Submitted: 11/04/2025 - Accepted: 12/05/2025 - Published: 28/06/2025

Fostering Academic Excellence in Higher Education: A SEM Analysis of Total Quality Management, Organizational Innovation, and Institutional Performance in the UAE

Ahmed Ibrahim Alhosani[1], Kamarul Bahari Yaakub[1]

[1]Faculty of Management and Economics, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris

DOI: 10.26417/w8f7x506

Abstract

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) face intense pressure to evolve from teaching-centric bodies into innovation-driven engines of economic growth. This study develops and tests a structural model to investigate the mechanisms through which quality management translates into superior institutional outcomes. Specifically, it examines the mediating role of organizational innovation in the relationship between Total Quality Management (TQM) practices and institutional performance. A quantitative, cross-sectional survey was conducted, gathering data from 342 academic staff at major public and private universities in Abu Dhabi. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) revealed that TQM has a significant positive direct effect on both organizational innovation and institutional performance. Furthermore, organizational innovation demonstrated a strong positive impact on institutional performance. Bootstrapping analysis confirmed that organizational innovation acts as a significant partial mediator, clarifying that a substantial portion of TQM's benefit is channeled through the enhancement of innovative capabilities. The findings provide an empirically validated framework for university leaders, suggesting that TQM is a foundational strategy whose value is maximized when it is leveraged to cultivate a culture of pedagogical and administrative innovation, thereby driving sustainable institutional excellence.

Keywords: Total Quality Management (TQM), Organizational Innovation, Institutional Performance, Higher Education, UAE, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

1. Introduction

The global landscape of higher education has undergone a paradigm shift in the 21st century. Universities are no longer viewed solely as repositories of knowledge but are increasingly positioned as strategic national assets, critical for driving economic diversification, fostering innovation, and enhancing global competitiveness (Altbach & Knight, 2007). This transformation is particularly acute in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) nations, where national strategic plans, such as the UAE's "We the UAE 2031" vision, explicitly mandate a transition from resource-dependent economies to sustainable, knowledge-based economies. This national imperative places immense pressure on Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to transcend their traditional teaching roles and become world-class centers for research, innovation, and human capital development.

In response to this hyper-competitive environment, HEIs are increasingly adopting management philosophies from the corporate sector to enhance operational efficiency and strategic outcomes. Among the most pervasive of these is Total Quality Management (TQM), a holistic philosophy centered on continuous improvement, stakeholder satisfaction, and total organizational involvement. While the application of TQM in manufacturing is well-documented, its translation to the service-oriented, professionally-driven context of academia has been a subject of ongoing debate (Shattock, 2003). Early research attempting to draw a direct line between TQM implementation and institutional performance has yielded inconsistent and sometimes contradictory results, suggesting that the relationship is more complex than a simple cause-and-effect linkage.

This study posits that a critical missing variable in the TQM-performance equation is organizational innovation. The core argument is that TQM, when implemented effectively, does not merely enforce rigid quality controls but rather cultivates an organizational culture conducive to innovation. TQM principles such as employee empowerment, data-driven decision-making, and a focus on stakeholder needs create the fertile ground upon which both pedagogical and administrative innovations can flourish (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). A university that excels in TQM should, therefore, become more adept at developing novel teaching methods, launching relevant academic programs, and streamlining its administrative processes. It is this enhanced innovative capability, we argue, that serves as the primary mechanism through which TQM's benefits are translated into tangible improvements in institutional performance, such as graduate employability, research output, and stakeholder satisfaction.

While this mediational pathway is theoretically sound, and has been explored in corporate settings (Thai Hoang et al., 2006), its empirical validation within the unique

context of UAE higher education remains a significant research gap. This study aims to fill this gap by proposing and testing a new, robust structural model. Building upon foundational work, this research advances the discourse by sharpening its focus on the HEI sector, operationalizing innovation as a dual-faceted construct (pedagogical and administrative), and employing Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to rigorously test the mediating hypothesis. This approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of *how* quality management works in an academic setting, moving beyond *if* it works.

