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Abstract. State legitimacy is increases quality of education as in the absence of it the higher education institution will make more profit and gave low quality of education. If the state legitimacy prevails in the country, then the government will be able to regulate these institutions and can bring better policies in the country. Democracy gave right to the students to study whatever they want, to get enrolled in whatever education and can have their own point of view. Democracy empowers students and thus this will contribute to the quality of the education. In any nation the number of public services given to the individuals increase the life standard in the same way if scholarships and funds should be given to the students, electricity would be provided to the educational institution then the quality of the education can be improved. So, state legitimacy, democracy and public services have significant association with the quality of education. The aim of this study was to assess the impact of three dependent variables including state legitimacy, democracy and public services on the independent variables on the quality of the education. The data was collected from ten different Asian countries including are Pakistan, India, Malaysia, Indonesia, China, Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. The timeline of the study is 29 years from 2019 and the data was collected from The Economic Form, The World Bank reports as well as the Transparency International. The analysis was performed by using EViews and various statistical tests were applied including ADF, LLC, cointegration test and ARLD test. The results of ARLD test showed that all three dependent variables were significantly associated with the quality of education. Literacy rate was correlated with the rise in quality of education in both long and short run, but population growth showed rise in quality of education in long run but not in the short run. Only state democracy showed positive association in the long run but showed no association in the short run. The results of our study have social, political and economic implications.
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1. Introduction

Quality education has fundamental role in tapping the full potential of human resource of the country having valuable technical skills. The rising importance of education quality in Asia has turned the debate from the access to education to provision of quality education. The challenges in the education system of Asia are majorly emanated from the substantial quality of education which is equivalent to no education at all. There is little argument on the fact that poor standards of education are tantamount to merely fulfilling the formality of provision of basic education to child. Quality education employs human capital with technical skills which has significant impact on the sustainable development and economic growth of the country. High-end human capital has higher return than low-
end human capital (Faggian, Modrego, & McCann, 2019; Fitzsimons, 2017; Pelinescu, 2015). Different theoretical and empirical studies have explored the channels through which government positively affects the quality of education such as technical training of teachers, R&D, and financial assistance (Hopkins, 2015; Howard, 2018; Qayyum, Zipf, Gungor, & Dillon, 2019).

This study aims to probe the various channels which intervene in ameliorating the poor education quality of the country such as state legitimacy, democracy and public services. Along with the traditional factors of quality education, state legitimacy and regulations in education also contribute in checking the quality control of education. Moreover, the state legitimacy may have two-way causality with quality education because later also strengthen the state legitimacy and compliance of regulation (Mahrinasari, Haseeb, & Ammar, 2019). Fayolle, Verzat, and Wapshott (2016) explained in their manuscript that education research by entrepreneur strive for legitimacy and regulations to overcome the complexities in the field (Anser, Zhang, & Kanwal, 2018; Gong & Yi, 2018; Olasupo & Idemudia, 2017; Tight, 2019). Moreover, democracy may also have the considerable impact on the provision of quality education to masses because it’s the government of majority with least exploitation. Ideologically, democracy connotes with the provision of equitable basic opportunities to people without discriminating on the basis of wealth position, language, and caste. Another channel through which government may also raise the quality of education is the provision of public services in education system (Bassok, Fitzpatrick, Greenberg, & Loeb, 2016; Hampton, 1993; Odhiambo, 2011). Government though optimal provision of public services and public spending in education system may raise the standards of education in the state (Haddad, Freguglia, & Gomes, 2017).

The deteriorating quality of education in Asia has captured the attention of policy makers. Raising the quality education in Asia has become the matter of urgency to exploit the full potential of human resource. Without improving the quality of education, optimal level of technical skills and human capital is hard to attain. Consequently, it will obstruct the sustainable development of the State (Pelimescu, 2015; TyndorfJr & Glass, 2017). However, challenges in quality education have been addressed by various studies, but no empirical study has present in literature for Asia which has explored the impact of State legitimacy, democracy, and public services on quality education. Moreover, no studies have employed the multivariate regression model to explained quality education
Our study aims to fill the gaps in the literature of quality education by explaining it empirically with state legitimacy, democracy, and public services (Dinç Aydemir & Aren, 2017; Gong & Yi, 2018; Muda, 2017). Novelty of this study is that it has employed panel data technique to control the time wise and cross section wise variation in data. Moreover, add into the empirical literature of quality education by explaining it with government quality variables. This study has following objectives:

- To analyze the impact of State legitimacy on quality education in Asia.
- To determine the role of Democracy in education quality of Asia
- To explore the effect of Public service on quality education in Asia

The past studies on quality education captured the attention of policy makers in education which has positive implication (Dinda, 2016; Pelinescu, 2015; TyndorfJr & Glass, 2017). Furthermore, the previous literature on quality education is foundation of theoretical and practical frameworks. This study also means to contribute in same lines. In next sections study comprises discussion on the literature review; methodology and data collection; results and policy recommendation.

