Abstract—The phenomenon of neoliberalism in HEI has forced University to conduct various improvement in QA to increasing quality. Enhance stakeholder involvement is case of good QA practices. Including student can be advantage to QA process. Student participation in QA activities impacts the quality of higher education. During this time, research in QA has focused on making standards, whereas research focuses on compliance with standards is little. Therefore, this research focuses on compliance toward standard in QA. However, while creating standards is a significant starting point, but it is not enough. It should be to guarantee student compliance with standards. An analyzing of what factors motivate student to comply with standard can help QA process in HEI.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The expansion of neoliberal ideology reflected upon in higher education institutes (HEI) on its market principles [1-8]. HEI was pressured to transform its roles into corporate organizations, as these is the contextual prerequisites for market-driven management. It might have an impact on academic works, relates to the way academics do their works and how they see themselves. This creates a competitive university to compete with other universities. Academic competition includes competition in the field of quality, price, service. This phenomenon has compelled universities to conduct various improvements in Quality Assurance (QA) to increasing quality.

QA was very important to improve quality of HEI. QA regimes have become an increasingly dominant regulatory tool in the management of HEI around the world, and almost half of the world’s nations now have quality assurance system for higher education [4]. Over the past 20 years, there has been a worldwide interest with quality assurance in higher education, predicated on its perceived ability to ensure and enact stakeholders’ desire for quality [9]. Enhance stakeholders’ involvement in QA of HEI is one case of good QA practices [10]. Including students in QA process is a significant topic. Including students in QA process can be advantage to the QA process [11]. Student participation in QA activities impacts the quality of higher education [12]. In this way, including student helps to increase quality for QA process in HEI.

QA is increasing quality through to ensure compliance toward quality standard. While the quality standard definition recognizes diversity, quality assurance methods are increasingly promoting adherence to predetermined methodology [13]. Regulation of the higher education sector is thus similarly a monitoring policy where quality assurance serves as an accreditation tool and a compliance mechanism [14,15]. Compliance means to ensure that business practice and processes are aligned at commonly accepted norms. Compliance requirements are frequently linked to regulations that may be implemented for an organization itself either externally or internally [16]. Whereas, intention is a mental state that representing a commitment to carry out an action [17]. So, Compliance intention is defined as an individual’s intention to comply with standards refers to the individual’s will to conduct voluntary behavior. Much of behavior is triggered by intentions, and understanding intentions helps to interpret these behaviors. Intention is also a need to understand and predict the plans and future behavior of others [18]. Furthermore, this study contributes in proposing student compliance intention model for quality assurance in higher education institutes.

The phenomenon of neoliberal in HEI has forced university to conduct various improvement in QA to increasing quality. During this time, research in QA has focused on making standards, it is rare that research focuses on compliance with standards. Therefore, this research focuses on compliance toward standard in QA. QA improves quality through ensuring compliance, so, QA can be a tool to ensure compliance to local standard and regulations [13]. QA can be a way of preventing mistakes and defects, such as noncompliant student behaviors. Noncompliant student behaviors usually encompass behaviors that violate the academic social norms, such as sending wireless messages during class, arriving late to class, leaving class early, and inappropriate use of laptop computers in class [19]. There may also be noncompliant student behaviors outside the school in the form of rude and demanding emails, [20] requested faculty and staff from various universities to send stories of noncompliant student behaviors, they were met with a flood of responses describing noncompliant student behavior. Noncompliant student behaviors can lead to a breakdown in student-faculty relations, hampering effective education [21].
Since each student is a unique case and present conditions within an academic organization are quickly changing [22], comprehension student compliance intention is crucial for university that want to increasing quality in QA. However, while creating standard is a significant starting point, but it is not enough. It should be to guarantee student compliance with standard. An analyzing of what factors motivate student to comply with standard can help QA process in HEI. Understanding of what factors motivate student to comply with regulation in quality assurance will help HEI to increase and develop their QA to be better HEI. This study contributes in proposing student compliance intention model for quality assurance in higher education institutions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Quality Assurance

One of the main challenges facing Quality Assurance in HEI to increase quality. Some research may contribute to improving quality based on Quality Function Development (QFD) as an Assessment and Quality Assurance Model, [23,24,25,26]. The proposed QFD is a useful strategy for aligning company, industry, and education with the ability to introduce innovation to their existing curriculum and program evaluation approaches.

