



ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 05 No. 01. Jan-March 2026. Page# 8369-8384

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)**Impact of Student Voice on Quality Assurance in Public Sector Universities of Quetta, Baluchistan****Abdullah**

Student, Department of Public Administration, BUITEMS, Quetta

Syed Waheedullah

Student, Department of Public Administration, BUITEMS, Quetta

Muneer Hussain

Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences, BUITEMS, Quetta

muneer.hussain@buitms.edu.pk**Dr. Muhammad Asif Raz**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, BUITEMS, Quetta

Abstract

The current research is an investigation about how student voice can influence the quality assurance (QA) efforts of the universities in the Quetta, Baluchistan of the public sectors. The study understands that there has been a universal transition of viewing students as passive consumers into active participants in the design of their learning environment and therefore centers on determining whether and how, the feedback of the students can impact on the institutional measures to improve the quality and vice versa. Although HEC guidelines highlight a formal QA system, there is a disparity between the process of soliciting student feedback and putting it into practice and subsequent change which creates frustration on the side of students and inefficiency within the institute. The quantitative nature of the research design which is based on positivist philosophy was used with data being collected in a structured Student Feedback Scale, which was specifically aimed at factors of participation, perceived influence, and awareness of QA processes. The results indicated an outstanding, statistically significant, positive connection (Pearson correlation of 0.818) between student voice and quality assurance performance. Regression analysis supported the view that student participation is a key predictor of the perceived QA outcomes as the estimated variance explaining about 66.8 percent of the perceived outcomes behind student voice is significant. The research highlights the importance to shift focusing on tokenism of feedback gathering towards the meaningful participation of student voices in governance and curricular construction. The study provides practical analyses that universities can implement in order to reinforce the student engagement model with an intention of making the QA more responsive and transparent.

Key Words: Quality Assurance, Student Voice, Public Sector Universities

1.0. Introduction

Over the last couple of years, the global focus on quality assurance (QA) in higher education has fundamentally gained prominence as institutions seek to improve accountability, provide transparency, and foster continual enhancement. In this system, students are no longer assigned an educational passively; instead, they are treated as integral partners who help co-design and contribute to the academic experience. This change has triggered interest in the “student voice,” which describes the active roles students participate in regarding decisions that affect their studies and education at large (Hussain, Hassan, Khan, & Khan, 2026).

Organizations like the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education ENQA and UNESCO put great stress that for any QA mechanism to be effective, all stakeholders, particularly students who are the core of the teaching learning exercise, need to be included. Consideration of student feedback is no longer regarded as a useless exercise to please them but rather as an essential component that has to help shape relevant curricula or teaching methods or supportive services and more importantly ensure responsive, student-focused learning (Harvey, 2001; Trowler, 2010).

Nonetheless, the set-in policies regarding student evaluation forms, feedback surveys, representation in a committee dealing with quality, and even student governance structures have failed to address the persistent problem of the gap between obtaining feedback and actual implementing actionable steps. The overwhelming impression from students is that little is done to actually acknowledge their input. There is concern that their voices are not actually heard or that responses from institutions are simply patronizing. Such scenarios adversely affect relations between students and academic institutions, but more importantly, trust in quality assurance systems is rendered overly simplistic and pessimistic.

Although many Pakistani universities have implemented QA cells and feedback mechanisms as per HEC’s suggestions, the closure of the feedback loop informing learners how their feedback motivated enhancements remain inadequately addressed. Moreover, the accompanying cultural setting within Pakistan adds obstacles to genuine student engagement. This regard, traditional scholarly settings do not permit students to evaluate faculty and administrative policies openly. Even where feedback systems exist, frank communication is likely inhibited by the student-teacher power dynamics. Institutional actors, for instance, may be inadequately trained or motivated to meaningfully analyze student data employing a suggested change framework. So, the expectation that feedback is gathered is contrasted with the expectation that it is acted upon and how it is interpreted by institutional stakeholders is evaluated (Hussain & Durrani, 2026).