Consequently, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the direct effect of TQM practices on organizational innovation within UAE HEIs?
2. What is the direct effect of TQM practices on institutional performance?
3. What is the direct effect of organizational innovation on institutional performance?
4. To what extent does organizational innovation mediate the relationship between TQM practices and institutional performance?

By answering these questions, this paper aims to provide a clear, evidence-based framework for university leaders and policymakers in the UAE. The findings will offer actionable insights into how to build institutions that are not only quality-assured but are also dynamic, adaptive, and innovative—qualities essential for achieving the nation's ambitious strategic goals.

2. Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

2.1. Theoretical Underpinnings: Dynamic Capabilities View

To frame the relationship between TQM, innovation, and performance, this study draws upon the Dynamic Capabilities View (DCV) of the firm (Teece et al., 1997). The DCV extends the Resource-Based View (RBV), which posits that a firm's competitive advantage stems from its unique, valuable, and inimitable resources. The DCV addresses a key limitation of the RBV in rapidly changing environments by focusing on an organization's ability to "integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments" (Teece et al., 1997, p. 516). In this framework, dynamic capabilities are the organizational routines and processes by which firms achieve new resource configurations.

Within the context of this study, TQM practices can be conceptualized as foundational organizational routines that build first-order capabilities—such as process efficiency,

stakeholder analysis, and employee engagement. However, these routines alone may not confer a sustainable advantage in the dynamic HEI sector. Organizational innovation represents a higher-order dynamic capability—the capacity to sense new opportunities (e.g., market demand for new skills), seize them (e.g., launch a new program), and reconfigure the organization's resource base (e.g., retrain faculty, adopt new educational technology). Therefore, TQM provides the stable platform of operational excellence (a resource), while innovation provides the dynamic capability to leverage that platform for superior performance in a shifting landscape. This theoretical lens suggests that TQM's primary value lies in its role as an enabler of the more crucial dynamic capability of innovation.

2.2. Total Quality Management (TQM) in Higher Education

TQM is a management philosophy rooted in the work of pioneers like Crosby (1979). It emphasizes a systematic, organization-wide approach to continuous improvement, with the ultimate goal of achieving stakeholder satisfaction. Key principles of TQM include top management commitment, customer (stakeholder) focus, employee involvement and empowerment, process-centered management, data-driven decision-making, and a culture of continuous improvement (*kaizen*) (Sila & Ebrahimpour, 2005).

The adaptation of TQM to HEIs has been met with both enthusiasm and skepticism. Proponents argue that in an increasingly marketized and competitive sector, HEIs must adopt such frameworks to improve service quality, enhance administrative efficiency, and ensure accountability to a diverse range of stakeholders including students, employers, and government bodies (El-Kareh & El-Kareh, 2024). In this view, "customer focus" translates to understanding student learning needs and graduate market demands, while "process management" applies to optimizing everything from admissions to curriculum delivery. However, critics caution against a simplistic corporate metaphor, arguing that viewing students as "customers" can commodify education and undermine academic rigor, and that the "product" of higher education—a critically thinking individual—is far too complex to be measured by standard quality metrics (Shattock, 2003).

Despite this debate, a growing body of empirical evidence suggests a positive link between the thoughtful implementation of TQM principles and improved HEI outcomes. Studies have associated TQM with enhanced student satisfaction, greater administrative efficiency, and a stronger institutional reputation (Hasan & Lopa, 2023). Based on this prevailing evidence and the theoretical premise that well-managed organizations perform better, we hypothesize a direct positive relationship:

H1: *Total Quality Management (TQM) practices have a significant positive direct effect on Institutional Performance.*

2.3. TQM as an Antecedent to Organizational Innovation

Organizational innovation is the implementation of a new or significantly improved product, process, marketing method, or organizational method in business practices (OECD, 2005). Within HEIs, innovation can be broadly categorized into two domains: pedagogical innovation (new teaching methods, curriculum designs, learning technologies) and administrative innovation (new student support systems, streamlined processes, novel industry partnership models) (Sula & Elenurm, 2022).

