Governance and Allocation of University Function for Management System Reform

Luo Ding

Student, Adamson University

ABSTRACT:

This study examines university governance and resource allocation practices, focusing on the perceptions of stakeholders at C University in China. The research identifies significant discrepancies in governance and resource management based on stakeholders' positions, lengths of service, academic degrees, and experiences. Utilizing surveys, interviews, and case studies, the findings highlight the need for more inclusive, transparent, and data-driven approaches to enhance institutional effectiveness. The study's implications extend to policy formulation and institutional reforms, offering a framework for creating more effective governance structures and improving stakeholder satisfaction in higher education institutions. The proposed "Enhancement of University Governance and Resource Allocation" program aims to foster stakeholder engagement, provide targeted training, and establish continuous evaluation mechanisms.

INTRODUCTION:

The optimal allocation of power within Chinese universities is a critical focus, emphasizing the two-level management system that includes both the university and its colleges. This system is foundational to the universities' function and healthy development. The colleges are considered the "economic foundation" of universities and play a central role in their operation. Consequently, reforming the college system is a significant measure to adjust the internal organizational structure and management system, addressing the evolving needs of higher education in China. These reforms aim to establish a modern university system with Chinese characteristics, optimizing the power distribution and regulation within the institutions.

"College run university" has emerged as a popular concept in recent years, becoming an important idea for many Chinese universities seeking better governance. This approach involves empowering colleges, adjusting power structures, and promoting autonomy at the grassroots level. The reform slogans like "college run university," "department run university," and "school run university" reflect efforts to redefine the relationship between universities and their constituent parts. This movement is inspired by the organizational traditions of Western universities, where a decentralized, bottom-heavy management style has historically promoted sustainable development.

The researcher, serving as a department head at C University, embarked on this study to understand and improve university governance and resource allocation. Through firsthand observations and practical experience, the researcher noted significant discrepancies in governance that impacted the efficiency and satisfaction of the academic community. This motivated a comprehensive assessment focusing on stakeholder perceptions across different roles and experiences. The goal was to identify key areas for improvement and propose evidence-based recommendations to enhance governance and resource management.

The study's importance lies in its potential policy and practical implications. Effective governance and equitable resource allocation are crucial for fostering a supportive and productive academic environment. The findings could provide valuable insights for university administrators and policymakers, aiding them in implementing changes that enhance transparency, inclusiveness, and overall institutional effectiveness. By addressing these issues, the study aims to contribute to a more equitable and efficient academic landscape, ultimately improving the quality of higher education.

Methodologically, the study employs literature review, surveys, interviews, and case studies, particularly focusing on the ongoing reforms at C University. The research highlights the importance of balancing power between university and college levels, addressing issues like power concentration and responsibility ambiguity. Drawing from governance theory, stakeholder theory, game theory, and procedural justice theory, the study proposes a comprehensive framework for power allocation. This framework integrates organizational, systemic, mechanistic, and cultural support systems to ensure effective management, suggesting that reform and innovation in these areas are essential for sustainable development and improved institutional performance.

Background of the Study. Foreign scholars have extensively studied the distribution and operation of power in higher education institutions. John van de Graaff (2019) analyzed academic power structures in seven countries, identifying four power structure models and analytical points. John Brubaker (2007) highlighted the diversification and imbalance in power allocation within universities, emphasizing stakeholder involvement. Thompson (2019) distinguished between formal and informal power, noting the impact of shared governance and academic freedom. Schattock (2019) explored factors influencing power allocation in the US, UK, and Japan, linking political systems and historical behaviors to current structures. Robert Bergdahl (2017) defined substantive and procedural self-governance, emphasizing university autonomy in goal-setting and execution.

Empirical research by foreign scholars also delves into faculty-level power distribution. Matthew Wasner (2006) concluded that universities cannot be fully democratized due to limited college control over resources, with significant decisions typically made by higher executives. Gareth Williams and Tesa Blackstone (2006) advocated for a collegiate governance system, while Cliff Dimmock (2006) identified key interest groups in university management. David Hollinger (2012) described the shared governance model in American universities, highlighting the collaborative yet distinct roles of academic and administrative departments.

Chinese scholars have examined the two-level power allocation between universities and colleges, noting the slow progress of reforms. Shi (2016) argued that the "university-run college" model restricts higher education development, advocating for "college-run university" reforms to enhance college autonomy. Yang (2017) and Zhang (2017) discussed the significance and challenges of these reforms. Xuan (2003) suggested moving towards a flatter organizational structure to improve governance.

Research on internal power allocation within Chinese universities shows a complex landscape. Tang (2017) and Teng (2016) used game theory to analyze power dynamics, advocating for balanced development of political, administrative, and academic powers. Yuan (2019) and Lin (2020) discussed horizontal and vertical management systems and reform measures. Zhu (2020) emphasized defining responsibilities and powers to promote efficient governance.

The researcher, a head of a department at C University, conducted this study to address the pressing need for effective power allocation strategies in Chinese universities. Given the slow progress and challenges of current reforms, there is a need for a deeper understanding and more systematic analysis of power

structures and governance practices. By examining both foreign and domestic models, the researcher aims to provide insights and recommendations that can enhance the governance and operational efficiency of higher education institutions in China.

Statement of the Problem. In higher education, how universities manage their resources and make decisions is crucial for their success. However, there are often obstacles that get in the way of effective management. Recently, there's been a growing demand for universities to be more transparent, accountable, and efficient in how they run things. This study aims to understand the challenges universities face in governance and resource allocation. By uncovering these challenges, the study hopes to offer solutions that can improve how universities operate. Through this research, we aim to contribute valuable insights to the ongoing conversation about how universities can better manage their resources and make decisions. Drawing from the aforementioned, this study asks the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents based on:
   * Position
   * Length of service
   * Academic Degree
   * Academic Experience
2. What is the respondents' assessment of the current situation of university governance in terms of:
   * Partnerships
   * Accountabilities
   * Equity
   * Ownership
3. Is there any significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on university governance when their profile is taken as test factors?
4. What is the respondents' assessment of the allocation of university functions in terms of:
   * Planning
   * Budgeting
   * Collaborating
5. Is there any significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on university allocation practices when their profile is taken as test factors?
6. Is there a significant relationship between respondents' assessment of the current situation of university governance and their assessment of university allocation practices?
7. What output can be made as a result of the study?

Significance of the Study. The research titled delves into the dynamics of power allocation within Chinese universities, particularly focusing on decentralization and power checks and balances. By examining the allocation of power at both the university and college levels, the study aims to enhance autonomy within colleges, foster greater participation from teachers in management processes, and empower grassroots managers. Through theoretical analysis and empirical investigation, the research offers insights into the pathways of power allocation within Chinese higher education institutions.

Theoretical significance is derived from the study's contribution to expanding the research scope within higher education, deepening theoretical understandings of power allocation, and enriching higher education management theories. Practically, the study provides actionable strategies and methods for optimizing power allocation within Chinese universities, thereby enhancing their governance, contributing

to national higher education reforms, and improving resource utilization efficiency. Ultimately, the research aims to bolster the international standing of Chinese higher education through systematic governance improvements.

Specifically, this study is beneficial to:

Students. For students, the significance of this study lies in its potential to influence the quality of their educational experience. By focusing on governance and management system reforms within universities, this research aims to enhance the overall environment in which students learn and grow.

Education Sector. This study holds significance for the education sector by offering insights into governance reforms within universities. It provides a framework for enhancing autonomy, participation, and efficiency within higher education institutions, ultimately contributing to the overall improvement of the education system.

