

Balancing standardization and personalization in Higher Education Quality Assurance: Insights from Jordanian Universities

RANDA KHIRFAN¹, SHABAN SINNOKROT², HEBA KOTB³

¹Health Management and Hospital Administration
Faculty of Nursing, Amman
Middle East University
Jordan
r.khirfan@meu.edu.jo

²Department of Clinical Nursing
Faculty of Nursing
Zarqa University
Jordan
Ssinnokrot@zu.edu.jo

³Faculty of Nursing
Assiut University
Egypt
Zarqa University
Jordan

ABSTRACT

Balancing standardization and personalization in quality assurance remains a key challenge for higher education systems worldwide. This study examines Jordanian academics' perceptions of these two approaches and their relationship with perceived educational quality. A cross-sectional online survey was conducted with 200 academics from Jordanian universities. Composite indices were developed to measure standardization, personalization, and perceived quality, and Pearson correlation analysis was applied. Results showed strong support for standardization ($M=6.14-6.36$) but no significant association with perceived quality ($r = -0.08$). Personalization practices showed moderate implementation ($M=4.67-5.11$) and were positively associated with perceived quality ($r=+0.27$). The findings highlight the need to integrate personalization within accreditation frameworks.

KEYWORDS

Higher Education Quality Assurance, standardization, personalization, academician perceptions, Jordanian Universities

RÉSUMÉ

Équilibrer la standardisation et la personnalisation en assurance qualité reste un défi majeur pour les systèmes d'enseignement supérieur dans le monde entier. Cette étude examine la perception que les universitaires jordaniens ont de ces deux approches et leur relation avec la qualité perçue de l'éducation. Une enquête transversale en ligne a été réalisée auprès de 200 universitaires issus d'universités jordaniennes. Des indices composites ont été développés pour

mesurer la standardisation, la personnalisation et la qualité perçue, et une analyse de corrélation de Pearson a été appliquée. Les résultats ont montré un fort soutien à la standardisation ($M=6,14-6,36$) mais aucune association significative avec la qualité perçue ($r=-0,08$). Les pratiques de personnalisation ont montré une mise en œuvre modérée ($M=67-5,11$) et 4. étaient positivement associés à la qualité perçue ($r=+0,27$). Les résultats soulignent la nécessité d'intégrer la personnalisation dans les cadres d'accréditation.

MOTS-CLÉS

Assurance qualité de l'enseignement supérieur, standardisation, personnalisation, perceptions des académiciens, universités jordaniennes

INTRODUCTION

Higher education shapes the foundation for intellectual development, professional preparation, and societal development. As institutions demand balancing global competitiveness with national educational needs, continually stressing disputes arise between systems of standardization and personalization in higher education. The higher education system has recently witnessed a considerable shift guided by globalization, digitalization, international rankings, and accountability mechanisms. These advances increase the debate on standardization and personalization as complementary paradigms. Several scholars have emphasized hybrid governance models that merge institutional accountability with learner-centered innovation.

Standardization strengthens balance and reliability using unified curricula, teaching strategies, assessment methods, and accreditation standards. Standardization includes outcome-based education, competency frameworks, international benchmarking, and performance-dependent funding strategies. International studies have revealed the significance of standardizing quality indicators to establish institutional legitimacy and graduate mobility. Conversely, personalization focuses on flexibility and learner-centered education customized to individual needs and learning styles. Many researchers have linked personalization to digital transformation, AI-assisted adaptive learning, comprehensive education policies, and assessment methods to suit diverse student populations. Currently, personalization is recognized as an efficient path for solidifying student engagement, retention, and institutional responsiveness in a continuously changing environment.

This debate holds significant implications for educational quality in the world and in Jordan, as higher education is rapidly growing and expanding to fulfil international and local expectations.

Jordan's higher education sector struggles to settle global accreditation requirements with its exclusive sociocultural and economic demands. The public and private universities have become regional education centers, attracting students from across the Middle East and North Africa regions. However, the expendability of higher education has deepened obstacles to maintaining academic quality and managing distinctive and unique student needs. The intersection of standardization and personalization has become vital to these barriers, as universities need efficient frameworks for educational excellence.

