


Contemporaneous Approach to Higher Education in a Global Context

Tansif Ur Rehman¹, Mehmood Ahmed Usmani², Sajida Parveen³, Muhammad Ahad Yar Khan⁴

¹Department of Criminology, University of Karachi, Karachi

²Department of Sociology, University of Karachi, Karachi

³College of management sciences, PAF KIET, Karachi

⁴Area study Centre for Europe, University of Karachi, Karachi

Correspondence: tansif@live.com¹

ABSTRACT

Leaders of educational institutions must regularly evaluate the methods used in the classroom to enhance constant education and innovation. Leadership requires establishing new organizational frameworks and processes that would facilitate and support advanced learning and the capacity to measure the effects of education. Governments worldwide have gradually reduced their funding for advanced public learning, and the graduation rate has constantly risen over the last several years. Many Higher-Educational Institutions (HEI) are required to follow a transformation model to commercialize education to provide benefits to a large number of learners. The research explored the contemporary approach to higher education in a global context. A systematic review approach was used to conduct this research. The researchers elaborated that the path towards advanced education is beset with obstacles, threats, and worries that start with learning being regarded simply as a service, i.e., education is changing to a public benefit. Advanced education is growingly seen as an effective means of monetary growth. Although governments do not give universities much money, several countries have put high-performance Higher-Educational Institutions (HEI) study funding policies for focused programs. The research objectives were to discuss the dynamics of higher education in a global context and to elaborate on measuring the productivity of higher education in a global context. A systematic review approach was used to conduct this research. The key findings of the research emphasize the significance of money, accountability, efficiency, cost-benefit, and utility in comprehending the contemporary phenomenon of higher education in a global context.

Keywords: Accountability, Cost-benefit, Efficiency, Public policy, Utility.

Introduction

Contemporary society has undertaken a worldwide application sustained by technology. Institutions of higher education are required to provide high-quality education, particularly in technological competencies and skills, to an extensive range of audiences at a price that society could endorse. So, the question arises: what is the cost of that? When are the costs calculated? How are the findings evaluated? Technology usage can also raise costs without readily observable or distinct advantages.

Article History

Received:
August 4, 2022

Revised:
September 22, 2022

Accepted:
September 24, 2022

Published:
September 25, 2022

Several nations have placed quality control in higher education at the center of their policy frameworks. The leaders at educational institutions must continually review the approaches applied in the teaching procedures to improve constant education and creativity (Harrison et al., 2022). Accountability provides learning institutions with the evidence they need to make significant improvements to increase efficiency (Mahpudz & Palimbong, 2022).

Leadership should establish new organizational frameworks and processes that would facilitate and support quality education and the capacity to measure the effect of education (Waters & Leung, 2022; Young & Pinheiro, 2022). However, governments worldwide have gradually minimized their funding for public higher education, and the graduation rate has progressively risen over the last many years. As a result, many Higher-Educational Institutions (HEI) have to use a transformation paradigm to turn education into a business so that many students can benefit (Zhou, 2022).

The path forward for higher education is full of obstacles, threats, and ambiguities that start with education being considered more significant than just a service: education is becoming a community help. Higher education is gradually seen as an effective commercial growth (Young & Pinheiro, 2022). Despite small government funds, several countries have implemented high-performance Higher-Educational Institutions (HEI) research finance policies for focused programs to keep institutes responsible. People and administrators in several countries wonder more often what real gains society receives from the tax money invested in the higher-education domain (Waters & Leung, 2022).

Generally, education has been seen as a fundamental human right and a crucial aspect of socioeconomic growth. Financing education was considered to improve the welfare of people at the same time as increasing their human resources and economic potential (Alexiadou & Ronnberg, 2022). Besides, training has been used as a way of decreasing inequalities and a means for social growth. The capacity of countries to assume, spread, and optimize speedy technical and educational developments depends on satisfactory education structures.