Policymakers. Policymakers can benefit from this study as it provides evidence-based recommendations for reforming university governance structures. By understanding the dynamics of power allocation and decentralization within universities, policymakers can formulate more effective policies to promote institutional autonomy and improve the quality of higher education.

School Administrators. School administrators can leverage the findings of this study to streamline decision-making processes and enhance administrative efficiency within their institutions. The insights provided can help administrators optimize power allocation structures to better align with the unique characteristics and needs of their respective universities.

Teachers. For teachers, this study offers opportunities for increased participation in university management and decision-making processes. By empowering teachers to contribute ideas and suggestions, the study aims to create a more inclusive and collaborative environment within universities, ultimately enhancing the quality of education.

Academic Researchers. Academic researchers in the field of higher education management can use this study to deepen their understanding of power allocation mechanisms within universities. The theoretical insights and empirical findings presented in the study can serve as a foundation for further research and scholarly inquiry into university governance reforms.

Future Researchers. Future researchers can build upon the findings of this study to explore new avenues in the field of university governance and management. By identifying gaps in existing research and suggesting areas for further investigation, this study can inspire future researchers to contribute to the ongoing development of higher education management theory and practice.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study. In undertaking this study on governance and management system reforms within Chinese public universities, it was essential to delineate the boundaries within which the research operates. Firstly, due to the constraints of time and resources, the study primarily relies on literature sourced from within China, with limited engagement with references from developed countries. While recognizing the potential benefits of comparative research, the study prioritizes providing a comprehensive overview of governance dynamics specific to the Chinese higher education context rather than conducting specialized cross-country comparisons.

Moreover, the research focuses on a case study of "C University" as emblematic of Chinese public universities, intending to delve deeply into the intricacies of power allocation within this specific institutional context. By concentrating efforts on a singular case, the study aims to extract nuanced insights into governance structures and practices prevalent within Chinese academia. However, this narrow focus may limit the generalizability of findings to other universities within China.

The duration of this study was one academic year, encompassing initial planning, data collection, analysis, and reporting. The findings offer significant insights into stakeholder perceptions of university governance and allocation practices, emphasizing the need for targeted improvements. Considering variables such as job position, length of service, academic degree, and academic experience, the study provides a nuanced understanding that can inform more inclusive policy-making.

Additionally, the proposed countermeasures and recommendations formulated within this study are grounded in the distinctive national characteristics of China's higher education landscape. While designed to offer practical guidance for enhancing governance mechanisms within public universities across the nation, these recommendations may not be directly applicable to private educational institutions. The exclusion of private schools from the study's scope acknowledges the need for separate investigations into governance reforms within this sector.

Furthermore, the involvement of university leaders posed logistical challenges during the data collection phase. Coordinating interview schedules with busy administrators required careful negotiation and encountered some resistance, potentially impacting the depth and breadth of data gathered. Despite these challenges, the study endeavors to provide valuable insights into governance reforms within Chinese public universities, contributing to ongoing discussions surrounding institutional management and effectiveness in higher education.

METHODOLOGY

The research conducted by the head of a department at Chengdu University aimed to investigate power allocation within Chinese universities, primarily focusing on Chengdu University. This choice was driven by the university's representativeness during its developmental phase and the strong support it received from the Chengdu municipal government.

Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, the study employed both quantitative and qualitative research designs. The quantitative aspect involved a survey questionnaire distributed to 580 participants, representing various stakeholders within the university community. These stakeholders included university and college leaders, experts, scholars, frontline teachers, and researchers. The questionnaire was structured to gather data on respondents' profiles, current university governance status, and allocation practices. Statistical analyses, including item and factor analysis, were performed to ensure the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.

The qualitative component consisted of brief interviews with key stakeholders, such as university and college leaders, as well as experts and scholars. Thematic analysis was used to explore current situations and issues in two-level management, providing complementary insights to the survey findings.

Ethical considerations were paramount throughout the research process, with measures in place to obtain informed consent, protect participant privacy and confidentiality, address conflicts of interest, and minimize risks to participants. Recruitment was conducted transparently and voluntarily, with collaboration from university administrators and department heads to ensure diverse representation.

Data analysis was conducted using statistical software, including SPSS, to analyze the survey responses. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to summarize and interpret the findings. Various statistical tools, such as frequency and percentage calculations, weighted means, standard deviations, t-tests, ANOVA, and Pearson's product moment correlation, were utilized to assess relationships and differences among variables.

The study's findings provided valuable insights into power allocation dynamics within Chinese universities, informing recommendations for improving governance and allocation practices. The comprehensive approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods, ensured a holistic understanding of the research topic and contributed to the body of knowledge in higher education management.

RESULTS

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents
Table 1 Profiles of the Respondents

Variables	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Job Position	School leader	97	17.0
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	99	17.0
	Dean and Vice Dean	82	14.0
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	97	17.0
	Front-line Teachers	105	18.0
	General Administrative Personnel	100	17.0
	Total	580.0	100.0
Length of Service	Less than 5 years	104	18.0
	6-10 years	110	19.0
	11-15 years	114	20.0
	16-20 years	128	22.0
	More than 20 years	124	21.0
	Total	580.0	100.0
Highest Academic Degree	Doctorate Degree	194	33.0
	Master's Degree	178	31.0
	Bachelor's Degree	208	36.0
	Total	580.0	100.0
Length of Academic Experience	Less than 5 years	122	21.0
	6-10 years	112	19.0
	11-15 years	115	20.0
	16-20 years	111	19.0
	More than 20 years	120	21.0
	Total	580.0	100.0

The study found that most respondents were male, primarily aged 25 and above, with many majoring in musical performance, followed by technical research and musical education. This balanced gender representation underscores the need for inclusivity and diversity in music talent programs, ensuring equal access to resources and opportunities for all genders, which is crucial for fostering creativity and innovation. The diverse age range highlights the importance of tailoring talent cultivation initiatives to

various developmental stages and learning preferences, enhancing engagement and skill development. Furthermore, the multidisciplinary nature of respondents' majors emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to music education, integrating performance, education, and technical research to nurture well-rounded professionals and encourage collaboration, driving innovation and expanding artistic expression in the music industry.

Table 2. Overall Assessment of Respondents on the University Governance

Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Rank
Partnerships	2.52	1.10	Agree/ To an Extent	T1
Accountabilities	2.50	1.13	Disagree/ Somewhat	3
Equity	2.52	1.14	Agree/ To an Extent	T1
Ownership	2.51	1.13	Agree/ To an Extent	2
Overall	2.51	1.13	Agree/ To an Extent	--

Scale: 4.00-3.51= Strongly Agree/ To a Great Extent; 3.50-2.51= Agree/ To an Extent; 2.50-1.51= Disagree/ Somewhat Extent; 1.50-1.00= Strongly disagree/ None at All

The respondents in the study generally agreed on their assessments of university governance, with particular emphasis on partnerships and equity, which demonstrated the highest mean scores (Mok, 2015). These findings suggest that there is a level of satisfaction and effectiveness in establishing and maintaining partnerships, as well as in promoting equity among stakeholders within the institution. Strong partnerships can lead to increased resources, opportunities, and support, while prioritizing equity fosters a fair and inclusive environment conducive to collaboration and growth. However, there was a somewhat lower mean score for accountabilities, indicating potential challenges in clarity, transparency, or enforcement in holding individuals or groups responsible for their actions or decisions.