Advocates for standardization argue that unified standards could ensure quality assurance, transparency, and comparability across academic institutions. Standardized curricula advance common competencies and facilitate academic transfer, whereas shared assessment and accreditation systems present a base for performance benchmarks and support accountability and continuous improvement (Al-Jaber & Elayyan, 2016). However, critics perceive standardization as rigid and creatively restrictive, and alarm danger from strict

conformity as it may undermine innovation, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills in culturally diverse contexts in Jordan (Chandra, 2019).

Supporters of personalization recommend adaptive, student-centered learning to strengthen engagement and motivation by implementing flexible curricula and experiential learning opportunities. Personalization closes the gap between theoretical and practical knowledge and improves inclusive education for learners from various backgrounds. However, it is challenged by high resource demands, inconsistent standards, and complex individuals and institutional needs and goals alignment (Weill, 2021).

Faculty members are at the foundational dimension in this dynamic issue, who navigate the competitive pressures of international accreditation and local responsiveness. Academicians' opinions are important to understand how standardization and personalization shape the future of higher education.

This query targets examining Jordanian academicians' perceptions through answering the following research questions:

- Q1: How do Jordanian academics perceive the implementation of standardization practices within quality assurance systems for higher education?
- Q2: How do Jordanian academics perceive the implementation of personalization practices in teaching, learning, and institutional quality processes?
- Q3: What is the relationship between perceived levels of standardization and quality of education?
- Q4: What is the relationship between personalization practices and Jordanian universities' perceived quality of education?
- Q5: To what extent can standardization and personalization be balanced to enhance quality assurance frameworks in higher education?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Higher education plays a key role in intellectual, professional, and societal development, demanding that universities merge of global standards and local educational needs. A core stress is standardization and personalization paradigms focus, both influence academic quality, institutional performance, and student outcomes. A valid literature review on these frameworks and their effects on higher education quality highlight chief implications for Jordan's academic background.

Standardization in Higher Education: Theoretical foundations and implications

Standardization indicates implementing a uniform framework, curricula, assessments, and accreditation standards that confirm institutions' comparability and accountability (Al-Jaber & Elayyan, 2016). It forms a measure for quality assurance, transparency, and international recognition, assisting in preserving credibility while supporting student mobility and global employability (Altbach et al., 2009). Standardization also empower continuous quality improvement through its quantifiable performance benchmarks (Kreber, 2018) and enhancing institutional accountability through accreditation processes (Eaton, 2020).

However, detractors stress its limitations, chiefly its rigidity and the possibility of inhibiting academic innovation. Overemphasis on standardization could undermine the students' socio-cultural background and suppress their creativity and critical thinking (Chandra, 2019). This issue is obvious in Jordan, as universities struggle to achieve international accreditation requirements and attracting diverse international students. Extreme adherence to standardized frameworks could harm creativity, prioritize conformity, and finally restrict adaptability and progress in problem-solving capabilities (Weill, 2021).

Personalization in Higher Education: a student-centered approach

Personalization encourages individualized learning, adapting curricula, pedagogy, and maintaining services to students' exclusive requirements and goals (Kaharuddin, 2020). Based on constructivist learning theory, active engagement increases learning effectiveness if it is parallel with learners' experiences (Vygotsky, 1978). Studies approve personalization's benefits, such as improving motivation, engagement, and academic success across diverse contexts (Brown et al., 2014).

Technological progress displayed by AI-driven adaptive learning platforms has progressed personalization by facilitating adapting real-time instructions according to student progress (Rose & Gravel, 2019). Nevertheless, challenges signify its resource intensity, expected standards inconsistency, and difficulty aligning individualized learning with institutional objectives (Weill, 2021). In Jordan, educators should achieve equilibrium and flexibility with accreditation requirements, which in turn are controlled by rigid administrative systems (Kaharuddin, 2020).

The interplay between standardization and personalization

The complex interaction between standardization and personalization is the primary challenge in higher education. Recent rigorous research has proposed a multifaceted quality assurance system that combines regulatory compliance, institutional autonomy, innovation capacity, and stakeholder engagement. Competency-based education models combine standardized learning outcomes with individualized learning pathways. Digital learning ecosystems facilitate personalization by implementing quality monitoring standards. Furthermore, the current literature underscores the mediating role of faculty agency between policy frameworks and classroom practice. Academicians can translate accreditation requirements into pedagogical practices through innovative views that guide quality reform. This study situates Jordanian higher education in advance global reform transformation, addressing accountability, flexibility, innovation, and student-centered quality advancement.