2. Literature Review

Literature on educational quality presents various theoretical and empirical studies which discussed different quality assessment theoretical model to improve the education quality. Noaman, Ragab, Madbouly, Khedra, and Fayoumi (2017) also developed the theoretical model for assessing the education quality of university which includes e-learning as important quality indicator for education. Moreover, different model to improve the quality education has been tested such as provision of technical training to teachers, provision of basic infrastructure, adoption of e-learning (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015; Azeiteiro, Bacelar-Nicolau, Caetano, & Caeiro, 2015; King & Boyatt, 2015; Hasan, Hatidja, Nurjanna, Guampe, Gempita, Ma’ruf, 2019; Senan, 2018; Girdzijauskaite, Radzeviciene, Jakubavicius, 2019).

The adoption of e-learning in education is meant to support teachers’ and students’ access to learning material (Khalid, Pahi & Ahmed, 2016). However, procrastination in adopting the latest learning techniques is mainly spurt from the lack of legitimacy, control, and regulations in education system. For this purpose, we have explored the literature on the impact of government quality variables such as democracy, state legitimacy and public service on the education quality.

2.1 Educational quality and State legitimacy

State legitimacy assure the strict compliance of rules and regulation in the State. It refers to good governance, compliance of rules and regulation, and practice of democratic rights. The prevalence of state legitimacy assures the strict compliance of rules and regulation and laws and order. State legitimacy assures that all policy decisions are executed under the light of law and regulations (Tran, 2018). Same is perceived for the education system in state legitimacy that the policy decision for education will be in the best interest of the education quality of the state. Furthermore, the State legitimacy will assure the credibility and accountability of the government. Government in state legitimacy is accountable for every decision taken in different sphere including education. Mbiti (2016) mentioned in his study that despite of increasing enrollment rate, the quality standards of education in developing countries cannot be uplifted due to lack of accountability in education. Moreover, the state legitimacy will also indirectly facilitate the diffusion of quality education to masses through the channel of democracy. State legitimacy has both direct and indirect impacts on the education policy of the State because the correlation between the State legitimacy and democratic practice in the country is also supported by the various studies in the literature (Van Beek,
State legitimacy by provision of democratic rights will contribute in designing the policy for education which in the best interest of the students. Hence, in the light of above discussion we can generate the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a significant impact of state legitimacy on quality of education in Asia.

2.2 Educational quality and Democracy

Rule of democracy is an indicator of good governance in the country, which also promotes the quality of education. The democratic rule of government is the government of majority which takes the policy initiative for the betterment of society. Biesta (2015) also illustrates in his book that good education quality is widespread in the age of democracy and politics. In his study, he focused on democracy, ethics and politics as a factors of education quality of the country. Democracy, by promoting the democratic and political rights of the people, attempts to provide equitable quality education for further strengthening rule of democracy.

Higgins and Coffield (2016) in their book paid tribute to Dewey's contribution in building the relationship between democracy and education. Fortunato and Panizza (2015) empirically explored the interaction between the democracy and quality of education by employing cross-sectional panel data. The index of democracy has been taken from the freedom house which has positive correlation with quality of education. The empirical findings of the study also confirm the positive linkages between democracy and education quality in the country. However, there are few studies which do not support the significant role of democracy in promoting the quality education. Dahlum and Knutsen (2017) investigated the linkages between the democracy and the education by conducting empirical research. The study employs the panel dataset of 128 countries from 1965 to 2016 to test the hypothesis: Democracy provide education access to relatively more students than autocracies. In addition, study also explore the positive relationship between democracy and better learning and technical skills of students. The empirical findings of the study inferred that democracy has not significant association with the provision of quality education. Furthermore, study illustrated that democracy does not significantly offer better education than autocracies. According to Belcastro (2015) the democratic legislation in USA has jeopardize the education quality by slandering the voice of teachers and truncating the curriculum to commensurate with corporate measurement. The mix views of researcher have been found in the literature about the association of democracy and education quality. Hence, on the basis of above literature we can construct following hypothesis:

H2: There is a significant impact of democracy on quality of education in Asia.

