

The Praxis of Quality Assurance in Open Distance Learning Contexts

M. W. Maila* and V. J. Pitsoe

University of South Africa, PO Box 392, UNISA 0003, Pretoria, South Africa

**E-mail: mailamw@unisa.ac.za*

KEYWORDS Social Critical and Praxis Framework. Teacher Self Development. Quality Assurance

ABSTRACT Scholars contend that quality assurance at open distance learning (ODL) contexts/institutions should solely be the prerogative of 'top' management structures and, that academics should be exonerated from this task. However, some disagree on the ground that academics are part of management because they are expected to manage research, teaching, and community engagement (core business of academics), and conversely, that management structures at ODL institutions are state-owned or state funded, deliberately designed efforts geared to assure quality in research, teaching and community engagement processes within these institutions. These processes do not just call for insights into governments' education priorities but, also for insights and competences in the promotion of the quality of what is taught and why it's taught. The paper assumes that grounding insights and competences to enhance quality in teaching, research and community engagement, reflexivity is seen as an integral element of the process of ongoing quality assuring processes. For achieving this outcome, the exploration is informed by a social critical and praxis framework, noted as a broad base framework for quality assurance processes in ODL institutions.

INTRODUCTION

Issues of quality assurance in higher education institutions in general, and ODL institutions in particular, are seriously influenced by what students believe to be critical and valuable to their learning and practice. What they value as critical is usually prioritised and attended with agency by management of these institutions. Checks and balances are put in place to ensure responsiveness, compliance and quality outcomes (Malcolm 1994, UNESCO 2006). Of note to this observation, is the need to understand that quality assurance matters in ODL, whether they be about audits, controls, accreditation, validation, measurements, quality indicators, peer reviews, efficiency, accountability, etc., are all measurement issues suitable for ODL contexts. Therefore, they are not to be taken as given quality assurance programmes or activities, but they must be accorded the seriousness they deserve in ongoing, deliberate, collaborative and reflexive engagement processes (Karimi 2008).

If a quality assurance programme or activity is assumed as a given, it stagnates quality assurance processes and render management to move into a total 'comfort-zone'. In such an instance, management is inclined not to engage the institution's community, and if engaged, sometimes it is just for 'market purposes and media display. Completely taking things for granted and undermining educational processes

that seek to ensure quality learning, this leads to vision, commitment and accountability to excellence becoming lost and forgotten. Such tendency is an indication that management processes regarding quality learning are not people-centred, they lack insightful guidance and direction in educational quality processes.

Of note, is that such actions are non-praxised (no reflective and reflexive actions), are grounded on irrelevant, uninformed decisions that do not enhance nor account for quality as praxis (continuous reflective and reflexive actions or practice) as an integral component of best practice in quality education. They virtually ignore and peripherize programmes or activities geared to improve quality education, to the detriment of the 'excellence in ODL agenda', hence, praxis in ODL quality education processes cannot be more emphasized. For that reason, a detailed clarification of what is meant by the praxiological approach to ODL quality assurance is inevitable in this discussion.

However, before actually focusing on this approach, we firstly, determine the meaning of some of the pertinent concepts to this trajectory. Secondly, we discuss quality assurance and how this strategy to quality processes in ODL should be understood and, thirdly, we explore quality assurance as praxis and, lastly, we discuss some of the challenges in actualizing informed reflexive teaching, research and community engagement processes in ODL institutions.

CONCEPTUALISING THE DISCUSSION

Various scholars clarify concepts differently, but meaningfully. The reason being that concept clarification is not disjointed or separated from the context within which it is defined. This view, acknowledges the influence of one's context in clarifying concepts or giving meaning to ones' contextual realities. Such plethora of meanings enriches our understanding of reality instead of confusing scholars or research. OrNSTEIN and HUNKINS (2004) argues that he concurred with what is pertinent to him might not be pertinent to another scholar. However, it is important that we attach common meanings to what we talk about in order that our readers are on the 'same page' with what we are discussing. Therefore, in the ensuing discussion, we provide a critical clarification of pertinent concepts for this paper.

Teacher Education in Open Distance Learning Context: Deliberating on the learning in higher education institutions, of which ODL institutions are part, Schwartz and Teichler (2000) and Harman (2000), say higher education institutions should be perceived as the field of study offered at post-secondary/high school and tertiary institutions. But, according to Silverman (1984) and Childs et al. (2010) higher education is not only a field of education offered at post-secondary/high school and tertiary institutions, but is also a field of scholarship and practice – not necessarily bound by institutional settings, but by the rigour of one's scholarly endeavours. Such an observation is useful for teacher education in ODL contexts because other sites where teacher education takes place, for example teaching practice which occurs at school sites, can also be reflected upon and be seen as integral to rigorous teacher education endeavours.