Many leaders, nevertheless, considered education a luxury and not a facility. Some prominent policymakers have found higher education both commercial and social benefits. While education has increasingly been considered an export product, higher education specialists have viewed higher education as both a pro bono service and a commercial product (Buckner, 2022). While, scholars believe that globalization and internationalization have misrepresented higher education, causing it to be viewed primarily as a personally applicable product dependent on multicultural markets in global countries.

The future path for higher education is thus full of obstacles, threats, and uncertainty that started with education being considered more significant than just a product or a pro bono service (Jung, 2022; Karpov & Karpova, 2022). Besides, promoting and marketing education on the global stage has both beneficial and detrimental impacts on the prospects of international education. Consumers are constantly questioning whether students are acquiring knowledge and if educational institutes are delivering quality programs that justify their costs.

Study Objectives

1. To discuss the dynamics of higher education in a global context.
2. To elaborate on measuring the productivity of higher education in a global context.

Research Methodology

Numerous issues arise as a result of a large amount of scholarly literature. One is how to fully document and evaluate the status of knowledge on a specific aspect. A systematic review method is an effective tool for accomplishing this. The continual increase in research and the need to synthesize available content resulted in the formal establishment of the systematic review method in the late twentieth century (Chalmers *et al.*, 2002; Higgins *et al.*, 2011; Meerpohl *et al.*, 2012). The systematic review method comb through assesses and compiles all pertinent empirical information to give a comprehensive interpretation

of the study findings. Although the systematic review method is often employed in the social sciences, it is also used in management sciences, law studies, life sciences, earth sciences, and physical sciences (Gilbody, 2005; O'Hagan, 2006; Pullin & Stewart, 2006).

The systematic review approach has many advantages. To begin, they provide a concise and comprehensive summary of the available data on a particular subject. Additionally, it assists in identifying research gaps in a field's understanding. Furthermore, they can draw attention to methodological issues in research projects, enhancing future work in the field (Eagly & Wood, 1994). Finally, they may identify clear answers based on current data and do not require more study (Chalmers *et al.*, 2009). Conducting systematic reviews, particularly for new writers, demonstrates to be a valuable endeavor. Authors get a deeper understanding of their topic area of interest, generate fresh research ideas, and build critical abilities for synthesizing current material.

A systematic review approach was used to conduct this research. This technique highlights establishing the research objectives and comprehensively examines the subject's literature (Komba & Lwoga, 2020). According to Petticrew and Roberts (2006), the study results are categorized per the subject's topic. The study incorporates classified data by categorizing it into categories (Pawson *et al.*, 2005). The study's flow is determined by evaluating classified material and titles (Rahi, 2017). Victor (2008) mentions that the integrity guarantee is maintained by comparing the research subjects and their contents.

Consequently, this technique was selected, and the associated processes were observed. Reviewing the relevant literature resulted in accumulating data and information coded according to the study goals. The coded data were grouped by subject. After classifying and merging the subjects, they were ordered by degree of connection.

Results

Changing the Appearance of Higher Education

Recently, higher education has become a profitable commercial system by instructing a valuable service using knowledge-based materials. The belief that accesses to knowledge and education is a constitutional right, one of international society's fundamental privileges, is rooted in all of these concepts, and one could argue that it derives from them (Kalyanpur, 2022).

Globalization compels HEIs to evaluate their effect on the global context and determine their position in a free world. Information has opened up a vast new field of expanding worldwide higher education marketplaces. Because post-secondary colleges provide online courses, these marketplaces have entered the globe.

Higher education is widely recognized as a vital contributor to socioeconomic development. Unfortunately, the government's tax revenue does not keep pace with the rising cost of higher education. For institutions that have historically offered free or well-funded post-secondary education, the development of numerous students has been an important experiment. A financially untenable paradigm has compelled organizations to simplify the social compact between culture and higher education.