The central thesis of this paper is that TQM and innovation are sequentially linked. A robust TQM culture creates the organizational antecedents necessary for innovation to thrive. This connection operates through several mechanisms. First, TQM's emphasis on employee involvement and empowerment fosters psychological safety, encouraging faculty and staff to experiment with novel approaches without fear of failure. Second, a deep, data-driven understanding of stakeholder needs—a core TQM tenet—enables HEIs to direct innovative efforts toward creating relevant, high-demand programs and services. Third, TQM's focus on process analysis provides the analytical tools to identify systemic barriers to innovation and implement administrative changes effectively. Finally, the principle of continuous improvement institutionalizes a mindset that rejects the status quo, creating a persistent demand for innovative solutions (Al-Ahbabi et al., 2021).

Recent research in the HEI context supports this linkage. Hasan and Lopa (2023) found that TQM was a critical enabler of innovation by fostering a supportive knowledge management culture. Similarly, El-Kareh and El-Kareh (2024) demonstrated a strong positive relationship between TQM and innovation in Lebanese HEIs. This leads to our second hypothesis:

H2: *Total Quality Management (TQM) practices have a significant positive direct effect on Organizational Innovation.*

2.4. The Mediating Role of Organizational Innovation

If TQM builds the capacity for innovation (H2), then it is the successful exercise of that innovation that directly drives performance improvements (H3). An HEI can have efficient processes, but if its curriculum is outdated and its teaching methods are stagnant, it will ultimately fail to meet stakeholder expectations. Conversely, an institution that successfully innovates—by launching a cutting-edge program in artificial intelligence or implementing a seamless digital student experience—will see direct improvements in performance metrics like enrollment, graduate employability,

and institutional ranking. This direct link between innovation and performance is a cornerstone of strategic management theory.

H3: *Organizational Innovation has a significant positive direct effect on Institutional Performance.*

Integrating these three hypotheses leads to the central proposition of this study: that organizational innovation mediates the relationship between TQM and institutional performance. The effect of TQM on performance is not merely direct (A → C) but is substantially channeled through an indirect pathway (A → B → C). This mediational model helps explain the inconsistent findings in prior research. An HEI that implements TQM as a rigid, top-down, compliance-focused bureaucracy may improve some operational metrics but could simultaneously stifle the faculty autonomy and creativity essential for innovation, thereby neutralizing or even negatively impacting overall performance. In contrast, an HEI that embraces TQM as a holistic, empowering philosophy will unlock its faculty's innovative potential, leading to superior performance.

This model suggests that TQM's greatest value is not in control, but in enablement. It provides the structure and culture that allows innovation to emerge and thrive, which in turn drives institutional success. This leads to our final, integrative hypothesis:

H4: *Organizational Innovation significantly mediates the relationship between Total Quality Management (TQM) and Institutional Performance.*

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework and Hypothesized Relationships

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Total Quality Management (TQM) (Independent Variable)</td>
<td>→
H2 (+)</td>
<td rowspan="2">Institutional Performance (Dependent Variable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→
H1 (+) (Direct Effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↑
Organizational Innovation (Mediating Variable)
↗
H3 (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

**Source: Developed by the authors based on the Dynamic Capabilities View.*

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design and Sample

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design to test the hypothesized mediation model. The target population comprised full-time academic staff (lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors) at major HEIs in Abu Dhabi, the capital of the UAE. This demographic was chosen as they are key informants, deeply involved in the core academic and administrative processes of their institutions and thus well-positioned to provide insights into quality management, innovation, and performance. A multi-stage sampling approach was utilized. First, five major universities in Abu Dhabi—representing a mix of public (n=3) and private (n=2) institutions of varying sizes—were purposively selected to ensure a representative cross-section of the emirate's HEI landscape. Second, within these institutions, a stratified random sampling technique was employed, with faculties (e.g., Business, Engineering, Arts & Sciences, Education) serving as the strata to ensure disciplinary diversity. The survey was administered over a three-month period using both a secure online platform and paper-based questionnaires distributed with the assistance of university human resources departments to maximize reach.

