEO):  
The only CEO interviewed avers:

Yes, there are several graduate students we interviewed and found not adequately prepared for the job market. A number of them obtained high grades with
certification, but could not apply what they studied in school. Employers are reluctant to hire graduating students because of the costs associated with upskilling them.

The interpretations from the conflicting stakeholders’ expectations/requirements confirm a ‘mystery’ with the earlier theory that all stakeholders must have a common goal to achieve the intended outcome (Taylor, 1964). Alvesson and Kärreman, (2007) suggest qualitative research first must find a ‘mystery’ and if possible present the solution as a contribution. Using the stakeholder theory to define the objectives of a university, Ansoff (1965) posits that for HEG to rely on external stakeholders for resource support, it must satisfy all the stakeholder expectations/requirements including the conflicting demands (Pfeffer and Salancik 1978). Thus, management theorists have shifted the focus from the traditional to an entrepreneurial university setting as a solution to achieve institutional effectiveness (Clark, 1998; Jungblut and Lee, 2022).

6.3 SENIOR MANAGEMENT COMMITMENT

In addressing the broad research question, we suggest that senior management must demonstrate commitment to enhancing the HEG-QA-LO relationship to achieve institutional effectiveness. In response, Cooper and Kleinschmidt (1995, 376) identified nine QA constructs that will drive the HEG-QA-LO relationship in an entrepreneurial university to achieve institutional effectiveness: (a) a high-quality new knowledge creation process; (b) a clear, well-communicated new program strategy; (c) adequate resources for new knowledge creation in the form of patents; (d) senior management commitment to new marketable innovations; (e) an entrepreneurial knowledge creating-climate for innovation; (f) senior management accountability for institutional effectiveness; (g) strategic focus and synergy (i.e., new programs focusing on existing markets and leveraging existing technologies); (h) high-quality development teams (faculty); and (i) cross-functional faculty teams that will create value for all stakeholders. We, therefore, propose that senior management must embrace all the nine QA constructs to demonstrate commitment with a proposition:

Proposition 1: Quality Assurance (QA) in an entrepreneurial university will require a high-quality new knowledge creation process; a clear, well-communicated new program strategy;
an adequate resource for new knowledge creation in the form of patents; and senior management commitment to new marketable innovations to achieve institutional effectiveness.

### 6.4 STAKEHOLDERS AND SOCIAL IMPACT FEEDBACK

Holder-Webb, Cohen, Nath, and Wood (2009) argue that stakeholders can only use community resources when society considers that the university is legitimate. Stakeholders may threaten to boycott the products of the university business if society deems the university illegitimate. Since university education operates in a dynamic and complex human society, and societal values keep changing over time, the onus lies on HEG to continuously demonstrate that its operations are legitimate and would create value for stakeholders and society, a concept that perfectly fits in QA’s continuous improvement construct (Zmuda, Kuklis and Kline 2004).

When and where HEG perceives that the university’s operations are not commensurate with its social contract, a remedial strategy must be put in place for the corrective action and publicized (Chan, Watson, and Woodliff 2014; Holder-Webb et al. 2009). We suggest that it is a self-protection identity theory coupled with a legitimacy theory that differentiates entrepreneurial universities from the traditional university and drives them to make substantive-technical social impact changes to their existing operations in response to intense negative social performance feedback. We state this more formally in the following proposition:

**Proposition 2:** Entrepreneurial universities are likely to respond to intense negative social impact feedback (institutional effectiveness gap) from internal and external stakeholders with changes to the existing operations more than a traditional university.

**Proposition 3:** To maintain and reinforce self-continuity in their identity, entrepreneurial university stakeholders are likely to tolerate and adapt to minor discrepancies by granting a wide range of acceptable social impact behaviors to university education more than a traditional university.
The psychological role university climates play in shaping stakeholders' expectancy-related perceptions and ultimately their motivation is unclear. Some scholars (for example, Ashkanasy, Celeste, and Peterson 2000; Purvis, Zagenczyk, and McCray 2015) have theorized that stakeholders' psychological climate perceptions affect their motivation to participate in QA interventions to achieve institutional effectiveness. Nevertheless, the research of Ashkanasy, Celeste, and Peterson (2000) and Vroom, Lyman, and Lawler (2005) do not explain the processes through which a university climate shapes motivation. Hence, we develop propositions considering an entrepreneurial and a traditional university climate, since not many studies have investigated this phenomenon.

6.5 STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR EXPECTANCY

**Proposition 4:** An entrepreneurial university stakeholders will actively participate when the climate is perceived positively, will support motivation by the effort that is exerted, and adequate levels of social impact will follow in a particular QA initiative \((I)\).

**Proposition 5:** An entrepreneurial university stakeholders will actively participate when the climate is perceived positively and will support motivation by performing well which will result in the attainment of a positive social impact \((E)\).

**Proposition 6:** An entrepreneurial university stakeholders will actively participate when the climate is perceived positively and will support motivation by those outcomes that are judged to be attractive \((V)\).