Although ODL institutions and contexts seem to be evolving from the time when the distance education learner depended on the study material only for her/his learning success, nowadays students depend on a number of resources or technologies for their learning success. In the past ODL contexts students were adult learners, but nowadays they are not necessarily adult learners only – young people also study through ODL for various reasons. In most countries financial assistance to students is made available to higher education institutions, making it pos-

sible for students to study wherever they secure financial support for their studies. The ODL context is highly resourced nowadays, and the student's chances or opportunities for meaningful learning and success, are greatly enhanced. It is for that reason that most students who want to study to become teachers do so through ODL institutions.

Quality Education: The concept 'quality education,' seem to be complex and broad in its application, and as alluded to above, the concept is also contextually grounded. Quality education is inclusive of other knowledge types, for example, indigenous ways of knowing than the western knowledge types that are hegemonic in their application. The quality of indigenous ways of knowing can be attested by those who used such knowledge and accomplish unprecedented levels of excellence in their application. Quality education is also seen in terms of simplistic measurement standards set and expected to be achieved. If students achieve the set standards or outcomes, then the educator is satisfied that their programme(s) is/are of an acceptable quality. Such a notion of quality seems to be misleading since quality is not only to be attained through quantifiable set standards, but must also be excellently disposed through the empowerment of capabilities through enabling programmes that focuses on ensuring that people are capacitated to be capable and resilient in their life-orientation.

The implication of quality education as embrace of knowledge types and not only based on set standards, but also on capabilities that are not necessarily measurable, is useful and, demands that teacher education quality be assured within broader based frameworks which will allow broad based curricular.

Quality Education and ODL Institutions: We note that Malcolm (1994 in UNESCO 2005) claims – that the 1980s were known as the *efficiency* period, the 1990s as "the decade of quality", and so is the "21st century" a period of quality education (UNESCO 2005). This observation is confirmation that quality in education in general and in ODL in particular, must be acknowledged as an integral part and core business of higher education. UNESCO (2005) and UNESCO (2009), opiate that the concept quality education, is "a dynamic concept that changes and evolves with time and changes in the social, economic, and environmental con-

texts of place, because quality education must be locally relevant and culturally appropriate, and that it takes many forms around the world.

It is precisely for these reasons that scholars/researchers clarify this concept differently and note that its application is varied. Emphasizing the critical nature of quality in African higher education and its dynamic, Maila (2005: 2) argues, “just like most higher institutions in the world, communities – governments if you may, oblige higher education to set up globally acceptable standards for quality”. This means that ODL institutions should set up quality assurance mechanisms that work, and that could be emulated by other nations globally. However, it must be noticed that not only are communities or governments concerned about higher education’s quality, so are employers of graduates students and their parents, students, professors and managers in universities (Maila 2008; Alexander 2008).

Ensuring quality in ODL calls for localized guidelines and principles, which are informed by globally acceptable measures and standards. Maila (2006: 3) claims that “there is need for ... higher education to match own quality standards with globally acceptable assurance standards without compromising contextual obligations that seek to provide education equitably and justly to all, and at the same time give account to the public for those resources provided and entrusted”. Supporting this view expounded by Maila, UNESCO (2005) posits that quality education is an “effective means to fight poverty, build democracies, and foster peaceful societies. Quality education empowers individuals, gives them voice, unlocks their potential, opens pathways to self actualization, and broadens perspectives to open minds to a pluralist world.

Of note, is that quality education – be it in any higher education institution – is not only perceived in terms of measurement and standards to be met by those in charge and managing higher education processes, but that quality empowers, unlocks potential in people, it gives them voice to argue, reflect and “say what they want and how they want things to be”. Such qualities of higher education are enhanced and enabled by capabilities that ensure and assure quality education.

Praxis as Quality in Education: Practice and theory are often juxtaposed when discussed by scholars or students. Action –in-practice guided

by theory (or theory-evolving-in-practice) is never equated to praxis. Yet praxis is normally equated to practice and theory in social research investigations. Of note is that practice involves a process-oriented action and theory involves principles that guide action. May (2005) reaffirms the above view about practice and theory. He notes that these two concepts are simply two sides of the same coin. Citing Cohen 1984 (May 2005:30), when saying:

Theory aims at the production of thoughts which accord with reality. Practice aims at the production of realities which accord with thoughts. Therefore, common to theory and practice is an aspiration to establish congruity between thought and reality.

