

## Enhancing the Efficacy of Higher Education: Integrating Quality Assurance with Dialogic Pedagogy

Yashoda Kumari Bhatta Joshi <sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Lecturer, Ganeshman Singh Multiple Campus, Kathmandu, Nepal

### Article Info

### Abstract

**Received:** October 09, 2024

**Accepted:** December 29, 2024

**Published:** May 22, 2025

**Available online:** May 29, 2025

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.3126/gd.v10i1.80604>

**Keywords:** Classroom dialogue, educational innovation, higher education, quality assurance, stakeholder engagement

*The integration of quality assurance systems with dialogic pedagogy represents a critical challenge in contemporary higher education. This paper examines how universities can effectively balance institutional quality management requirements with innovative teaching practices that promote meaningful classroom dialogue. Through comprehensive analysis of secondary literature and own observations, the article demonstrates the interconnected nature of systemic quality assurance and classroom-level pedagogical effectiveness. The findings emphasize the vital role of stakeholder engagement, evidence-based approaches, and the alignment between micro-level teaching practices and macro-level educational objectives. This paper concludes enhancing both – quality assurance processes and dialogue-based teaching methods, ultimately preparing students for the complexities of a rapidly evolving global milieu.*

### Introduction

Challenges with regard to quality in higher education exist everywhere; they are not unique to any particular country or continent (Matei, 2016). The issue has been in policy agendas for priority action in nearly all parts of the world for at least the last three decades, if not longer in some parts of the world. In United States of America, the process of voluntary accreditation, as an endeavor to ensure and certify quality, dates back to the 1900s. In Europe, the first major discussions and reforms related to assuring quality of higher education took place around 1980s, mainly in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, while a bigger, revolutionary wave of changes followed across the other European countries in the 2000s.

Driven by increasing demands for accountability, internationalization, and pedagogical innovation, the landscape of higher education has undergone deeper transformation in the recent years. According to Harvey and Williams (2010), states have adopted “steering from a distance” approach placing an unprecedented pressure on universities to establish robust internal quality assurance systems while maintaining excellence in teaching and learning. This shift requires institutions to navigate complex relationships between systemic quality management and classroom-level educational practices.

Today, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a rapidly advancing class of foundational capabilities which are increasingly embedded in all types of educational technology systems and are also available to the public. educational leaders need to bring these and their own policy priorities to the table at every discussion about AI, driving the conversation around human priorities and not only their excitement about what new technology might do. Fundamentally, AI seeks to automate processes that achieve goals, and yet, AI should never set goals. The goals must come from educators’ vision of teaching and learning and educators’ understanding of students’ strengths and needs (Cardona et al., 2023).

Studies show that higher education institutions struggle to balance compliance-driven quality assurance with innovative pedagogical approaches (Brennan & Shah, 2021). A comprehensive study found that 73% of surveyed universities reported difficulties in maintaining pedagogical flexibility while meeting quality assurance requirements. This tension between systemic requirements and classroom innovation necessitates a deeper understanding of how

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: ybhattajoshi@gmail.com

quality assurance and dialogic pedagogy can be effectively integrated. The significance of this integration has become increasingly apparent in the wake of rapid technological advancement and changing student expectations. Going forward, the modern higher education institutions must adapt to serve an increasingly diverse student population while maintaining rigorous academic standards. This adaptation requires careful consideration of both – systemic quality measures and innovative teaching approaches.

Within the above evolving context, the role of classroom dialogue has emerged as a critical factor in educational effectiveness, yet its integration with quality assurance frameworks remains understudied. While theoretical foundations ranging from Socratic methods to Vygotskian social learning emphasize the importance of dialogue in education, the practical implementation of dialogic pedagogy within quality-assured educational environments presents unique challenges and opportunities (Mercer & Howe, 2012).

## **Objectives**

This paper aims to: (a) Analyze the evolution of quality assurance practices in higher education within increasingly internationalized contexts; (b) Investigate the integration of quality management systems with dialogic pedagogy; and (c) Examine the impact of technological advancement on both – quality assurance processes and dialogic teaching methods.

## **Methodology**

This study employs a qualitative analysis of secondary literature, incorporating selected peer-reviewed journal articles, institutional reports, and theoretical texts. Adding self-reflection, the author focuses on patterns, challenges, and best practices related to both – quality assurance and classroom dialogue.

