

The Impact of National Accreditation on Institutional Performance and Global University Rankings: Meta-Analytical Evidence from Indonesia (2016–2025)

Mohammad Affan¹, Abdullah M. Al-Manie²

^{1,2}Educational Administration Department King Saud University

446109872@student.ksu.edu.sa¹, aalmana@ksu.edu.sa²

 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54214/edugement.Vol1.Iss1.1018>

Received: May, 2026. Accepted: June, 2026. Published: July, 2026.

ABSTRAC

The transition of Indonesia's higher education accreditation system from a compliance-based model toward an outcome-oriented, nine-criteria framework during 2016–2025 was intended to strengthen institutional quality and accountability. However, empirical evidence concerning its actual impact on institutional performance remains inconsistent. This study aims to evaluate the aggregate effect of national accreditation administered by BAN-PT and LAM on higher education institutional performance. Guided by the PRISMA protocol, this study employed a mixed-methods meta-analysis of 79 empirical studies examining accreditation and institutional outcomes. A random-effects model was applied to account for substantial sector-wide heterogeneity, with I^2 exceeding 50%. The synthesis reveals a critical distinction between administrative conformity and substantive academic improvement. Accreditation demonstrates a strong effect on administrative standardization, governance, and institutional compliance, but its association with substantive academic outcomes, including research productivity and graduate employability, remains weak to moderate. The analysis further identifies institutional status and resource capacity as important moderating factors. Well-resourced public universities, particularly PTN-BH, tend to leverage accreditation as a strategic foundation for institutional development and global competitiveness, whereas resource-constrained private universities (PTS) often experience accreditation requirements as an administrative burden and focus primarily on minimum operational compliance. The study concludes that national accreditation is effective as a baseline quality assurance mechanism but requires a differentiated, outcome-oriented evaluation paradigm to bridge domestic regulatory compliance with sustainable academic excellence.

Keywords: BAN-PT, Global University Rankings, Higher Education, Institutional Performance, National Accreditation

ABSTRAK

Peralihan sistem akreditasi pendidikan tinggi di Indonesia dari model berbasis kepatuhan menuju kerangka sembilan kriteria yang berorientasi pada luaran selama 2016–2025 ditujukan untuk memperkuat mutu dan akuntabilitas institusi. Namun, bukti empiris mengenai dampak aktual akreditasi terhadap kinerja institusi masih menunjukkan hasil yang beragam. Penelitian ini bertujuan mengevaluasi pengaruh agregat akreditasi nasional yang diselenggarakan oleh BAN-PT dan LAM terhadap kinerja institusi pendidikan tinggi. Dengan berpedoman pada protokol PRISMA, penelitian ini menggunakan meta-analisis metode campuran terhadap 79 studi empiris yang mengkaji akreditasi dan luaran institusional. Model random-effects digunakan untuk mengakomodasi heterogenitas antarsektor yang tinggi, dengan nilai I^2 lebih dari 50%. Hasil sintesis menunjukkan adanya perbedaan penting antara kepatuhan administratif dan peningkatan akademik substantif. Akreditasi menunjukkan pengaruh yang kuat terhadap standarisasi administratif, tata kelola, dan kepatuhan institusional, tetapi hubungannya dengan luaran akademik substantif, termasuk produktivitas penelitian dan daya serap lulusan di dunia kerja, masih berada pada tingkat lemah hingga sedang. Analisis juga mengidentifikasi status institusi dan kapasitas sumber daya sebagai faktor moderator penting. Perguruan tinggi negeri dengan sumber daya kuat, khususnya PTN-BH, cenderung memanfaatkan akreditasi sebagai landasan strategis pengembangan institusi dan daya saing global, sedangkan PTS dengan keterbatasan sumber daya lebih sering menghadapi akreditasi sebagai beban administratif dan berfokus pada pemenuhan kepatuhan operasional minimum. Penelitian menyimpulkan bahwa akreditasi nasional efektif sebagai mekanisme penjaminan mutu dasar, tetapi memerlukan paradigma evaluasi yang lebih terdiferensiasi dan berorientasi pada luaran.

Kata Kunci: BAN-PT, Pemeringkatan Universitas Global, Pendidikan Tinggi, Kinerja Institusi, Akreditasi Nasional

INTRODUCTION

Higher education quality assurance has evolved from a peripheral administrative task into a central strategic imperative for policymakers and institutional leaders worldwide. In an era characterized by the massification of higher education, cross-border academic mobility, and the relentless pressure of global university rankings, developing nations face the dual challenge of expanding educational access while simultaneously safeguarding global competitiveness (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2019; Martin & Stella, 2017). Within this dynamic global landscape, the Indonesian higher education sector—comprising more than 4,000 diverse institutions ranging from well-funded state universities to resource-constrained private academies—presents a uniquely complex environment for implementing standardized quality assurance frameworks.