May (2005) argues that the thoughts and ideas proposed as theoretical implications are actualized as/in practice. However, on the one hand practice can be narrowly clarified as that which one does at her/his workplace as guided by the vision, mission and objectives. On the other hand, praxis is not just what one does at his/her workplace as expected, but focuses on a broader and deeper view of one’s practice. Praxis is informed reflective and reflexive action-in-practice guided by systematic, purposive planned, implemented, and monitored processes of one’s workplace expectations. Such a process intends to ensure that quality assurance issues are not left to chance, but are integral to reflective and reflexive processes of ODL accountability and provisioning plans.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

Quality assurance clarifications are many and varied. Making these clarifications more difficult to contemplate is the fact that scholars are not in agreement on what constitutes assured quality in higher education or in ODL. Malcolm (1992) and Alexander (2008) indicate that quality assurance as defined by different scholars (and industry) has four components:

- Everyone in the enterprise has a responsibility for maintaining the quality of the product or service (that is, the sub-standard rarely reaches the quality controllers because it has been rejected at source);
- Everyone in the enterprise has a responsibility for enhancing the quality of the product or service;
- Everyone in the enterprise understands, uses and feels ownership of the systems

- which are place for maintaining and enhancing quality; and
- Management (sometimes the client) regularly checks the validity and viability of the systems for checking quality.

Some scholars perceive classroom-based teaching activities as indicators of assured quality and others see management-focused activities as the only ones assuring quality. However, Malcolm (1994 in UNESCO 2005) proposes that if we replace the term 'enterprise' with university (in this paper with ODL) then ODL that 'takes quality assurance seriously emerges as a self-critical community of student-teachers, lecturers, support staff and senior managers, all contributing to and striving for continued improvement' (1992: 11). This view of observing quality assurance processes as ongoing and not as products (end-product if you may) and, as enabled by collaborative-deliberative efforts, is certainly problematic for ODL institutions. A state of 'quietness' and 'lay-back' atmosphere on campuses is seen as good management of the higher education service. Yet, students would probably disagree with such a view.

Dhanarajan and Hope (1992: 208) and Davis (2010) concur and sympathise with students. They argue that whether or not one considers quality in education in its conventional form, there is a wide range of issues to be considered in higher education (also ODL institutions). Critical to these matters is the educational process, how well students learn the purpose of education and what it means to the educated. These ranges of issues and others are reiterated by Malcolm (1994 in UNESCO 2005) as concerns of quality assurance in education. All those communities, governments, employers of graduates, students and their parents, teachers, academics and managers in universities (and colleges) are all integral to the process. Hence, the refutation of the simplistic view that excellently formulated policies put in place can be the solution to assured quality education, instead of rigorous, reflective and reflexive educational praxis processes.

Quality Assurance as Praxis

Clarifying deduction and induction research, May (2005) posits that deduction research occurs when a particular aspect of a general picture of social life is considered and then researched to test the strength of the theory (in

this case theorizing comes before research), and deduction research occurs when a researcher examines a particular aspects of social life and then derives a theory (or theories) from the resultant data (in this case research comes before theory and seeks to generate theoretical propositions on social life from the data. Both of these processes involve action-in-practice, not just practice.

Although some scholars see praxis as practice, practice cannot be seen as praxis unless it is described and validated as such. Most activities in practice are not necessarily informed by continuous cycles of reflections and reflexivity. If any evaluation is done, it is summative. Such practice cannot then be referred as praxis. Praxis is more than just an action-in-practice, it involves continuous reflexivity in one's practice, that is, "understanding one's work through critical reflection and reflexivity in/on that work, and being critical involves scrutinizing the theories within one's practice, and the social structures that shape them" (Janse van Rensburg 1998: 39). Janse van Rensburg and Le Roux (1998: 104) reiterate "praxis implies a conscious recognition of the relationship that exists between practice and its rationale(s)" and that "praxis constitutes deliberation on the 'why' question that illuminates meaningful resonance amidst the 'what' and the 'how' of one's work" (Janse van Rensburg and Le Roux 1998; Holley 2009).