Utilizing additional human resources cannot have a good impact on production, but it does raise labor expenses. Likewise, productivity measures are contingent upon the debate. For example, HEIs have long offered the knowledge basis in a variety of fields. As knowledge progressively increases, often as contradicting research findings or academic debates, the topic will progress erratically and undergo sudden shifts.

Information collection makes it difficult for leaders of higher education institutions to gauge return on investment (ROI) or efficiency. Moreover, it is no more relevant than a department or staff member's average number of magazines or displays. Similar metrics, particularly the total number of credit hours, describe learning as a product. As a result, it is not easy to quantify the contribution of higher education institutions to the local economy.

Measuring the Productivity of Higher Education

HEIs rely on ineffective, externally-imposed efficiency criteria (Asad *et al.*, 2020). Despite the ineffectiveness of several reorganizations, activists advocated for decisive external output criteria without acknowledging the limited executive capacity of HEIs to deliver vital efficiency (Jung, 2022). The scope of the current output capacity program shows that higher education's survival may depend on instructors' capacity to evaluate efficiency in a confusing market (Bengu *et al.*, 2020) where output measurements are changing, resulting in activities with questionable consistency.

Without a balance between productivity and efficiency, educators may fail to meet the demands of their clients. However, there is no significant financial waste than spending money on the wrong things (Patrinos & Psacharopoulos, 2020). Therefore, HEIs striving to distribute dwindling funds aim to build consistent, efficient methods, although tasks are evolving in response to globalization's shifting economic environment.

The purpose of higher education is the proper management of academics, which necessitates efficiency. However, the expense of higher education must be affordable. However, its objective is not competence but rather effectiveness. However, not all educational duties may be accurately quantified (Shaturaev & Bekimbetova, 2021).

The leader may remedy the issue by utilizing efficiency measurements for certain operations. For example, how much does transporting twenty-five student-athletes on a basketball game tour cost? Educationists must be constructive and pragmatic. However, they should be more inclined to control performance, with a minimal emphasis on competence (Shaturaev & Bekimbetova, 2021).

Utilizing additional human resources cannot have a good impact on production, but it does raise labor expenses. Likewise, productivity measures are contingent upon the debate. For example, HEIs have long offered the knowledge basis in a variety of fields. As knowledge progressively increases, typically in the form of contradicting research findings or academic debates, the topic will progress erratically and undergo sudden shifts.

Money as a Primary Motivator

Gloomy international economies, resource deficits, declining government investment in higher education, and growing operating expenditures describe the existing higher education market (Tandberg & Anderson, 2020). Officials are under growing stress to collect proceeds and tend to have few choices to meet the requirements of their electoral districts (Fredricks-Lowman & Smith-Isabell, 2020). For instance, if they increased school charges, they would invite the wrath of pupils, parents, and the people who argue that they were achieving nothing by offering contact to various students and employees (Patrinos & Psacharopoulos, 2020). However, if they reduce expenses, they would suffer the anger of teaching staff, student service staff, and others who say that expenditures are being reduced to the detriment of excellence and lofty academic and student help principles (Jung, 2022).

The notion of higher education as a commercial enterprise is abhorrent to several faculties. Various educationalists experience much stress in behaving as a businessman and actively find new ways of making money (Fredricks-Lowman & Smith-Isabell, 2020). It helps intensify the teaching staff's mistrust because those at the college do not generally believe in the perception of the college as an enterprise.

Such innovative methods consist of tactics, for example, accessing new marketplaces individually or in partnership with companies or other non-earning entities, leaving current ones, and developing novel commodities (Fredricks-Lowman & Smith-Isabell, 2020). However, unfortunately, successfully creating revenues damages the philosophy of customary educational institutes.

State national curriculum and syllabus delivery prototypes, conventionally within the teaching staff's expertise, are generally established through lengthy working group procedures. In the existing environment of fast change, such committee procedures do not permit the dexterity or promptness needed

to fulfill the needs of a competitive marketplace. Enterprises with non-revenue organizations, for instance, could be enormously disturbing as two philosophies clash as a venture grows.