A total of 400 questionnaires were distributed. After data cleaning to remove responses with significant missing data or patterned answers, a final usable sample of 342 responses was obtained, representing a robust response rate of 85.5%. According to Kline (2015), a sample size greater than 200 is generally considered adequate for conducting Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). To assess potential non-response bias, an independent samples t-test was conducted comparing early respondents (first 25%) and late respondents (last 25%) on key demographic and study variables. No statistically significant differences were found, suggesting that non-response bias is not a significant concern in this study.

3.2. Sample Characteristics

The demographic profile of the 342 respondents is presented in Table 1. The sample was balanced in terms of gender, with 57.9% male and 42.1% female participants. The academic ranks were well-distributed, with Assistant Professors forming the largest group (35.4%). A significant majority of respondents (61.4%) held a doctoral degree, indicating a highly qualified sample. Furthermore, the sample was highly experienced, with 70.8% possessing over 10 years of academic experience. This depth of experience enhances the validity of the perceptual data, as respondents have a long-term perspective on their institution's practices and performance.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Respondent Demographics (N=342)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	198	57.9%
	Female	144	42.1%
Academic Rank	Lecturer	102	29.8%
	Assistant Professor	**121**	**35.4%**
	Associate Professor	85	24.9%
	Full Professor	34	9.9%
Highest Degree	Master's Degree	132	38.6%
	Ph.D. / Doctorate	**210**	**61.4%**
Years of Experience	0 - 5 years	35	10.2%
	6 - 10 years	65	19.0%
	11 - 15 years	110	32.2%
	16+ years	**132**	**38.6%**

Note: Bold indicates the modal category for each variable.

3.3. Instrumentation and Measures

All constructs were measured using multi-item scales adapted from established, validated literature to ensure content validity. A 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) was used for all items. The instrument was pilot-tested with 30 academics to ensure clarity and contextual relevance.

- **Total Quality Management (TQM)** (Independent Variable): This was operationalized as a second-order construct with four first-order dimensions, measured by 20 items adapted from Sila and Ebrahimpour (2005) and Teh et al. (2009). The dimensions included: Top Management Commitment (5 items; e.g., "Our university leadership is deeply committed to quality improvement"), Student Focus (5 items; e.g., "We actively use student feedback to improve courses"), Employee Involvement (5 items; e.g., "Faculty are empowered to make decisions about their courses"), and Process Management (5 items; e.g., "Our administrative processes are clearly defined and efficient"). The overall scale demonstrated excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$).

- **Organizational Innovation** (Mediating Variable): This was also measured as a second-order construct with two first-order dimensions, using 10 items adapted from Sula and Elenurm (2022) and Thai Hoang et al. (2006). The dimensions were: Pedagogical Innovation (5 items; e.g., "My faculty regularly implements new and creative teaching methods") and Administrative Innovation (5 items; e.g., "My university is quick to adopt new administrative technologies"). The scale showed excellent reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$).
- **Institutional Performance** (Dependent Variable): This 8-item scale was adapted from prior studies in the HEI context (e.g., Al-Ahbabi et al., 2021) to measure perceived performance relative to competitors. Items captured a holistic view of performance, including: "Our graduates are highly sought-after by employers," "Our university has a strong reputation for research," and "Student satisfaction at our university is high." The scale was reliable (Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$).