In the context of quality assurance in ODL, this observation challenges management, academics, students and management to continuously ask themselves why they do things the way they do, and the response will then impact on what they do next (feed back into the action spiral); the how of doing things in their practice is then grounded in self-critical reflections and reflexivity.

Carspecken (2002) highlights that the view of praxis is embedded within the actions of humanity and that, action is not determined by structure but is, rather, conditioned by cultural milieu and is always productive of new cultural forms. He further observes that human beings are strongly motivated to continuously produce themselves (Carspecken 2002: 62). He concludes by noting Hegel's philosophy, which explains how human beings, continuously "produce himself or herself", through *Geist* as the agent of praxis. *Geist* is the impetus, process,

and product of its own self-production. According to Marx (cf Carspecken 2002: 63), self production is located within the work humans do. This means *human's* work to produce useful objects is simultaneously work to produce themselves'. All human beings need to produce themselves through praxis, or the praxis' needs. However, realistically, these needs might be denied to them by the capitalist relations production (Carspecken 2002).

For praxis needs to be realised, certain social cum educational conditions are obligatory for ODL stakeholders. These are the control of the conceptualisation of production, the control of the tools and resources used for work and the control of the product (of ODL) (Carspecken 2002: 64). This view of praxis probably needs to be unpacked but, in this discussion, we will only list the actions that are said to be embedded in praxis as quality assurance guidelines/principles:

- ***The Need for Human Beings to Realize Self-production:*** Quality assurance in education is a human activity. Thus, as praxis, it allows the higher education community and other collaborators to be engaged in processes that foster a better understanding of people themselves and their actions – their practice.
- ***The Need for Human Beings to Produce Worthy Goods:*** Quality assurance in ODL ensures that partners in the education fraternity get maximum value for the resources they invest in. However, management also responds positively to the quality of their 'service' (as a commodity) to the public, and the institution's community. Producing services of a low quality is unethical and immoral. It *peripherizes* those who want to achieve optimal results in education. Their worthiness in producing themselves is marginalised and compromised tremendously. They end up not being part of quality assurance processes in their own environments. Remember that praxis is not just practice, but it is practice that seeks informed actions, based on continuous reflection and reshaping of actions.
- ***The Need of Human Beings to Overcome Challenges and Obstacles That Deny the Realization of the Needs of Self-production:*** It is said that 'practice makes

perfect', attesting to the fact that being involved in 'action' is better than being 'told' about something. Those masses participating in sustainable development initiatives or programmes are better positioned in understanding the need to use resources wisely, now, in order to ensure a better quality of life for future generations.

- ***The Need for Human Beings to Ensure that They Overcome, Minimize and Eradicate Those Factors That Deny the Realization of the Praxis Needs:*** Those who are engaged in praxis as assuring quality in education need to deliberately make sure they understand their actions-in-practice; they need to know and understand how they want to produce themselves and must also be prepared to be informed by their critical reflections-in-practice. Hence, praxis, in assured quality education processes, calls for collaborative and sustainable actions.

It is imperative and critical that quality assurance guidelines or principles be integral to the core business of ODL institutions and should also be integral to the stakeholders' actions – and praxis should inform the practice of ODL core business, vision and mission in order to mitigate and eliminate challenges that might undermine meaningful outcomes.

CHALLENGES IN ACTUALIZING INFORMED REFLEXIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES IN ODL INSTITUTIONS

There are numerous challenges encountered in the endeavour to actualize reflective and reflexive actions in ODL. These include varied limitations of quality assurance indicators that undermine quality – poor and inadequate accountability and provisioning mechanisms for education, as reaffirmed by Riley and Nutall (1994); budgetary constraints (Maila 2006); and ignoring programmes that seek to develop a world citizenry (Rojo 1996; Morrow 2009). Of note, is that some scholars (Thomson 2000; Gidley 2010) are of the opinion that the lack of critical learning skills essential in ODL context are a major draw-back for most students at this level of learning. therefore, it is not just the training models in ODL or higher education in general, which are sometimes problematic to qual-

ity issues but, also, numerous factors embedded in the very nature of higher education and ODL management, teaching and learning processes (Walsh 1994: 49). Hence, the need to ground ODL quality assurance processes, that is, reflexive action focused processes, in praxis in order to ensure successful and transformative teaching and learning in ODL.