Despite the overall agreement on various aspects of university governance, the study reveals areas for improvement, particularly in strengthening accountability mechanisms (Huang et al., 2018). Insufficient accountability can lead to issues such as inefficiency, misconduct, and distrust among stakeholders. Strengthening these mechanisms is crucial for promoting transparency, responsibility, and trust, which are essential for the institution's overall effectiveness and reputation. Additionally, maintaining and enhancing partnerships and promoting equity are important for fostering collaboration, inclusivity, and sustainability within the university community.

In conclusion, while the study highlights positive aspects of university governance, such as effective partnerships and equity promotion, it also underscores the need for continued efforts to enhance accountability mechanisms. By addressing these areas for improvement, the institution can further cultivate a transparent, responsible, and inclusive governance environment that supports its mission and fosters collaboration and growth.

Table 3 Differences in Respondent Assessment on University Governance in terms of Job Position

Variables	Job Position	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Partnerships	School Leader	2.49	.235	.947	Accept	Not Significant
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.55				
	Dean/Vice Dean	2.50				
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.52				
	Frontline Teachers	2.52				
	General Administrative Personnel	2.50				
Accountabilities	School Leader	2.50	.160	.977	Accept	Not Significant
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.52				
	Dean/Vice Dean	2.51				
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.48				
	Frontline Teachers	2.49				
	General Administrative Personnel	2.48				
Equity	School Leader	2.53	.156	.978	Accept	Not Significant
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.53				
	Dean/Vice Dean	2.53				
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.52				
	Frontline Teachers	2.53				
	General Administrative Personnel	2.49				
Ownership	School Leader	2.54	3.535	.004	Reject	Significant
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.35				
	Dean/Vice Dean	2.55				

	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.58				
	Frontline Teachers	2.49				
	General Administrative Personnel	2.55				
Overall			1.021	.727	Accept	Not Significant

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the difference in the assessments of the respondents by job position yielded no significant differences in terms of partnership, accountabilities and equities. This implied that regardless of the job positions the respondents had similar perceptions on the current situation of their university governance in terms of those aspects. On the other hand, only the ownership provided significant difference in the assessment of respondents, thus, this aspect yielded varied opinions according to job position of respondents.

The assessment of respondents on university governance, analyzed according to job position, reveals both areas of consensus and notable differences. In terms of partnerships, all job positions—including school leaders, responsible persons of functional departments, deans/vice deans, responsible persons of disciplines, frontline teachers, and general administrative personnel—provided similar evaluations. The mean scores across these groups were closely aligned, and the F-value indicated no significant differences, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This suggests a generally shared perception of the effectiveness and health of the university's partnerships across different job roles.

For the dimension of accountabilities, there was no significant difference in assessments among the various job positions. The evaluations were consistent, with all groups rating this aspect at approximately the same level. This uniformity is reflected in the insignificant F-value, which supports the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Additionally, the perception of equity in university governance did not significantly vary across job positions. School leaders, functional department heads, deans/vice deans, discipline heads, frontline teachers, and administrative personnel all provided nearly identical ratings. The uniformity of the responses resulted in the acceptance of the null hypothesis, indicating that perceptions of equity are similarly experienced regardless of job position.

However, a significant difference was found among the job positions in terms of ownership. The mean scores varied more notably, and the F-value was significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Specifically, responsible persons of functional departments rated this dimension lower compared to other groups, while discipline heads and deans/vice deans rated it higher. This discrepancy suggests differing levels of perceived involvement and recognition among different roles within the institution, highlighting an area where targeted improvements could enhance the sense of collective ownership and engagement across all job positions (Zhang, 2018).

Despite the significant difference found in ownership, the combined assessments across all dimensions did not show significant variation by job position. The F-value for the overall assessment was insignificant, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis and indicating a broadly consistent view of university governance among different job roles. This overall consistency suggests that while specific areas like ownership may need targeted improvements, the general perception of governance practices is relatively stable across the university's diverse job positions (Zhang, 2017). Strengthening areas like ownership could lead to a more inclusive and cohesive governance structure, benefiting the institution as a whole.

Table 4 Post Hoc ANOVA Test on the Assessment of the University Governance in terms of Ownership by Respondents' Job Position

Variable	Job Position	Mean	School Leader	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	Dean/ Vice Dean	Responsible Person of Disciplines	Frontline Teachers	General Administrative Personnel
			2.54	2.35	2.55	2.58	2.49	2.55
Ownership	School Leader	2.54						
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.35				*		
	Dean/Vice Dean	2.55						
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.58		*				
	Frontline Teachers	2.49						
	General Administrative Personnel	2.55						

Using a Sheffe Test, the post hoc analysis on the assessment of respondents by job position in terms of ownership yielded a significant result between the assessments of the responsible person of the functional departments and the responsible person of disciplines, and vice-versa. This implied that differences in the assessments of ownership in the university governance were only seen by the respondents with those job positions.

The post hoc ANOVA test on ownership perceptions across job positions underscores significant disparities, particularly highlighted by the notably lower scores reported by responsible persons of functional departments compared to other roles such as deans/vice deans. This disparity suggests a potential disconnect in how different segments of the institution perceive their involvement and recognition in decision-making processes and ownership of institutional affairs. While some roles may feel more empowered and recognized, others may perceive a lack of engagement or acknowledgment, indicating a need for targeted interventions to bridge these gaps and foster a more inclusive governance structure (Sun, 2016; Ma & Zhang, 2015).

Conversely, school leaders, frontline teachers, and general administrative personnel displayed consistent perceptions of ownership, aligning closely with the overall trend. While this consistency may suggest a shared understanding of ownership across these roles, it remains essential to address any disparities that may exist to ensure that all members feel valued and engaged in shaping the institution's governance and direction. Addressing these disparities and promoting a culture of inclusivity and recognition can allow universities to enhance their effectiveness and cohesion, ultimately working towards achieving their mission and goals more effectively (Sui, 2020).

Table 5 Differences in Respondent Assessment on University Governance in terms of Length of Service

Variables	Length of Service	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Partnerships	Less than 5 years	2.48	1.841	.119	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.59				
	11-15 years	2.54				
	16-20 years	2.51				
	More than 20 years	2.46				
Accountabilities	Less than 5 years	2.50	.040	.997	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.49				
	11-15 years	2.49				
	16-20 years	2.49				
	More than 20 years	2.51				
Equity	Less than 5 years	2.48	.388	.817	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.52				
	11-15 years	2.53				
	16-20 years	2.55				
	More than 20 years	2.52				
Ownership	Less than 5 years	2.58	1.923	.105	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.43				

	11-15 years	2.55				
	16-20 years	2.50				
	More than 20 years	2.50				
Overall			1.048	.510	Accept	Not Significant

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the difference in the assessments of the respondents by length of service yielded no significant differences in terms of partnership, accountabilities, equities and ownership. This implied that regardless of the length of service the respondents had similar perceptions on the current situation of their university governance in terms of those aspects. The null hypothesis was accepted at a 5% level of significance.

The assessments of respondents on university governance, analyzed in terms of length of service, indicate relatively consistent perceptions across different tenure groups. In terms of partnerships, accountabilities, equity, and ownership, the mean scores did not vary significantly among respondents with varying lengths of service. The F-values for these dimensions were not significant, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis and suggesting that differences in length of service did not have a notable impact on perceptions of university governance.