Conventionally, national curriculum and curriculum delivery prototypes are generally established through lengthy committee procedures within the faculty's expertise. However, in the existing environment of fast change, such committee procedures do not permit the dexterity or promptness needed to fulfill the needs of a competitive marketplace. For example, businesses with non-profit organizations could be very upset if two different ideas clashed as the business grew.

It is, however, evident that various managers are observing conventional orders in consideration of financial gains (Ayed *et al.*, 2021). As a result, online distance education has become a new revenue center where principal representatives are suppliers of computer accessories and content who envisage multi-billion dollars markets for their products. Furthermore, their educational cohorts foresee new income sources and more economical learning delivery (Karpov & Karpova, 2022).

The educationalists have contributed willingly to the 'commoditization' of higher education in all possible aspects (Fredricks-Lowman & Smith-Isabell, 2020). The focus has been diverted from the knowledge of individuals participating in the education procedure to the creation and recording of disjointed course materials: curriculums, discourses, classes, and tests, currently denoted as content in the summative (Harrison *et al.*, 2022).

Although it is meant to satisfy customers' requirements, the above unbundling of programs could be perplexing for customers and those designing a program. Both buyers and designers, more familiar with packaged syllabi that result in effortlessly recognizable qualifications, are tested to assess the worth of unbundled educational products. This misunderstanding is like that which occurred in the communications business recently.

Online services have now become an essential component of HEIs, generating billions of dollars annually (Sousa *et al.*, 2020). Some managers see significant potential gains in online educational content and services, while others create direct professional services (Youssef *et al.*, 2021).

Such services have a tremendous opportunity for profit since they are cheap to run, and the education managers have more freedom to fix higher school charges (Sousa *et al.*, 2020). Online classes appear to be very broad on such platforms, resulting in a cost advantage; casual jobs and attached faculties are freely offered to employees at low salaries. As virtually no specific kit or supplies are required, and contents are instead organized (Keller *et al.*, 2021). Providing a good education with the right student care services brings up new problems with program development, the amount of time spent online for student care, and getting in touch with students.

Accountability

The existence of accountability has been a problem for educationalists in schools (Brady, 2021), but only in recent times has technology been the subject of accountability (Daruwala *et al.*, 2021). However, in the contemporary world, the globalization of the present century is fueling the present concern about transparency since globalization is intimately linked to higher education, and learning seems to be practically linked to technology (Youssef *et al.*, 2021).

Besides, accountability offers HEIs the evidence it requires to create a significant change in performance (Brady, 2021). The critical notion is assessing productivity in service companies, namely in educational institutes (Sodirjonov, 2020). Initially designed as analytical/regulatory tools, accountability tools have evolved into implements for validating disciplinary action for managers and educational institutions (Daruwala *et al.*, 2021).

Transparency is aimed at improving efficiency (Paulsson & Macheridis, 2021). Secondly, the critical use of transparency is a measurement of efficiency through people, universities, and even challengers (Choi &

Chun, 2021). Finally, accountability is essential for quantitatively evaluating expenditure and HR use. The performance reflects outcomes from realistic accountability procedures (Daruwala *et al.*, 2021).

Efficiency and Effectiveness

Efficiency and productivity should go hand in hand with responsible learning institutions (Shaturaev & Bekimbetova, 2021). Learning organizations may exist briefly without flawless competence; they frequently perish if they are inefficient. Performance and efficacy features are primarily representative of spending on education. Other shared priorities of enormous productivity and enhanced efficacy are typically at the center of most educational spending.

Nevertheless, new international programs' feasibility and efficacy are essential to educational institutes' accomplishments (Alexiadou & Ronnberg, 2022). Moreover, in the present globalization era, all expenses must represent amplified productivity and better efficiency for the company (Buckner, 2022).