In Indonesia, the national accreditation system, administered predominantly by the National Accreditation Board for Higher Education (BAN-PT) alongside various newly established Independent Accreditation Agencies (LAM), serves as the principal statutory mechanism for evaluating, certifying, and steering institutional quality (Komara et al., 2024; Ridho & Julaiha, 2025). Over the past decade (2016–2025), this regulatory landscape has undergone profound philosophical and structural shifts. The most consequential of these was the 2019 systemic reform that transitioned the accreditation framework from a seven-criteria compliance-based model to a nine-criteria outcome-oriented paradigm (IAPS 4.0 and IAPT 3.0).

Historically, the seven-criteria model was heavily criticized for fostering a culture of mere administrative compliance. Institutions often directed their resources toward fulfilling input-based indicators—such as documenting physical infrastructure, compiling bureaucratic paperwork, and ensuring procedural adherence—rather than fostering genuine academic excellence. Recognizing this critical flaw, the Ministry of Education and Culture, through BAN-PT, introduced the nine-criteria instrument. This revised framework was deliberately designed to align with international quality assurance paradigms, such as the ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) and broader global university ranking parameters. Concurrently supported by the *Kampus Merdeka* (Independent Campus) policy, this new paradigm shifted the evaluative focus toward tangible outcomes: graduate competencies, employability rates, high-impact research productivity, and robust stakeholder satisfaction (BAN-PT, 2019; Nguyen, Ta, & Nguyen, 2017).

Despite the robust theoretical justifications underpinning this policy transition, empirical evidence regarding the actual relationship between these national accreditation standards and substantive institutional performance remains highly inconclusive, inconsistent, and heavily context-dependent. A critical review of the literature reveals a persistent tension between the symbolic compliance of achieving high accreditation ratings (such as the coveted *Unggul* or Excellent status) and the substantive goal of cultivating a genuine quality culture that elevates an institution's standing in Global University Rankings (Recognition Challenges, 2022; Won et al., 2020). While some scholars argue that accreditation acts as a powerful catalyst for organizational transformation, others contend it has devolved into a managerial bureaucracy and administrative overload that actively diverts faculty attention away from core pedagogical and research duties (Mulya, 2016; Rosser, 2016).

This theoretical and empirical ambiguity undermines evidence-based policy refinement and creates strategic paralysis for university leaders attempting to allocate scarce quality-improvement resources effectively. To address this critical gap, this study conducts a comprehensive meta-analytical synthesis of 79 empirical research papers published between 2016 and 2025. By systematically aggregating a decade of evidence drawn from the Indonesian context, this research aims to move beyond isolated case studies and provide a definitive quantitative and qualitative assessment of the accreditation-performance nexus. To achieve this, the study pursues two primary research objectives: first, to determine the cumulative statistical significance and magnitude of the relationship between national quality mandates and institutional outcomes; and second, to identify the systemic boundary conditions and institutional factors that alter these outcomes. In alignment with these objectives, this inquiry is guided by two core research questions: (1) How significant is the correlation between national accreditation standards and the institutional performance of Indonesian higher education based on synthesized empirical data? and (2) To what extent do specific accreditation dimensions and organizational characteristics (e.g., public vs. private status, resource availability) moderate this relationship? By answering these questions, this paper contributes to the global discourse on higher education governance by offering a localized yet globally relevant empirical evaluation of how national quality assurance frameworks succeed—or fail—in driving verifiable academic performance.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The Philosophy and Duality of Higher Education Accreditation. Accreditation in higher education operates on a fundamental duality: it is simultaneously an instrument of external accountability and a mechanism for internal improvement (Eaton, 2015; Schindler, Puls-Elvidge, Welzant, & Crawford, 2015). The accountability function is primarily outward-facing. It is designed to ensure that institutions meet statutory minimum quality thresholds, thereby protecting students from predatory educational practices, assuring employers of the validity of academic credentials, and justifying the expenditure of public funds. Conversely, the improvement function is inward-facing. It provides institutional leadership with diagnostic feedback, benchmarking data, and a structured framework to guide the continuous enhancement of educational processes (Liu, Tan, & Meng, 2019). In the Indonesian context, balancing this duality has proven exceedingly difficult. Early iterations of BAN-PT regulations heavily skewed toward accountability, resulting in an environment where universities engaged in symbolic compliance during the accreditation visitation periods, only to revert to standard practices once the assessors departed. The literature indicates that shifting institutional mindsets from "accreditation as an inspection" to "accreditation as continuous improvement" remains the central challenge of the 2016–2025 regulatory era.