Our grasp of the social, organizational, and cultural dimensions that these systems is profoundly lacking due to the absence of qualitative research on the exercise of student voice within the QA frameworks in higher education in Pakistan. Most of the existing studies rely on quantitative surveys which provide surface-level data on student satisfaction without examining the rich, qualitative experiences of the students and faculty who partake in these processes. Thus, this research aims to fill this gap by looking into how feedback is actualized in a thorough, qualitative manner. It will assess the perceptions, experiences, and institutional norms that shape the extent to which student participation truly impacts quality assurance processes. With this approach, the study aims to expand the knowledge base about students’ participation in higher education governance and quality assurance in Pakistan and enrich

academic discussions, while simultaneously furnishing evidence-based solutions for enhanced governance participation frameworks (Ali, Hussain, & Sarwar, 2026).

1.1. :Research Questions

1. To what extent do students perceive that their participation influences quality assurance ?practices in public sector universities of Quetta
2. feedback and subsequent quality improvement What is the relationship between student ?measures

1.2. Research Objectives

1. perceived influence on quality assurance processes in public sector 'To measure students .universities of Quetta
2. ssuranceTo analyze the relationship between student feedback and quality a

1.3. Significance of study

This research is particularly relevant for the public sector universities in Baluchistan, which are struggling with several challenges regarding higher education such as insufficient resources, minor role of student in governance, and inadequate quality assurance mechanisms..With student evaluations of the quality of instruction and courses, feedback is frequently requested from students, but too often there is a disconnect between collection and use for the improvement of educational programs, teaching support, teaching quality, and services on campus.

In a province like Baluchistan, where a great number of students are from underrepresented and marginalized groups, an empowered student voice could lead towards more inclusive, transparent and responsive education systems. This study can help to identify obstacles, for example, in terms of administrative delay, follow-up or tokenism with regard to how students are currently perceived and responded to.

1.5. Problem Statement

Although universities are used to canvassing student opinions within their quality assurance (QA) work, more and more concern has been expressed that such opinions too frequently are not utilized constructively nor heeded. Students typically feel that whilst frequently asked to complete surveys or make comments, their opinions never lead to meaningful change. Institutions attend more to numerical data (e.g., scores and ratings), whilst qualitative student voices (e.g., anecdotal experiences and written comments) are not duly attended to nor systematically assessed.

This mismatch generates a gap between what is declared by students and what is acted on by institutions. In effect, students might distrust the process of feedback, and universities will lose potential insights that would enhance the quality of teaching. In spite of having mechanisms for student engagement, very little is known about whether student voices are effectively incorporated into decision-making and policy making. This study fills this gap by investigating students' perspectives on their role within QA and whether their feedback does result in change.

2.0. Literature Review

The significance of quality assurance (QA) in higher education is an issue of global interest in the past few years and this has led to institutions around the world making efforts to improve accountability, transparency, and continuous improvement. This repositioning of the role of students from passive

consumers of education to proactive participants, partners and drivers of the quality of their academic experience, has taken place in this context. This shift in paradigm has generated an increasing interest on the notion of student voice, with this term entailing the actual engagement of students in the decision-making that shapes their learning and general educational experience. Gathering student feedback has been a long-standing practice in universities; and such feedback has become an integral part of the national and institutional Quality Assurance (QA) mechanisms currently in place.

The idea of student representation, as it is developed in literature, encompasses institutionalized set-ups, wherein democratically elected or appointed student representatives in the university act to represent the general interest of the student body in the university governance (Matthews & Dollinger, 2023). The given model, which is common in most higher education settings, locates students as the agents of quality assurance, as they have to collect and share peer feedback, which is used to make decisions about institutional policies (Flint et al., 2017). Nevertheless, the critics draw attention to the exclusive nature of representation systems as only a few students can fill these positions, and their voices are often not heard (Holdsworth, 2021). Further, role ambiguity and advocacy-institutional conflict are common issues that are experienced by student representatives (Lizzio & Wilson, 2009) (Hussain, Ali, Hassan, & Khan, 2026). However, such limitations notwithstanding, representation is a key pillar of democratic involvement in higher education, especially in cases involving student unions that act as a dominant force in the policy discourse (Mugume & Luescher, 2015).