## **Quality Assurance in Higher Education**

The development of quality assurance in higher education reflects broader changes in educational governance and accountability. Knight (2013) traces this evolution through several distinct phases, beginning with traditional peer review systems, moving through standardized quality metrics, and arriving at today's integrated quality management approaches. This progression reflects the increasing complexity of higher education systems and the growing demands of diverse stakeholders.

Contemporary quality assurance systems face multiple challenges in meeting the needs of various stakeholder groups. Research by Schindler et al. (2015) identifies the complex interplay between students, faculty, employers, and accreditation bodies as a central challenge in maintaining effective quality assurance systems. Each group brings distinct expectations and requirements that must be balanced against institutional capabilities and educational objectives.

The impact of globalization has introduced additional complexities in quality assurance practices. International standards, such as the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance, require institutions to demonstrate transparent quality processes, meaningful stakeholder involvement, regular external review, and public reporting of outcomes. These requirements have fundamentally altered how institutions approach quality management and pedagogical innovation.

Recent developments in quality assurance frameworks have emphasized the importance of student engagement and learning outcomes. Effective quality assurance must move beyond simple compliance measures to embrace more comprehensive approaches that consider the entire educational experience. This perspective aligns with growing recognition of the importance of student voice in quality processes while analyzing student participation in quality assurance systems.

The practical implementation of quality assurance systems requires careful consideration of institutional context and capacity. Several critical frameworks have been identified for effective quality management through regular assessment cycles, stakeholder feedback, and systematic implementation of improvements. Similarly, integrated stakeholder engagement provides structured approaches for involving all stakeholders in quality processes. Lately, contemporary quality assurance increasingly relies on sophisticated data analysis by effectively utilizing learning analytics and performance metrics to inform quality improvement strategies.

## **Classroom Dialogue and Pedagogical Innovation**

The theoretical foundations supporting dialogue in education draw from multiple scholarly traditions. Social Constructivist Theory of Vygotsky (1978) has long back emphasized the fundamental role of social interaction in learning processes. This framework has found modern application in collaborative learning environments and guided discussion techniques that form the backbone of contemporary dialogic pedagogy.

The work of Freire (2000) on critical pedagogy further enriches our understanding of dialogue as a tool for

developing critical consciousness. His emphasis on problem-posing education and student-teacher partnerships continues to influence how institutions approach classroom dialogue and pedagogical innovation.

This author has observed the importance of cultural sensitivity in dialogic pedagogy, particularly in increasingly diverse educational environments, within Nepal as well as abroad. The real-life practical experience of educators well demonstrates how traditional dialogue-based approaches may need modification to accommodate different cultural perspectives on learning and communication.

Our understanding of practical dialogue implementation emphasizes the collective nature of learning tasks, the importance of reciprocal listening, and the need for supportive environments where ideas can be freely shared and built upon. Modern technology has expanded the possibilities for implementing these principles through various platforms and tools that facilitate both synchronous and asynchronous dialogue.

The evolution of online and hybrid learning environments has introduced new considerations for dialogic pedagogy. In the post COVID-19 scenario, the world has witnessed how virtual learning platforms can support meaningful dialogue while maintaining educational quality. Our own experience is that successful online dialogue requires careful attention to both technological affordances and pedagogical design principles.

In the recent decades, the line between the role of teachers and computers has been discussed in education (Cardona et al., 2023). particularly in the debates for terms, like “computer-aided instruction,” “blended instruction,” and “personalized learning”. Today, AI systems and tools are enabling the adaptation of instructional sequences to student needs to give students feedback and hints, such as in foreign language learning. However, technology processes theory and data differently than humans that may be biased or inappropriate vis-a-vis human assessment despite appearing to be more objective and authoritative. Whatever, this discussion about the use of technology in classroom pedagogy and student learning will continue to be renewed and intensify as AI-enabled systems and tools advance in capability coming to common use.

### **Integration of Quality Assurance and Dialogue**

The successful integration of quality assurance systems with dialogic pedagogy requires careful consideration of both institutional frameworks and classroom practices. Research by Biggs (2012) demonstrates that effective integration depends on creating clear connections between institutional quality metrics and actual teaching practices. This alignment ensures that quality assurance processes support rather than hinder innovative pedagogical approaches.

Institutional approaches to this integration have evolved significantly in recent years. A notable example can be found in the European University Initiative, where a consortium of universities has developed comprehensive frameworks that combine quality assurance requirements with dialogic teaching methods. This approach has yielded measurable improvements in student engagement and learning outcomes, as documented by Harvey and Williams (2010) in their longitudinal study of quality assurance effectiveness.