Specifically, for partnerships, accountabilities, and equity, respondents across all tenure groups provided similar mean scores, indicating a shared perception of these aspects of university governance regardless of the length of their service. Similarly, in terms of ownership, while there were slight variations in mean scores among different tenure groups, the differences were not statistically significant. This consistency suggests that individuals with varying lengths of service perceive similar levels of involvement, recognition, and engagement in the ownership and decision-making processes within the institution (Song et al., 2021).

The findings suggest that length of service does not significantly influence perceptions of university governance among respondents. While there may be individual variations in experiences and perspectives, the overall assessment of governance practices remains relatively consistent across different tenure groups. This highlights the stability and uniformity of governance perceptions within the institution, irrespective of the duration of individuals' service, and underscores the importance of fostering a consistent and inclusive governance culture that engages all members, regardless of their tenure, in shaping the institution's direction and decisions (Tian & Lu, 2017).

Table 6 Differences in Respondent Assessment on University Governance in terms of Academic Degree

Variables	Academic Degree	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Partnerships	Doctoral Degree	2.52	.074	.929	Accept	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	2.51				
	Bachelor's Degree	2.52				
Accountabilities	Doctoral Degree	2.53	2.425	.089	Accept	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	2.44				
	Bachelor's Degree	2.51				
Equity	Doctoral Degree	2.53	.202	.817	Accept	

	Master's Degree	2.50				Not Significant
	Bachelor's Degree	2.53				
Ownership	Doctoral Degree	2.54	.794	.452	Accept	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	2.50				
	Bachelor's Degree	2.49				
Overall			**.874**	**.572**	**Accept**	**Not Significant**

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the difference in the assessments of the respondents by academic degree yielded no significant differences in terms of partnership, accountabilities, equities and ownership. This implied that regardless of the academic degree the respondents had similar perceptions on the current situation of their university governance in terms of those aspects. The null hypothesis was accepted at a 5% level of significance.

The evaluations of university governance by respondents, examined according to their academic degrees, suggest a notable consistency in perceptions across different educational backgrounds. Across dimensions such as partnerships, accountabilities, equity, and ownership, there were no significant differences in mean scores among individuals holding doctoral, master's, or bachelor's degrees. The lack of statistical significance in the F-values indicates that variations in academic degrees did not strongly influence how respondents assessed university governance.

Respondents with different levels of educational attainment provided similar mean scores for partnerships, accountabilities, equity, and ownership. This implies a shared understanding and perception of governance practices within the institution, regardless of academic qualifications (Jiang, 2020; Guo & Cui, 2015). These findings underscore the inclusive nature of governance perceptions, suggesting that individuals, irrespective of their academic backgrounds, view governance processes similarly and feel equally engaged in shaping the institution's direction and decisions.

The results indicate that academic degree does not significantly shape perceptions of university governance among respondents. Whether holding doctoral, master's, or bachelor's degrees, individuals appear to perceive governance practices through a similar lens. This emphasizes the importance of fostering a governance culture that values diverse perspectives and contributions, regardless of educational qualifications, to ensure a cohesive and inclusive decision-making environment within the institution.

Table 7 Differences in Respondent Assessment on University Governance in terms of Academic Experience

Variables	Academic Experience	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Partnerships	Less than 5 years	2.51	1.060	.375	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.57				
	11-15 years	2.52				
	16-20 years	2.52				
	More than 20 years	2.45				
Accountabilities	Less than 5 years	2.57	3.111	.015	Reject	Significant
	6-10 years	2.51				
	11-15 years	2.42				

	16-20 years	2.43				
	More than 20 years	2.54				
Equity	Less than 5 years	2.55	.293	.883	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.53				
	11-15 years	2.50				
	16-20 years	2.52				
	More than 20 years	2.50				
Ownership	Less than 5 years	2.49	1.768	.134	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.47				
	11-15 years	2.56				
	16-20 years	2.45				
	More than 20 years	2.57				
Overall			1.558	.352	Accept	Not Significant

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the difference in the assessments of the respondents by academic experience yielded no significant differences in terms of partnership, equities and ownership. This implied that regardless of the academic experience the respondents had similar perceptions on the current situation of their university governance in terms of those aspects. On the other hand, only the accountabilities provided significant difference in the assessment of respondents, thus, this aspect yielded varied opinions according to the academic experience of respondents.

The F-values for these dimensions were not significant, indicating that variations in academic experience did not strongly influence perceptions of partnerships and equity within the institution. Thus, individuals with varying academic backgrounds perceive these aspects of university governance similarly.

However, significant differences emerged in the dimension of accountabilities. Respondents with less than five years of academic experience rated accountabilities higher compared to those with 6-10, 11-15, and 16-20 years of experience. This disparity was significant, as indicated by the rejection of the null hypothesis. Similarly, in the dimension of ownership, there were notable differences in mean scores among respondents with different lengths of academic experience. Those with more than 20 years of experience rated ownership higher compared to other groups, albeit not significantly. These findings suggest that individuals with varying academic experience levels may have distinct perceptions of accountabilities and ownership within the institution, potentially influenced by their tenure and exposure to governance practices.

While academic experience did not significantly impact perceptions of partnerships and equity, it played a more pronounced role in shaping assessments of accountabilities and ownership. These findings underscore the importance of considering individuals' academic backgrounds and tenure when evaluating university governance, as differing levels of experience may influence perceptions of certain governance dimensions. Therefore, fostering a governance culture that accommodates diverse perspectives and experiences can enhance inclusivity and effectiveness in decision-making processes within the institution (Wen et al., 2022; Zhang & Zhang, 2018).

Table 8 Post Hoc ANOVA Test on the Assessment of the University Governance in terms of Accountabilities by Respondents' Academic Experience

Variable	Academic Experience	Mean	< 5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
			2.57	2.51	2.42	2.43	2.54
Accountabilities	< 5	2.57			*		
	6-10	2.51					
	11-15	2.42	*				
	16-20	2.43					
	> 20	2.54					

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Using a Sheffe Test, the post hoc analysis on the assessment of respondents by academic experience in terms of accountabilities yielded a significant result between the assessments of less than 5 years and 11-15 years, and vice-versa. This implied that differences in the assessments of ownership in the university governance were only seen by the respondents with those particular academic experiences.

The post hoc ANOVA test on the assessment of university governance regarding accountabilities by respondents' academic experience underscores significant variations in perceptions among different tenure groups. Notably, respondents with less than 5 years of academic experience rated accountabilities significantly higher than those with 11-15 years of experience, as highlighted by an asterisk (*) in the table. Conversely, individuals with 11-15 years of experience reported significantly lower ratings for accountabilities compared to those with less than 5 years or more than 20 years of experience. These findings suggest that the duration of academic tenure plays a crucial role in shaping perceptions of accountabilities within the institution, potentially influenced by varying levels of exposure and familiarity with governance practices.

However, no significant differences were observed in perceptions of accountabilities between other pairs of academic experience categories. This indicates that while certain tenure groups exhibit distinct perceptions of accountabilities, others perceive this aspect of governance similarly. Understanding these nuances is vital for fostering an inclusive governance culture that accommodates diverse perspectives and experiences, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness and transparency of decision-making processes within the institution (Yi, 2021; Yang, 2022).

Table 9 Overall Assessment of Respondents on the University Allocation Practices

Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Rank
Planning	2.52	1.11	Agree/ To an Extent	T1
Budgeting	2.48	1.12	Disagree/ Somewhat Extent	2
Collaborating	2.52	1.12	Agree/ To an Extent	T1
Overall	**2.51**	**1.12**	**Agree/ To an Extent**	**--**

Looking at the overall measurements of the results, there was an extent of planning, budgeting and collaborating in the university allocation practices as assessed by the respondents. Planning and collaborating were highly practiced in the university allocation practices as assessed by the respondents. However, somewhat extent can be observed in budgeting as part of the allocation practices of the university.

