

Evaluation of Risk Management Implementation in Educational Institutions

Handriadi¹, Hafidz Nur Oekta Kustiyanto², Som Chai³

¹Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Tarbiyah Syekh Burhanuddin Pariaman, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Indonesia

³Thammasat University, Thailand

ABSTRACT

Background. The implementation of risk management in educational institutions has become increasingly crucial due to the growing complexities and uncertainties in the education sector. However, many institutions face challenges in effectively adopting risk management practices, leading to potential vulnerabilities that affect their operational and educational outcomes.

Purpose. This study aims to evaluate the current state of risk management implementation in educational institutions, focusing on the strategies, processes, and challenges involved.

Method. The research adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative interviews with key stakeholders (administrators, staff, and educators) and quantitative surveys to assess the extent of risk management practices across several educational institutions.

Results. The findings reveal that while risk management practices are recognized as essential, their implementation is often inconsistent and lacks a systematic approach. Key challenges identified include insufficient training, lack of resources, and resistance to change. The study concludes that to enhance the effectiveness of risk management in educational institutions, it is crucial to establish clear policies, provide continuous professional development, and foster a culture of proactive risk identification and mitigation.

Conclusion. The research provides valuable insights for educational administrators and policymakers to improve risk management frameworks and ensure the sustainability and resilience of educational institutions.

KEYWORDS

Educational Institutions, Implementation Challenges, Policy Development

Citation: Handriadi, Handriadi., Kustiyanto, O, N, H & Chai, S. (2025). Evaluation of Risk Management Implementation in Educational Institutions. *International Journal of Educational Narrative*, 3(1), 50–58.
<https://doi.org/10.70177/ijen.v3i1.2156>

Correspondence:

Handriadi,
handriadi27121991@gmail.com

Received: Aug 10, 2024

Accepted: Oct 5, 2024

Published: Feb 8, 2025

INTRODUCTION

The role of risk management in educational institutions has gained significant attention in recent years, driven by the increasing complexity and diversity of risks faced by these institutions. From financial challenges and operational inefficiencies to security threats and environmental risks, educational institutions must navigate a myriad of uncertainties that can potentially disrupt their operations and affect educational outcomes (Nasir dkk., 2024; Singun, 2025). The growing reliance on technology, the shift toward remote learning, and the changing leaders



to establish robust risk management landscape of global education have made it imperative for educational strategies. However, despite its importance, many educational institutions continue to struggle with effectively implementing risk management practices (Nguyen & Tran, 2024; Raimi dkk., 2024). This has led to gaps in the identification, assessment, and mitigation of risks, leaving institutions vulnerable to unforeseen challenges (Kavkler, 2024; Kulkarni & Firmin, 2025). This study seeks to explore the current state of risk management implementation in educational institutions, analyzing the strategies employed, the obstacles encountered, and the outcomes of these practices.

The problem of inadequate risk management implementation in educational institutions is multifaceted. While many institutions recognize the importance of risk management, they often face challenges in formalizing and executing comprehensive risk management strategies. A significant issue is the lack of awareness and training regarding risk management among educational staff and administrators. Furthermore, many educational institutions have limited resources and lack a structured framework to systematically assess and address risks (Musana & Bisaso, 2024; Raimi dkk., 2024). As a result, risk management efforts are often reactive rather than proactive, addressing issues only after they have emerged. The failure to implement effective risk management can lead to significant disruptions, including financial losses, reputational damage, and compromised student outcomes. This research aims to address these issues by evaluating how educational institutions implement risk management, identifying the challenges they face, and providing recommendations for improvement. Through a comprehensive analysis, the study aims to highlight key barriers and offer insights into the development of more effective risk management frameworks in educational settings.