3.4. Data Analysis Strategy

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 28 for descriptive statistics and preliminary analyses, and AMOS 28 for the SEM analysis. A Covariance-Based SEM (CB-SEM) approach was chosen because the primary goal of the study is theory testing and confirming the hypothesized relationships, for which CB-SEM is more appropriate than prediction-oriented approaches like PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2017). The analysis followed the recommended two-step procedure (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). First, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed on the measurement model to establish construct validity (convergent and discriminant). Convergent validity was assessed using Average Variance Extracted (AVE > 0.5) and Composite Reliability (CR > 0.7). Discriminant validity was confirmed by ensuring that the square root of the AVE for each construct was greater than its correlation with other constructs. Second, after confirming a valid measurement model, the structural model was tested to evaluate the hypothesized paths (H1, H2, H3). Model fit was evaluated using a battery of indices: Chi-square/df (χ^2/df < 3), Comparative Fit Index (CFI > .90), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI > .90), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA < .08), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR < .08). Finally, to test the mediation hypothesis (H4), a bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 resamples was used in AMOS to generate bias-corrected confidence intervals for the indirect effect. A significant indirect effect is confirmed if the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlation matrix for the three latent constructs. The mean scores for TQM (M = 3.71), Organizational Innovation (M = 3.65), and Institutional Performance (M = 3.75) were all above the scale's midpoint of 3.0, indicating generally positive perceptions among the academic staff. The correlation matrix provided strong preliminary support for the hypotheses, with all constructs showing significant positive correlations ($p < .001$). The strongest correlation was observed between TQM and Organizational Innovation ($r = .62$), followed by Organizational Innovation and Institutional Performance ($r = .58$). All correlation coefficients were below the .80 threshold, suggesting that multicollinearity is not a significant issue.

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlation Matrix (N=342)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3
1. Total Quality Management (TQM)	3.71	0.78	(.94)		
2. Organizational Innovation	3.65	0.82	.62***	(.91)	
3. Institutional Performance	3.75	0.80	.51***	.58***	(.89)

Note: Cronbach's α reliability coefficients are on the diagonal in parentheses. *** $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

4.2. Measurement Model Assessment

The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted on the measurement model comprising the three latent constructs and their respective indicator items. The model demonstrated an excellent fit to the data, with fit indices meeting or exceeding recommended thresholds: $\chi^2/df = 2.18$, CFI = .95, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .058, and SRMR = .045. Construct validity was firmly established. Convergent validity was confirmed as all factor loadings were significant ($p < .001$) and above .60, Composite Reliability (CR) values ranged from .89 to .94 (above the .70 threshold), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values ranged from .63 to .68 (above the .50 threshold). Discriminant validity was also confirmed, as the square root of the AVE for each construct was greater than its inter-construct correlations. These results indicate that the measures were reliable and the constructs were empirically distinct, providing a sound basis for testing the structural model.

4.3. Structural Model and Hypothesis Testing

Following the successful validation of the measurement model, the hypothesized structural model was tested. The model also exhibited a strong fit to the data (χ^2/df = 2.31, CFI = .94, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .061, SRMR = .052), indicating that the proposed theoretical structure accurately represents the relationships in the data. The model explained a substantial portion of the variance in the endogenous variables: 38% of the variance in Organizational Innovation (R^2 = .38) and 41% of the variance in Institutional Performance (R^2 = .41).

The standardized path coefficients for the direct effects are presented in Table 3. All three direct-effect hypotheses were supported.

- **H1 (TQM → Performance):** The direct path from TQM to Institutional Performance was positive and statistically significant (β = 0.25, p < .05), supporting H1.
- **H2 (TQM → Innovation):** The path from TQM to Organizational Innovation was very strong and highly significant (β = 0.62, p < .001), providing robust support for H2.
- **H3 (Innovation → Performance):** The path from Organizational Innovation to Institutional Performance was also strong and highly significant (β = 0.48, p < .001), supporting H3.

Table 3: Structural Equation Model Path Coefficients (Hypothesis Testing)

Hypothesized Path	Estimate (β)	S.E.	C.R.	p-value	Result
H1: TQM → Inst. Performance	0.25	0.11	2.27	.023	**Supported**
H2: TQM → Org. Innovation	0.62	0.14	8.81	<.001	**Supported**
H3: Innovation → Inst. Performance	0.48	0.12	5.95	<.001	**Supported**

Note: β = Standardized Beta Coefficient; S.E. = Standard Error; C.R. = Critical Ratio.