The highest mean scores for planning and collaborating, both at 2.52, indicate a general agreement, to some extent, that these aspects are functioning satisfactorily within the institution. This suggests that there

is a positive perception of the institution's efforts in planning for the future and fostering collaboration among stakeholders. Effective planning ensures that the institution can set clear goals and objectives, while collaboration promotes teamwork and synergy, leading to more successful outcomes (Zhang, 2017; Zha & Shen, 2018).

Conversely, the mean score of 2.48 for budgeting suggests a disagreement or somewhat disagreement regarding the effectiveness of budgeting practices within the institution. This indicates potential challenges or deficiencies in the institution's budget allocation and management processes, which could lead to inefficiencies, resource mismanagement, and financial instability.

The overall mean score of 2.51 reflects a general agreement, to some extent, with the statements presented in the table across all variables. While planning and collaborating are perceived positively, there are areas for improvement, particularly in budgeting practices (Zhang, 2018).

The table highlights both positive aspects and areas for improvement within the institution's operational processes. Strengthening budgeting practices to ensure transparency, efficiency, and alignment with institutional goals is crucial for financial stability and effective resource utilization. Additionally, continuing to prioritize planning and collaboration efforts can lead to greater strategic alignment, innovation, and overall institutional success (Zhang & Zhang, 2018).

Table 10 Difference in the Assessments of the Respondents on the University Allocation Practices in terms of Job Position

Variables	Job Position	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Planning	School Leader	2.54	1.760	.119	Accept	Not Significant
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.50				
	Dean/Vice Dean	2.46				
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.54				
	Frontline Teachers	2.47				
	General Administrative Personnel	2.61				
Budgeting	School Leader	2.47	.614	.689	Accept	Not Significant
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.46				
	Dean/Vice Dean	2.49				
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.53				
	Frontline Teachers	2.43				
	General Administrative Personnel	2.51				
Collaborating	School Leader	2.49	.690	.631	Accept	Not Significant
	Responsible Person of Functional Departments	2.53				

	Dean/Vice Dean	2.49				
	Responsible Person of Disciplines	2.49				
	Frontline Teachers	2.51				
	General Administrative Personnel	2.58				
Overall			**1.022**	**.480**	**Accept**	**Not Significant**

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the university allocation practices as assessed by the respondents were found no significant results in terms of planning, budgeting and collaborating by respondents' job position. This implied that the respondents have the same opinions on those aspects of university allocation practices regardless of their job positions. The null hypothesis was accepted at a 5% level of significance.

The assessment of respondents on university allocation practices reveals some differences in perception based on job position, although these variances are not statistically significant. In terms of planning, there are slight variations among different job positions, with general administrative personnel rating planning practices the highest and frontline teachers the lowest. However, these differences do not reach statistical significance, indicating that overall, perceptions of planning practices do not significantly vary across job positions within the institution (Yang, 2022).

When considering budgeting practices, there are minor differences in ratings among job positions, with general administrative personnel providing the highest rating and frontline teachers the lowest. However, like with planning, these differences are not statistically significant, suggesting that perceptions of budgeting practices remain relatively consistent across different job positions within the university.

Regarding collaboration, while there are variations in ratings among job positions, particularly with general administrative personnel providing the highest rating and frontline teachers the lowest, these differences do not reach statistical significance. This indicates that overall, perceptions of collaboration practices do not significantly differ across various job positions within the institution. Despite these minor differences, the overall assessment of university allocation practices does not demonstrate any statistically significant discrepancies based on job position, suggesting a general consensus among respondents regarding the institution's allocation practices regardless of their roles within the organization (Jiang, 2022; Mok, 2015).

Table 11 Difference in the Assessments of the Respondents on the University Allocation Practices in terms of Length of Service

Variables	Length of Service	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Planning	Less than 5 years	2.52	1.117	.347	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.58				
	11-15 years	2.56				
	16-20 years	2.48				
	More than 20 years	2.50				
Budgeting	Less than 5 years	2.44	1.378	.240	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.48				
	11-15 years	2.44				

	16-20 years	2.49				
	More than 20 years	2.55				
Collaborating	Less than 5 years	2.44	2.863	.023	Reject	**Significant**
	6-10 years	2.52				
	11-15 years	2.63				
	16-20 years	2.49				
	More than 20 years	2.50				
Overall			**1.786**	**.203**	**Accept**	**Not Significant**

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the university allocation practices as assessed by the respondents were found no significant results in terms of planning and budgeting by respondents' length of service. This implied similar perception among the assessments of the respondents on the university allocation practices irrespective of the length of service. Of all the variables of the university allocation practices, only collaborating was found a significant result, thus, this aspect yielded varied opinions among the assessments of the respondents when grouped according to the length of service.

The assessment of university allocation practices reveals noteworthy differences in perception based on the length of service of respondents. In terms of planning, while there are variations in ratings across different lengths of service, these differences are not statistically significant. This suggests that perceptions of planning practices remain relatively consistent regardless of the length of service of respondents within the institution.

However, when considering budgeting practices, there are notable differences in ratings among respondents with varying lengths of service. Particularly, respondents with more than 20 years of service provide the highest rating for budgeting practices, while those with less than 5 years of service rate them the lowest. This variance is statistically significant, indicating that perceptions of budgeting practices differ significantly based on the length of service of respondents within the institution.

Furthermore, significant differences in perception are observed concerning collaborating practices. Respondents with 11-15 years of service provide the highest rating for collaboration, while those with less than 5 years of service rate it the lowest. This discrepancy is statistically significant, suggesting that perceptions of collaborating practices vary significantly depending on the length of service of respondents within the institution (Sui, 2020; Zhang, 2018). Despite these differences, the overall assessment of university allocation practices does not demonstrate any statistically significant discrepancies based on the length of service, indicating a general consensus among respondents regarding the institution's allocation practices regardless of their tenure within the organization.

Table 12 Post Hoc ANOVA Test on the Assessment of the University Allocation Practices in terms of Collaborating by Respondents' Length of Service

Variable	Length of Service	Mean	< 5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
			2.44	2.52	2.63	2.49	2.50
Collaborating	< 5	2.44			*		
	6-10	2.52					
	11-15	2.63	*				
	16-20	2.49					
	> 20	2.50					

Using a Sheffe Test, the post hoc analysis on the assessment of respondents by length of service in terms of collaborating yielded a significant result between the assessments of less than 5 years and 11-15 years, and vice-versa. This implied that differences in the assessments of collaborating in the university allocation practices were only seen by the respondents with those particular length of service.

The post hoc ANOVA test on university allocation practices in terms of collaborating by respondents' length of service shows significant differences. Respondents with 11-15 years of service perceive collaborating practices more positively compared to those with less than 5 years. However, no significant differences are observed among other tenure groups, suggesting a relatively consistent perception of collaborating practices within these groups.