2.3 Education Quality and Public Services

The public services is refer to the provision of basic services to the people living in its jurisdiction. Public service is the nonexclusive public goods which is provided to all member of society regardless of caste, ethics, income, and mental and physical abilities. The public services also aim to serve the education system of the state by spending on education. Diffusion of public services in education raises the quality of education by providing equal opportunity to all strata of population without any discrimination. Public services is also proxied by the public spending on education which is relatively higher in OCED and European countries than Asian economies. Kundu (2017) conducted an empirical research to find the long-term relationship between effectiveness of public services in education and quality education in India. For this purpose, the study employed the time series data and cointegration model (Johansen cointegration test) to explore the long run relationship between public services and education quality. The empirical findings of the study also support the presence of cointegration relationship between public services and education quality. Therefore, in the light of aforementioned studies in literature we can build our hypothesis as follow:
H3: There is a significant impact of public service in education on quality of education. This manuscript aims to contribute in the literature of quality education by investigating its association with government quality indicators such as state legitimacy, democracy, and public services. In the literature, hardly any study has been found which has explained the quality of education by controlling the impact state legitimacy, democracy and public services.

3. Materials and methods

3.1 Data collection

This study investigates the relationship between better quality of education with three different factors like state legitimacy, democracy and public services. Data was collected regarding these factors with the span of 28 years before 2019. Ten countries included in the study are Pakistan, India, Malaysia, Indonesia, China, Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Turkey and Saudi Arabia was included in the study. The data regarding the depending variables were collected from The Economic Form, The World Bank reports as well as the Transparency International. The collection of the data was accompanied with the units of the variables of the factors.

3.2 Modeling

After the collection of the data analysis was performed. The data comprise of one independent variable and two controls and dependent variables. There was one dependent variable that is quality of education and other three dependent variables were state Legitimacy, democracy and public services. Additionally, to compare the results of our study a set of controls was also included. These control variables include literacy rate and per capita income. The measurement units were also included in the study based on their own factors. The unit for measuring the quality of the education is the student and teacher’s satisfaction about the education standard and availability. State legitimacy includes the percentage of application of the policies and rules of the government. Democracy is measure by the percentage of the freedom of expression in the educational sector and right to choose the relevant course in the country. Public services include the number of the services like availability of the library, managing the funding for the research purposes and ensuring the health of the population. The population count is done in numbers. The measurements of control variables were also included in the study. The control variable is literacy rate and it is measure of the number of the people who can read and write their names in the country other control variable includes the population growth of the country. It is measured in the by the increase in the population each year.

\[
\begin{align*}
QE_{it} &= \beta + \beta_1 SL_{it} + \beta_2 SD_{it} + \beta_3 PS_{it} + \beta_4 LR_{it} + \beta_5 PG_{it} + \epsilon_{it}
\end{align*}
\]

In the above given equation, QE shows the term quality of education, SL shows state legitimacy, SD shows state democracy, PS shows public service, PG shows population growth, LR shows literacy rate and \(\epsilon_{it}\) is used to represent error. The series is converted to the to the per capita and the model after the log form can be written as,

\[
\begin{align*}
\lnQE_{it} &= \beta + \lnSL_{it} + \beta_2 \lnSD_{it} + \beta_3 \lnPS_{it} + \beta_4 \lnLR_{it} + \beta_5 \lnPG_{it} + \epsilon_{it}
\end{align*}
\]

3.3 Analysis of the data

To analyze the data different test were applied like the unit root test, cointegration test, coefficient estimation test and Granger Casualty test for various purposes. The details of each of these tests are given below;

3.4 Panel unit root test
A panel unit root analysis was the first tool used for this study to evaluate and investigate the collected data. This experiment was designed to determine the order of integration and to see if data is stationary (null hypothesis). Levin–Lin–Chu (2002), Im–Pesaran–Shin (2003), and Fisher-type (Choi., 2001) are commonly used for the analysis. Conventional test lacks the ability of to resolve certain power and size of the collected data. These issues are addressed by the panel unit root test. The standard distribution graphs provided by the both tests are the same. In this study LLC test of the panel unit root test is applied as it gives homogeneous autoregressive process. Whereas, heterogeneous autoregressive process is done in the IPS test. In LLC root test basically two hypotheses are made null and alternate hypothesis. The null hypothesis is that the data included in the study is non-stationary. This non-stationary data is due to the presence of the unit root. Whereas, the alternate hypothesis concludes that data is stationary. And the unit root is present in data.