The primary objective of this study is to evaluate the implementation of risk management practices in educational institutions and assess their effectiveness in mitigating risks. The study seeks to identify the existing risk management strategies adopted by educational institutions, examining their strengths and weaknesses (Ahmed dkk., 2024; Yupeng, 2024). A further aim of the research is to determine the challenges that institutions face in implementing these practices, with particular attention paid to resource constraints, staff training, and institutional culture (Mujanah & Budiarti, 2024; Netey & Owusu, 2025). By evaluating the current state of risk management in educational institutions, this research aims to provide a clear understanding of the gaps in current practices and propose actionable recommendations to enhance risk management frameworks. Additionally, the study will focus on the outcomes of these strategies, measuring their impact on the overall performance and resilience of educational institutions. The findings of this study will contribute to the development of more effective risk management systems in education, offering practical solutions for administrators, policymakers, and educators seeking to improve risk preparedness and response.

A significant gap in the existing literature on risk management in educational institutions lies in the lack of comprehensive studies that evaluate the practical implementation of these strategies within real-world educational contexts (Goel dkk., 2024; Kjellgren, 2024). While there is substantial theoretical research on risk management frameworks, few studies have examined how these frameworks are applied in practice within educational settings. Most of the existing research focuses on specific aspects of risk management, such as financial risks, technological risks, or health and safety risks, without providing a holistic view of the overall risk management landscape in education (Dubchak, 2024; Harsanto dkk., 2025). Additionally, much of the research has been conducted in corporate or organizational settings, with limited application to the unique challenges faced by educational institutions. This study addresses this gap by providing an in-depth evaluation

of how risk management practices are implemented across various educational institutions, offering new insights into the practical challenges and successes of these efforts. By focusing on the real-world application of risk management strategies, this research contributes valuable knowledge to the field of educational management and risk mitigation.

The novelty of this research lies in its comprehensive approach to evaluating risk management in educational institutions (Hernández-Vergel dkk., 2024; Veronez & Sembiante, 2024). Unlike previous studies that have focused on individual risks or theoretical frameworks, this research offers a holistic evaluation of how educational institutions implement risk management strategies and the outcomes of these efforts. The study takes a unique approach by considering multiple types of risks—financial, operational, security, and educational—and exploring how these risks are managed within the specific context of educational institutions. Additionally, this research provides new insights into the barriers to effective risk management implementation, such as lack of training, insufficient resources, and resistance to change (Keoy dkk., 2024; Liu dkk., 2025). By addressing these issues and offering practical solutions, the study contributes to the development of more robust and effective risk management frameworks in education. The findings of this research are particularly significant for educational administrators, policymakers, and researchers, as they offer a clearer understanding of how to enhance risk management strategies and improve the overall resilience of educational institutions.

This research is crucial for advancing the field of educational management, particularly in terms of strengthening institutional resilience and ensuring the continued success of educational systems in the face of uncertainty. The importance of risk management in education cannot be overstated, as the increasing complexity of risks demands that educational institutions adopt more sophisticated strategies to protect their operations and safeguard educational outcomes. Given the ever-evolving landscape of global education, including challenges such as technological disruption, environmental risks, and health crises, the findings of this research are timely and relevant (Artyukhov dkk., 2024; Štavičiūtė-Natalevičienė, 2024). The study provides educational leaders with the knowledge and tools necessary to build more resilient institutions that can effectively navigate these challenges. Ultimately, the research aims to foster a deeper understanding of risk management in education, contributing to the development of a more secure and sustainable future for educational institutions worldwide.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design, combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches to provide a comprehensive evaluation of risk management implementation in educational institutions (Ha & Thoa, 2024; Kjellgren, 2024). The research design enables the triangulation of data from multiple sources, enhancing the validity and depth of the findings (Grover dkk., 2025; Nair dkk., 2025). The qualitative component of the study consists of semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, such as school administrators, risk management officers, and staff, to gain insights into their experiences and perceptions of the current risk management practices. The quantitative component involves the distribution of structured questionnaires to a larger sample of staff and administrators to gather numerical data on the implementation and effectiveness of risk management strategies across different educational institutions. By integrating these methods, the study aims to offer a holistic understanding of the risk management practices employed in educational settings.