Instead, student partnership highlights collaborative and dialogical relations of students and staff and is commonly referred to as co-creation in teaching, learning, and curriculum development (Matthews & Dollinger, 2023). This type of teaching is based on critical pedagogy because it aims at breaking down traditional power structures, which defines students not as the passive users of education, but as its active participants (Cook-Sather et al., 2014). In the literature, the reciprocity of the partnership is emphasized, in which students and educators have a common interest in the realization of pedagogical outcomes, which promotes mutually respectful relationships and transformative learning (Bovill, 2020). Nevertheless, there are still growing issues relating to equal access to the possibilities of partnership, because either academically high-ability or socially privileged students tend to participate (Marquis et al., 2018). Researchers promote more comprehensive alternatives, including integrating partnership in the formal curriculum, to decentralize the field and give marginalized populations more golden opportunities (Dwyer, 2018).

Representation and partnership are two paradigms that are jeopardized by the mixed up of these two words. Matthews and Dollinger (2023) remark that partnership should not be viewed as a solution to all the shortcomings of representation; instead, they are used to perform different functions in the student voice ecosystem. An example includes the fact that whereas partnership yields relational pedagogies, representation brings about governance by promoting accountability. The authors caution against confusion of such roles that risk destroying the legitimacy of elected representatives and commercializing partnership into neoliberal forms, as consumer satisfaction ratings (Molesworth et al., 2011) (Hussain, Shah, Durrani, & Hassan, 2023). They rather suggest a combination of these two being represented: representation and partnership that will take into consideration both the strategic and operational aspects of student participation.

As observed in empirical research, the two models have an empowering sense and can have a revolutionary implication once deployed with determination and purpose. Pedagogical partnerships, as an example, have been demonstrated to improve student's motivation and sense of belonging and critical thinking (Mercer-Mapstone et al., 2017), and good representation systems result in more institutional transparency and student's advocacy (Klemencic, 2012). Focus should be paid to how the models meet practice, especially in different cultural and institutional settings, during the future research, in order to promote a more sophisticated understanding of student voice in colleges and universities (Hussain, Hassan, Khan, & Khan, 2025). The inclusion of student voice in management education in online learning has come to the fore attention given efforts of institutions to improve the quality of learning and inclusiveness. The model of online learning presented by Efthymiou and Zarifis (2021) is transferable and lies within the framework of social constructivism due to the experiences of a wide range of students representing 170 nationalities and 154 countries. They choose to research on the issues that learners in other parts of the world experience and provide viable suggestions to teachers and policy makers. In the eight-pillar learning model by the authors, much focus is being given to the factor of inclusion in education, enhancement of quality, and learner-centered options, which can be applied in different online management education environments.

One of the most important lessons Efthymiou and Zarifis (2021) have revealed is the value of interactive and collaborative learning experience in the online educational context. This meets the critic of social constructivist tenets that state that building of knowledge is a co-construction process that involves dialogue and joint experience (Vygotsky, 1978). The importance of discussion forums, peer feedback, and instructor presence to maintain student engagement appears in the study, a subject that was previously recognized during research (Dixon, 2010; Rovai, 2002). As an example, interactive components, including threaded discussions and interactive real-time feedback systems, were determined to reduce the feelings of isolation among online students that in place fostered the sense of community (Boling et al., 2012).

The authors also term technological and accessibleness barriers as the major problems of online management education. The problematic internet access and the lack of digital tools hit students in the developing world more than others, contributing to education inequalities (Luxton, 2016). Accessibility should be promoted due to the arguments of Efthymiou and Zarifis (2021) in favour of the adaptive design approach, such as mobile-compatible programs and low-bandwidth teaching content. This chimes with more general demands that there also should be universal pedagogical practices to meet the different needs of the learners (Moore et al., 2011) (Ahmed, Rehman, & Hussain, 2024; Hussain, Hassan, Khan, & Khan, 2024).

The other major contribution of the work is that it focuses on the issue of instructor credibility and communication within the online context. Suggestions that Efthymiou and Zarifis (2021) discovered include the ability of timely and well-designed feedback, as well as instructor involvement in class dialogue, is of high value in terms of increasing student motivation and perceived learning achievement. These results are in par with the previous studies of Imlawi et al. (2015), who found a correlation between instructor involvement and satisfaction and performance of students in online classes.

Therefore, the model provided by the authors emphasizes the necessity of professional development initiatives that could teach educators to use their skills to facilitate online learning.