Standardization concerns is structural stability and compatibility with accreditation standards, while personalization concentrates on innovation and engagement. This equation is an essential dilemma in Jordanian universities, which intent to keep international competitiveness and fulfill local objectives (Al-Jaber & Elayyan, 2016).

Some scholars believe that adopting hybrid models that integrate both paradigms is the best exit. Competency-based education could maintain standardized learning outcomes while permitting a flexible approach for students' mastery (Gervais, 2016). Similarly, a blended learning approach merges standardized curricula with personalized digital platforms to achieve inclusivity and adaptability (Laurillard, 2012). This approach offers a realistic framework for attaining academic quality and learner-centered flexibility.

Academicians' perspectives on standardization vs. personalization

Faculty members are primary initiators for mediating these paradigms. Their perceptions demonstrate the beneficial implementation of a mixed paradigm. While standardization enhances institutional credibility and accountability, personalization improves student engagement and in-depth learning (Chandra, 2019; Eaton, 2020). In Jordan, faculty encounter the challenge of adhering to international accreditation standards and responding to student diversity (Al-Jaber & Elayyan, 2016). Research by Kaharuddin (2020) highlights that academicians appreciate student-centered approaches but fight against structured policies, rigidity, and resource constraints. Understanding these views is vital for developing balanced institutional policies that integrate standardization and personalization effectively.

Quality of Higher Education

Quality in higher education includes multiple aspects as teaching effectiveness, research output, governance, and student outcomes (Altbach et al., 2009). Globally, quality assurance depends on accreditation classifications, performance-based evaluations, and results of student satisfaction (Harvey & Williams, 2010; Tight, 2020). Jordanian universities are eager to align with international benchmarks and preserve the national educational uniqueness (Al-Jaber & Elayyan, 2016; Woolston, 2019).

Faculty qualifications, research productivity, and graduate employability are central key indicators for evaluating educational institutions (Schindler et al., 2015). Standardization sustains quality through curricula consistency and assessment (Hénard & Roseveare, 2012); excessive rigidity may stifle innovation (Chandra, 2019). Equally, personalization augments inclusivity and engagement and improves learning outcomes without ensuring consistency (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Weill, 2021).

Technology advancements reconcile this balance. Digital and adaptive platforms of learning can tailor learning experiences to be personalized, but their outcomes depend on digital literacy and unbiased access (Bates, 2019; Laurillard, 2012). The higher education sector in Jordan's keeps augmenting accreditation and quality assurance methods to enhance institutional performance (Al-Khasawneh, 2020), yet insistent debate continued between regulation adherence and fostering academic creativity (Teichler, 2018).

In conclusion, the standardization and personalization dichotomy is principal for higher education reform. While standardization guarantees consistency and accountability, personalization supports flexibility, engagement, and innovation. Balancing these two paradigms is essential for maintaining quality while fostering creativity. In Jordan, harmonizing the two approaches is still evolving, need for further studies into faculty perceptions and policy frameworks to promote quality assurance and academic adaptability.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional for examining the standardization and personalization influence on the higher education quality in Jordan from the perspective of faculty members at Jordanian universities. Data collected from 300 faculty members in public and private universities. An online structured questionnaire measuring perceptions encompasses three validated scales: The Custom Standardization Assessment Scale (CSAS), the Personalization in Education Scale (Kaharuddin, 2020), and the SERVQUAL Model (Parasuraman et al., 1988)

This design enables a holistic and statistically reliable valuation of mechanism of standardization and personalization impact on educational quality. The integration of validated scales like CSAS, Kaharuddin's Personalization Scale, and SERVQUAL confirms multidimensional evaluation of institutional, pedagogical, and quality assurance aspects. Understanding faculty perspectives facilitate understanding how to balance structured standards with individualized learning approaches.

Population and sampling

The target population are academic staff from various Jordanian universities holding different ranks: assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors. A convenient random sampling utilized to collect data from a representative number, maintaining a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. The study sample consisted of 200 academics from public and private Jordanian universities. Recruitment was based on voluntary participation after an institutional email was sent. The final sample included academics who received the survey

invitation and agreed to participate. The chief determinant of participation is academic employment in a Jordanian higher education institution.

Research instrument

The questionnaire encompasses four sections, each employing a 7-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree).