Efficiency usually requires a temporary reaction to transparency, whereas effectiveness determines a lasting response. According to Drucker (1974), "efficiency is concerned with doing the right things in the right manner" (p. 45). Unfortunately, efficiency is often brutal to quantify precisely in higher education for the reasons mentioned previously in this section.

As we have seen before, efficiency assessment metrics could be addressed regarding their effectiveness. The quantity of growth that specific organizations are supposed to help the knowledge base would show difficulty as knowledge gradually builds up, study findings clash, and matters concerning that knowledge have been discussed for several years.

Cost-Benefit

Education leaders worldwide are pressured to target, monitor, and reckon with individuals, programs, and procedures (Shaturaev & Bekimbetova, 2021). The disparity in amount vis-à-vis quality produces a toxic culture in educational institutions that intimidates the same individuals and services intended to assess accountability (Brady, 2021). The risk of assessing and enhancing features of the activity that are not important to the company's general efficiency is termed the risk of 'sub-optimization'—improving the output of ancillary or even insignificant phases of the process.

The challenge of under-optimization is particularly true in the contemporary world's vast and multifaceted educational institutions, with hundreds of subdivisions (Keller *et al.*, 2021). Due to the generally recognized education paradigm, transparency develops into administrative affectation, not comprehensive educational practices (Macheridis & Paulsson, 2021). For example, it is hard to figure out how many graduates there are, and since institutes vary in how good they are, it is even harder to figure out how good they are.

Utility

The definition of utility includes analyzing the total fraction of the institutions that use a specific commodity or facility. Unfortunately, worldwide educational institutes have been conditional on external transparency needs that have not been successful (Karpov & Karpova, 2022). Also, these need burden managers to buy products and amenities that have little to no use in the modern world (Jones *et al.*, 2021). Even though they are not very good at what they do, many countries with democratically elected leaders have pushed for solid transparency on the outside without realizing that education rules are not very well set up to produce actual results (Oleksiynko, 2022).

The accountability drive scale suggests that higher education's existence could strongly depend on the capability of teachers to prove efficiency and culpability in a disordered market (Young & Pinheiro, 2022). Besides, quality control in higher education precedes the program outline in various countries. Moreover, since the 1980s, universities have become more professional and creative because of pressure

from the government in the 'knowledge economy' and 'information society' (Chankseliani & McCowan, 2021).

The government's tax collections do not match the rising higher-education expenses (Tight, 2020). The growing number of students has been a big test for programs that make Higher-Educational Institutions (HEI) free or well-funded (Tandberg & Anderson, 2020). The economic vise has become an untenable paradigm, putting a strain on structures to radically reform the 'social contract' between HEIs and general culture (Bray, 2021; LahmandiAyed *et al.*, 2021).

Key Findings

The key findings of the research emphasize the significance of money, accountability, efficiency, cost-benefit, and utility in comprehending the contemporary phenomenon of higher education in a global context.

Discussion

Higher education is primarily acknowledged as an essential contribution to socioeconomic growth. Higher education costs are increasing faster than the government's tax collection. The development of many students has been a significant experiment for schools that typically provide free or well-funded post-secondary education. A financially unsustainable paradigm has drastically made organizations simplify the social contract between culture and higher education. More significant human resources will not positively affect the output but increase labor costs.

Similarly, productivity indicators depend on the discussion. For instance, HEIs have long provided foundational knowledge in many professions. As information grows, sometimes in the guise of contradictory study results or academic arguments, the issue may develop irregularly and experience abrupt changes.

Several academic institutions reject the concept of higher education as a business venture. The fact that various educationalists are under a great deal of pressure to act as business people and actively seek new revenue streams only increases the teaching staff's mistrust, as those at the institution do not tend to believe the institution's perception as a business. These innovative methods include accessing new markets individually or in partnership with businesses or other non-profit organizations, leaving current ones, and developing new products. Despite their success in generating revenue, they are detrimental to the philosophies of conventional educational institutions.