We concur with Cummins (2000: 245; Davis 2010: 246) that transformative pedagogy (science and art of teaching), should be perceived “as interactions between educators and students that attempt to foster collaborative relations of power in the classroom”. We however, caution that, power relations in ODL teaching and learning contexts are complex and cannot be seen in linear lenses. They can also not be envisaged as located in classroom dialogues, because they are mostly located in print and the various technological media used to enable the student to learn better from “a distance”. The implication is that the print media and all technologies used to enable better learning need to be deliberately aware of power relations that should be negotiated between students and lecturers in order to ensure that the pedagogical relation “challenges the operation of coercive relations of power in the school and wider society” (Cummins 2000: 245). It is a huge challenge for ODL educators to ignore the needs of their students and concentrate on what they think need to be taught, how it must be taught and why it is taught.

Matos (2000) reiterate this notion when he claims that students’ African knowledge is not included in university curricula. He argues that

University education (ODL as part of) refuses to acknowledge the knowledge present in African society. Literature, poetry, art and in general culture represents other extreme cases where African philosophy has been ignored and at best tolerated within the content of the educational systems. These disciplines are as exotic and absent from the curricula in Africa as anywhere else in the world (Matos 2000: 19).

Besides replacing these disciplines with western fields of study, our argument is that, when students are brought on an acceptable level of power sharing in the pedagogic relation, their knowing is bound to come as their own identities. Conversely, what students know, is integral to their community life.

The failure of the African University to adapt to the African student’s community life is a major challenge for higher education. Reiterat-

ing this observation Matos (2000: 19-20) laments that learning is not

Conceived to adapt to the African learner, the very concept of school as we know it from western civilisation (as a place where students of well-defined age groups come together at well-defined times and periods and acquire well-defined sequences of skills and a body sequences of skills and a body of information) is unlike learning systems in the homes, villages and countries of average African students.

We concur with Matos (2000) that to understand African societies and minds, learning systems, and to design schools, universities, study programmes and curricula which seek to assist students adapt to society and make them agents of a gradual but sustained improvement of the standard of living requires a deep understanding of and respect for African societies, and Cummins (2000 quoting Banks 1996: 9) that pedagogic power relations require educators to perceive transformative academic knowledge as

The facts, concepts, paradigms, themes and explanations that challenge mainstream academic knowledge. And [as that which] expand and substantially revise established canons, paradigms, theories, explanations and research methods.

This is a huge challenge for higher education institutions, ODL institutions included. This means that ODL institutions cannot claim to be the sole spaces for knowledge construction. Because knowledge is not neutral, but is influenced by human interests, as human interests are also influenced by created knowledge, we agree that transformative teaching and learning should be grounded in the lives of students. Students in ODL teaching and learning processes are integral to the dispersal structures of pedagogic power relations (Cummins 2000).

CONCLUSION

In this paper we have argued that praxis is informed reflective and reflexive action-in-practice, guided by purposive and planned, systematic, implemented, and formatively monitored processes of one’s workplace goals. Such a process intends to ensure that quality assurance imperatives are not left to chance, but are integral to intended ODL accountability and provisioning plans and should also be integral to the stakeholders’ actions. This means that – praxis

should inform the practice of ODL's core business, vision and mission in order to mitigate and eliminate challenges that might undermine meaningful outcomes.

It is envisaged that quality assurance in ODL should emerge as a self-critical community of student-teachers, lecturers/teachers, support staff and senior managers, all contributing to and striving for continued improvement of their practice. Observing quality assurance processes as ongoing and not as products (end-product if you may) and, as enabled by collaborative-deliberative efforts, is useful, but may be problematic for some ODL institutions. Why? because a state of 'quietness' and 'lay-back' atmosphere on many campuses is seen as good management of the higher education service. Yet, students and academics would probably disagree with such a view.

It is for that reason that, in this paper we have argued for an inclusive ODL learning community, with all stakeholders (policy makers, employers of graduates, students and their parents, educators, academics and managers in universities (and colleges) involved and perceived as integral part of the achievement of objectives set. Hence, the refutation of the simplistic view that excellently formulated policies put in place can be the solution to quality assured education, instead of rigorous, reflective and reflexive educational praxis processes, embedded within all aspects of the learning environment of ODL institutions. In this exploration, we noted that social critical praxis in ODL learning environments, cannot be seen as a far-fetched process, only essential as a waste of time and resources, but should be seriously noted as a pillar for solid praxis learning.