Another test applied with the LLC is the ADF known as Augmented Dickey Fuller Test. It is also used to check if the data is stationary or not. The null hypothesis in ADF is that unit root is present in our data. Whereas, alternate hypothesis signifies that our time series is stationary.

\[ DF_t = \gamma SE(\gamma) \]

\[ \text{If } \gamma = 0 \text{ then the null hypothesis will be accepted and if the } \gamma < 0 \text{ then the alternate hypothesis will be accepted.} \]

### 3.5 Cointegration Test

The next test the author uses in this analysis is the Panel cointegration test. The fundamental purpose of using this particular test is to confirm the occurrence of any co-integrated and long-term equilibrium relationships between variables. In this test null and alternate hypothesis are also made. Null hypothesis in panel cointegration test is that our independent variable has no is cointegrated relationship with the dependent variables. Whereas, alternate hypothesis is that our independent variable has cointegrated relationship with the dependent variables. Two other approaches involved in this test are Kao and Pedroni (1954). The dimensions are checked through these approaches and conclusion regarding null and alternate hypothesis are made according to the result of these approaches.

### 3.6 ARDL Test

Unit test identify the order of the series and cointegration of the series is determined by the panel ARDL test (Pesaran, Shin, & Smith, 2001). The conventional cointegration test are not flexible like ARDL test. Pesaran et al. (2001) stated the importance of the panel ARDL test over conventional test that this test can work best for the small data size. By keeping the lag length optimal the relationship of the log-run is calculated in this test. Two types of test are used in this test like Wald test and F test is done to analyze the relationship of variables.

\[
\Delta \ln Q_E t = \beta_0 + I = 0 \ln P \beta_1 \Delta \ln Q_E t - i + L = 0 \ln q \beta_2 k \Delta \ln S_L t - q + I =
0 \ln r \beta_3 \ln S_D t - r + I = 0 \ln s \beta_4 \Delta \ln P_S t - s + i + L = 0 \ln u \beta_5 \Delta \ln L_R t - u + i + L = 0 \ln v \beta_6 \Delta \ln P_G t - v + i + \pi Q E T - 1 \pi + \pi S L t - 1 \pi + \pi S D t - 1 \pi + \pi S D t - 1 \pi + \pi P S t - 1 \pi + \pi L R t - 1 \pi + \pi P G t - 1 \pi + v t
\]

In this equation the \( v \Delta t \) accounts for the error term and \( \Delta \) represents the short. Wald test is always used for analysis when short run are more than 1. The short run difference of variables is zero in the short run. When (Pesaran et al., 2001) is used then the F-statistics value will compare the e I(0) and I(1).

### 4. Results
To analyze any data of mixed integration the ARDL test can be used. However it cannot be applied unless the data is not in I(2) series. To analyze this integration panel unit root test including ADF and LLC test are applied. Usually both these tests are applied by using intercept. After these tests are applied then analysis with trend and intercept are done. This trend is with level and difference.

### 4.1 ADF and LLC unit roots

The results of ADF and LLC unit roots are given in the table 1 and 2. This test was applied in order to investigate the order of integration and to check the stationary properties of the variables. In the table 1 in ADF test it can be seen from the level series of the table that all variables except the population growth and quality of education have accepted the null hypothesis this means that majority of acceptance shows that in level series, unit root exists and the data is non-stationary. Whereas, in LLC test all variables except state legitimacy, population growth and quality of education have accepted the null hypothesis this means that majority of acceptance shows that in level series, unit root exists, and the data is non-stationary. But after applying the log the data became stationary as shown by the first differentiation series in both ADF and LLC test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>ADF Test</th>
<th>LLC Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; diff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>6.287***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>4.846***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>12.293***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>4.361*</td>
<td>6.298***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE</td>
<td>6.287*</td>
<td>12.287***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Cointegration test

The Kao cointegration test was applied in the study so that the presence of cointegrated relationships can be estimated and investigated between the variables by using F-statistics. Optimum lag length as shown in the table is A.I.C. The detailed results of this test have been given in the table 2 of the study. According to the results shown in the tables the F-statics 24.1 have exceed the upper bound CV. This value rejects the null hypothesis of cointegration. Whereas the LBCV at 1 percent is 2.83 and UBCV at 1 percent is 5.77 and 4.20 at 10 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>ADF Test</th>
<th>LLC Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; diff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.P.L. length (A.I.C)</td>
<td>(2,0,1,0,1,0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Stat. (Bound Test)</td>
<td>24.0921***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.C</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.B.C.V.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.B.C.V.</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Panel ARDL Estimation