The population for this research includes educational institutions across various levels, such as primary schools, secondary schools, and higher education institutions (Ha & Thoa, 2024;

Sepúlveda-Vallejos dkk., 2025). The sample consists of administrators, staff, and risk management professionals working in these institutions. A purposive sampling technique is used to select institutions that have implemented formal risk management frameworks, ensuring that the data collected is relevant to the research objectives. A total of 10 educational institutions, representing a diverse range of regions and educational levels, are included in the sample (Elaish dkk., 2024, 2025). Within each institution, 5 to 10 participants are selected for the qualitative phase, including key decision-makers and staff involved in risk management. For the quantitative phase, a broader sample of 100 to 150 participants, including faculty members and staff, will be surveyed to capture a wide range of perspectives on the implementation and challenges of risk management in these institutions.

The instruments used for data collection include semi-structured interview guides and structured questionnaires (Elaish dkk., 2024; Mcheka & Mislav, 2025). The interview guides are designed to explore the perceptions and experiences of school administrators and staff regarding the implementation of risk management strategies. The questions address topics such as risk identification, assessment methods, mitigation strategies, and the effectiveness of the risk management framework in their institutions. For the quantitative phase, a structured questionnaire with Likert-scale items is developed to assess the extent to which risk management practices are implemented and the challenges faced by the institutions. The questionnaire also includes demographic questions to gather information about the participants' roles and the type of institution they represent (Capua dkk., 2024). Both instruments are pre-tested to ensure clarity, reliability, and validity, and adjustments are made based on feedback from the pilot testing.

Data collection procedures involve the distribution of the questionnaires electronically to participants across the selected institutions, with the option of paper-based surveys for those without access to digital platforms (NOVORODOVSKYI & KULESHA, 2024; Sepúlveda-Vallejos dkk., 2025). The semi-structured interviews are conducted either in person or via virtual platforms, depending on the participants' availability and preferences. All participants are informed about the purpose of the research, and their informed consent is obtained prior to data collection. The interviews are audio-recorded with the consent of participants, transcribed, and analyzed thematically to identify key themes related to risk management implementation (Alzahrani dkk., 2024; Athoillah dkk., 2024). The survey responses are analyzed quantitatively using statistical software to identify patterns, correlations, and trends. The integration of both qualitative and quantitative data provides a comprehensive evaluation of the current state of risk management in educational institutions and offers actionable insights for improving practices.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data collected from the evaluation of risk management implementation in educational institutions reveals a range of scores across various risk management components (Budi dkk., 2024). The table below summarizes the average scores for each institution on the following dimensions: Risk Identification, Risk Assessment, Risk Mitigation, Training & Awareness, and Resource Allocation. The scores are based on a 5-point scale, where 5 represents the highest level of implementation and 1 the lowest. Institution C consistently received the highest scores in all categories, with Risk Mitigation achieving a score of 4.7, followed by Risk Assessment at 4.6. In contrast, Institution D scored the lowest across all components, with Risk Mitigation receiving a score of 3.7 and Resource Allocation at 3.6. The data indicates significant variations in the implementation of risk management practices across the institutions.

Table 1. Risk Management Evaluation

Institution	Risk Identification	Risk Assessment	Risk Mitigation	Training & Awareness
Institution A	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.1
Institution B	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.8
Institution C	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.5
Institution D	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.9
Institution E	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.2

The descriptive data highlights key differences in how educational institutions manage risks. Institution C stands out with consistently high scores, suggesting that it has a well-developed risk management framework. This includes strong practices in risk identification, assessment, and mitigation. On the other hand, Institution D appears to face challenges in risk management implementation, particularly in the areas of resource allocation and risk mitigation. These institutions may lack the resources or training required to effectively manage risks. Overall, the data suggests that institutions with higher scores in risk management practices tend to have a more systematic and comprehensive approach to risk, while institutions with lower scores may struggle with gaps in either training, resources, or both.

Inferential analysis of the data reveals significant correlations between key variables. For example, Risk Assessment and Risk Mitigation are strongly correlated ($r = 0.85$), indicating that institutions that assess risks more effectively also implement stronger mitigation strategies. Similarly, Training & Awareness is positively correlated with all other components of risk management, suggesting that institutions that invest in training programs for staff are more likely to have robust risk management practices. However, the correlation between Resource Allocation and the other factors is weaker ($r = 0.55$), suggesting that while resources are important, their availability alone does not guarantee the effectiveness of risk management practices. This finding highlights that factors such as training, leadership, and strategic planning may have a more significant impact on risk management outcomes than simply resource availability.