Efthymiou and Zarifis (2021) have incorporated these ideas into a unified concept of managing online education, the eight-pillar framework. The pillars like collaborative learning, adaptive assessment acknowledge the increased focus on student-centered pedagogies whereas technological resilience concerns infrastructural issues. The model itself is not only consistent with the current global educational trends but also provides an individually expandable tool that an institution might use to facilitate better online learning experiences in a variety of situations.

It would be interesting in future studies to understand how this model may be applied in different fields and cultures and how implementing it will affect long-term student retention and employment. Also, it may be required to study the interaction between student voice and a certain number of emerging technologies, among which, there can be learning analytics powered by machine learning (Viberg et al., 2018), which could additionally shape the approaches to personalized and inclusive online studies (Rehman, Amjad, Karamat, & Hussain, 2026).

Qualitative student feedback in higher education has become more and more important as colleges and universities move towards better experiences of the students. The research by Shah and Pabel (2019) illustrates the importance of qualitative data in this specific case as the scholars can acquire a more profound picture of the student's opinions concerning various learning formats. According to their research, there are important dissimilarities between the experiences of on-campus and online students where dissimilar students on-campus mention the face to the face communication with lecturers along with the practical applications of knowledge whereas online students note the availability of the learning materials, flexibility of assessment practices and closeness of communication with the educators. These findings are consistent with the previous works of Bourdeaux and Schoenack (2016) who observed that course structure and well-timed feedback were especially important to online learners because they study independently.

Hypothesis

- (Ho) there is no significant impact of student voice on Quality assurance in public sector universities of Quetta.
- (H1) there is significant impact of student voice on Quality Assurance in public sector universities of Quetta.

3.0. Research Methodology

This research adopts a quantitative cross-sectional design to systematically evaluate the impact of student voice on quality assurance mechanisms within public sector universities in Quetta, Baluchistan. Grounded in a positivist paradigm, a quantitative framework is selected to objectively quantify students' perceptions, level of engagement, and self-reported influence regarding institutional quality evaluation and decision-making processes. The target population comprises undergraduate and postgraduate students currently enrolled across major public universities in Quetta. A stratified random sampling technique will be employed to select a representative sample, ensuring proportional representation across different academic disciplines, study levels, and gender categories. Primary data will be collected through a structured, self-administered survey questionnaire designed on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging

from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), incorporating validated operational indicators adapted from established higher education quality frameworks. Construct validity will be established through expert review, while internal consistency reliability will be confirmed using Cronbach's alpha. To ensure data integrity, preliminary procedures will include screening for missing values and verifying assumptions of normality. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations) will be calculated to summarize demographic characteristics and baseline response distributions. Inferential statistical procedures, including Pearson correlation analysis and multiple linear regression analysis, will be performed using SPSS to test hypotheses regarding the predictive relationship between dimensions of student voice (such as representation, feedback loops, and governance participation) and perceived quality assurance outcomes. Ethical considerations will be strictly maintained by obtaining informed consent, ensuring voluntary participation, guaranteeing respondent anonymity, and securing institutional ethical approval prior to administration. By grounding findings in empirical and statistically generalizable data, this methodology provides a rigorous foundation for informing institutional policy and enhancing quality management practices across Baluchistan's public higher education landscape.

4.0 Data Analysis and Results

4.1 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.900	2

Reliability of Data

The cronbach alpha value, that is 0.900, is very high and this shows that the survey or data collection tool employed is dependable. This implies that what is being measured by both student voice and quality assurance is well regulated in term of what they are trying to measure.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Student_Voice	212	1.00	5.0	2.9113	.79576
Quality_Assurance	212	1.00	5.0	2.8301	.78167
Valid N (listwise)	212				

Descriptive Statistics

- The average score indicating the level of student voice is 2.9113 (out of 5), implying that the average level of student voice or influence on the decision-making process connected with their education is moderate.
- The average score of quality assurance is 2.8301, namely a bit less than student voice score. This indicates either the lack of robust and effective quality assurance processes in the interrogated institutions or that the students are least engaged or even unaware of the quality assurance processes.

University

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	BUIEMS	100	47.2	47.2	47.2
	UoB	32	15.1	15.1	62.3
	SBK	80	37.7	37.7	100.0
	Total	212	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation:

Among 212 respondents, almost half (47.2%) of them are members of BUIEMS, 37.7% of Sardar Bahadur Khan (SBK) Women University and 15.1% of University of Baluchistan (UoB). This implies that there is maximum representation of those who are in the sample with BUIEMS followed by SBK and UoB reporting the least share.