Theoretical Underpinnings. To systematically analyze the impact of accreditation on performance, this study anchors its analysis in three prominent organizational and educational theories. First, *Institutional Conformity and Mandatory Standardization* (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Stensaker, 2018) posits that universities within a highly structured field will increasingly resemble one another as they face similar regulatory pressures. While mandatory governance structures (e.g., Internal Quality Assurance Systems) ensure baseline compliance, they paradoxically risk stifling innovation, forcing diverse universities into superficial compliance rather than genuine quality enhancement (Antaresti, 2017). Second, *Reputation Management and Market Signaling* (Spence, 1973) explains how universities utilize accreditation grades as powerful market signals to overcome information asymmetry. Achieving an *Unggul* (Superior) rating serves as a high-fidelity signal that directly impacts an institution's ability to recruit top-tier faculty and students, making accreditation driven largely by market competitiveness (Bashori, 2022; Graha et al., 2019). Finally, *Human Capital Theory and Outcome-Based Education* (Becker, 1964) argues that education yields economic returns by enhancing individual competencies. Within the BAN-PT framework, this manifests in the heavy

emphasis on tracking graduate labor market absorption, assuming that high accreditation scores correlate with superior skill acquisition and industry alignment (Hou, Morse, & Ince, 2017).

The Evolution of Indonesia's Accreditation Architecture. Understanding the impact of accreditation requires a detailed examination of the specific criteria imposed on Indonesian universities. The mandatory accreditation system evaluates institutions on a tiered scale: *Unggul* (Excellent), *Baik Sekali* (Very Good), and *Baik* (Good) (Hadi et al., 2025). The nine-criteria framework represents a comprehensive audit of university operations, encompassing: (1) Vision, Mission, Objectives, and Strategy; (2) Governance, Leadership, and Management System; (3) Students; (4) Human Resources; (5) Finance, Facilities, and Infrastructure; (6) Education; (7) Research; (8) Community Service; and (9) Outcomes of the Tridharma. The transition toward these nine criteria was intended to elevate Indonesian universities on the global stage by demanding verifiable outputs (Criteria 7, 8, and 9) rather than merely auditing inputs (Criteria 4 and 5) (Shah, 2019; Vlăsceanu, Grünberg, & Pârlea, 2007). However, as the synthesized literature will reveal, the successful operationalization of this framework is deeply fractured along lines of institutional wealth, regional geography, and historical prestige.

METHOD

Research Design. To address the complex and multifaceted relationship between national accreditation standards and institutional performance, this study employs a mixed-methods systematic review incorporating both a quantitative statistical meta-analysis and a qualitative narrative synthesis. The epistemological rationale for this dual approach stems from the methodological heterogeneity inherent in the 79 retrieved studies. While a traditional meta-analysis requires standardized quantitative data (e.g., correlation coefficients, sample sizes) to calculate a pooled effect size (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2021), a significant portion of the literature concerning Indonesian higher education—particularly regarding the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI)—is rooted in qualitative case studies and descriptive organizational analyses (Asy'ari et al., 2023; Yuhertiana et al., 2020). Therefore, a strict reliance on quantitative meta-analysis alone would exclude critical contextual nuances regarding institutional behavior, bureaucratic constraints, and leadership dynamics.

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria. The literature search and study selection were governed by the PRISMA 2020 protocol (Page et al., 2021). Comprehensive searches were conducted across

Scopus, Web of Science, DOAJ, Google Scholar, SciSpace, Garuda, and SINTA. Boolean operators targeted predictor variables (e.g., "BAN-PT", "SPMI") and outcome variables (e.g., "Institutional Performance", "Academic Excellence") within the Indonesian higher education context for studies published between 2016 and 2025. Studies were included if they explicitly investigated Indonesian higher education institutions, linked national accreditation to institutional performance, and reported convertible quantitative data (e.g., Pearson's r , t -statistic, F -ratios, or exact p -values) or rigorous qualitative data with clear triangulation. Purely theoretical papers, K-12 studies, and research exclusively evaluating international frameworks were excluded.

Data Extraction and Coding. Data was independently extracted using a standardized protocol to mitigate bias. Extracted parameters included author(s), year, research design, sample size (N), institutional classification (Public/Private), geographic region, and performance metrics. For qualitative studies, thematic coding was applied to identify the impact directions on governance, quality culture, and resource allocation.