7.0 DISCUSSION

Our findings are consistent with the view that universities with effective HEG are more likely to achieve institutional effectiveness and a social impact than those with ineffective HEG by paying attention to stakeholder expectations/requirements (van der Laan Smith, Adhikari, and Tondkar 2005). Entrepreneurial university is a pervasive topic among scholars, and how universities achieve institutional effectiveness is intensively debated in the literature (Clark 1998).
We suggest that traditional universities should not blindly and selflessly pursue entrepreneurial agenda nor coldly and calculatedly avoid it. Rather, traditional universities should follow stakeholder expectations/requirements that involve framing a high-quality new knowledge-creation process to achieve institutional effectiveness. However, we argue that traditional universities in developing countries need to adopt the entrepreneurial university concept to reduce the unemployment rate. Our results also support Thurik et al. (2008) who suggested entrepreneurship as a remedy against the high unemployment rate, high inflation, and the stagnant economy experienced in developing countries (EC 2003).

To educators who will venture into the mass production of students, we suggest they adopt the Toyota Production System (TPS) that could simultaneously achieve high quality, low cost, and short lead time (Dawson, 2004). Even though the TPS was successful initially, other industries unsuccessfully tried to imitate it, since it is not only a system of management, manufacturing, and inventory control but it includes the system of the work process. In the year 2010, Toyota wanted 15 percent of the global automobile market share and that resulted in several millions of car recalls, due to quality problems (Andrews, Tian, and Zhao 2011). Thus, we suggest that HEG must adopt Cooper and Kleinschmidt’s (1995) nine QA constructs to achieve institutional effectiveness and create value for all stakeholders.

7.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE
Regardless of the strength of the evidence behind the principles we have identified, HEG practitioners still need to adapt the advice to the situations they face. Since the seminal work of Amit, Glosten, and Muller (1993) there has been a pervasive antecedent in the implementation of the entrepreneurial university, and there is still much to be learned. The six propositions suggested in this research offer contributions to the challenges of implementing an entrepreneurial university to achieve institutional effectiveness. The propositions have practical implications for leadership and HEI management’s work and training. Thus, there is a need to train HEI leadership and management in using quality assurance systems as a strategy and not just as a program. The practical implication of the study is that the management of education should incorporate good governance mechanisms that ensure a robust educational system that embraces ‘quality’ teaching and learning leaving no student behind.
Secondly, the conceptual model of the HEI system in Figure 1 addresses Chou, Jungblut, Ravinet, and Vukasovic's (2017) challenge of the entrepreneurial university model taking into consideration stakeholder expectations/requirements. However, what happens when HEG encounters stakeholder expectations/requirements that are conflicting and opposing forces? Tetteh (2017) suggests the use of the Kano et al. (1984) model to resolve stakeholder conflicts and opposing forces.

Thirdly, the nine QA constructs suggested in this study will assist HEG in making decisions to create value for all stakeholders by paying attention to stakeholder expectations/requirements. Value creation activities and processes must be understood by university leadership based on the HEG-QA-LO relationship. University leadership must take decisions to maximize value to multiple stakeholders and minimize its associated costs simultaneously thereby optimizing the objective function to satisfy all stakeholders. Following the lean philosophy, all the HEI’s stakeholders (governing council, senior management, administrators, students, lecturers) must maximize value and eliminate ‘waste’ in the HEI system to achieve world-class status (Tetteh, Amoako-Gyampah and Twumasi 2021). Thus, there is a need for a Decision Quality Officer role (Marino and Eastman, 2017) to advise university leadership on ‘how’ to maximize value for all stakeholders in the education sector.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS
Our findings suggest that QA is an emerging field of study in the education management environment and the HEG-QA-LO relationship needs support for survival, especially in the entrepreneurial university setting. QA is the vehicle that can be used to monitor and control HEG structure and processes to achieve organizational goals such as delivering efficiency, equity, and academic quality. Senior management, staff commitment, transparency, and truthfulness are important concepts to help achieve institutional effectiveness in the HEG-QA-LO relationship. While there may be studies that have examined the social impact of QA and HEG on educational outcomes, very few studies have focused on conducting an in-depth study into the interactions between the three constructs (i.e., HEG, QA, and LO) at the same time thus, making this study necessary. The present study presents sustainability as a key characteristic of HEG that has not been captured in the literature (Risanty and Kesuma 2019).
Sustainability relates to the ability to invest, develop sustainable smooth income, improve research overhead recovery, improve productivity, and increase revenue from other sources. The findings, therefore, although derived from educational management, may resonate with other industries beyond academia trying to implement QA. Our approach also provides an opportunity to increase the credibility and rigor of qualitative research design research.

Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

Even though the goal of the study is to achieve effectiveness and is, thus, limited to the classical management theory (Taylor, 1964), a systems theory approach to describe and explain how HEIs work could be considered. Hence, there is no attempt to generalize the results of one case study for the entire HE sector, particularly for developing countries. However, universities in other developing countries could identify some commonalities that they could benefit from.

Further studies should incorporate case studies in other developing countries to solidify the contribution to the HEG-QA-LO relationship. To provide focus and depth to our theoretical development, we have necessarily made restricting assumptions that the universities can deliver university education to achieve institutional effectiveness. Relaxing this assumption and investigating the capabilities of universities may serve as fertile ground for future theoretical development. Further, data in this study were collected using the interpretive paradigm and future studies may use the mixed method by adopting the positivist paradigm to provide additional detail on the HEG-QA-LO relationship.
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