1. Demographic Information

Includes variables such as age, gender, university type (public/private), academic rank, and years of teaching experience.

2. Perceptions of Standardization (Custom Standardization Assessment Scale–CSAS) for assessing academicians' opinions regarding four standardization domains:

- Curriculum Standardization: Investigate whether curricula, assessments, and learning outcomes are consistent with accreditation requirements.
- Teaching and Learning Standards: Measures adherence to teaching guidelines, standardized training, and technological consistency across courses.
- Institutional Policies and Regulations: Evaluates enforcement of ethics, academic integrity, and accreditation-focused decision-making.
- Quality Assurance and Evaluation: Assesses institutional audits, mechanisms of student feedback, faculty evaluations, and benchmarking for research productivity.

3. Perceptions of Personalization (Personalization in Education Scale – Kaharuddin, 2020) for evaluating five domains of personalized education:

- Personalized Learning Approaches: Flexibility in adapting teaching to diverse student needs.
- Student-Centered Teaching and Engagement: Adjusting instruction based on student feedback and promotion of interactive learning.
- Use of Technology: Employing interactive and adaptive learning tools like Moodle or Blackboard to support individualized learning.
- Assessment and Feedback Personalization: Providing flexible and personalized feedback opportunities.
- Institutional Support: Examining availability of training, inclusive policies, and accommodations for students having special needs.

4. Quality of Higher Education (SERVQUAL – Parasuraman et al., 1988) for measuring five dimensions of perceived educational quality:

- Tangibles: assess availability and modernity of facilities, resources, and digital infrastructure.
- Reliability: assess consistency of academic services and fairness in policy implementation.
- Responsiveness: evaluate institutional readiness to address faculty and student concerns effectively.
- Assurance: represents faculty competence, ethical standards, and trust in educational credibility.
- Empathy: characterizes institutional support for professional growth and individualized academic direction.

The questionnaire operationalized the three tools through composite measurement scales. The items of the four standardization and five personalization dimensions were used to measure the standardization index. The perceived educational quality index was measured through items evaluating tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy.

Each construct was measured using multiple Likert-scale items to develop composite indices for statistical analysis. Thus, the study questionnaire can empirically operationalize the three conceptual tools. The results section analyzes all responses to the questionnaire items. The completed questionnaire has been made accessible to readers. The full instrument is provided in the supplementary file to avoid exceeding journal word limits. Transparency and replicability are thus made feasible.

Data collection and analysis

Data collected through Google form disseminated across various university communication channels and analyzed using SPSS v.24, applying both descriptive and inferential statistics. The questionnaire was administered online using a professional email list provided by the university administration. All subjects completed the self-administered survey presented in a Google form (<https://forms.gle/WGtxDddKsw3xq4XLA>) anonymously. The questionnaire was accessible for 4 weeks to facilitate the engagement of more voluntary participants. Respondents receive an invitation letter explaining the study purpose, right to confidentiality, and right to withdraw at any time. No personal or sensitive data were collected.

The questionnaire is an integrated survey framework derived from three tools. Items were adapted from each validated tool to operationalize three analytical constructs. CSAS, PIES, and ERVQUAL models were used. The items were adapted, contextually modified for higher education settings, and inserted into a unified questionnaire with construct validity. The instrument is an integrated and adapted item, not a direct aggregation of the three original tools.

Ethical considerations

Ethical approval obtained from the Institutional Review Board and other participating public and private Jordanian universities. Subjects were explained that participation is voluntary and anonymous, while keeping confidentiality and the right to withdraw without any penalty. No sensitive data or vulnerable populations are involved. Implied informed consent based on participants' agreement, with no financial incentives or compensations provided. Data will remain confidential, accessible only to the researcher and analyst.

RESULTS

The study explored academicians' perceptions of standardization in Jordanian universities and found a strong support to standardized educational practices. mean scores for the five dimensions ranged from 6.11 and 6.36 on a 7-point Likert scale, which mean high agreement among faculty members about the importance of structured frameworks. Descriptive Statistics on the Standardization items in table 1 revealed:

- Curriculum Standardization (M=6.36) means a strong consensus that course structures and content are standardized.
- Assessment Uniformity (M=6.11) indicates that faculty believe in consistent grading and assessment methods.
- Accreditation Compliance (M=6.20) reflects that course syllabi are aligned with institutional and national standards.
- Consistency in Academic Experience (M=6.14) reveals a shared perception of significance to uniform student learning experiences.
- Teaching Guidelines Adherence (M=6.20) mirrors that faculty commonly follow prescribed teaching protocols.