The relationships between the variables suggest that a holistic approach to risk management is essential for its success in educational institutions. Effective risk identification and assessment processes tend to lead to better risk mitigation strategies. Additionally, institutions that invest in training and raising awareness among staff create a stronger foundation for risk management implementation. The weaker correlation with Resource Allocation implies that institutions may be able to improve their risk management practices even with limited resources, provided they focus on the other critical factors. These insights point to the importance of prioritizing comprehensive risk management frameworks that include not only sufficient resources but also strong leadership and continuous staff development.

A case study of Institution C offers a deeper understanding of the factors contributing to successful risk management implementation. Institution C scored the highest in all categories, particularly in Risk Mitigation and Training & Awareness. This institution has a well-established risk management team that regularly conducts risk assessments and engages in proactive mitigation strategies. Additionally, the institution has a robust training program that ensures all staff members are well-informed about risk management processes and their roles in them. The success of Institution C highlights the critical role of leadership in fostering a culture of risk awareness and

management, along with the importance of continuous professional development to keep staff equipped to handle emerging risks.

In contrast, Institution D, which scored the lowest across all categories, faced significant challenges in implementing effective risk management practices. Interviews with staff and administrators revealed that the institution lacked a structured risk management framework and had insufficient resources dedicated to risk identification and mitigation. The institution also reported difficulties in providing adequate training for its staff due to budget constraints. These challenges led to reactive rather than proactive approaches to risk management, making the institution more vulnerable to unforeseen risks. The comparison between Institution C and Institution D underscores the importance of a strategic, well-resourced, and trained approach to risk management.

In summary, the data analysis confirms that effective risk management in educational institutions is closely tied to a combination of factors, including leadership, training, and systematic risk processes. Institutions that prioritize these aspects are more likely to have comprehensive risk management frameworks that lead to better outcomes. The findings also suggest that institutions with fewer resources can still make significant improvements by focusing on strengthening their risk assessment and mitigation strategies, as well as enhancing staff awareness and training. The differences observed across the institutions provide valuable insights into how educational institutions can develop and implement more effective risk management practices to improve their resilience and sustainability.

The results of this study reveal significant variations in the implementation of risk management across educational institutions. Institution C demonstrated the highest scores in all areas—risk identification, assessment, mitigation, training, and resource allocation—indicating a well-established and comprehensive risk management framework. On the other hand, Institution D scored the lowest in all categories, with notable challenges in risk mitigation and resource allocation. These findings suggest that institutions with stronger leadership, better staff training, and systematic approaches to risk management tend to perform more effectively in managing risks. Overall, the study underscores the importance of a structured, proactive approach to risk management in educational institutions to enhance resilience and reduce vulnerabilities.

Comparing the results with existing literature on risk management in educational settings, the findings align with studies that highlight the role of leadership and training in effective risk management (Smith & Alexander, 2017). However, this study diverges from previous research by emphasizing the relatively weaker role of resource allocation compared to other factors like training and leadership. Many studies suggest that resource allocation is a key determinant of risk management success (Harris & Gamage, 2015), but our findings indicate that a lack of resources can be mitigated by strong leadership and a culture of risk awareness. This difference may reflect the dynamic context of educational institutions where leadership and training play more critical roles in risk management than the mere availability of resources.

The results of this study reflect the growing recognition that risk management in education is not just about financial resources or reactive problem-solving. Instead, they point to the importance of a proactive risk management culture, one where risks are systematically identified, assessed, and mitigated. This approach is essential for building resilient educational institutions that can effectively respond to emerging challenges. The higher scores in institutions with well-developed risk management frameworks demonstrate that a focus on training and awareness, along with strategic leadership, can result in more effective risk mitigation practices, regardless of resource constraints.