REFERENCES

- Alexander FK 2008. Public policy reform and expanding societal expectations. In: DE Heller, MB D'Abrasio (Eds.): *Generational Shock Waves and the Implications for Higher Education*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 172-180.
- Banks JA 1996. The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. In: JA Banks (Ed.): *Multicultural Education, Transformative Knowledge and Action: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 3-29.
- Carspecken PF 2002. The critical hidden history of praxis theory within ethnography and the criticalism/postmodernism. In: Y Zou, FT Trueba (Eds.): *Ethnography and School: Qualitative Approaches to the Study of Education*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, pp. 55-86.
- Childs S, Finnie R, Mueller, RE 2010. Family environment, family habits, and children's cultural experiences: Is there a link to participation in post-secondary education? In: R Finnie, M Frenette, RE Mueller, A Sweetman (Eds.): *Pursuing Higher Education in Canada: Economic, Social, and Policy Dimensions*. Kingston, Ontario: School of Policy Studies, Queens University, pp. 243-267.
- Cummins J 2000. *Transformative Pedagogy: Who Needs It?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Davis NT 2010. Matching educational intentions with assessment: Using an integral map. In: S Esbjorn-Hargens, J Reams, O Gunnlaugson (Eds.): *Integral Education: New Directions for Higher Learning*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 245-256.
- Dhanarajan G, Hope A 1992. "Quality Assurance at the Open Learning Institute." In: A Craft (Ed.): *Quality Assurance in Higher Education*. London: Falmer, pp. 207-219.
- Gidley JM 2010. Evolving higher education integrally: Delicate Mandalia theorizing. In: S Esbjorn-Hargens, J Reams, O Gunnlaugson (Eds.): *Integral Education: New Directions for Higher Learning*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 345-361.
- Harman G (Ed.) 2000. *Quality Assurance in Higher Education*. Armidale, NSW, Australia: Centre for Higher Education Management and Policy, University of New England.
- Holley KA 2009. *Understanding Interdisciplinary Challenges and Opportunities in Higher Education*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.
- Janse van Rensburg E 1998. *The Educational Response to the Environmental Crisis*. Unpublished paper, Gold Fields Participatory Course File, Rhodes University Environmental Education Unit. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Janse van Rensburg E, Le Roux K 1998. *Gold Fields Participatory Course in Environmental Education: An Evaluation in Process*. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Karimi FK 2008. *Factors Contributing to Academic Performance of Students in a Private University in Kenya*. D.Ed. Thesis (Psychology of Education), Unpublished. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Maila MW 2005. Producing quality enabling knowledge: A priori for higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 19 Special Issues, pp. 1456-1463.
- Maila MW 2006. Quality provisioning and accountability in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 21 (4): 120-131.
- Maila MW 2008. Embedding governance and sustainable development in ethics. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 3(3/4): 364-358.
- Matos N 2000. The nature of learning, teaching and research in higher education in Africa. In: P Higgs, NCG Vakalisa, TV Mda, NT Assie-Lumumba (Eds.): *African Voices in Education*. Cape Town: The Rustica Press, Western Cape, pp. 12-38.
- May T 2005. *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process*. New York: Open University Press.
- Morrow W 2009. *Bounds of Democracy*. Cape Town: Human Science Research Council Press.
- Ornstein AC, Hunkins FP (Eds.) 2004. *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles and Issues*. 4th Edition. Boston: Pearson.

- Riley KA, Nutall DL 1994. *The Framework Measuring Quality Education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Rojo JM 1996. University autonomy and the search for quality. In: A Burgen (Ed.): *Goals and Purposes of Higher Education in the 21st Century*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 155-166.
- Schwartz S, Teichler U 2000. *The International Basis of Higher Education Research: Experiences and Perspectives*. Kassel, Germany: Centre for Research on Higher Education.
- Silverman RJ 1984. Knowledge types in 'Higher Education'. In: G Bergendal (Ed.): *Knowledge Policies and Higher Education*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksel International.
- Thomson GF 2000. Towards a re-legitimation of Higher Education: Reinvestigating the Humanities and Social Sciences. In: RH Brown, JD Schubert (Eds.): *Knowledge and Power in Higher Education: A Reader*. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, pp. 150-163.
- UNESCO 2005. *Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education*. Draft 15 March, 2005. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 2009. Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution. A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education. *Executive Summary*. Paris: UNESCO
- Walsh K 1994. Quality, surveillance measurement. In: KA Riley, L Nuttall (Eds.): *Measuring Quality: Education Indicators – and International Perspectives*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 49-68.