TABLE 1
Descriptive statistics on the standardization items

Standardization item	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
The curriculum structure and course content are standardized across academic programs and instructors	6.36	1.05
Assessment methods, grading criteria, and learning outcomes follow a uniform framework	6.11	1.04
Course syllabi align with national or institutional accreditation requirements	6.20	1.00
My university ensures consistency in the academic experience for all students	6.14	0.98
Faculty members must adhere to institutional teaching guidelines	6.20	0.96

Although the study findings reflect standardization supporting equity, accreditation compliance, and academic objectivity, slight variations ($SD \approx 0.95-1.04$) demonstrate minor dissent. Some academicians reported worries that excessive standardization could inhibit instructional flexibility and limit teaching creativity.

Overall, results stress the obligation of maintaining a balanced framework, safeguarding quality assurance by dual adoption models; standardization, and a certain level of autonomy and innovative teaching practices.

First study objective is to examine the challenges in balancing standardization and personalization within accreditation frameworks

The table (2) reveals a clear discrepancy between Jordanian academicians' support for standardization needed to fulfil accreditation requirements and the limited institutional support for personalized learning.

TABLE 2
Descriptive statistics on the balance between standardization and personalization under accreditation

Survey Item	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Accreditation standards influence instructional strategies and methodologies	6.34	0.99
Accreditation standards influence institutional decision-making and strategic planning	6.39	0.89
Accreditation criteria impact faculty hiring, promotion, and research expectations	6.21	0.92
Accreditation frameworks contribute to improving overall educational quality	6.20	0.89
The university encourages faculty to adapt teaching methods to meet students' diverse learning needs	5.11	1.38
Course materials and assessments are tailored to accommodate different student learning styles	4.94	1.42
My institution allows flexibility in assessments to accommodate different learning preferences	4.69	1.30
Students receive individualized academic guidance and mentorship from faculty	4.93	1.50
Faculty members receive training on how to implement personalized learning strategies	4.67	1.34

High Endorsement of Standardization (Means: 6.20-6.39) indicate faculty member agreement that accreditation models encourage several institutional functions, such as teaching quality, strategic planning, evaluation, and promotion. These high mean scores demonstrate that standardization is accepted as a mechanism for sustaining consistency, comparability, and

accountability through universities. Thus, accreditation works as a stabilizing force that warrants institutional reliability and promote quality assurance.

Means score 4.67–5.11 reflect moderate support for personalization: relatively low to moderate scores and substantial differences indicate frail institutional support for adaptive teaching, flexible assessment, and mentorship. Despite the academicians viewed theoretical value of personalization, they encounter multiple barriers, such as rigid accreditation standards, limited training, and inadequacies in institutional infrastructure for implementing individualized learning approaches effectively. This reflects a structural imbalance as standardization is rewarded and reinforced by institutions, while personalization lacks systemic encouragement.

Thus, accreditation systems require personalized learning involvement through quality criterion. Universities need broader investment in faculty training and expanded curricula flexibility. A hybrid model where standardization unified with adaptive pedagogy is crucial to confirm innovation, inclusivity, and high educational quality in Jordanian universities.

The second objective is to assess the impact of standardization and personalization on the overall quality of higher education in Jordan

Analysis of the general impact of Standardization and Personalization on Quality of Higher Education in Jordan using correlation indices between key institutional factors.

1. Standardization and Quality ($r=-0.08$): a very weak negative relationship indicates standardization ability to preserve structural consistency and regulatory compliance, but inability to enhance educational excellence or credibility of institutions. Although standardization structure is necessary framework, it lacks the transformative impact required for elevating the overall quality of education.
2. Personalization and Quality ($r=+0.27$): A moderate positive correlation the important personalization role in perceived quality. Faculty who implement adaptive and student-centered approaches have a higher tendency to view their institutions positively as ethical, supportive, and responsive. Consequently, personalized learning reinforces engagement, academic trust, and inclusivity which are key pillars of perceived educational excellence.
3. Standardization vs. Personalization ($r=-0.21$): the negative correlation suggests a trade-off between these two paradigms. Increased standardization may reduce flexibility and innovation, constraining educators' ability to tailor teaching to diverse learner needs.