Accountability has been a challenge for school instructors, but recently, technology has been a topic of accountability. Nevertheless, in the modern world, the globalization of the twenty-first century is feeding the current worry about transparency since globalization is intrinsically tied to higher learning, and education seems to be realistically dependent on technology. First, the purpose of transparency is to increase efficiency. The second essential use of disclosure is evaluating efficiency via individuals, colleges, and competitors. Third, accountability is needed for quantitative evaluations of expenditures and human resource use. Finally, the performance represents the results of practical accountability measures.

However, the viability and effectiveness of new international programs are crucial to educational institutions' success. In the current age of globalization, all firm expenditures must result in increased production and efficiency. Effectiveness requires an enduring response to openness, while efficiency necessitates a short response. In the context of higher education, it is sometimes difficult to evaluate efficiency precisely for the reasons discussed in this research.

The problem of under-optimization is especially prevalent in the many sub-divisions of the world's enormous and complex educational institutions in the present day. Due to the widely accepted education paradigm, transparency has become an administrative fad rather than an integral part of educational processes. For instance, it is difficult to determine the number of graduates, and because institutions differ in quality, it is much more challenging to determine their quality.

Universities have grown more professional and innovative since the 1980s due to government pressure during the "knowledge economy" and "information society." Unfortunately, the government's tax revenue does not meet the escalating cost of higher education. The expanding student population has tested schemes that make Higher-Education Institutions accessible or well-funded. The economic vice has become an intolerable paradigm, placing pressure on organizations to restructure the 'social contract' between HEIs and broader society substantially.

Conclusion

Higher education is a component of global and economic developments. Higher education is at a crucial juncture, with several alternatives and an uncertain future. A number of these reforms are already prepared and require detailed responses from the legislators and organizers. However, distance learning, connectivity, and cost-effectiveness are all important domains for policy discussions and the aim of HEIs. Technology is now accessible to make higher education obtainable everywhere and everywhere. It makes education a crucial part of creating a global world that is inundated by international marketing. It led to the query: if higher education a product to be purchased and traded, or is it a facility for the development of financial globalization? The critical student development in this international marketplace is generally mobile in professional education and computations. However, higher education is necessary for developing, sharing, and applying the information in an international market with numerous unintentional concerns, such as transparency. Globalization creates an environment for HEIs where expertise and data are much valued. The most exemplary case is the web-based Internet technology that encourages remarkable profitability, makes a more significant input to disseminating knowledge and data, and should be seen via the prism of technology and transparency. Hence, what should be determined would be the syllabus options that would be most applicable to a market that would experience drastic and relentless transformation in the coming century.

Recommendations

1. Utilization of technology to be ensured by HEI.
2. HEI should enhance educational quality.
3. HEI and the government should focus on access to education.
4. Increased funding by government and non-government sectors should be sought.
5. Promoting and encouraging the culture of research by HEI and the government is needed.
6. HEI and the government should increase exchange programs.
7. A lot needs to be done in the sphere of interactive learning by HEI and the government.
8. Administering the faculty by HEI and the government is of utmost attention.
9. HEI should increase the access to digital classrooms.
10. HEI and government should strictly monitor the student-to-teacher ratio.

Acknowledgements

None


Conflict of Interest

Authors have no conflict of interest.

Funding Source

The authors received no funding to conduct this study.

ORCID iDs

Tansif Ur Rehman¹  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5454-2150>