Table 13 Difference in the Assessments of the Respondents on the University Allocation Practices in terms of Academic Degree

Variables	Academic Degree	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Planning	Doctorate Degree	2.53	1.984	.138	Accept	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	2.56				
	Bachelor's Degree	2.48				
Budgeting	Doctorate Degree	2.50	.273	.761	Accept	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	2.46				
	Bachelor's Degree	2.48				
Collaborating	Doctorate Degree	2.55	1.185	.307	Accept	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	2.48				
	Bachelor's Degree	2.52				
Overall			**1.147**	**.402**	**Accept**	**Not Significant**

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the university allocation practices as assessed by the respondents were found no significant results in terms of planning, budgeting and collaborating by respondents' academic degree. This implied that the respondents have the same opinions on those aspects of university allocation practices regardless of their academic degree. The null hypothesis was accepted at a 5% level of significance.

The assessment of university allocation practices in terms of academic degree reveals minor differences in perception among respondents with different educational backgrounds. In terms of planning, while there are variations in ratings across different academic degrees, these differences are not statistically significant. This suggests that perceptions of planning practices remain relatively consistent regardless of respondents' academic degrees within the institution (Zhang, 2017; Huang et al., 2018).

Similarly, when considering budgeting practices, there are slight differences in ratings among respondents with different academic degrees, but these differences are not statistically significant. Thus, perceptions of budgeting practices do not significantly differ based on respondents' academic degrees within the institution (Wen et al., 2023). Furthermore, in terms of collaborating practices, while there are variations in ratings among respondents with different academic degrees, these differences are not statistically significant. This indicates that perceptions of collaborating practices remain relatively consistent across different academic degrees within the institution (Wu & Li, 2019). Overall, the assessment does not demonstrate any statistically significant discrepancies in perceptions of university allocation practices based on respondents' academic degrees, suggesting a general consensus among respondents regardless of their educational backgrounds.

Table 14 Difference in the Assessments of the Respondents on the University Allocation Practices in terms of Academic Experience

Variables	Academic Experience	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Planning	Less than 5 years	2.50	.311	.871	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.55				
	11-15 years	2.53				
	16-20 years	2.51				
	More than 20 years	2.53				
Budgeting	Less than 5 years	2.52	.442	.778	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.48				
	11-15 years	2.49				
	16-20 years	2.44				
	More than 20 years	2.47				
Collaborating	Less than 5 years	2.58	1.069	.371	Accept	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.49				
	11-15 years	2.53				
	16-20 years	2.48				
	More than 20 years	2.49				
Overall			.607	.673	Accept	Not Significant

Using ANOVA or F-Test, the university allocation practices as assessed by the respondents were found no significant results in terms of planning, budgeting and collaborating by respondents' academic experience. This implied that the respondents have the same opinions on those aspects of university allocation practices regardless of their academic experience. The null hypothesis was accepted at a 5% level of significance.

The assessment of university allocation practices in terms of academic experience suggests minimal differences in perception among respondents with varying lengths of experience within the institution. When considering planning practices, there are slight variations in ratings across different lengths of academic experience, but these differences are not statistically significant. This implies that perceptions of planning practices remain relatively consistent regardless of respondents' years of experience within the institution (Zhang, 2018).

Similarly, perceptions of budgeting practices do not significantly differ based on respondents' academic experience within the institution. While there are slight differences in ratings among respondents with different lengths of academic experience, these differences are not statistically significant. Therefore, the assessment indicates that perceptions of budgeting practices remain relatively consistent across different levels of academic experience within the institution.

Moreover, in terms of collaborating practices, while there are variations in ratings among respondents with different lengths of academic experience, these differences are not statistically significant. This suggests that perceptions of collaborating practices remain relatively consistent regardless of respondents' years of experience within the institution (Yi, 2021; Zha & Shen, 2018). Overall, the assessment does not reveal any statistically significant discrepancies in perceptions of university allocation practices based on respondents' academic experience, indicating a general consensus among respondents regardless of their length of experience within the institution.

Table 15 Relationship between the Assessments of the University Governance and the University Functions in terms of Allocation Practices

University Governance	Statistical Treatment	University Allocation Practices			Overall
		Planning	Budgeting	Collaborating	
Partnerships	Pearson r	-.028	-.033	.050	**-.004**
	sig	.508	.423	.228	**.386**
	Decision Ho	Accept	Accept	Accept	**Accept**
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	**Not Significant**
Accountabilities	Pearson r	.007	.099*	-.018	**.029**
	sig	.866	.017	.662	**.515**
	Decision Ho	Accept	Reject	Accept	**Accept**
	Interpretation	Not Significant	**Significant**	Not Significant	**Not Significant**
Equity	Pearson r	.040	.081	.015	**.045**
	sig	.338	.052	.718	**.370**
	Decision Ho	Accept	Accept	Accept	**Accept**
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	**Not Significant**
Ownership	Pearson r	.017	.034	-.064	**-.004**
	sig	.674	.416	.124	**.405**
	Decision Ho	Accept	Accept	Accept	**Accept**
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	**Not Significant**

The correlations between partnerships and operational practices like planning, budgeting, and collaborating seek to unveil how the involvement of external stakeholders influences these practices. Within the context of shared governance, where decisions are made collaboratively among diverse stakeholders, strong partnerships are vital for fostering a sense of inclusivity and ensuring that decisions reflect the perspectives and interests of all involved parties.

Accountabilities represent another cornerstone of shared governance, embodying transparency and responsibility within the institutional framework. The correlations between accountabilities and operational practices offer insights into how accountability mechanisms impact budgeting practices. Heightened accountability often translates to improved financial management and resource allocation, aligning with the shared governance ideal of ensuring that decision-making processes are transparent and accountable to all stakeholders. Implicitly assessing the relationship between accountability and budgeting practices, the table sheds light on how shared governance principles manifest in operational aspects of the institution.

Equity, as a fundamental aspect of shared governance, ensures fairness and inclusivity in decision-making processes. The correlations between equity and operational practices explore how considerations of

fairness influence planning, budgeting, and collaborating within the institution. Shared governance emphasizes the importance of equitable representation and participation, ensuring that decisions reflect the diverse perspectives and interests of all stakeholders. By implicitly examining the relationship between equity and operational practices, the table underscores the role of fairness and inclusivity in fostering effective governance processes within the institution.

Ownership, reflecting a sense of collective responsibility among stakeholders, is another key element of shared governance. The correlations in this context assess how ownership influences operational practices, subtly suggesting that a strong sense of ownership fosters active engagement in decision-making and investment in the institution's success. Shared governance principles encourage stakeholders to take ownership of institutional decisions and outcomes, fostering a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility. Implicitly aligning operational practices with the concept of ownership, the table underscores the importance of stakeholder engagement and investment in achieving institutional goals within the shared governance framework.

The correlation between accountability and budgeting within an institution is crucial for effective governance and resource management. Accountability ensures that the budgeting process is transparent, with stakeholders being informed about how budgetary decisions are made, who makes them, and the criteria used for allocation. This transparency builds trust and ensures efficient use of resources. Additionally, accountability involves clear roles and responsibilities for those involved in the budgeting process, holding them accountable for adhering to budget constraints and achieving financial goals. Regular monitoring and evaluation are essential components, as they help identify any deviations and enable prompt corrective actions. Moreover, involving stakeholders in the budgeting process promotes a sense of ownership and commitment to the institution's financial health. This approach leads to enhanced decision-making, improved financial stability, increased trust among stakeholders, and alignment with strategic goals. However, challenges such as balancing flexibility and control, resource constraints, and the need for cultural change must be addressed to implement robust accountability measures effectively. Such correlation between accountability and budgeting underscores the importance of responsible financial management in supporting the institution's mission and long-term success.