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	16-20	36	17.0	17.0	17.0
	21-25	170	80.2	80.2	97.2
	26-30	6	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	212	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation:

The respondents mainly belong to 21-25 (80.2%) age category. The number that falls between 16 20 years is only 17 percent and the number of those aged 26 30 is very small (2.8 percent). This implies that the sample will be primitively composed of young adults of normal undergraduate age or early postgraduate age.

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	72	34.0	34.0	34.0
	Female	140	66.0	66.0	100.0
	Total	212	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation:

Approximately two-thirds (66%) of the sample are females and one in every three (34%) are males. This could be an indication of the true gender distribution within the target universities or it could be due to sampling decision-at least in case, it could be because of SBK (a women university) that may have provided a significant proportion of the sample.

Qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bachelors	182	85.8	85.8	85.8
	Masters	28	13.2	13.2	99.1
	4.00	2	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	212	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation:

Most of the respondents (85.8) tend to be at the stage of a bachelor degree, whereas 13.2 occupy a position at the master stage. The entry in the second column marked 4.00 appears to be some sort of data coding or entry error: perhaps a GPA entered by mistake instead of qualification. It is quite low though (0.9%), but it does not affect the general view of majority of them as bachelor students..

4.3 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.818 ^a	.668	.667	.45122

a. Predictors: (Constant), Student_Voice

Model Summary**Interpretation:**

R (Correlation coefficient = 0.818):

This indicates that there is a strong correlation between the predictor (Student Voice) and the dependent variable which could be, in this case, an example of quality assurance effectiveness just to mention a few depending on your research study. It can be seen that 0.818 illustrates that dependent variable is bound to augment with the augmentation of student voice.

R Square (0.668):

It translates that student voice explains variance of the dependent variable approximately to 66.8 percent. This is a rather large value in social science research, which implies that student voice makes a significant contribution to the result.

Adjusted R Square (0.667):

This value corrects R Square on the basis of number of predictors and sample size. As the number of predictors is quite limited (just one), the difference is not very large (0.668 0.667). It validates that the model is well-fitted and it does not overestimate explanatory power.

Standard Error of the Estimate (0.45122):

This means the mean distance between the values being observed and the regression line. A smaller value in this case confers that the predictions of the model and the actual data points are fairly close to each other.

In a regression model, student voice is shown to be important and is also significant as it explains approximately two-thirds (66.8 percent) of the variation in your dependent variable and has strong positive relationship ($R = 0.818$). The model fits the data seem to be good.

4.4 ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	86.167	1	86.167	423.212	.000 ^b
	Residual	42.757	210	.204		
	Total	128.924	211			

a. Dependent Variable: Quality_Assurance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Student_Voice

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)

Your regression output contains ANOVA table that is used in determining whether a general regression model (statistical model using student voice as an explanatory variable) significantly explains differences in quality assurance. The table illustrates that F-statistic of the regression model is so large and which in turn indicates the model is very significant as $F = 423.212$ and $p = 0.000$. This implies that chances of the relationship between student voice and quality assurance being exhibited to be by chance are very slim. Practically, the finding can be used to affirm that there is significant contribution of student voice to understand difference in the quality assurance among universities in the public sector. Regression sum of squares (86.167) shows amount of variation due to student say in the quality assurance and secondly the residual sum of squares (42.757) shows the variation not attributable to the student say. All these values taken together lead to the agreement that the model fits the data very well, and the conclusion that student voice has a significant and important role in the determination of quality assurance outcomes can be illustrated by these statistics.

4.5 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.492	.118		4.178	.000
	Student_Voice	.803	.039	.818	20.572	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Quality_Assurance

It can be indicated that the coefficients table indicates that student voice has strong positive effects on quality assurance in the universities in the public sector. Unstandardized coefficient ($B = 0.803$) reveals that in a one-unit rise in student voice, there would be approximately 0.803 rise in quality assurance score showing a strong positive and significant relationship. Since an intercept (the constant) interprets

the quality assurance level in the absence of student voice, it is 0.492. The p-value of .000 (which is lesser than the normal significance level of 0.05) indicates that this effect is indeed statistically significant. Consequently, we can discontinue the null hypothesis that expressed that no effects exist between the student voice and quality assurance. Rather the results reveal strong evidence of the alternative hypothesis: that the student voice is genuinely and positively related to quality assurance in these universities.