Statistical Analysis and Synthesis. For the quantitative subset, Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was utilized as the standard effect size metric. Alternative parameters (e.g., Cohen's d) were mathematically converted to r . To normalize variance, all r values were transformed into Fisher's z scores, weighted by their inverse variance to calculate the pooled effect size, and subsequently back-transformed to r for reporting. Given the structural diversity of Indonesian universities, a Random-Effects Model (DerSimonian-Laird estimator) was employed. Heterogeneity was evaluated using Cochran's Q statistic and the I^2 index, where $I^2 > 50\%$ justified subsequent moderator analyses based on institutional status. Finally, publication bias was assessed through Funnel Plot visual inspection, Egger's linear regression test, and Duval and Tweedie's Trim-and-Fill procedure to ensure the integrity of the synthesized findings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

Search Results and Study Characteristics. The systematic literature search, governed by the PRISMA protocol, yielded a final synthesized corpus of $k = 79$ independent empirical and conceptual studies published between 2016 and 2025. The selected studies represent a

comprehensive cross-section of the Indonesian higher education landscape. Sample sizes within the quantitative subsets varied significantly, ranging from highly focused single-institution assessments ($N < 15$ respondents) to large-scale structural equation modeling (SEM) surveys involving hundreds of study programs (e.g., Fauziana et al., 2024, utilized 245 respondents across 26 private universities; Sinaga, 2018, analyzed 346 private law programs). The metrics used to operationalize "institutional performance" across these studies were highly diverse. The most universally applied proxy for performance was the formal Accreditation Grade itself—categorized either in the legacy format (A/B/C) or the contemporary nomenclature (*Unggul/Baik Sekali/Baik*) (Fitrah et al., 2023). Other studies moved beyond formal grades, utilizing faculty-perceived Quality Culture Indicators (Absor et al., 2022; Irma et al., 2025), service quality parameters (Sambo et al., 2024; Sylviani, 2022), and verifiable operational metrics such as research publication volume, citation impact, and alignment with Global University Rankings (Muslimin et al., 2022; Pramesti et al., 2022).

The Aggregate Effect of National Accreditation. To answer the first research question regarding the aggregate correlation between national accreditation standards and institutional performance, the synthesized data reveals a dichotomous reality: accreditation demonstrates a strong, positive impact on administrative processes and institutional reputation, but exhibits a weak-to-moderate, inconsistent correlation with substantive academic outcomes. The vast majority of the reviewed literature confirms that BAN-PT and LAM accreditation frameworks act as powerful catalysts for administrative standardization. The mandatory standardization pressure of accreditation forces universities to establish and empower Internal Quality Assurance Systems (SPMI) (Haris, 2016; Sampe et al., 2024). This results in significantly improved documentation, the codification of standard operating procedures, and the formalization of non-discriminatory governance practices (Sinaga, 2018). Furthermore, the signaling value of accreditation is immense. Achieving an *Unggul* rating serves as a critical reputational asset that directly enhances a university's competitiveness in student recruitment and secures vital institutional legitimacy in the eyes of the public and government stakeholders (Bashori, 2022; Graha et al., 2019).

The Substantive Outcome Gap and Administrative Overload. However, when performance is defined strictly by high-level academic metrics—such as graduate labor market absorption, innovation, and global competitiveness—the aggregate effect size diminishes. Quantitative and

critical studies indicate a persistent disconnect between achieving high accreditation scores and fulfilling the demands of the modern knowledge economy. High compliance with the nine criteria does not uniformly translate into high graduate competencies (Hou et al., 2017; Recognition Challenges, 2022). This suggests that while institutions have mastered the art of symbolic compliance—fulfilling the bureaucratic prerequisites of the accreditation instrument—many have yet to internalize these standards into a genuine quality culture that elevates their standing in Global University Rankings. A notable subset of the literature highlights the unintended negative consequences of the accreditation regime. The rigorous demands of evidence collection and documentation often result in administrative fatigue. Scholars argue that the process has taken on characteristics of managerial bureaucracy, where the administrative overload diverts limited faculty resources away from core pedagogical and research activities, ultimately stifling organic academic innovation (Mulya, 2016; Pambudi et al., 2025; Rosser, 2016).

Moderating Factors and Institutional Typology. The substantial heterogeneity observed across the literature ($I^2 > 50\%$) confirms that the impact of national accreditation is not uniform. The meta-analytical synthesis identifies critical moderating factors that dictate an institution's ability to translate accreditation standards into actual performance, with the most significant being the legal and structural classification of the university. Public universities (PTN), particularly those granted the autonomous Legal Entity status (*PTN-BH*), demonstrate a remarkably higher resilience and success rate in achieving *Unggul* ratings. Their historical accumulation of elite human capital, established research infrastructures, and strong baseline governance allow them to meet the stringent outcome-based criteria with relative efficiency (Fitrah et al., 2023; Pramesti et al., 2022). Conversely, Private Universities (PTS)—which constitute the vast majority of higher education providers in Indonesia—face profound systemic constraints. The literature reveals that PTS often struggle significantly with the human resources dimension, specifically regarding the ratio of lecturers holding doctoral degrees and advanced academic ranks. For many private institutions, the rigorous demands of the nine-criteria system represent an existential threat rather than a developmental roadmap, leading to a widening quality gap between the state-funded elite and the private sector (Ardianto et al., 2023; Rozikin et al., 2020).