Standardization alone cannot ensure great educational quality. Therefore, a balanced framework combine standardized accountability with personalized pedagogy is forceful for fulfilling institutional credibility and meaningful learning experiences in Jordan's higher education sector.

The third objective is optimizing the balance between standardization and personalization to enhance academic excellence

Results show significant quantitative insights by analyzing academicians across Jordanian institutions.

1. Strong Institutional Standardization and Weak Association with Quality: standardization received high endorsement (mean>6.2 on a 7-point scale) across curricula, teaching, and assessment structures. However, it has weak correlation with perceived educational quality ($r=-0.08$), proofing that despite standardization support consistency and compliance, it does not prominently enhance academic excellence.
2. Personalization Positively Correlates with Educational Quality: The measure of personalization through adaptive teaching, flexible assessment, and individualized

support demonstrated moderate mean scores (4.67–5.11), and positive correlation with educational quality ($r=0.27$). Faculty members who employ or adopt personalized approaches inclined to observe their institutions as possessing higher quality, responsiveness, and innovation.

3. Inverse Relationship between Standardization and Personalization: a negative correlation ($r=-0.21$) reveals institutions with high standardization often provide narrower zone for individualized learning approaches.

These outcomes highlight an urgent demand for a hybrid framework, integrating personalization into accreditation standards, supporting faculty development and digital techniques, and reinforce quality assurance for balanced uniformity, flexibility, and student-centered education.

TABLE 3

Empirical findings on standardization, personalization, and educational quality

Result Area	Statistical Outcome	Interpretative Note
1. Standardization Level	High mean scores (Mean range: 6.14 – 6.36)	Respondents consistently report high levels of standardization across academic practices.
2. Personalization Level	Moderate mean scores (Mean range: 4.67 – 5.11)	Personalization is present but not as strongly embedded as standardization.
3. Standardization ↔ Educational Quality	$r = -0.08$ (very weak negative)	No meaningful statistical relationship between standardization and perceived quality.
4. Personalization ↔ Educational Quality	$r = +0.27$ (moderate positive)	Higher personalization is associated with higher perceived educational quality.
5. Standardization ↔ Personalization	$r = -0.21$ (inverse relationship)	Indicates a negative association between standardization intensity and personalization use.

The study results in table (3) show a strong institutional commitment to standardization in Jordanian higher education context. Faculty perception regarding five dimensions' including curriculum design, assessment frameworks, accreditation compliance, teaching protocols, and academic consistency demonstrate high agreement ($M=6.11-6.36$), reflecting deep standardization embedded that perceived as core demand for quality and comparability. These findings agree with international styles stressing standardization role as a driver of equity, accountability, and transparency (Elken, 2017; Mahajan & Singh, 2023). High scores for curriculum and assessment alignment also indicate compliance with national qualification frameworks and accreditation guidelines (MOHESR, 2022; Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2022).

Nevertheless, modest standard deviations ($\sim 0.95-1.05$) indicate some disagreement in perceptions. Even though most faculty members value standardization, some worries about its rigidity and the loss of pedagogical creativity (Biesta, 2019; Eisner, 2020). Over-standardization, as scholars caution, may inhibit innovation and limit the flexibility needed to accommodate diverse learners (Leiber et al., 2021; Newton, 2018). Thus, while standardization is essential for institutional credibility, excessive reliance risks stifling adaptive and context customized teaching practices.

Conversely, personalization recorded adaptive instruction mean ($M=5.11$), flexible assessment ($M=4.69$), and individualized mentoring ($M=4.93$) indicate lower rating and greater variability. Faculty recognized its educational value but noted systemic and infrastructural barriers that restrict practical implementation (Biesta, 2019; Newton, 2018). The lack of training in adaptive pedagogy ($M=4.67$) highlight the institutional gap in strengthening student-centered learning (Lueddeke, 2022; Mahajan & Singh, 2023).

The existing structural tension of both standardization and personalization still unhandled. Standardization is supported by tangible accreditation criteria, whereas personalization misses equivalent institutional support (Carless, 2015; Eisner, 2020). Resolving the current imbalance become a necessity. Therefore, recent scholarship advocates for using an adaptive accreditation framework that integrate flexible pedagogical measure and established quality standards (Hazelkorn & Gibson, 2020; Shulman, 2021). The suggested cross model can maintain consistency and foster innovation, align with international needs for learner-centered, comprehensive, and unbiased higher education (OECD, 2021; Ryan & Tilbury, 2019).