Professional development plays a crucial role in successful integration. Faculty members require ongoing support and training to effectively implement dialogic techniques while meeting quality assurance requirements. Studies by Mercer and Howe (2012) indicate that teachers who receive specific training in dialogic pedagogy are better equipped to create meaningful learning experiences while satisfying institutional quality metrics.

Modern interpretations of dialogic pedagogy include new theoretical perspectives and practical applications encompassing enhanced technology, cultural responsiveness, and interdisciplinary approach. Digital platforms can facilitate meaningful dialogue across physical and temporal boundaries. COVID-19 has already demonstrated how asynchronous discussion forums, virtual reality environments, and collaborative digital tools can enhance traditional dialogic approaches. While having so, diverse cultural sensitivity needs priority attention as cultural contexts just cannot be ignored for shaping meaningful educational dialogue. Once interdisciplinary boundaries are bridged, even complex learning can be achieved holistically.

### **Cross-cultural and International Perspectives**

The internationalization of higher education has added another layer of complexity to the integration of quality assurance and dialogic pedagogy. Knight (2013) explains how cultural differences in educational approaches can significantly impact both quality assurance implementation and classroom dialogue practices. These differences require institutions to develop flexible frameworks that can accommodate diverse cultural perspectives while maintaining consistent quality standards.

According to Matei (2016), self-assessment (also referred as self-review, self-study, self-evaluation) is a core element in most quality assurance systems. It is carried out by higher education institutions as part of their internal quality assurance, but it is also closely linked with, and forms a foundation for the external quality assurance process. A

self-assessment helps an institution check how far it is achieving its strategic mission and goals, and it allows it to prepare an action plan for further development. It is practiced by many higher education institutions in varying nature. In United States of America, self-reviews have a long tradition and are widely practiced as part of the institutional accreditation process. The US-accredited universities, therefore, typically have well-developed processes for self-studies, and are used to related systematic collection and analysis internal data. In Europe, self-assessment is comparatively newer practice but is widely spread lately.

Recent collaborative efforts among Asian universities have demonstrated the potential for regional approaches to quality-dialogue integration. These initiatives have focused on developing shared understanding of quality standards while respecting local pedagogical traditions. According to Brennan and Shah (2021), such collaborative approaches have strengthened regional educational partnerships while enhancing teaching quality across participating institutions.

### **Overwhelming use of technology in education**

The integration of quality assurance and dialogic pedagogy presents both significant challenges and opportunities for higher education institutions. Resource constraints often pose a primary challenge, as noted by Schindler et al. (2015), who identify the need for sustained investment in both infrastructure and professional development. However, these same challenges have driven innovation in how institutions approach both quality assurance and pedagogical practice.

Today, many priorities for improvements to teaching and learning are unmet (Cardona et al., 2023). Educators seek technology-enhanced approaches addressing these priorities that would be safe, effective, and scalable. Naturally, they wonder if the rapid advances in technology, including AI, in everyday lives could help. Most of us use AI-powered services in our everyday lives, such as voice assistants in their homes; tools that can correct grammar, complete sentences, and write essays; and automated trip planning on their phones. Many educators are actively exploring AI tools as they are newly introduced in the market. They use AI-powered capabilities, such as speech recognition, to increase the support available to students with disabilities, multilingual learners, and others who could benefit from greater adaptivity and personalization in digital tools for learning. The educators are exploring how AI can enable writing or improving lessons, as well as their process for finding, choosing, and adapting material for use in their lessons.

In a nutshell, technological advancement offers new opportunities for enhancing both quality assurance processes and dialogic teaching methods. Modern learning management systems can facilitate detailed tracking of student engagement while supporting various forms of dialogue-based learning. It is well proving today that these technological tools, when properly integrated with pedagogical objectives, can significantly enhance the effectiveness of dialogic teaching while satisfying quality assurance requirements.

### **Findings**

The findings of this study have significant implications for higher education practice. Institutions must develop comprehensive approaches that address both systemic quality requirements and pedagogical innovation. This involves creating flexible frameworks that can accommodate diverse teaching styles while maintaining consistent quality standards. As Freire (2000) argues, effective education requires a balance between structure and flexibility, allowing for meaningful dialogue within established quality frameworks.

Professional development emerges as a critical factor in successful implementation. Faculty members need ongoing support to develop skills in both dialogic teaching methods and quality assurance compliance. This includes training in facilitation techniques, assessment methods, and the use of supporting technologies. Regular evaluation and feedback mechanisms help ensure continuous improvement in both teaching practice and quality assurance processes.