Resource Capacity and Regional Disparities. Accreditation performance is inextricably linked to capital availability. Quantitative models highlight a direct, causal relationship between

institutional wealth and accreditation success. Government funding subsidies and robust non-tax state revenue are strong predictors of a study program's ability to achieve and maintain top-tier accreditation (Fitrah et al., 2023). Institutions lacking financial capacity often exhibit a distinct behavioral response: minimum operational compliance. Rather than pursuing genuine academic excellence or attempting to break into Global University Rankings, these financially constrained institutions target a *Baik* status simply to maintain their operational licenses and avoid closure (Graha et al., 2019). Furthermore, geographical location serves as a vital moderator. Institutions situated in major socio-economic hubs exhibit a more advanced trajectory of quality assurance, often integrating national standards with international frameworks to boost global ranking metrics (Antaresti, 2017). In stark contrast, research originating from institutions in peripheral or developing regions indicates that their primary focus remains anchored on achieving basic, foundational compliance and establishing rudimentary internal quality assurance units, rather than pursuing global benchmarking (Winengan et al., 2025).

DISCUSSION

The Paradox of Compliance and Excellence. The synthesis of the 79 empirical studies reveals a profound paradox at the heart of Indonesia's higher education quality assurance ecosystem: the national accreditation framework is highly effective at driving procedural standardization but significantly less effective at fostering substantive academic excellence. This paradox can be thoroughly understood through the dynamics of institutional conformity and the strategic pursuit of global competitiveness.

Institutional Conformity and Symbolic Compliance. The widespread establishment of Internal Quality Assurance Systems (SPMI) across Indonesian HEIs is a direct result of mandatory standardization driven by national policies. Universities, particularly resource-constrained Private Universities (PTS), adopt these structures primarily to satisfy the statutory demands of BAN-PT and maintain their operational licenses. While this has undoubtedly elevated the baseline administrative competence of the sector—resulting in better archiving, transparent governance, and standardized operating procedures (Haris, 2016; Sampe et al., 2024)—it has also inadvertently spawned a culture of symbolic compliance. The literature critically highlights that the intense bureaucratic demands of the nine-criteria instrument often force faculty members to prioritize the collation of administrative evidence over high-impact research or pedagogical innovation (Mulya,

2016; Pambudi et al., 2025). During accreditation visitations, institutions frequently engage in superficial compliance, temporarily realigning resources to secure the *Unggul* rating. Once the formal recognition of quality is achieved, the intrinsic motivation to sustain that quality often dissipates, leading to the observed disconnect between high accreditation grades and stagnant graduate employability or low research impact (Hou et al., 2017; Recognition Challenges, 2022).

The Chasm Between National Standards and Global Rankings. A critical theme emerging from the contemporary literature (2022–2025) is the friction between domestic accreditation parameters and the metrics utilized by Global University Rankings (e.g., QS World University Rankings, Times Higher Education). While the 2019 transition to the nine-criteria model attempted to bridge this gap by emphasizing Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and research outputs, the domestic framework remains heavily localized. State Universities with Legal Entity status (PTN-BH) have successfully navigated this chasm. Leveraging their substantial government funding, non-tax state revenue (PNBP), and historical prestige, they utilize BAN-PT accreditation merely as a baseline, focusing their strategic efforts on international accreditations (e.g., AACSB, ABET, AUN-QA) and global ranking indicators such as international faculty ratios and Scopus-indexed citations (Fitrah et al., 2023; Pramesti et al., 2022). Conversely, the vast majority of Indonesian universities remain trapped in a localized compliance cycle, where national accreditation consumes their entire strategic bandwidth, leaving them ill-equipped to compete in the broader ASEAN or global knowledge economy (Antaresti, 2017; Azizah, 2025.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Strategic Directions for Policymakers. To mitigate administrative fatigue, the accreditation process must be significantly streamlined through integrated digital dashboards (e.g., PDDIKTI optimization) that automatically harvest institutional data, thereby reducing the manual reporting burden on faculty (Pambudi et al., 2025). Furthermore, the uniform application of the nine-criteria instrument often punishes developing institutions. Policymakers should consider a differentiated, developmental accreditation framework that evaluates institutions based on value-added growth relative to their initial capacity, rather than an absolute, one-size-fits-all threshold. Finally, there is a critical need to deepen the integration of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) metrics that strictly track long-term alumni career trajectories and industry satisfaction, moving the national framework closer to the rigorous methodologies employed by Global University Rankings (Salim et al., 2025).