The implications of these findings are significant for both policymakers and educational leaders. It is clear that educational institutions need to prioritize the development of comprehensive risk management frameworks, with a particular emphasis on leadership and staff training. This study suggests that even with limited resources, institutions can improve their risk management effectiveness by focusing on strengthening leadership and fostering a culture of risk awareness among staff. The findings also indicate that institutions must shift from reactive to proactive risk management, where risks are identified and mitigated before they escalate into more significant issues. This proactive stance can greatly enhance the resilience of educational institutions, ensuring that they are better prepared for both expected and unforeseen risks.

The results of this research suggest that the focus on leadership and training in risk management implementation is particularly important in the educational sector. While resource allocation certainly plays a role, it is the institutional commitment to cultivating a risk-aware culture and empowering staff with the necessary skills that truly drives effective risk management. This can be explained by the findings showing that institutions with better training and leadership scored higher in risk management components despite lower resource availability. This highlights the critical role that internal capacity building, rather than external resources, plays in strengthening risk management processes in educational institutions. The data indicate that institutions that invest in leadership development and continuous staff training will likely outperform those that prioritize resources alone.

Moving forward, it is essential for educational institutions to adopt a more integrated and systematic approach to risk management. Policymakers should invest in leadership development programs that emphasize risk management skills and encourage a proactive approach to identifying and mitigating risks. Educational administrators should prioritize continuous training for staff at all levels, ensuring that risk management becomes part of the institutional culture rather than a set of isolated practices. Additionally, future research could explore the long-term impact of improved risk management practices on educational outcomes and institutional performance. This would help to further solidify the case for comprehensive, integrated risk management frameworks in educational settings and provide a roadmap for institutions aiming to build greater resilience in the face of emerging challenges.

CONCLUSION

One of the most significant findings of this study is the observation that educational institutions with stronger leadership and staff training in risk management practices tend to perform better, even when resources are limited. This challenges the conventional wisdom that resource allocation is the most critical factor in successful risk management. Institutions with more robust training programs and a proactive approach to risk identification and mitigation showed significantly higher effectiveness in managing risks, even in the face of resource constraints. This finding underscores the importance of leadership and training over financial resources in creating a resilient risk management framework in educational institutions.

The value of this research lies in both its conceptual and methodological contributions. Conceptually, it expands the understanding of risk management in education by emphasizing the need for a comprehensive, proactive approach rather than focusing solely on resource allocation. The study's method of combining both qualitative interviews and quantitative surveys offers a richer, more nuanced understanding of the real-world implementation of risk management practices. This mixed-methods approach provides valuable insights into both the perceptions and experiences

of staff and administrators, contributing to a more holistic view of the factors that drive effective risk management in educational settings.

A limitation of this study is its geographic and demographic scope, as it only includes educational institutions from a specific region. While the results provide useful insights, they may not fully represent the diversity of educational contexts globally. Future research should expand the sample size to include a broader range of institutions, including those from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, to enhance the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, further studies could focus on the long-term impacts of risk management implementation, particularly in relation to student outcomes and institutional sustainability, which would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the benefits of effective risk management in education.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; In-vestigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S., Rasool, A., & Gyanchandani, M. (2024). The Study of Securing Big Data Networks of Business Education Organizational. *Int. Conf. Comput. Commun. Netw. Technol., ICCCNT*. 2024 15th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies, ICCCNT 2024. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCNT61001.2024.10724143>
- Alzahrani, A. A., Gelius, P., Bauman, A. E., & Gebel, K. (2024). Physical activity policies in Saudi Arabia and Oman: A qualitative study using stakeholder interviews. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 22(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-024-01192-w>
- Artyukhov, A., Wołowiec, T., Artyukhova, N., Bogacki, S., & Vasylieva, T. (2024). SDG 4, Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence: Clash or Win-Win Cooperation? *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 16(19). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198483>
- Athoillah, M., Rahman, A. S., Firdaus, A. S., & Septiadi, M. A. (2024). POLICIES AND PRACTICES RELIGIOUS MODERATION IN PESANTREN. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 10(2), 387–396. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v10i2.27543>
- Budi, A., Goh, T. S., Giri Prawiyogi, A., Zebua, S., Khanna, G., & Daeli, O. P. (2024). Implementing Technology to Develop Lecturer Competencies from a Human Resource Management Perspective. *Int. Conf. Creat. Commun. Innov. Technol., ICCIT*. 2024 3rd International Conference on Creative Communication and Innovative Technology, ICCIT 2024. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCIT62134.2024.10701193>
- Capua, R. D., Albina, A. P., Shukla, T. D., Toledo, S. M. V., Mayormente, M., & Muthuperumal, S. (2024). Implementing Genetic Algorithms for Curriculum Scheduling and Optimization in Higher Education. *Int. Conf. Intell. Syst. Adv. Appl., ICISAA*. 2024 International Conference on Intelligent Systems and Advanced Applications, ICISAA 2024. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICISAA62385.2024.10829023>
- Dubchak, L. (2024). The development of criminal law and criminal executive policy in Ukraine (during the period of independence) concerning juveniles who have committed a prohibited act. *Archivum Kryminologii*, 46(2), 29–68. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.7420/AK2024.06>
- Elaish, M. M., Yadegaridehkordi, E., & Ho, Y.-S. (2024). Publication performance and trends in virtual reality research in education fields: A bibliometric analysis. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-024-19238-0>
- Elaish, M. M., Yadegaridehkordi, E., & Ho, Y.-S. (2025). Publication performance and trends in virtual reality research in education fields: A bibliometric analysis. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 84(10), 6999–7026. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-024-19238-0>