Some research may contribute to improving quality based on best practices in evaluation model [27,28,29,30] which applies an international performance evaluation test to latest graduates, as well as evaluating the efficacy of education system. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) is example of organization for evaluation model [48],[53].

Other research contributes to improving quality in QA which focus on analyzing global convergence and local context [54], [55], [57]. This convergence studies explain how quality assurance in each nation is becoming similar across time. Rhoades and Sporn in [56] argue that the terminology and usage of quality assurance underscores the significance of local adaptation. Ansah (2015) studied based on a pragmatist analysis on quality assurance in higher education [9]. A pragmatist strategic view has been regarded helpful in analyzing higher education quality assurance conceptualizations of quality assurance in higher education because pragmatism focuses on solving a real-world issue in a context [58], [59]. A pragmatist view was used to conceptualize a logical inner quality assurance model to incorporate the alignment of graduate competencies in curriculum of Ghanaian polytechnics. He found that from a pragmatist perspective, quality assurance could be utilized to develop a model of quality assurance for HEI in Africa, but the application of such a model will be challenging. As a note of the fact that effective planning and engagement of stakeholders can overcome the difficulties of ensuring efficient execution of the quality improvement system (Ansah, 2015).

Zineldin et al (2011) proposed a new quality assurance model 5Qs and to examine the significant factors influencing students’ perception of cumulative satisfaction. The model involves student satisfaction behavioral dimensions. The factors included in this cumulative summation are technical, functional, infrastructure, interaction and atmosphere of higher education institutions. Student survey, student feedback and measurement are also significant elements in quality improvement for quality management applications [60, 61, 62, 63, 64].

B. Compliance Intention

Studies have appeared in latest years to indicate the applicability of people's compliance with organizational laws, regulations, and regulations as a helpful tool for shaping or affecting their people's behaviors with respect to how organizational IS resource is used. The literature also indicates that where there is regulation to help prevent misuse, misuse and abuse, and destruction of IS assets, people often do not readily comply regulatory documents [31].

Although human behavior is highly complicated and remains unpredictable, in the process of forming intentions and performing activities, psychologists try to understand the important variables. The theories of Reasoned Action and Planned Behavior are comprehensive theories that specify a limited number of psychological variables that can influence behavior, namely (a) intention; (b) attitude toward the behavior; (c) subjective norm; (d) perceived behavioral control; and (e) behavioral, normative and control beliefs[33].

In the theory of reasoned action, intention is affected by the attitude of people toward performing the behavior and the subjective norm. However, according to the theory of planned behavior, the level of perceived control is believed to be influential on people's behavioral intention along with their attitude and subjective norms. In many researches, the intention is motivated by attitudes to a greater extent than by subjective norms. A people's intention to comply with the standard is essentially affected by attitude, normative beliefs, and self-efficacy to comply [32, 33, 34]. An attitude of a person toward compliance is formed when he considers the compliance-related consequences that he will personally experience if he complies or does not comply (punishment, and so forth.).

Using insights acquired from the literature, this study aims to broaden our understanding of the intention of an individual to comply by proposing an integrative model to explain the function of people's convictions in an organization's intention to comply. Psychological factors have also taken a prominent role in explaining the factors that affecting the intention to comply with regulations. Of the various psychological factors that may be applicable, variables from the theory of planned behavior (TPB) and the general deterrence theory (GDT) were used to analyze the influential factors for compliance intention. It showed that users' awareness of counter measures impacts perceptions on organizational sanctions, which in turn decreases users' IS misuse intention.

Lebek et al (2013) evaluated the applied theories for compliance intention where the TPB and the GDT are found as the most commonly used models [35]. These studies designed to increase of knowledge of the sorts of issues that may be encouraging the student compliance intention for quality assurance in higher education institutes. These studies were designed to increase knowledge of the kinds of issues that might encourage student compliance intention in higher education institutions for quality assurance.