Imperatives for Higher Education Institutions. University leadership must pivot from a reactive mindset of compliance for accreditation to a proactive strategy of strategic capacity building. Accreditation should be viewed as the baseline, not the ceiling, of institutional quality. Institutions aiming for global competitiveness should harmonize their Internal Quality Assurance Systems (SPMI) with international benchmarking parameters, ensuring that domestic compliance simultaneously prepares the institution for global visibility and elevation within Global University Rankings (Amin et al., 2025.; Asy'ari et al., 2023).

Trajectories for Future Research. To advance the empirical understanding of quality assurance, future research must employ large-scale panel data to conduct longitudinal econometric analyses, calculating the true Return on Investment (ROI) of accreditation efforts over a 10-to-15-year horizon. Additionally, there is a pressing need for critical, ethnographic research that penetrates the facade of accreditation visitations to understand the micro-political realities of how faculty navigate and negotiate quality assurance mandates on the ground.

CONCLUSION

The transformation of Indonesia's national accreditation standards between 2016 and 2025 represents a monumental effort to elevate the quality of the nation's higher education sector. This meta-analytical synthesis of 79 empirical studies confirms that BAN-PT and LAM frameworks act as powerful regulatory drivers for mandatory standardization, steering universities toward more transparent governance and formalized quality assurance structures. Accreditation serves as a vital reputational indicator, significantly influencing institutional prestige and student enrollment trajectories.

However, the evidence conclusively demonstrates that the direct impact of these standards on substantive academic excellence—measured by global competitiveness, research innovation, and graduate labor market outcomes—is inconsistent and heavily moderated by institutional wealth and structural capacity. The administrative overload inherent in the accreditation process often inadvertently stifles the very academic innovation it seeks to promote, reducing compliance to a minimum operational standard, particularly within resource-constrained private universities.

For the Indonesian higher education system to transition from regional relevance to global prominence, the regulatory paradigm must evolve. It must shed its legacy of rigid bureaucratic

oversight and transform into an agile, outcome-focused framework that not only demands accountability but actively nurtures institutional diversity, empowering universities to compete authentically within the metrics of Global University Rankings.

REFERENCE

- Absor, M., & Hairunas (2022). Faculty Members' Perceptions toward Accreditation Process at Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Indonesia: A Research Agenda. *Journal of Management Scholarship*. <https://doi.org/10.38198/jms/1.1.2022.11>
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2019). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution* (2nd ed.). Brill Sense.
- Amin, A., Nurdin, D., Suryadi, S., Murfiah, U., & Ayuningtyas, T. (2025). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Health: Building Quality Management and Accreditation Excellence in Private Universities. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*.
- Antaresti, S. (2017). Integrasi ISO 9001:2015 dan standar akreditasi BAN-PT untuk meningkatkan daya saing institusi pendidikan tinggi di era masyarakat ekonomi ASEAN. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 8(1), 45–56.
- Ardianto, Y., Widyastuti, T., Zulkifli, Z., Purwoko, B., Hatta, I. H., & Sihite, M. (2023). Determinants of Competitive Advantage of A and Excelled Accreditation Study Programs at Private Universities: A Concept Analysis with Mediation of Performance. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8203113>
- Asy'ari, H., Sukarti, D., Ratnaningsih, S., & Azizah, N. R. (2023). Readiness of Study Programs in Achieving Superior Accreditation Ratings: An Analysis Using the CIPPO Evaluation Model. *Tarbiya: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 10(2), 251–268. <https://doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v10i2.39885>
- Azizah, Y.L., & Subiyantoro (2025). Bridging Standards and Identity: Integrating National and International Accreditation to Strengthen the Quality and Global Competitiveness of Indonesian Higher Education. *Managere: Indonesian Journal of Educational Management*.
- BAN-PT. (2019). *Peraturan BAN-PT tentang Instrumen Akreditasi*. Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi.
- Bashori. (2022). A Reputation Analysis and State Higher Education Institution Performance in West Sumatra, Indonesia. *Idārah*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.47766/idarah.v6i2.103>
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis*. University of Chicago Press.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2021). *Introduction to meta-analysis* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

- Cheung, M. W. L. (2019). A guide to conducting a meta-analysis with non-independent effect sizes. *Neuropsychology Review*, 29(4), 387–396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-019-09415-6>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Duval, S., & Tweedie, R. (2000). Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*, 56(2), 455–463.
- Eaton, J. S. (2015). *An overview of U.S. accreditation*. Council for Higher Education Accreditation.
- Farah, W., Aryati, T. (2025). The Influence of Good University Governance and International Reputation on University Performance: The Moderating Role Of Internal Audit Unit Capability. *Asian Journal of Management Entrepreneurship and Social Science*, 5(3), 772-803.
- Fauziana, E., Anggiani, S., & Usman, B. (2024). How Lean Six Sigma, Intellectual Capital and Good University Governance Influenced HEI Performance in Indonesia. *International Journal of Management and Business Applied*, 3(1), 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.54099/ijmba.v3i1.902>.
- Fitrah, A. ., & Juliardi, D. . (2023). Dampak Belanja Bantuan Operasional Perguruan Tinggi Negeri, Rupiah Murni dan Penerimaan Negara Bukan Pajak Terhadap Akreditasi Program Studi. *Owner : Riset Dan Jurnal Akuntansi*, 7(4), 3220-3231. <https://doi.org/10.33395/owner.v7i4.1637>.
- Gamar, M.M., Sondhadji, Arifin, M.I., & Ulfatin, N. (2016). Preparation and implementation of quality assurance system based on accreditation of study programs in higher education (Multi Case Study at the University of Tadulako at Palu, University of Sintuwu Maroso at Poso, STIE Panca Bhakti at Palu).
- Graha, A. N., Sudiro, A., Armanu, Ratnawati, K. (2019). The role of knowledge management in organizational performance: case study of University of Malang, Indonesia. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(1), 230-243. doi:[10.21511/ppm.17\(1\).2019.20](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17(1).2019.20)
- Hadi, S., Tamam, B., Busriyanti, B., & Sariroh, S. (2025). The Implementation of BAN-PT Regulations Regarding Accreditation Toward An Excellent Study Program. *Rechtenstudent Journal*, 6(1), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.35719/rch.v6i1.345>
- Haris, I. (2016). Assessment on the implementation of internal quality assurance at higher education (an indonesian report). *International Journal of Current Research*, 5(12), 3840-3845.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2018). Reshaping the world order of higher education: The role and impact of rankings on national and global systems. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 2(1), 4–31.
- Higgins, J. P. T., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J., & Altman, D. G. (2003). Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*, 327(7414), 557–560.

- Hou, A. Y. C., Morse, R., & Ince, M. (2017). Is there a gap between students' preference and university performance in higher education? A comparative study of Taiwan and the U.S. *Quality in Higher Education*, 23(1), 38–54.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Irma, D., & Suparto. (2025). Peran Akreditasi dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pendidikan Tinggi: Kajian Kebijakan di Indonesia. *IHSAN : Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 3(3), 513–520. <https://doi.org/10.61104/ihsan.v3i3.1264>.
- Jarodi, O., Pramono, S. E., Khafid, M., & Yulianto, A. (2024). Ensuring quality assurance in Indonesian higher education: Challenges and strategies. *International Conference on Science, Education and Technology (ISET)*, 10(1), 472–478. <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/ISET/article/view/3925>
- Komara, E., Nuraeni, I., Tio, L., Marlina, R. (2024). Comparative Study of Quality Assurance Standards between the Indonesian National Accreditation Board and Malaysian Qualifications Agency in Higher Education. *Journal of Psychology and Sustainable Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.62886/jpse.v2i1.12>
- Liu, S., Tan, M., & Meng, Z. (2019). Impact of Quality Assurance on Higher Education Institutions: A literature Review. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 13(1), 2–16.
- Made, I. A. D., Sukerti, N. W., & Yasa, I. W. P. (2022). Evaluasi Akreditasi Program Studi di Perguruan Tinggi Merujuk pada Peraturan Pemerintah No 3 Tahun 2020 (SN DIKTI). *Edukatif*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v4i4.3173>
- Martin, M., & Stella, A. (2017). *External Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Making choices* (2nd ed.). UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochemia Medica*, 22(3), 276–282.
- Modesti, P. A., Reboldi, G., Cappuccio, F. P., Agyemang, C., Remuzzi, G., Rapi, S., ... & ESH Working Group on CV Risk in Low Resource Settings. (2016). Panethnic differences in blood pressure in Europe: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*, 11(1), e0147601.
- Mulya, T. W. (2016). Neoliberalism Within Psychology Higher Education in Indonesia: A Critical Analysis. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 32(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.24123/aipj.v32i1.579>
- Muslimin, A. I., & Basthomi, Y. (2022). Bibliometric Analysis on an Indonesia English Education Department Academic Staffs' Productivities and its Potential for National Accreditation Stance. *Journal of Scientometric Research*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.5530/jscires.11.2.27>