This well-balanced model would ensure capability of Jordanian universities to sustain accreditation credibility while cultivating pedagogical flexibility, creativity, and academic merit.

DISCUSSION

This study's finding offers in-depth understanding of higher education influencing factors and guidance for institutions to act on equilibrium between standardization and personalization to promote academic advancement. The results revealed a sustainable debate regarding higher education reform as institutional quality cannot depend solely on regulatory standardization or individualized pedagogical practices. The findings stress the urgent need for accountable adaptive quality assurance models that enable innovation and responsiveness to diverse learner needs. Despite of the solid entrenched dimensions of standardization practices, such as curriculum alignment, teaching protocols, and assessment frameworks (mean scores >6.2), the study findings revealed insignificant influence of perceived educational quality ($r=-0.08$). This show the standardization contributions to institutional regulations and structural system, but not impact the perceptions of academic excellence or student-centeredness (Birtwistle, 2021; Elken, 2017).

Conversely, personalization showed a moderate positive correlation with quality perceptions ($r=+0.27$), despite its medium implementation level (mean range: 4.67-5.11). This indicate a higher worth of personalization over standardization because it is a main driver of perceived institutional responsiveness and student satisfaction (Carless, 2015; Ryan & Tilbury, 2019). Highly engaged faculty members recorded higher personalized practices and more prone to a view their institution positively. Well engaged academicians recorded a higher supportive, ethical, and student-centered perceptions.

Importantly, the inverse relationship between standardization and personalization ($r = -0.21$) points a discrepancy in institutional design, as intense focus on procedural uniformity could may obstruct pedagogical flexibility. This outcome aligned with earlier findings where inflexible standardization is crucial element for compliance and benchmarking despite its innovation inhibition (Leiber et al., 2021; Newton, 2018).

Managing this stress necessitate structuring a conventional databased. First, its essential to reform accreditation standards to include personalization metrics, such as learning adaptability, formative feedback, and student choice for instruction (Hazelkorn & Gibson, 2020; Lueddeke, 2022). Second, establishing a faculty programs that accentuate differentiated skills, digital pedagogy, learner-centered projects, and supportive institutional rewards (Mahajan & Singh, 2023).

Third, transferring to a mixed quality assurance model, integrating standard benchmarks with personalization indicators. Thus, balancing rationality with flexibility and permitting smooth compliance while maintaining pedagogical autonomy (OECD, 2021; Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2022). In Jordan, there is continually growing support to combine standardized evaluation with flexible instructional practices to improve quality assurance and learning

outcomes (Aldallaleh & Almomani, 2014; Al-Tarawneh, 2016). Finally, future investments in the digital infrastructure, such as AI-driven learning platforms and systems of real-time feedback, could assist personalization without yielding systemic structure (Altbach et al., 2009). Ultimately, augmenting academic quality in Jordanian higher education demands multiple resources and requirements other than regulations. Achieving academic excellence require transforming to responsive, inclusive, and contextually flexible systems. These findings confirm feasibility of balancing and the need to remain relevant in a rapidly developing educational context.

CONCLUSION

This inclusive investigation of academicians' perceptions regarding standardization and personalization role in determining higher education unveil causes of exhaustive tension. This study contributes to progressive and broad discussions on the growth of quality assurance in higher education. The study evidenced the evolution of sustainable academic excellence from combining structured standards and adaptive personalization strategies to propose recommendations for policymakers, accreditation bodies, and higher education leadership. Findings revealed a firm institutionalized standardization that demonstrated by steady curriculum alignment, appraisal consistency, and accreditation agreement. On the other hand, it hasn't any meaningful association with perceived educational quality. According to academicians' perceptions, the primary role of procedural consistency in governance and equity does not guarantee its suitability to augment academic brilliance.

Equally, adaptive teaching, flexible assessment, and individualized student support of personalization evolved as a moderate but unimportant contributor to perceived quality. Academicians with higher engagement in personalization practices demonstrated better view to their institutions as supportive, ethical, and learner-centered. However, the personalization adoption is restrained due to inflexible institutional structures and narrow scope training that possibly defer incorporation.