Educators today are worried about new risks concerning technological applications. They recognize that AI can automatically produce output that is inappropriate or wrong and may amplify unwanted biases. They are wary that students may represent others' work as their own. They are well aware of teachable moments and pedagogical strategies that a human teacher can address, but are undetected or misunderstood by AI models. As the technological concerns are manifold, everyone in education has a responsibility to harness the good to serve educational priorities while also protecting against the dangers that may arise as a result of AI being integrated in edtech.

### **Conclusion**

The discussion presented in this paper suggests that successful integration of quality assurance and dialogic pedagogy is not only possible but essential for contemporary higher education. As higher order academic discourse continues to influence our understanding of learning processes, institutions must find ways to balance systematic quality management with the dynamic nature of classroom dialogue. This balance will be crucial for preparing students to engage effectively in an increasingly complex global environment.

The integration of quality assurance and dialogic pedagogy represents an ongoing challenge in higher education, requiring continued attention and innovation. Future studies should focus on developing more sophisticated understanding of how quality assurance frameworks can support rather than constrain pedagogical innovation. This includes investigation of cross-cultural applications, technology integration, and long-term impact assessment.

Today, many priorities for improvements to teaching and learning are unmet. Educators seek technology-enhanced approaches addressing these priorities that would be safe, effective, and scalable. Naturally, educators wonder if the rapid advances in technology in everyday lives could help.

In the above backdrop, it is high time that we engage our teachers, educational leaders, researchers, educational technology innovators, and policy-makers work together to navigate the emerging issues of quality assurance vis-à-vis monitoring ethics in our identical education systems. After all, academia has to determine the types and degree of responsibility technology must be granted within educational processes.

## References

- Biggs, J. (2012). Aligning teaching for constructing learning. *Higher Education Academy*. [https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/hea/private/resources/id477\\_aligning\\_teaching\\_for\\_constructing\\_learning\\_1568036613.pdf](https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/hea/private/resources/id477_aligning_teaching_for_constructing_learning_1568036613.pdf)
- Cardona, M. A., Rodríguez, R. J., & Ishmael, K. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence and Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations*, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology, Washington, DC. <https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf>
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th anniversary ed.)*. Continuum. <https://envs.ucsc.edu/internships/internship-readings/freire-pedagogy-of-the-oppressed.pdf>
- Harvey, L., & Williams, J. (2010). Fifteen years of quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1), 3-36. <https://www.qualityresearchinternational.com/Harvey%20papers/Harvey%20and%20Williams%2015%20Years%20Pt1.pdf>
- Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(1), 3-12. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263687801\\_The\\_changing\\_landscape\\_of\\_higher\\_education\\_internationalisation\\_-\\_for\\_better\\_or\\_worse](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263687801_The_changing_landscape_of_higher_education_internationalisation_-_for_better_or_worse)
- Matei, L., & Iwinska, J. (2016). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education. A Practical Handbook*. Central European University, Budapest, Hungary. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Liviu-Matei-2/publication/331345390\\_Quality\\_Assurance\\_in\\_Higher\\_Education\\_A\\_Practical\\_Handbook/links/5c74f6cd92851c6950415551/Quality-Assurance-in-Higher-Education-A-Practical-Handbook.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Liviu-Matei-2/publication/331345390_Quality_Assurance_in_Higher_Education_A_Practical_Handbook/links/5c74f6cd92851c6950415551/Quality-Assurance-in-Higher-Education-A-Practical-Handbook.pdf)
- Mercer, N., & Howe, C. (2012). Explaining the dialogic processes of teaching and learning: The value and potential of sociocultural theory. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1(1), 12-21. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257740026\\_Explaining\\_the\\_dialogic\\_processes\\_of\\_teaching\\_and\\_learning\\_The\\_value\\_and\\_potential\\_of\\_sociocultural\\_theory](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257740026_Explaining_the_dialogic_processes_of_teaching_and_learning_The_value_and_potential_of_sociocultural_theory)
- Schindler, L., Puls-Elvidge, S., Welzant, H., & Crawford, L. (2015). Definitions of quality in higher education: A synthesis of the literature. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 5(3), 3-13. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284217681\\_Definitions\\_of\\_Quality\\_in\\_Higher\\_Education\\_A\\_Synthesis\\_of\\_the\\_Literature](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284217681_Definitions_of_Quality_in_Higher_Education_A_Synthesis_of_the_Literature)
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. <https://home.fau.edu/musgrove/web/vygotsky1978.pdf>