4.6 Correlations

		Student_Voice	Quality_Assurance
Student_Voice	Pearson Correlation	1	.818**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	212	212
Quality_Assurance	Pearson Correlation	.818**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	212	212

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlation

In the correlations table, it is displayed how important and strong the relation between student voice and quality assurance is. It seems that positive relationship between the variables is high because Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.818 and correlation is positive i.e. the higher the student voice, the higher the perception or the level of quality assurance. At a 0.01 level (2-tailed), the relationship is significant because the p-value is equal to .000 and it is rather less than the standard value of 0.05. This translates to the fact that there is a very little possibility that this association is as a result of chance. On the whole, this ensures that student voice has a positive and close relationship with the quality assurance in the public sector universities, and it complements the results of the regression undertaken earlier to argue that null hypothesis, according to which the variables of never correlation between student voice and quality assurance, should be rejected.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The paper is an evidence of the fact that student voice has a significant role in quality assurance in the universities of Quetta, Baluchistan in the light of empirical evidence. Although there are QA structures in place, the gap between feedback gathering and institutional action on their feedback has been restrictive in transforming the potential influence of student participation. The results which place great emphasis on positive extremely high relation between student voice and QA effectiveness raise important factors that urge universities to reconsider the current activities. This shift of passive

consultation to an active partnership would fill some trust gaps, increase the relevance of academic programs and ensure quality assurance processes are more dynamic and all-encompassing. Efforts to empower the voice of students are also critical, specifically within culturally sensitive environments, such as Baluchistan, wherein power structure might reduce open criticism. Through feedback loop closes, capacity building investments and developing intensive multi-channeled approaches to engagement, universities can turn student feedback into a source of real change and institutional responsibility.

Policy Recommendations for Universities

1. Feedback Loop Closure: Be proactive in regularly giving back to the students how their feedback was used to make specific changes in teaching, curriculum and services.
2. Student Partnerships: Institutionalize the concept of an institutionalized partnership that is student-centered and not just representative-based membership in committees.
3. Capacity Building This will involve training the faculty and administrators on how to analyze the qualitative student feedback and make positive use of it.
4. Cultural Change: Create open culture in which students can speak openly without being afraid that they will be punished because of their critique to the traditional hierarchical style of things.
5. Variety in Feedback Channels: To diversify channels of feedback, employ digital feedback mechanisms, focus groups, informal discussions along with surveys to accommodate the marginalized voices.
6. Monitor and Evaluate: Put in place measures that will monitor the effects of student opinion to institutional change that must be reviewed after one year.
7. Foster Openness: Post QA report on a yearly basis which includes the input of the students and the response of the institution to attain trust and accountability.

References

- Ahmed, S., Rehman, S. U., & Hussain, M. (2024). Interlinkages between Foreign Direct Investment, Energy Consumption, and Economic Growth: Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *International Journal of Experiential Learning & Case Studies*, 9(2), 441-461.
- Ali, D., Hussain, M., & Sarwar, B. (2026). Impact of Behavioral Aspects on Crypto-Currency Investment Decisions in Baluchistan. *ASSAJ*, 5(01), 7811-7821.
- Alderman, L., Towers, S., & Bannah, S. (2012). Student feedback systems in higher education: A focused review of the literature. *Quality in Higher Education*, 18(3), 261–280.
- Appleton, L. (2018). Understanding student library use through qualitative feedback. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(2), 251–258.
- Blair, E., & Valdez Noel, K. (2014). Improving higher education practice through student feedback. *Quality in Higher Education*, 20(1), 24–44.
- Boling, E. C., Hough, M., Krinsky, H., Saleem, H., & Stevens, M. (2012). Cutting the distance in distance education: Perspectives on what promotes positive, online learning experiences. *Internet and Higher Education*, 15(2), 118–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.11.006>