The results of ARDL test and its long and short run relationship are shown in table 3.1 and 3.2. The relationship of the quality of education in the long run results showed a positive and significant association. Our results showed that state legitimacy implies the rise in quality of education by 21%, state democracy rise the quality of education by 19.3%, and public services gave raise the quality of education by 18.3%. Population growth and literacy rate gave rise to quality of education in the long run by 28%. This shows that the positive impact of long run of our variables on the quality of education. In short run relationship only state legitimacy (SL), public services (PS) and literacy rate (LR) showed the positive association with our independent variable that is quality of education. The presence of state legitimacy in short run give rise the quality of education by 39.92%, public services give rise the quality of education by 24.98% and literacy rate give rise the quality of education by 29.44%. Our controls including the population growth have 28.4% and literacy rate have 28.7% impact on the rise of quality of education in the long run. Whereas, population growth in short run have no impact on the rise of quality of education but gave literacy rate 18.7% rise in the quality of the education.

Table 3. ARDL Estimation in long run

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run Long Results</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Summary &amp; Diagnostic Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QE</td>
<td>2.732***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE (-1)</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adj. ( R^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE (-2)</td>
<td>1.298***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>3.283***</td>
<td>( X^2SC )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>2.023***</td>
<td>( X^2W )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>2.474***</td>
<td>( X^2AR )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>4.246**</td>
<td>( X^2SC )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>3.387**</td>
<td>( X^2W )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>4.482***</td>
<td>( X^2AR )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Run Results</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Summary &amp; Diagnostic Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>3.992***</td>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>Adj. ( R^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>2.498**</td>
<td>( X^2SC )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>( X^2W )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>2.944***</td>
<td>( X^2AR )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Discussion

As the study was conducted in order to investigate and explore the impact of state legitimacy, democracy and public services increase the quality of education in presence of two control variables i.e. population growth and literacy rate, some hypotheses were generated for this purpose. Our first hypothesis was that the state legitimacy has significant impact on the quality of the education. Our study proves this hypothesis that the presence of state legitimacy there will be a positive impact on the quality of the education. The result are in accordance with the
(Katz, 2008; Van Zanten & Maxwell, 2015; Yang & Zhao, 2015) that associated the implementation of state legitimacy there will be positive impact on the quality of the education. Our second hypothesis was state democracy have the significant impact on the quality of the education. The results are in accordance with the (Biesta, 2015; Fortunato & Panizza, 2015; Reid & Filby, 2018) that also suggest that state democracy have positive influence with the quality of the education. Our study shows that state democracy have positive impact on the quality of education in the long run but not in the short run. Our third hypothesis was that the public services have significant impact on the quality of education. Our study showed that in both long and short run public service has positive impact on the quality of the education. (Aaberge, Langørgen, & Lindgren, 2017; Agostino & Arnaboldi, 2017) also suggest that better the public services better will be the quality of education in any region.

State legitimacy is increases quality of education as in the absence of it the higher education institution will make more profit and gave low quality of education. If the state legitimacy prevails in the country, then the government will be able to regulate these institutions and can bring better policies in the country. Democracy gave right to the students to study whatever they want, to get enrolled in whatever education and can have their own point of view. Democracy empowers students and thus this will contribute to the quality of the education. In any country the number of public services given to the individuals increase the life standard in the same way if scholarships and funds should be given to the students, electricity would be provided to the educational institution then the quality of the education can be improved.

5.2 Conclusion

Our study was conducted in the data collected from the ten Asian countries to assess the role of state legitimacy, democracy and population growth on the quality of the education. Different tools were used to analyze the data including ADF, LLC, cointegration test and ARDL test. The results of our study concludes that all the dependent variables have positive influence on the quality of the education in the long run and except state democracy all other dependent variables have the positive impact on the independent variable that is quality of the education in the presence of two control variables literacy rate and population growth.

5.3 Limitation and implication

This study has some implications as well as some limitations. This study have provided with the literature about the impact of the three variables state legitimacy, democracy and public services on the quality of the education, this can be considered as theoretical implication. The practical implication of the study is that the developing countries of Asia who have been struggling with democracy, state legitimacy should pay more heed to resolving them as this will not only improve the quality of education but with the economic status of the country as education brings prosperity and wellbeing to the nation. This study has also provided assistance and guidance to the policy making departments of government to make such policies and regulations that increase the implementation of these variables to enhance the quality of education in these countries. The limitation of this study includes the sample size is small and is only limited to ten countries of the Asia. A larger prospective study including larger sample size and more countries from different continents of the world should be included. Also, more efficient models for analysis can be used like GMM modeling, fixed and random effect modeling.
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