4.4. Mediation Analysis

To test H4, the mediating role of Organizational Innovation, the bootstrapping procedure was employed. The analysis revealed a significant, positive indirect effect of TQM on Institutional Performance through Organizational Innovation (Standardized Indirect Effect = 0.30). The 95% bias-corrected confidence interval for this indirect effect was [0.22, 0.39]. As this interval does not contain zero, the mediation effect is statistically significant. Since both the direct effect (β = 0.25) and

the indirect effect (β = 0.30) are significant, this confirms a partial mediation. This finding indicates that while TQM does have a modest direct benefit on performance, a larger portion of its impact is transmitted indirectly through its ability to foster innovation. Thus, H4 was fully supported.

5. Discussion

This study set out to clarify the complex relationship between quality management, innovation, and performance within the high-stakes context of UAE higher education. By testing a mediation model grounded in the Dynamic Capabilities View, the findings offer several significant theoretical and practical contributions.

5.1. TQM as a Foundational Capability for Performance

The confirmation of a significant direct relationship between TQM and Institutional Performance (H1) provides a clear, evidence-based mandate for HEI leaders in the UAE. It aligns with the dominant stream of literature (e.g., L-Hmoud & Al-Adwan, 2022) and empirically validates the notion that systematic quality management practices are positively associated with key performance outcomes. This finding is particularly important in the UAE context, where national accreditation and international ranking bodies place a heavy emphasis on quality assurance processes. It suggests that investments in building a TQM culture—characterized by leadership commitment, stakeholder focus, and process efficiency—yield direct returns in perceived institutional quality and reputation.

5.2. Unpacking the Mechanism: Innovation as the Engine of TQM's Success

The most compelling finding of this study is the powerful mediating role of organizational innovation. The results demonstrate that the path from TQM to innovation (H2: β = 0.62) is the strongest in the model, and that the indirect effect of TQM on performance via innovation is larger than its direct effect. This provides a clear answer to the "how" question: *How* does TQM lead to better performance? The answer is, primarily, by creating an organization that is better at innovating.

This finding strongly supports our theoretical framing using the Dynamic Capabilities View. TQM practices build the stable, first-order operational capabilities, but it is the dynamic capability of innovation that allows the institution to adapt, reconfigure, and thrive. This explains the inconsistencies in prior research; TQM initiatives that are implemented as rigid, bureaucratic control systems may fail because they inadvertently stifle the very innovation that is the primary conduit for performance enhancement. Our results suggest that for TQM to be truly effective, it must be implemented as an empowering philosophy that unleashes the creative potential of faculty and staff, rather than a restrictive checklist.

This insight is critical for HEIs in the UAE. To meet the goals of a knowledge-based economy, universities cannot simply be efficient; they must be innovative. They must continuously develop new curricula that meet industry needs, adopt pedagogical approaches that engage digital natives, and create administrative systems that are agile and student-centric. Our model shows that a holistic TQM framework is the most effective foundation upon which to build this essential innovative capacity.

5.3. Implications for Policy and Practice in UAE Higher Education

The findings of this study have direct and actionable implications for various stakeholders in the UAE's higher education ecosystem:

- **For University Leaders (Presidents, Provosts, Deans):** The message is clear: champion a holistic TQM culture, but do so with the explicit goal of fostering innovation. This means moving beyond compliance and focusing on the "soft" elements of TQM—empowering faculty, promoting cross-disciplinary collaboration, and creating a psychologically safe environment for experimentation. Performance metrics should reward not just efficiency, but also innovative teaching, curriculum development, and process improvements.
- **For Quality Assurance Agencies:** Accreditation and quality assurance frameworks should evolve to not only assess quality control processes but also to evaluate and encourage an institution's capacity for innovation. Audits could include metrics related to the launch of new programs, the adoption of new educational technologies, and the presence of institutional structures that support faculty-led innovation.
- **For Policymakers (e.g., Ministry of Education):** National policies and funding models should incentivize innovation within HEIs. This could include competitive grants for pedagogical research, funding for technology-enhanced learning initiatives, and policies that provide institutions with the autonomy to rapidly adapt their program offerings to meet the evolving demands of the UAE economy.