DISCUSSION

Understanding the diverse profiles of respondents, including their positions, length of service, academic degrees, and experiences, reveals the wide range of perspectives within the institution. This diversity underscores the importance of considering varied backgrounds in governance and resource allocation decisions. Assessments of university governance have identified areas for improvement in partnerships, accountabilities, equity, and ownership, highlighting the need for transparent, accountable, and inclusive governance practices that align with institutional values. Significant differences in assessments based on respondents' profiles indicate the necessity for tailored interventions in governance and resource allocation strategies to enhance stakeholder engagement and address diverse needs effectively.

The evaluation of university allocation practices emphasizes the importance of effective resource management in planning, budgeting, and collaboration to optimize institutional success and stakeholder satisfaction. The variations in assessments based on respondent profiles further stress the need for inclusive resource allocation approaches that cater to the diverse priorities and roles within the institution. Moreover, the interconnectedness between governance and allocation practices suggests that improvements in governance can enhance resource allocation outcomes, ultimately contributing to better

institutional performance and stakeholder satisfaction.

To address these findings and enhance institutional effectiveness, several recommendations are proposed:

- Create committees comprising members from different departments, academic backgrounds, and lengths of service to facilitate collaborative decision-making on governance and resource allocation. This will ensure diverse perspectives are considered and promote inclusivity in the decision-making process.

- Offer training sessions and workshops focused on governance principles, resource management, and effective communication for all stakeholders. Tailor these sessions to address the specific needs and challenges faced by stakeholders based on their positions, academic degrees, and length of service.

- Develop and maintain transparent communication channels, such as regular town hall meetings, online forums, and feedback mechanisms, to keep stakeholders informed about governance decisions and resource allocation processes. Encourage open dialogue and feedback to foster a culture of transparency and trust.

- Implement systems to collect and analyze data related to governance and resource allocation, including stakeholder feedback, institutional priorities, and financial metrics. Use this data to inform decision-making and ensure resources are allocated effectively and efficiently.

- Promote a culture of collaboration and accountability among stakeholders by setting clear goals, roles, and responsibilities for governance and resource allocation. Encourage collaboration across departments and disciplines to leverage collective expertise and resources.

- Conduct periodic evaluations of governance and resource allocation practices to identify areas for improvement. Solicit feedback from stakeholders and use this input to adapt and refine processes over time, ensuring continuous improvement and responsiveness to changing needs.

- Develop policies and procedures that prioritize equity and inclusivity in governance and resource allocation. Consider factors such as diversity, representation, and fairness when making decisions to ensure resources are distributed equitably and all stakeholders have an equal voice in the process.

Moreover, a program on Enhancement of University Governance and Resource Allocation was proposed with objectives to enhance university governance and resource allocation practices to promote organizational effectiveness and stakeholder satisfaction, and specifically:

- To assess the current state of university governance, including partnerships, accountabilities, equity, and ownership, to identify areas for improvement.

- To evaluate the existing resource allocation practices, focusing on planning, budgeting, and collaboration, to enhance transparency, efficiency, and effectiveness.

- To identify significant differences in stakeholder perceptions of governance and resource allocation practices based on their positions, length of service, academic degree, and academic experience.

- To develop targeted interventions and strategies to address identified deficiencies in governance and resource allocation, tailored to accommodate diverse stakeholder perspectives and priorities.

- To implement and monitor the effectiveness of the proposed enhancements in university governance and resource allocation practices, ensuring alignment with institutional goals and stakeholder expectations.

- To establish mechanisms for ongoing evaluation and review of governance and resource allocation

practices, fostering a culture of continuous improvement and accountability within the institution.

REFERENCES

1. (2007). Study on the Relationship between Administrative Power and academic Power based on two-level management system of university and college. Heilongjiang Education: Educational Research and Evaluation, 2007(5), 75-76.
2. Barker, K. (1984). Social Psychology [Monograph]. (Department of Sociology, Nankai University, Trans.). Tianjin: Nankai University Press.
3. Bedonjung. (2000). Academic management of Chinese and American universities [Monograph]. Wuhan: Huazhong University of Science and Technology Press.
4. Bedonjung. (2000). The definition of academic management and academic power. Educational Research of Tsinghua University, 2000(2), 44-47.
5. Birnbaum, R. (2003). University operation model: Control system of university organization and leadership [Monograph]. (B. Wing, Trans.). Qingdao: Ocean China University Press.
6. Birnbaum, R. (2003). University operation model: Control system of university organization and leadership [Monograph]. Qingdao: Ocean China University Press.
7. Brubeck, J. (2002). Philosophy of Higher Education [Monograph]. (W. Chengxu, et al., Trans.). Hangzhou: Zhejiang Education Press.
8. Chen, H. (2009). Research on power distribution in universities [Doctoral dissertation, Jinan University]. Guangzhou.
9. Chen, X. (1997). Study on Contemporary Higher Education Thought in America, France, Germany and Japan [Monograph]. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press.
10. Chen, Y., & Yang, J. (2009). Study on the game relationship of university interests based on the Faculty system. Journal of Southwest Petroleum University (Social Science Edition), 2009(1), 112-115.
11. Clark, B. (1994). Higher Education System: A transnational study of academic organizations [Monograph]. (W. Chengxu, et al., Trans.). Hangzhou: Hangzhou University Press.
12. Dahl, R. (1987). Modern political analysis [Monograph]. (W. Huning, et al., Trans.). Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
13. Deng, M. (2010). Research on financial governance model of colleges and universities: From the perspective of power allocation. Journal of Nanjing University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition), 2010(6), 37-41.
14. Dong, Y. (2006). On the concept of power. Human Rights, 2006(2), 28-29. [In Chinese]
15. Dye, T. (1985). Who runs America [Monograph]. (Z. Wei, W. Jigan, & L. Juchou, Trans.). Beijing: World Knowledge Publishing House.
16. Guo, G. (2010). Power allocation patterns and incentives in universities: An analytical framework based on principal-agent theory. Journal of World Economics, 2010(3), 92-104.
17. Guo, L., & Cui, Q. (2015). An Analysis of the Value of Academic Power and Administrative Power in Universities from the Conjugate Perspective. Academic Exploration, 2015(03), 147-151.
18. Hu, J. (1995). New theory of higher education [Monograph]. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.
19. Huang, B., Lin, M., Ren, C., & Chen, Y. (2018). Eforts to build a discipline evaluation system of international infuence with Chinese characteristics. China Higher Education, 1, 13–18.
20. Huang, H. (2012). Research on the Two-Level teaching Management of colleges and universities

under the Modern University System [Doctoral dissertation, Zhongyuan University of Technology]. Zhengzhou.

21. Jiang, F. (2007). Public rationality and institutional reform in universities. Educational Research, 2007(1), 76-79.

22. Jiang, L. (2020). Infuence of Discipline Evaluation on University Management—A Case Study on H University (unpublished doctoral thesis). Graduate school of education of Peking University.

23. Li, J. (1995). Politics of power [Monograph]. Heilongjiang Education Press.

24. Li, S. (2011). Discussion on the financial management Mode of colleges and universities under the two-level management system. Journal of Finance and Accounting, 2011(10), 156-157. [in Chinese]

25. Li, Y. (2012). Allocation and management of university resources under two-level management system. Friends of Accounting, 2012(12), 109-110.

26. Lin, J. (2009). The division of power and responsibility in the two-level management model of university and college. Journal of National Academy of Education Administration, 2009(11), 37-43.

27. Liu, J. (2005). Research on legal issues in the reform of higher education system [Monograph]. Beijing: Peking University Press.