There are many research in compliance intention model, there are many research in quality assurance, there are also many research in student intention such as student
continuance use intention for flipped classroom [35]. Student intention and behaviour toward environment sustainability [37], Student Entrepreneurial Intention[38, 39]. But, to the best of authors’ knowledge, there is no model student compliance intention for Quality Assurance in Higher education institutes (HEI). Compliance intention for quality assurance in HEI has different from other domain because different process business, different working environment, perspective employee so student compliance intention model should be different too. Furthermore, this study contributes in proposing new student compliance intention model for quality assurance in higher education institutions.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research contributes to propose a student compliance intention model for quality assurance in higher education institutes. We conduct literature review of factor that influence in quality assurance and factor that influence in compliance intention. This literature review from scholarly databases, e.g. Google Scholar, Science Direct, Scopus, Web of Science, with the keywords related to factor that influence in quality assurance and factor that influence in compliance intention. This review is based on the suggestions from Webster and Watson [65]. By analyzing of these literature reviews, this research proposes a student compliance intention model.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research aims to develop a student compliance intention model for quality assurance in higher education. In order to achieve this goal adequately, a conceptual model is needed to facilitate the investigation of the critical factors that influence compliance intention for student in quality assurance. The conceptual model helps to demonstrate the logical meaning of the relationships between the identified critical factors [40]. A proposed model consisting of three factors including awareness, motivation, technology, as shown in Figure 1.
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QA deals with the awareness of the people about the significance of quality, the spirit of people to do quality and to implement quality assurance [41].

The awareness that the concept of good academic quality constantly needs to be redefined puts the innovative ability of higher education institutions to the forefront. Meanwhile, quality assurance in HEI have indeed found continuous place and appear to increase quality awareness, while the effects of the environmental systems remain restricted [42].

In the QA process, awareness is required. The successful QA model will encourage quality awareness in the institution [43]. Critical awareness and the commitment to improvement lead critical systems practitioners to an interest in understanding the constraints associated with a given perspective or image of a problem of quality in QA in HEI [44]. Creating quality awareness in institutions is one of role of quality assurance [45].

Awareness was on QA model that was proposed by [46]. Therefore online higher education, as indicated in [47], is frequently faced with the need to prove its quality as regards its operation and the training offered, to which must be added the awareness of assessment that has emerged and the need to be more conscious that the assessment process can greatly influence learning by the students [48].

By motivation, can make people work together for a goal and increase their potential [15]. Create and maintain a motivating environment in the strategic objectives of the university, it has to create conditions for personal growth, affirmation their loyalty and using their abilities for the university's benefit [46].

Westerheijden [49] finding that ‘the development of higher education policy, illustrated . . . by quality assurance policies. . . derive from different motivations’ and the ‘different logics underlying it’ in [4]. Malik and Nelson also reported a gender difference in cognitive gains, motivation to study, affective engagement, and satisfaction with learning effectiveness [50]. Independent and powerful students are well handled, which can even be a system that increases the independence of that group of students. However, less independent and less self-motivated students can easily lose their way, become weak and operate at a low level because the study program does not provide them with the support they need. This is because the quality and collaboration within student groups lack of quality assurance; a system that largely relies on the attempts of the student organizations can effectively interfere the learning of some students and lead to reduced grades than the individual student might deserve [48].

Higher educational institutions have started to realize that they are working in an age characterized by increasing complexity, novelty, uncertainty, and technological developments that have never been previously imagined and experienced. Technology has allowed stakeholders to compare the quality of other educational systems with their own, subsequently causing the “quality desired” curve to rise at a quickening pace.

The quality processes are often seen as types of disciplining technologies [51] and are probably a significant component of the means by which new public management has been implemented to the sector. They have been perceived to monitor and control academic work in university.

Lack of the external quality monitoring process or to the effect of new technology. [13]. So, there are some research using technologies for Quality assurance in HEI, such as Lucas [14] explore some examples of academic resistance to audit technologies and quality assurance processes in relation to teaching and research in higher education. Amalia in [52] proposed software requirements elicitation to
support internal monitoring of quality assurance system for higher education in Indonesia. Other author explored an example of the power technologies embedded in accreditation [15].

V. CONCLUSION
This research aims to develop a student compliance intention model for quality assurance in higher education. To adequately accomplish this aim, a conceptual model is required for facilitating the investigation of the factors that influence compliance intention for student in quality assurance. From literature review, awareness, motivation, and technology are the factors that influence student compliance intention for quality assurance process in higher education institutes.

Finally, this article has provided a starting point for student compliance intention model for quality assurance process in higher education institutes.

Because this article provided a starting point for student compliance intention model for quality assurance in higher education institutes, it is recommended to examine and confirm these factors in further broader quantitative research studies and by some group of respondents from student in universities.
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