Ultimately, this study argues that the pursuit of quality and the pursuit of innovation are not separate objectives but are deeply intertwined. For UAE HEIs to achieve world-class status, they must build a foundational culture of quality that serves as the launching pad for sustained, impactful innovation.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Principal Contributions

This research makes a significant contribution to the literature on higher education management by providing a robust, empirically validated model of the TQM-innovation-performance relationship within the under-researched UAE context. Its primary theoretical contribution lies in successfully applying the Dynamic Capabilities View to explain *how* TQM works in HEIs, confirming that its main value is realized through the enhancement of organizational innovation. By demonstrating the partial mediating role of innovation, this study moves beyond simplistic direct-effect models and offers a more nuanced and accurate understanding of the mechanisms driving institutional excellence. This mediational framework provides a clear, actionable roadmap for university leaders seeking to align their quality management initiatives with the strategic imperative to innovate.

6.2. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite its robust methodology, this study has several limitations that offer avenues for future research. First, the cross-sectional design precludes definitive causal inferences. Although the hypothesized causal direction (TQM → Innovation → Performance) is theoretically grounded, a longitudinal study tracking HEIs over time as they implement TQM initiatives would provide stronger evidence of causality. Second, the study relies on perceptual data from a single source (academic staff), which raises the possibility of common method variance (CMV). While procedural remedies were employed, future research should triangulate these findings with objective performance data, such as graduate employment rates, research funding levels, and international ranking positions. Third, the sample was confined to universities in Abu Dhabi. While a major hub, its regulatory and funding environment may differ from other emirates or GCC nations; thus, future studies should seek to replicate this model in other geographical contexts to test its generalizability.

Future research could also expand the model by incorporating other important variables. For example, the role of transformational leadership as a moderator of the TQM-innovation link, as suggested by Al-Ahbabi et al. (2021), warrants further investigation. Additionally, exploring the impact of external factors, such as government policy or industry partnerships, on this mediational relationship would provide a more comprehensive understanding. By building upon this model, researchers and practitioners can continue to refine their strategies for building the high-quality, innovative universities that are essential for the future prosperity of the UAE and the broader region.

References

[1] Al-Ahbabi, S., Singh, S. K., & Balasubramanian, S. (2021). TQM, innovation, and sustainable performance of HEIs in the UAE: Does transformational leadership play a moderating role? *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 38*(5), 1089-1110. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-10-2019-0325

[2] Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 290-305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542

[3] Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411–423. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411

[4] Crosby, P. B. (1979). *Quality is free: The art of making quality certain*. McGraw-Hill.

[5] El-Kareh, R., & El-Kareh, A. (2024). The mediating role of innovation in the relationship between total quality management and sustainable performance in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 41*(2), 337-355. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-12-2022-0391

[6] Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

[7] Hasan, M. F., & Lopa, N. Z. (2023). Fostering innovation in higher education institutions: roles of TQM and knowledge management. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 27*(11), 3025-3046. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-07-2022-0545

[8] Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

[9] L-Hmoud, A., & Al-Adwan, A. S. (2022). The role of TQM in enhancing graduate employability in Jordanian universities. *The TQM Journal, 34*(6), 1605-1620. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-07-2021-0209

[10] OECD. (2005). *Oslo manual: Guidelines for collecting and interpreting innovation data* (3rd ed.). OECD Publishing.

[11] Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(3), 79–91.

[12] Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing successful universities*. Open University Press.

[13] Sila, I., & Ebrahimpour, M. (2005). Critical linkages among TQM factors and business performance: A theoretical model. *International Journal of*

Operations & Production Management, 25(11), 1123-1154. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570510627211

[14] Sula, E., & Elenurm, T. (2022). Organizational innovation in higher education institutions: a systematic review. *Educational Research Review, 35*, 100419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100419

[15] Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509–533.

[16] Teh, P. L., Yong, C. C., Arumugam, V., & Ooi, K. B. (2009). Does TQM reduce employees' role conflict? *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 109*(8), 1118-1135. https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570910991334

[17] Thai Hoang, D., Igel, B., & Laosirihongthong, T. (2006). The impact of TQM on innovation: Findings from a developing country. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 23*(9), 1092-1117. https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710610704250