References

- Alexiadou, N., & Ronnberg, L. (2022). Reading the internationalisation imperative in higher education institutions: external contexts and internal positionings. *Higher Education Policy*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-021-00260-y>
- Asad, M. M., Hussain, N., Wadho, M., Khand, Z. H., & Churi, P. P. (2020). Integration of e-learning technologies for interactive teaching and learning process: an empirical study on higher education institutes of Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-04-2020-0103>
- Bengu, E. L. İ. F., Abrignani, E., Sabuncuoğlu, İ., & Yılmaz, C. E. N. G. İ. Z. (2020). Rethinking higher education for the emerging needs of society. *Global Solutions Summit 2020 Edition*, 5.
- Brady, A. M. (2021). Response and responsibility: Rethinking accountability in education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 55(1), 25-40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12501>
- Bray, M. (2021). Shadow education in Europe: Growing prevalence, underlying forces, and policy implications. *ECNU Review of Education*, 4(3), 442-475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2096531119890142>
- Buckner, E. (2022). Embracing the global: The role of ranking, research mandate, and sector in the internationalisation of higher education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 52(2), 232-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2020.1753499>
- Chalmers, I., & Glasziou, P. (2009). Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of research evidence. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 114(6), 1341-5. 10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181c3020d
- Chalmers, I., Hedges, L. V., & Cooper, H. (2002). *A brief history of research synthesis*. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 25(1), 12-37. 10.1177/0163278702025001003
- Chankseliani, M., & McCowan, T. (2021). Higher education and the sustainable development goals. *Higher Education*, 81(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00652-w>
- Choi, S., & Chun, Y. H. (2021). Accountability and organizational performance in the public sector: Analysis of higher education institutions in Korea. *Public Administration*, 99(2), 353-370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12683>
- Daruwala, I., Bretas, S., & Ready, D. D. (2021). When logics collide: Implementing technology-enabled personalization in the age of accountability. *Educational Researcher*, 50(3), 157-164. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20960674>
- Drucker, P. F. (1974). *Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices*. Harper & Row.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1994). Using research syntheses to plan future research. In H. Cooper & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 485–500). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Fredricks-Lowman, I., & Smith-Isabell, N. (2020). Academic capitalism and the conflicting ideologies of higher education as a public good and commodity. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 19(2), 21-27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20388>
- Gilbody, S., Wilson, P., & Watt, I. (2005). Benefits and harms of direct to consumer advertising: A systematic review. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 14(4), 246-50. 10.1136/qshc.2004.012781
- Harrison, R., Meyer, L., Rawstorne, P., Razee, H., Chitkara, U., Mears, S., & Balasooriya, C. (2022). Evaluating and enhancing quality in higher education teaching practice: a meta-review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(1), 80-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1730315>
- Higgins, J. P. T., & Green, S. (2011). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. The Cochrane Collaboration. 10.1002/9780470712184

- Jones, E., Leask, B., Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2021). Global social responsibility and the internationalisation of higher education for society. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 25(4), 330-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153211031679>
- Jung, J. (2022). Working to learn and learning to work: Research on higher education and the world of work. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(1), 92-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.2002274>
- Kalyanpur, M. (2022). The global context for inclusive education. In *Development, education and learning disability in India* (pp. 35-60). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83989-5_2
- Karpov, E. S., & Karpova, E. G. (2022). Digitalization of higher education in the context of globalization. *KnE Social Sciences*, 9-19. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i3.10270>
- Keller, J. M., Ucar, H., & Kumtepe, A. T. (2021). Culture and motivation in globalized open and distance learning spaces. In *Research Anthology on Developing Effective Online Learning Courses* (pp. 1246-1265). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8047-9.ch061>
- Komba, M. M., & Lwoga, E. T. (2020). *Systematic review as a research method in library and information science*. 10.4018/978-1-7998-1471-9.ch005.
- Lahmandi-Ayed, R., Lasram, H., & Laussel, D. (2021). Is partial privatization of universities a solution for higher education? *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 23(6), 1174-1198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpet.12531>
- Macheridis, N., & Paulsson, A. (2021). Tracing accountability in higher education. *Research in Education*, 110(1), 78-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034523721993143>
- Mahpudz, A., & Palimbong, A. (2022, January). Designing tolerance learning in higher education to prepare students as global citizens. In *Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2021)* (pp. 32-38). Atlantis Press.
- Meerpohl, J. J., Herrle, F., Reinders, S. (2012). Scientific value of systematic reviews: Survey of editors of core clinical journals. *PLoS One*, 7(5), e35732. 10.1371/journal.pone.0035732
- O'Hagan, E. C., Matalon, S., & Riesenber, L.A. (2018). *Systematic reviews of the literature: A better way of addressing basic science controversies*. American Physiological Society. 10.1152/ajplung.00544.2017
- Oleksiyenko, A. (2022). On politics in comparative and international higher education. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada*, (40), 50-68. <https://doi.org/10.5944/reec.40.2022.31203>
- Patrinos, H. A., & Psacharopoulos, G. (2020). Returns to education in developing countries. In *The Economics of education* (pp. 53-64). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815391-8.00004-5>
- Pawson, R., Greenhalgh, T., Harvey, G., & Walshe, K. (2005). Realist review - A new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 10(1), 21-34.
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. 10.1002/9780470754887
- Pullin, A. S., & Stewart, G. B. (2006). Guidelines for systematic review in conservation and environmental management. *Conservation Biology*, 20(6), 1647-56. 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00485.x