28. Lv, C., & Ren, L. (2012). Exploration and practice of establishing and improving the teaching quality control system at University and College level. Jiangsu Higher Education, 2012(1), 88-89.

29. Ma, H., & Zhang, Y. (2015). Exploration and innovation of the power and responsibility system of School and Department in University charter. Modern Educational Management, 2015(10), 14-19.

30. Mok, K. H. (2015). Higher education transformations for global competitiveness: Policy responses, social consequences and impact on the academic profession in Asia. Higher Education Policy, 28(1), 1–15

31. Pan, M. (2001). Higher education research from a multidisciplinary perspective [Monograph]. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiao Huang Publishing House.

32. Pan, Y. (2007). Implementation of Professional Director System under two-level management system of university and college. Educational Review, 2007(4), 33-35.

33. Peng, Y. (2010). On faculty governance [Doctoral dissertation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology]. Wuhan.

34. Shi, X. (2009). Discussion on the theory and practice of university internal system construction. Heilongjiang Higher Education Research, 2009(1), 34-36.

35. Shi, X., & Yang, C. (2011). Analysis of the internal system construction stage of modern universities in China since the founding of New China. Black Longjiang Higher Education Research, 2011(7), 38-41.

36. Song, J. (2018). Creating world-class universities in China: Strategies and impacts at a renowned research university. Higher Education, 75(4), 729–742.

37. Song, J., Chu, Z., & Xu, Y. (2021). Policy decoupling in strategic response to the double world-class project: Evidence from elite universities in China. Higher Education, 82(2), 255–272.

38. Su, J. (2007). Toward Good Governance: Restructuring the power structure of University governance. Zhejiang Social Sciences, 2007(3), 103-107.

39. Sui, Y. (2020). A framework of the innovative study on the internal governance system in the higher education institution. Journal of East China Normal University (educational Sciences), 38(12), 21–32

40. Sun, J. (2006). A study on Personnel decentralization at two levels: A case study of the implementation of the teacher appointment system in Huazhong University of Science and Technology [Doctoral

dissertation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology]. Wuhan.

41. Sun, M. (2002). Educational Policy Theory: A Study of Socialist Educational Policy with Chinese Characteristics [Monograph]. Wuhan: Central China Normal University Press.

42. Sun, M. (2011). Unity of opposition between Academic Freedom and control: A Re-examination of the Essence View of Academic Freedom University. Educational Research Studies, 2011(6), 52-59.

43. Sun, S. (2016). Analysis of hot spots, trends and knowledge visualization map of University charter research in China. Modern Educational Management, 2016(9), 13-18.

44. Teng, S. (2015). Two-level management of university and college from the perspective of Game theory. Shandong Social Sciences, 2015(1), 138-139.

45. Tian, F. H. (2006). Thoughts on the reform of university internal system. Education and Occupation, 2006(7), 35-37.

46. Tian, M., & Lu, G. S. (2017). What price the building of world-class universities? Academic Pressure Faced by Young Lecturers at a Research-Centered University in China. Teaching in Higher Education, 22(8), 957–974.

47. Tomlin, F., & Suri, S. (2008). Literature search [Monograph]. Changchun: Jilin University Press.

48. Van de Graaf, J. (2001). Academic power: A comparison of higher education management systems in seven countries [Monograph]. (W. Chengxu, Trans.). Hangzhou: Zhejiang Education Press.

49. Wang, L. (2005). Academic Power and Administrative Power from the perspective of Democratic Governance. Chinese Higher Education, 2005(19), 5-7.

50. Wang, W. (2010). Power game and hierarchical governance between colleges and universities in merged universities. Research of Education, 2010(8), 45-48.

51. Wen, W. (2013). The formulation and transition of China's education policy from 1978 to 2007: A discourse analysis. Foreign Language Publications (funded by Title VI Grant of U.S. Department of Education). Ohio State University.

52. Wen, W., Hu, D., & Zhou, L. (2022). Navigating and negotiating global science: Tensions in China's national science system. Studies in Higher Education, 47(12), 2473–2486. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2081680

53. Wen, W., Wang, S., & Chang, L. (2023). Internationalization of higher education as a national strategy: A multi-country comparative study. Fudan Education Journal, 21(1), 112–128.

54. Wish, J. (2007). Thinking about power transfer in the Operation of secondary management mode in ordinary universities. Academic exploration, 2007(06), 137-146.

55. Wu, H., & Li, M. (2019). Three phases of de facto quasi-decentralisation of higher education in China since 1949. Higher Education Policy, 34(3), 685–705. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-019-00159-9

56. Xie, A., & Yan, G. (1998). The Power structure of universities and its adjustment. Higher Education Research, 1998(2), 20-24.

57. Xu, B. (2008). The concept of power from the perspective of jurisprudence. Party and Government Forum, 2008(09), 41-43.

58. Yang, L. (2022). Higher education, state and society: Comparing the Chinese and Anglo-American approaches. Bloomsbury Publishing.

59. Yang, R. (2022). The Chinese idea of a university: Phoenix reborn. Hong Kong University Press.

60. Yao, Q. (2000). Higher education management [Monograph]. Wuhan: Huazhong University of Science and Technology Press.

61. Yi, L. (2021). The problem of 'five-only's': The essence and solutions. [Wuwei wenti: Shizhi yu

chulu.] Educational Research, 42(1), 4–14

62. Yu, H. (2007). The construction of "question type" of university power allocation. Journal of Nantong University (Educational Science Edition), 2007(12), 19-22.

63. Yu, Y., & Zhou, L. (2008). Problems and Countermeasures in University management at two levels. Chinese Adult Education, 2008(21), 40-41.

64. Yuan, Z. (2005). College system and vertical management System reform in universities. Higher Science Education, 2005(1), 105-107.

65. Zha, Q., & Shen, W. (2018). The paradox of academic freedom in the Chinese context. History of Education Quarterly, 58(3), 447–452.

66. Zhang, A., & Dong, G. (2010). Thinking on Constructing a two-level teaching quality control system. Chinese Adult Education, 2010(2), 42-43.

67. Zhang, K. (2017). Current situation and analysis: A review of China's university system. Modern Educational Science, 2017(7), 127-135.

68. Zhang, W. (2004). The logic of university [Monograph]. Beijing: Peking University Press.

69. Zhang, X. (2010). Research on Some problems of post setting and Graded employment in Hangzhou University under the two-level management system. Human Resources Development of China, 2010(2), 102-105.

70. Zhang, X. (2018). Research on power allocation among universities and colleges in China -- A case study of universities in Shandong Province [Doctoral dissertation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology].

71. Zhang, Y. (2011). Study on Deepening the reform of Budget allocation Model of University and College. The Friends of Accounting, 2011(3), 89-91.

72. Zhang, Y., & Zhang, H. (2018). From market-like governance to quasi-market governance: The direction of governance reform of higher education in China. [Cong leishichanghua zhili dao zhunshihanghua zhili: Woguo gaodeng jiaoyu zhili biange de fangxiang.] Higher Education Research, 39(6), 3–19.

73. Zheng, Y., & Xu, G. (2010). Power allocation: The core of college system reform. Chinese Higher Education Research, 2010(12), 24-26.

74. Zhou, Z. (2014). Study on the two-level management mechanism of local undergraduate school. Education and Careers, 2014(1), 27-29.

75. Zhu, G. (2013). Construction and practice of management system and operation mechanism of secondary colleges. Journal of Chongqing University of Science and Technology, 2013(11), 164-167.