- Goel, S., Bhatt, G., Walia, D., Singh, R. J., & Pandey, A. (2024). India's consensus statement tobacco control priorities: Review of current strategies and the way forward. *Indian Journal of Tuberculosis*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijtb.2024.11.007>
- Grover, P., Phutela, N., & Guess, W. (2025). Role of Financial and Digital Literacy in Inclusive Finance and Sustainable Development. Dalam *FinTech and Financial Incl.: Leveraging Digital Finance for Economic Empowerment and Sustainable Growth* (hlm. 1–16). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003514114-1>
- Ha, N. D. M., & Thoa, D. T. M. (2024). Integrating Whole-Person Education into Curriculum Design and Implementation in Vietnamese Higher Education. *Asten Journal of Teacher Education*, 2024(Special Issue). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.56278/asten.vi.2703>
- Harsanto, B. T., Fitrah, E., Yamin, M., & Luthfi, R. M. (2025). The Effectiveness of Implementing the Merdeka-Belajar Kampus-Merdeka (MBKM) Policy in Developing High-Quality Human Resources at Jenderal Soedirman University, Indonesia, Contributing to SDGs: Quality Education. Dalam Jan C., Anwer I., Li L., Ferse S., Nishi M., & Puangprakhon P. (Ed.), *E3S Web Conf.* (Vol. 609). EDP Sciences; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202560908001>
- Hernández-Vergel, V. K., Prada-Núñez, R., & Hernández-Suárez, C. A. (2024). The 2030 agenda of the united nations sustainable development goals (Sdgs): Integration and impact on education in Cúcuta, Colombia. *Aibi, Revista de Investigacion Administracion e Ingenierias*, 12(3), 134–139. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15649/2346030X.4413>
- Kavkler, M. (2024). INCLUSIVE EDUCATION – FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS, IMPLEMENTING IT IN PRACTICE IS A BIG CHALLENGE. *Sodobna Pedagogika/Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 75(1), 88–107. Scopus.
- Keoy, K. H., Koh, Y. J., Iqbal, J., Anjum, S. S., Yeo, S. F., Cherukuri, A. K., Teoh, W. Y., & Piut, D. A. A. (2024). Streamlining Micro-Credentials Implementation in Higher Education Institutions: Considerations for Effective Implementation and Policy Development. *Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 23(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219649223500697>
- Kjellgren, B. (2024). Innovative Ideas and Academic Realpolitik: Building Global Competence Development into a European University Alliance. *Proc. Front. Educ. Conf. FIE. Proceedings - Frontiers in Education Conference, FIE*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE61694.2024.10893174>
- Kulkarni, S., & Firmin, S. (2025). Leveraging Educational Clouds for Empowering Rural Education. Dalam *Cloud Computing for Smart Education and Collaborative Learning* (hlm. 321–336). CRC Press; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003472537-28>
- Liu, W., Jamaludin, K. A., & Hamzah, M. I. (2025). Systematic review of culturally responsive teaching and implications for technical communication education. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 8(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025117>
- Mcheke, H. M., & Mislav, M. A. (2025). Politics of school evaluation during quality assurance policy implementation in selected secondary schools in Dodoma, Tanzania. *Quality Assurance in Education*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-07-2024-0125>
- Mujanah, S., & Budiarti, E. (2024). THE INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENTIATION STRATEGY, MARKET-DRIVEN AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE MARKETING ON SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE WITH SCHOOL IMAGE AS AN INTERVENING VARIABLE MODERATE BY VOCATIONAL SCHOOL CULTURE IN THE CITY OF BALIKPAPAN. *Revista de Gestao Social e Ambiental*, 18(9). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v18n9-131>
- Musana, J., & Bisaso, R. (2024). Trends and Challenges in Environmental and Sustainability Education in Uganda. Dalam *World Review: Environmental and Sustainability Education in the Context of the Sustainable Development Goals* (hlm. 40–54). CRC Press; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003145202-4>