- Rahi, S. (2017). Research design and methods: A systematic review of research paradigms, sampling issues, and instruments development. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, (6). 10.4172/2162-6359.1000403.
- Safdar, G., Javed, M.N., Amin, S. (2020). Use of Internet for Educational Learning among Female University Students of Punjab, Pakistan. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(8), 3371-3380.
- Safdar, G., Khan, A.W. (2020). E-Learning: Current Scenario of Internet and Educational Learning among University Students of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Educational Research*, 23(1), 171-185.
- Safdar, G., Rauf, A., Ullah, R., Rehman, A.U. (2020). Exploring Factors Leading to Quality Online Learning in the Era of Covid-19: A Correlation Model Study. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(12A), 7324-7329.
- Shabir, G., Safdar, G., Imran, M. (2014). Higher Education and its Importance for citizen: a Comparative Analysis of UK and USA. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(25), 17-23.
- Shabir, G., Safdar, G., Jamil, T., Bano, S. (2015). Mass Media, Communication and Globalization with the perspective of 21st century. *New Media and Mass Communication*, 34, 11-15.
- Shabir, G., Safdar, G., Shah, S.R.A., Asim, M. (2014). Iranian Higher Educational System and its Socio-Political Impacts in 21st Century. *Journals of Educational Research*, 17(2), 107-116.
- Shaturaev, J., & Bekimbetova, G. (2021). The difference between educational management and educational leadership and the importance of educational responsibility. *InterConf*.
- Sodirjonov, M. M. (2020). Education as the most important factor of human capital development. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 901-905. <https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.161>
- Sousa, R. D., Karimova, B., & Gorlov, S. (2020). Digitalization as a new direction in education sphere. In *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 159, p. 09014). EDP Sciences.
- Tandberg, D. A., & Anderson, C. K. (2020). Funding Higher Education for the Public Good. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 52(5), 41-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2020.1807882>
- Tight, M. (2020). Student retention and engagement in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(5), 689-704. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1576860>
- Tight, M. (2021). Globalization and internationalization as frameworks for higher education research. *Research Papers in Education*, 36(1), 52-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2019.1633560>
- Victor, L. (2008). Systematic reviewing in the social sciences: Outcomes and explanation. *Enquire 1*(1), 32-46.
- Waters, J., & Leung, M. W. (2022). Transnational higher education. In *Handbook on transnationalism*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789904017>
- Young, M., & Pinheiro, R. (2022). The post-entrepreneurial university: The case for resilience in higher education. In *Towards resilient organizations and societies* (pp. 173-193). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82072-5_7
- Youssef, A. B., Boubaker, S., Dedaj, B., & Carabregu-Vokshi, M. (2021). Digitalization of the economy and entrepreneurship intention. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 164, 120043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120043>
- Zhou, J. (2022). Global learning: Definition, assessment, and approaches. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 6(2), 115-132. <https://www.doi.org/10.5038/2577-509X.6.2.1148>