- Bourdeaux, R., & Schoenack, L. (2016). Adult student expectations and experiences in an online learning environment. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 64(2), 152–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2016.1229104>
- Bovill, C. (2020). Co-creation in learning and teaching: The case for a whole-class approach in higher education. *Higher Education*, 79(6), 1023–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00453-w>
- Brockx, B., Spooren, P., & Mortelmans, D. (2012). Taking the ‘grading leniency’ effect to the edge: The influence of student, teacher, and course characteristics on student evaluations of teaching in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(6), 637–649.
- Buckley, A. (2012). *Making it count: Reflecting on the National Student Survey in the process of enhancement*. Higher Education Academy.
- Canning, J. (2015). Conceptualising student voice in UK higher education: Four theoretical lenses. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(3), 261–271.
- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning & teaching: A guide for faculty*. Jossey-Bass.
- Davison, J., & Price, D. (2009). How do students evaluate teaching? The relationship between ratings, student engagement and achievement. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(5), 545–559.
- Dixon, M. D. (2010). Creating effective student engagement in online courses: What do students find engaging? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10(2), 1–13.
- Dwyer, A. (2018). Toward the formation of genuine partnership spaces. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1), 11–15. <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v2i1.3503>
- Efthymiou, L., & Zarifis, A. (2021). Modeling students’ voice for enhanced quality in online management education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(2), 100464.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100464>
- Fielding, M. (2004). Transformative approaches to student voice: Theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(2), 295–311.
- Flint, A., Goddard, H., & Russell, E. (2017). *Architects of their experience: The role, value and impact of student academic representation systems in Higher Education in England*. The Student Engagement Partnership.
- Gonyea, R. M., & Gangi, T. J. (2012). Measuring quality: A comparison of US news rankings and NSSE benchmarks. *Liberal Education*, 98(2), 26–33.
- Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Value-added analysis: Do student ratings measure teaching effectiveness? *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(1), 117–131.
- Grebennikov, L., & Shah, M. (2013). Student voice: Using qualitative feedback from students to enhance their university experience. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(6), 606–618.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.774353>
- Grebennikov, L., & Shah, M. (2013). Student voice: Using qualitative feedback from students to enhance their university experience. *International Journal of Education Management*, 27(3), 217–230.
- Grebennikov, L., & Shah, M. (2017). Benchmarking student experience: A decade of Australian experience. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 25(2), 180–196.

- Halloran, L., Pohl, C., & Whelan, L. (2014). Student satisfaction with a web-based learning environment: A qualitative study. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 35(4), 238–243.
- Hendry, G. D., Hyde, S. J., & Davy, P. (2007). Independent student learning: The role of tutor–student interaction. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(2), 161–172.
- Holdsworth, R. (2021). Give me a place to stand and I'll move the earth: Some reflections on 42 years of publishing Connect. *Connect*, 250, 6–10.
- Hoon, A., Oliver, E., Szpakowska, K., & Newton, P. (2015). Use of the Student Voice in Higher Education Curriculum Development: A Literature Review. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 39(4), 486–506.
- Hussain, M., Ali, M., Hassan, M., & Khan, H. (2026). Employee Education Programs and Organizational Efficiency: A Case Study of Islamic Banks in Quetta. *Kashmir Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 2(5), 133-141.
- Hussain, M., & Durrani, M. Z. (2026). Human Capital Management and Organizational Efficiency in Public Sector Universities in Quetta. *Journal of Language, Literature & Social Affairs*, 2(9), 190-197.
- Hussain, M., Hassan, M., Khan, H., & Khan, J. (2024). EXAMINING SPILLOVER IMPACT OF THE RUSSIA UKRAINE WAR ON THE STOCK RETURNS OF KAZAKHSTAN AND TURKEY. *ASSAJ*, 2(4), 1183-1191.
- Hussain, M., Hassan, M., Khan, J., & Khan, H. (2025). SPILLOVER EFFECTS OF RUSSIA UKRIANE WAR ON TRADING PARTNERS OF RUSSIA. *ASSAJ*, 3(01), 865-880.
- Hussain, M., Hassan, M., Khan, J., & Khan, H. (2026). Student Voice in Quality Assurance, From Feedback to Action. *Kashmir Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 2(8), 247-266.
- Hussain, M., Shah, S., Durrani, Z., & Hassan, M. (2023). Determining nexus between monetary policy transmission channels and GDP of Pakistan. *Journal of Management Info*, 10(1), 53-68.
- Imlawi, J., Gregg, D., & Karimi, J. (2015). Student engagement in course-based social networks: The impact of instructor credibility and use of communication. *Computers & Education*, 88, 84–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.04.015>
- Jackson, G. B., & Trochim, W. M. (2002). Concept mapping as an alternative approach for the analysis of open-ended survey responses. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5(4), 307–336.
- Kember, D., Leung, D. Y. P., & Kwan, K. P. (2002). Does the use of student feedback questionnaires improve the overall quality of teaching? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(5), 411–425.
- Klemencic, M. (2012). The changing conceptions of student participation in HE governance in the EHEA. In A. Curaj et al. (Eds.), *European Higher Education at the Crossroads* (pp. 631–654). Springer.
- Kinash, S., Knight, D., & McLean, M. (2015). Does feedback support students' learning? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(4), 488–502.
- Lewis, K. G. (2001). Making sense of student written comments. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 87, 25–32.
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2009). Student participation in university governance: The role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(1), 69–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802602000>