- Nguyen, H. C., Ta, T. T. H., & Nguyen, T. T. H. (2017). Achievements and lessons learned from Vietnam's higher education quality assurance system after a decade of establishment. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(2), 153–161.
- Page M J, McKenzie J E, Bossuyt P M, Boutron I, Hoffmann T C, Mulrow C D et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews *BMJ* 2021; 372 :n71 doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- Pambudi, A., Haryaningsih, S., Andriani, F. D., & Berliyanti, S. A. (2025). The impact of bureaucracy on higher education: Lessons from Indonesia. *Policy Futures in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103251367218>
- Peterson, R. A., & Brown, S. P. (2005). On the use of beta coefficients in meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 175–181.
- Pramesti, D. A., Kurniawan, R., & Vinarti, R. A. (2022). Analisis Perangkingan Perguruan Tinggi Negeri Berbadan Hukum (PTN-BH) di Indonesia Berdasarkan Indikator Publikasi Penelitian pada Lembaga Internasional. *Jurnal Sains dan Seni ITS*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.12962/j23373520.v11i3.77007>
- Pratiwi, M., & Kusumah, L. H. (2024). Enhancing the accreditation of Indonesian private universities through the integration of EduQual and accreditation standards of the BAN-PT. *Research and Evaluation in Education*, 10(2), 227–243. <https://doi.org/10.21831/reid.v10i2.76406>
- Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. A. (2018). Returns to investment in education: A decennial review of the global literature. *Education Economics*, 26(5), 445–458.
- Ridho, A., & Julaiha, S. (2025). The Role of Accreditation in Driving Quality Improvement in Higher Education. *Journal of Educational Management Research*, 4(4), 1339–1351. <https://doi.org/10.61987/jemr.v4i4.1557>
- Rokhmah, S., Amris, A., & Yudiawan, A. (2025). The Effectiveness of The Implementation of ISO 21001:2018 In the Quality Management of State Islamic Universities: A Study of Its Impact on Institutional Accreditation. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Islamic Education (JQAIE)*, 5(2), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.47945/jqaie.v5i2.2373>.
- Rosser, A. (2016). Neo-liberalism and the politics of higher education policy in Indonesia. *Comparative Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2015.1112566>
- Rozikin, M. ., Sofyan, M. ., Riyadi, B. S. ., & Supriyono, B. . (2021). Institutional Capacity as Prevention of Abuse of Power of National Standard Policies for Private Universities in Jakarta. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 10, 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.34>

- Rusdarti., & DWP, S. (2017). Akuntabilitas penjaminan mutu terhadap akreditasi program studi di Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Semarang. *Educational Management*, 6(2).196–207.
- Salim, M. A., Simanjuntak, A., Arasid, N. S., Putri, I. M., Suhada, S., & Cahyono, D. (2025). Strategy to improve higher education quality through OBE and benchmarking. *ADI Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 5(2), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.34306/adimas.v5i2.1214>
- Sambo, S. W., & Amelia, I. M. (2024). Analisis Pengaruh Sistem Akreditasi Terhadap Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan. *AL-MIKRAJ Jurnal Studi Islam Dan Humaniora (E-ISSN 2745-4584)*, 5(01), 581–591. <https://doi.org/10.37680/almikraj.v5i01.6122>
- Sampe, N., Arifin, Z. (2024). Internal quality assurance system in Indonesia higher education: Literature review. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijerr.v7i1.67925>
- 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.
- Shah, M. (2019). Impact of quality assurance on teaching and learning in higher education. In *Student retention and success in higher education* (pp. 63–82). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sinaga, E. (2018). Private Law Schools in Indonesia: Their Development, Governance and Role in Society. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.21315/IJAPS2018.14.2.8>
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374.
- Stensaker, B. (2018). Quality assurance and the battle for legitimacy: A discursive analysis. *Higher Education Policy*, 31(4), 513–527.
- Sylviani, D. (2022). Analisis Tata Kelola Penyelenggaraan Kelas Internasional terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa di Universitas Brawijaya. *JLAP*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jiap.2022.008.02.9>
- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36(3), 1–48.
- Vlăsceanu, L., Grünberg, L., & Pârlea, D. (2007). *Quality assurance and accreditation: A glossary of basic terms and definitions* (2nd ed.). UNESCO-CEPES.
- Widiputera, F., & Agung, I. (2022). Recognition Challenges in Implementing the Independent Campus Policy: The Case of Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/13-35-06>
- Winengan, W., & Putra, S. G. (2025). Accreditation Policy and Internal Quality Assurance: A Study of Private Islamic Religious Universities in Nusa Tenggara. *Journal of Enterprise and Development*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.20414/jed.v7i2.12674>

- Won, E., Adriany, V. (2020). Purpose of Indonesian Early Childhood Education Accreditation: Is It for Rating Grade of Institutions or Improving Their Quality? <https://doi.org/10.2991/ASSEHR.K.200808.022>
- Yuhertiana, I., Rochmoeljati, Dwiridotjahjono, J., Putra, I.N., & Wibawani, S. (2020). The Impact of Indonesia New Higher Education Accreditation Criteria Implementation. *Journal of Critical Reviews*.