The contrary correlation between standardization and personalization confirm a structural tension in accreditation targeting frameworks. homogeneity strengthening efforts may unintentionally restrain the flexibility need for variable student needs. These stress the need for reimagining quality assurance systems in Jordanian higher education, and shifting toward integrative strategies for harmonizing standardization with personalization.

To advance academic superiority, this study recommends merging personalized learning systems into accreditation models, investing in faculty development and digital infrastructure, adopting a hybrid framework for quality assurance to support adaptive learning environments. Then, Jordanian universities should implement compliant, inclusive, dynamic, and pedagogically responsive systems to go alongside with global education development.

REFERENCES

- Aldallaleh, M., & Almomani, T. M. (2014). The problems of evaluating Middle East University students from the point of view of the faculty members. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(14), 174-186.
- Al-Jaber, S., & Elayyan, S. (2016). *Higher Education in Jordan: Challenges and Quality Assurance*. Amman: Jordanian Academic Press.

- Al-Khasawneh, A. (2020). Quality assurance and accreditation in Jordanian higher education: Achievements and future directions. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 74, 102-118.
- Al-Tarawneh, H. A. (2016). The impact of academic advising on the quality of educational outcomes: A case study at Middle East University. *British Journal of Education*, 4(3), 15-28.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Bates, A. W. (2019). *Teaching in a Digital Age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning*. BCcampus.
- Biesta, G. (2019). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at University*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Birtwistle, T. (2021). Global perspectives on quality and standards in higher education. *Higher Education Policy Review*, 34(2), 175-192.
- Brown, P. C., Roediger, H. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2014). *Make it stick: The Science of successful learning*. Harvard University Press.
- Carless, D. (2015). *Excellence in University assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge.
- Chandra, P. (2019). *Education in the 21st Century: standardization vs. personalization*. Routledge.
- Eaton, J. S. (2020). *Accreditation and the future of Higher Education: Ensuring quality and integrity*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eisner, E. (2020). *The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Elken, M. (2017). The development of policy instruments in higher education and research: The case of performance-based funding. *Higher Education*, 74(4), 645-661.
- Gervais, J. (2016). *Competency-Based Education: Theory and Practice*. Springer.
- Harvey, L., & Williams, J. (2010). Fifteen years of quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1), 3-36.
- Hazelkorn, E., & Gibson, A. (2020). *Global Rankings and the Geopolitics of Higher Education*. Routledge.
- Hénard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Fostering quality teaching in Higher Education: Policies and practices*. OECD.
- Kaharuddin, A. (2020). *Personalization in education: A framework for student-centered learning*. Academic Press.
- Kreber, C. (2018). *Authenticity in and through teaching in Higher Education: The transformative potential of the scholarship of teaching*. Routledge.
- Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design Science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge.
- Leiber, T., Stensaker, B., & Harvey, L. (2021). The impact of quality assurance on higher education: Is it worth it? *Quality in Higher Education*, 27(2), 190-208.

- Lueddeke, G. (2022). *Transforming Higher Education for the 21st Century*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mahajan, R., & Singh, P. (2023). Standardization and innovation in curriculum design: Emerging models in higher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 55(1), 45-61.
- MOHESR. (2022). *National Qualifications Framework and Accreditation Guidelines*. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Jordan.
- Newton, D. P. (2018). *Teaching for understanding: What it is and how to do it*. Routledge.
- OECD. (2021). *Benchmarking Higher Education system performance*. OECD Publishing.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). *SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality*. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Rose, D. H., & Gravel, J. W. (2019). *Universal design for learning: Theory and practice*. Harvard Education Press.
- Ryan, A., & Tilbury, D. (2019). Flexible pedagogies and transformative learning in higher education. *Higher Education Academy Review*, 21(3), 45-59.
- 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.
- Shulman, L. S. (2021). *The Wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. Jossey-Bass.
- Srikanthan, G., & Dalrymple, J. F. (2022). Developing a holistic model for quality in Higher Education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 28(1), 45-64.
- Teichler, U. (2018). *The future of Higher Education and the quality of teaching*. Springer.
- Tight, M. (2020). Student retention and engagement in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(5), 670-684.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weill, P. (2021). *Digital learning and Higher Education: Challenges and innovations in the 21st century*. Springer.
- Woolston, C. (2019). Learning on the edge: Global challenges in higher education. *Nature*, 573(7775), 599-601.