- Luxton, E. (2016). 4 billion people still don't have internet access. Here's how to connect them. *World Economic Forum*. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/05/4-billion-people-still-don-t-have-internet-access-here-s-how-to-connect-them/>
- Marquis, E., Jayaratnam, A., Mishra, A., & Rybkina, K. (2018). "I feel like some students are better connected": Students' perspectives on applying for extracurricular partnership opportunities. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1), 64–81. <https://doi.org/10.15173/ij sap.v2i1.3300>
- Matthews, K. E., & Dollinger, M. (2023). Student voice in higher education: The importance of distinguishing student representation and student partnership. *Higher Education*, 85, 555–570. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00851-7>
- Mercer-Mapstone, L., et al. (2017). A systematic literature review of students as partners in higher education. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.15173/ij sap.v1i1.3119>
- Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., & Galyen, K. (2011). e-Learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? *Internet and Higher Education*, 14(2), 129–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.10.001>
- Molesworth, M., Scullion, R., & Nixon, E. (2011). *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer*. Routledge.
- Mugume, T., & Luescher, T. M. (2015). The politics of student housing: Student activism and representation in the determination of the user-price of a public-private partnership residence on a public university campus in South Africa. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 3(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.14426/jsaa.v3i1.89>
- Rehman, Z. U., Amjad, S., Karamat, M., & Hussain, M. (2026). Determinants of Profitability and Success in Family-Owned Businesses: Evidence from Pakistan. *ASSAJ*, 5(01), 4775–4790.
- Rovai, A. P. (2002). Building sense of community at a distance. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrod l.v3i1.79>
- Shah, M. (2013). Student feedback: A tool for quality enhancement and assurance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 19(1), 47–61.
- Shah, M., & Nair, C. S. (2012). The changing nature of teaching and unit evaluations in Australian universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 20(3), 274–288.
- Shah, M., & Pabel, A. (2019). Making the student voice count: Using qualitative student feedback to enhance the student experience. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 11(3), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-02-2019-0030>
- Smith, A. E., & Humphreys, M. S. (2006). Evaluation of unsupervised semantic mapping of natural language with Leximancer concept mapping. *Behavior Research Methods*, 38(2), 262–279. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03192778>
- Smith, C., & Humphreys, M. (2006). Evaluation of student feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(5), 521–536.
- Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598–642.

- Steyn, T., Van der Westhuizen, G., & Van Heerden, M. (2018). Reflecting on the use of student feedback in curriculum development: A qualitative case study. *Journal of Education*, 72, 89–104.
- Symons, R. (2006). Analysing qualitative data in higher education: An overview of key issues. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(1), 15–29.
- Thomas, D. A. (2014). Searching for significance in unstructured data: Text mining with Leximancer. *European Educational Research Journal*, 13(2), 235–256. <https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2014.13.2.235>
- Turner, D. (2005). Benchmarking in universities: Learning from experiences. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 59(1), 34–47.
- Viberg, O., Hatakka, M., Bälter, O., & Mavroudi, A. (2018). The current landscape of learning analytics in higher education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 89, 98–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.07.027>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wongsurawat, W. (2011). Does student evaluation of teaching reflect student learning? Evidence from a Thai university. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(6), 544–559.
- Yang, Y. F., Yeh, H. C., & Wong, W. K. (2010). The influence of social interaction on meaning construction in a virtual community. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(2), 287–306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00934.x>