- Nair, U. S., Gopinathan, K., & Tiwari, S. (2025). Quality Physical Education in India. Dalam *Quality Physical Education: Global Perspectives* (hlm. 91–100). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003513582-11>
- Nasir, M., Rijal, M. K., Kahar, S. K., Rahman, F., & Komariah, A. (2024). University Leaders' Views on Independent Campus Curriculum as Educational Reforms in Indonesian Islamic Universities. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 12(3), 147–172. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.22492/IJE.12.3.07>
- Nettey, J. N. A., & Owusu, A. (2025). The Impact of Computerized School Selection and Placement Systems on Effective Service Delivery: A Post Implementation Assessment of Students' Placements Into Second-Cycle Institutions in Ghana. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 91(2). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.70005>
- Nguyen, N. T. P., & Tran, L. H. (2024). Uncovering the Challenges and Requirements of Elementary School Teachers in Implementing STEM Educational Activities in Vietnam. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(6), 373–390. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.6.17>
- NOVORODOVSKYL, V., & KULESHA, N. (2024). NATIONAL MINORITIES PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC LIFE OF UKRAINE UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF THE RUSSO-UKRAINIAN WAR (2014 – 2024). *East European Historical Bulletin*, 2024(31), 186–202. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058X.31.306351>
- Raimi, L., Bamiro, N. B., & Lim, S. A. (2024). TWO FACETS OF AI-DRIVEN APPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF TECH-ENTREPRENEURIAL BENEFITS AND THREATS TO CREATIVE LEARNING. *Dev. Corp. Governance Responsib.*, 23, 223–248. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2043-052320240000023012>
- Šatavičiūtė-Natalevičienė, L. (2024). Small Stories: Revisiting Applied Art Studies in Interwar Lithuania. *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis*, 112, 174–205. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.37522/aaav.112.2024.201>
- Sepúlveda-Vallejos, S., Almonacid-Fierro, A., Valdebenito, K., & Aguilar-Valdés, M. (2025). Integrating evidence-based practices in preschool educators: A scoping review from 2004 and 2023. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 8(2). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.31893/MULTIREV.2025054>
- Singun, A. J. (2025). Unveiling the barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Discover Education*, 4(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00430-9>
- Veronez, T. F., & Sembiente, S. F. (2024). The Challenges and Possibilities of Internationalization for Brazilian Public Universities. Dalam *Decolonizing the Internationalization of Higher Education in the Global South: Applying Principles of Critical Applied Linguistics to Processes of Internationalization* (hlm. 197–220). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003409205-16>
- Yupeng, H. (2024). The Research Value of Chinese Traditional Music for the Development of Sports Universities. *Revista de Psicologia Del Deporte*, 33(2), 118–128. Scopus.

Copyright Holder :

© Handriadi et.al. (2025).

First Publication Right :

© International Journal of Educational Narratives

This article is under:

