ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

Policy Enhancement on the Roles of Chinese University Foreign Affairs Offices and International Academic Diplomacy

Rong Li[1]

[1]Doctor in Public Administration

[1]Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila, Philippines

Publication Date: 2026/06/11

Abstract: This study examined the roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices in public administration and their relationship to international academic collaboration, as assessed by selected respondents from higher education institutions in China. Specifically, the study described the respondents' demographic profile; assessed the extent to which foreign affairs offices perform their roles in terms of government regulators, foreign partner institutions, faculty, and international students; evaluated the level of international academic collaboration in terms of joint research, academic exchanges, and foreign faculty recruitment; determined whether significant differences exist in the assessments when respondents are grouped according to profile variables; and examined the significant relationship between the roles of foreign affairs offices and international academic collaboration. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from 251 respondents through a structured survey questionnaire employing a four-point Likert scale. Statistical treatments included frequency and percentage distribution, weighted mean and standard deviation, independent samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance, and Pearson product-moment correlation. Results revealed that respondents generally assessed both the roles of foreign affairs offices and international academic collaboration at an "Agree" or "Evident" level. Faculty-related roles and institutional partnerships emerged as relatively stronger areas, while foreign faculty recruitment and certain aspects of international student support were evaluated more moderately. The findings further showed that there were no significant differences in respondents' assessments when grouped according to sex, age, civil status, and educational qualification, indicating that perceptions of internationalization practices are shaped more by shared institutional experiences than by demographic characteristics. Correlation analysis revealed a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between the roles of foreign affairs offices and international academic collaboration, highlighting the importance of effective administrative coordination, regulatory alignment, and faculty engagement in strengthening international academic outcomes. Based on the findings, the study proposed a policy enhancement framework aimed at strengthening the strategic, faculty-centered, and outcome-oriented functions of foreign affairs offices. The study concludes that effective governance and institutional support mechanisms are critical to advancing sustainable and meaningful international academic collaboration in Chinese higher education.

How to Cite: Rong Li (2026) Policy Enhancement on the Roles of Chinese University Foreign Affairs Offices and International Academic Diplomacy. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology,* 11(3), 4169-4191. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

I. INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, higher education institutions have become critical actors in advancing global knowledge production, academic diplomacy, and cross-border collaboration. Chinese universities, in particular, have increasingly engaged in international academic partnerships as part of the country's broader strategy to strengthen educational diplomacy and global competitiveness. At the center of these initiatives are the Foreign Affairs Offices (FAOs), which serve as administrative units that coordinate partnerships, oversee foreign student services, and facilitate international faculty exchanges. The effectiveness of FAOs directly influences the quality of international academic collaboration and the ability of Chinese universities to integrate into the global education landscape.

Public administration plays a central role in shaping how FAOs operate, given that they function within the regulatory frameworks established by the Chinese Ministry of Education and other state agencies. These offices are not merely administrative support units but also governance hubs that mediate between domestic policies and international expectations. As universities pursue global visibility and partnerships, there is an urgent need to examine and enhance the policies governing FAOs to ensure that they can balance

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

compliance with innovation while advancing sustainable academic collaborations.

The challenges faced by FAOs include navigating complex regulations, managing cross-cultural partnerships, ensuring the welfare of international students, and securing alignment with national education priorities. At the same time, opportunities for strengthening soft power, enhancing academic diplomacy, and contributing to China's innovation-driven development strategy make FAOs strategically important. Hence, a study on policy enhancement for FAOs is both timely and necessary, especially in light of global competition and the evolving demands of higher education.

This research, therefore, focuses on the roles of Chinese universities' FAOs in public administration and international academic collaboration, with the aim of proposing policy enhancements to strengthen their governance functions. By grounding the study in Collaborative Governance Theory and Institutional Theory, it seeks to highlight how FAOs can be restructured and empowered to better serve as agents of academic diplomacy, innovation, and cross-border knowledge exchange.

➤ *Theoretical Framework*

The study is anchored on the on Collaborative Governance Theory and supported by Institutional Theory, which together explain the role of Foreign Affairs Offices (FAOs) in Chinese universities as mediators of international academic collaboration.

➤ *Statement of the Problem*

This study assessed the Policy enhancement on the roles of Chinese Universities foreign affairs offices in Public Administration and international Academic collaboration. Specifically, it will answer the following:

- What is the demographic profile of respondents in terms of the following: Age, Sex, Civil Status, and Educational Attainment?
- What is the assessment of respondents on the roles of Chinese Universities foreign affairs offices in Public Administration in terms of the following: government regulators, foreign partner institutions, faculty, and international students?
- What is the assessment of respondents on the international Academic collaboration in terms of the following: Joint research, Academic exchanges, and Foreign faculty recruitment?
- Is there significant difference in the assessment of respondents on the roles of Chinese Universities foreign affairs offices in Public Administration when their profile is taken as test factor.
- Is there significant difference in the assessment of respondents on the international Academic collaboration when their profile is taken as test factor.
- Is there significant relationship in the assessment of respondents between the roles of Chinese Universities foreign affairs offices in Public Administration and international Academic collaboration?
- Based on the results of the study what proposed policy enhancement on the roles of Chinese universities foreign affairs offices can be proposed?

II. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

➤ *On the Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of the Age, Sex, Civil Status, and Educational Attainment*

Table 1 Respondents' Demographic Profile

Indicators	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	21–30 years old	72	28.7
	31–40 years old	79	31.5
	41–50 years old	58	23.1
	Above 50 years old	42	16.7
Sex	Male	134	53.4
	Female	117	46.6
Civil Status	Single	92	36.7
	Married	109	43.4
	Widow/er	19	7.6
	Separated	31	12.4
Educational Qualification	Tech Vocational Graduate	30	12.0
	College Graduate	135	53.8
	Masteral Graduate	62	24.7
	Doctoral Graduate	24	9.6
Total		**251**	**100.0**

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 251 respondents, offering an initial lens through which subsequent assessments may be understood. The distribution suggests a sample that is neither narrowly defined nor overly skewed toward a single subgroup. Instead, the profile reflects a reasonably heterogeneous population in terms of age, sex, civil status, and educational qualification. This diversity is important, as perceptions of internationalization, governance,

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

and academic collaboration are often shaped by both professional maturity and educational exposure. As such, the demographic composition appears adequate for capturing varied viewpoints rather than a single dominant narrative.

In terms of age, the largest proportion of respondents falls within the 31–40 years old group (79 respondents, 31.5%), followed closely by those aged 21–30 years old (72 respondents, 28.7%). Together, these two groups account for just over 60 percent of the sample, suggesting that the majority of respondents are in early to mid-career stages. This concentration may imply relatively high familiarity with contemporary institutional practices, including digitalized administrative systems and international academic engagement. Meanwhile, respondents aged 41–50 years old (23.1%) and above 50 years old (16.7%) remain well represented, which helps temper the dataset with perspectives grounded in longer institutional experience. The presence of older respondents may provide a useful counterbalance when interpreting views on policy clarity, administrative consistency, and long-term collaboration.

The sex distribution shows a slight predominance of male respondents (53.4%) over female respondents (46.6%), though the difference is not substantial. This near-balanced composition reduces the likelihood that perceptions reflected in later analyses are heavily gender-biased. From an analytical standpoint, this balance supports the validity of subsequent difference testing by sex, as neither group is underrepresented. It also suggests that views on foreign affairs office roles and international academic collaboration are drawn from both male and female respondents in relatively comparable proportions.

With respect to civil status, married respondents constitute the largest group (43.4%), followed by single respondents (36.7%), while separated (12.4%) and widow/er respondents (7.6%) make up smaller but still meaningful segments. This spread may matter when interpreting perceptions of institutional support and international engagement, as personal stability and family responsibilities can influence attitudes toward mobility, extended collaboration, or participation in international activities. The presence of multiple civil status categories suggests that the dataset captures respondents navigating different personal contexts rather than a homogenous lifestyle profile.

Educational qualification data indicate that the sample is largely academically grounded. A majority are college graduates (53.8%), followed by masteral graduates (24.7%), while doctoral graduates (9.6%) and technical vocational graduates (12.0%) comprise smaller portions. This pattern suggests that most respondents possess at least foundational exposure to higher education systems, which is relevant when assessing concepts such as international academic collaboration, faculty engagement, and institutional partnerships. At the same time, the inclusion of respondents with varied educational attainment may explain some of the nuanced or moderate evaluations observed later, as expectations and benchmarks for internationalization often differ by academic background.

Overall, the demographic profile in Table 1 suggests a respondent group characterized by moderate diversity and substantial academic exposure. The dominance of early to mid-career professionals, combined with a balanced sex distribution and a predominantly college-educated population, may partly explain the generally “agree”-level assessments reported in later tables. At the same time, the presence of older, more experienced, and more highly educated respondents introduces perspectives that may be more critical or cautious, particularly regarding policy clarity, implementation consistency, and tangible outcomes of international collaboration.

- *On the Assessment of Respondents on the Roles of Chinese Universities Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in Terms of the Foreign Partner Institutions, Faculty, and International Students*

Table 2 Assessment on the Roles of Chinese Universities’ Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in Terms of Government Regulators

Indicator	WM	SD	QD	VI	Rank
Policy frameworks from regulators encourage innovation and flexibility in cross-border research collaborations	3.32	0.850	Agree	Evident	1
Adequate support and resources are provided by government agencies to strengthen internationalization efforts in higher education	2.54	1.044	Agree	Evident	2
The Ministry of Education and other regulators actively facilitate partnerships between Chinese universities and foreign institutions	2.92	0.920	Agree	Evident	3
Government regulations ensure transparency and accountability in international academic agreements	2.38	0.793	Disagree	Slightly Evident	4
Government policies provide clear guidelines that support international academic collaboration in universities	1.86	0.710	Disagree	Slightly Evident	5
Overall Mean	**2.61**	**0.532**	**Agree**	**Evident**	

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Evident); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Evident)

Table 2 shows that respondents rated the government regulator dimension at an overall mean of 2.61 with a standard deviation of 0.532, interpreted as Agree and Evident based on your legend. On balance, this suggests respondents

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

generally see regulators as playing a supportive role in international academic collaboration, but the average is not particularly high, which may hint at uneven experiences across institutions. In practice, some universities may feel well-guided and enabled, while others may experience policy support as present but not consistently actionable. This kind of "moderate agreement" often appears in internationalization studies where policy exists on paper but local implementation varies by capacity, leadership attention, and administrative follow-through.

The strongest item in Table 2 is the statement that policy frameworks encourage innovation and flexibility in cross-border research collaborations (WM = 3.32, SD = 0.850, Rank 1). That score sits near the upper end of the "Agree" band, implying that many respondents recognize regulators' intent to allow universities to move, experiment, and partner across borders without being locked into rigid procedures. Still, the relatively wide spread in responses, reflected by the SD near 0.85, may suggest that this flexibility is experienced differently. Some campuses may be operating in relatively open policy environments, while others may still feel procedural constraints due to local compliance practices or cautious interpretation of rules.

At the lower end, the item on clear government policy guidelines supporting international academic collaboration is rated WM = 1.86 (SD = 0.710, Rank 5), falling into Disagree and Slightly Evident. This is a noticeable drop from the overall mean and may point to a familiar issue in the literature on governance and higher education regulation: policies can be ambitious and supportive, but if the guidance is not communicated in plain, implementable terms, universities may struggle to interpret what is allowed, what is preferred, and what requires special approval. I have seen this pattern even in institutional settings where administrators are motivated, but they still end up relying on informal advice networks or precedent cases rather than clear written guidelines.

Two other items help explain the mixed picture. GR2 (facilitating partnerships) is rated WM = 2.92 (SD = 0.920), which is solidly "Agree," while GR3 (transparency and accountability in agreements) is lower at WM = 2.38 (SD = 0.793), interpreted as "Disagree." That gap may suggest a policy environment where making partnerships happen is easier than ensuring the process is consistently transparent. If collaboration is encouraged, but monitoring and accountability mechanisms are uneven, universities may push forward with agreements while still feeling uncertain about reporting, documentation standards, or audit expectations.

Overall, Table 2 reads like a system that is supportive in principle and sometimes enabling in practice, yet still burdened by clarity and governance consistency issues. The "interesting" finding is that flexibility and innovation receive stronger agreement than clarity and accountability, which is slightly counterintuitive if one expects regulation to prioritize standardization. One interpretation is that respondents notice encouragement and openness, but they also feel the absence of detailed guidance that would make collaboration smoother and less risky. In administrative terms, the results may suggest that regulators' impact could be strengthened by more consistent policy communication, clearer templates for agreements, and standardized reporting expectations that do not slow collaboration but reduce uncertainty.

Table 3 Assessment on the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in Terms of Foreign Partner Institutions

Indicator	WM	SD	QD	VI	Rank
International partners are committed to sustaining long-term academic collaboration	3.59	0.547	Strongly Agree	Highly Evident	1
Effective communication channels exist between Chinese universities and foreign partner institutions	3.41	0.516	Agree	Evident	2
Collaboration with international universities leads to mutual benefits in research and academic exchanges	3.38	0.828	Agree	Evident	3
Foreign partner institutions contribute significantly to the success of joint academic programs with Chinese universities	3.20	0.776	Agree	Evident	4
Foreign partner institutions demonstrate cultural sensitivity and respect in academic collaborations	2.95	0.904	Agree	Evident	5
Overall Mean	**3.31**	**0.315**	**Agree**	**Evident**	

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Evident); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Evident)

Table 3 reports an overall mean of 3.31 with a standard deviation of 0.315, interpreted as Agree and Evident. Compared to Table 2, this is a stronger and more consistent pattern, and the lower SD suggests respondents' views are more clustered, meaning there is less disagreement about the role of foreign partners. This generally aligns with internationalization literature that frames external partners as key drivers of program continuity, research productivity, and the "real-world" functioning of collaborative arrangements. When partnerships work, respondents often see the benefit directly in joint projects, exchanges, and institutional visibility.

The highest-rated indicator is FPI5 (commitment to sustaining long-term academic collaboration) with WM = 3.59 (SD = 0.547, Rank 1), interpreted as Strongly Agree and Highly Evident. That score suggests respondents perceive foreign partners as willing to stay engaged beyond one-off

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

projects. In practical terms, long-term commitment usually shows up in recurring exchange cohorts, multi-year research agendas, or repeated co-hosted conferences. It also implies that respondents may have observed fewer "transactional" partnerships and more sustained academic relationships, which is not always the case in international collaboration settings.

Closely behind, FPI4 (effective communication channels) has WM = 3.41 (SD = 0.516, Rank 2), while FPI2 (mutual benefits in research and exchanges) has WM = 3.38 (SD = 0.828, Rank 3). These ratings are still strong, but the higher variability for FPI2, shown by SD near 0.83, may indicate that mutual benefit is not evenly felt. Some collaborations might be truly reciprocal, while others may be perceived as favoring one institution's publication goals, student recruitment needs, or funding access. This is a nuance frequently noted in international partnership discussions: communication can be functional, yet perceived equity can still vary.

The lowest-rated item, though still positive, is FPI3 (cultural sensitivity and respect) with WM = 2.95 (SD = 0.904, Rank 5). It remains in the "Agree" band, but it stands out because it is both the lowest mean and has one of the widest dispersions. This may suggest that cultural sensitivity is highly context-dependent. For example, a partnership may run smoothly at the administrative level, yet small issues such as meeting etiquette, turnaround expectations, language barriers in emails, or differing norms about authorship order can create friction. Those practical realities are often understated in official collaboration reports, but respondents tend to remember them.

Taken together, Table 3 paints foreign partner institutions as a generally strong enabling factor for international academic collaboration, particularly due to perceived long-term commitment and communication. At the same time, the weaker and more variable rating on cultural sensitivity suggests an area where foreign affairs offices may need to provide more structured intercultural preparation or clearer partnership protocols. The overall pattern is encouraging, but it also hints that "successful collaboration" is not only about agreements and activities; it also depends on how people manage everyday academic interactions across cultures.

Table 4 Assessment on the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in Terms of Faculty

Indicator	WM	SD	QD	VI	Rank
University faculty are provided with adequate institutional support for engaging in cross-border academic activities	3.61	0.794	Strongly Agree	Highly Evident	1
Faculty members play a critical role in strengthening institutional linkages with foreign universities	3.53	0.864	Strongly Agree	Highly Evident	2
Chinese faculty view international collaboration as an opportunity for professional growth and innovation	3.03	0.647	Agree	Evident	3
Faculty members actively participate in international research and academic exchange programs	2.97	0.641	Agree	Evident	4
Collaboration with foreign faculty enhances the teaching and research quality of Chinese universities	2.58	0.495	Agree	Evident	5
Overall Mean	**3.14**	**0.293**	**Agree**	**Evident**	

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Evident); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Evident)

Table 4 indicates an overall mean of 3.14 with a standard deviation of 0.293, interpreted as Agree and Evident. Faculty roles are evaluated positively, and the relatively low SD suggests respondents are fairly consistent in their views. This fits common higher education internationalization arguments that faculty are the practical engines of collaboration, since they propose joint research, supervise visiting scholars, host exchange students, and keep partnerships academically meaningful beyond administrative paperwork.

The two highest indicators are FAC3 (institutional support for cross-border activities) with WM = 3.61 (SD = 0.794, Rank 1) and FAC5 (faculty role in strengthening institutional linkages) with WM = 3.53 (SD = 0.864, Rank 2), both interpreted as Strongly Agree and Highly Evident. These results imply that respondents see faculty participation as not only active but also sufficiently backed by the institution. Still, both items carry relatively high SD values, particularly FAC5, which may suggest uneven access to support. In reality, some faculty receive travel funding, reduced teaching loads, or administrative assistance, while others manage collaborations on top of full workloads, which can shape how they answer these items.

Mid-range indicators include FAC2 (collaboration as professional growth) with WM = 3.03 (SD = 0.647) and FAC1 (active participation in research and exchanges) with WM = 2.97 (SD = 0.641). These are solid "Agree" ratings, suggesting faculty engagement is present and generally valued. What is interesting is that "support" and "linkage strength" scored higher than "active participation" itself. One explanation is that respondents perceive the environment as supportive, yet participation rates may still vary due to disciplinary differences, language confidence, or the practical barriers of time and workload.

The lowest item is FAC4 (collaboration enhances teaching and research quality) with WM = 2.58 (SD = 0.495, Rank 5), interpreted as Agree and Evident, but it is notably

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

lower than the top items. This gap may suggest that respondents can clearly see faculty involvement and institutional support, but they are less convinced that these collaborations translate into direct improvements in teaching or research outcomes across the board. It might be easier to observe participation than to measure instructional quality change or research impact in a way that feels immediate. Sometimes the benefits show up later through curriculum revisions, new lab methods, or stronger graduate supervision, rather than in short-term visible gains.

Overall, Table 4 suggests that faculty are perceived as central to internationalization efforts, with meaningful institutional support, yet the translation of collaboration into teaching and research improvement appears more modest. This is not necessarily a negative finding. It can simply reflect a realistic lag between international activity and measurable academic outcomes. The data may suggest that foreign affairs offices and academic units could strengthen mechanisms that connect international collaboration to curriculum development, research mentoring, and departmental capacity-building so that faculty engagement produces outcomes that are easier for stakeholders to recognize.

Table 5 Assessment on the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in Terms of International Students

Indicator	WM	SD	QD	VI	Rank
The presence of international students contributes to the diversity and global competitiveness of Chinese universities	3.16	0.990	Agree	Evident	1
The policies of Chinese universities ensure inclusivity and integration of international students into the academic community	3.15	0.996	Agree	Evident	2
International students are actively engaged in collaborative academic activities such as research and conferences	2.95	0.668	Agree	Evident	3
International students are given adequate academic and administrative support in Chinese universities	2.83	0.990	Agree	Evident	4
Exchange and mobility programs provide meaningful academic and cultural experiences for international students	2.38	0.798	Disagree	Slightly Evident	5
Overall Mean	**2.89**	**0.518**	**Agree**	**Evident**	

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Evident); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Evident)

Table 5 presents an overall mean of 2.89 with a standard deviation of 0.518, interpreted as Agree and Evident, though it is weaker than the faculty and foreign partner constructs. This may suggest that while international students are recognized as part of the internationalization ecosystem, the lived experience of student support and integration is more uneven. In many universities, international student services can look strong in policy documents, but actual experiences vary depending on program staff capacity, language support, and how well academic units coordinate with student affairs.

The two highest-rated indicators are IS2 (contribution to diversity and global competitiveness) with WM = 3.16 (SD = 0.990, Rank 1) and IS5 (policies ensure inclusivity and integration) with WM = 3.15 (SD = 0.996, Rank 2). Both fall in the "Agree" range, and their high SD values near 1.0 are striking. That spread suggests respondents are split. Some likely observe strong inclusivity efforts such as orientation programs, bilingual support desks, or active international student associations. Others may see integration as more symbolic than practical, perhaps limited to marketing messages or isolated events rather than routine academic and social inclusion.

The middle indicators include IS4 (engaged in collaborative academic activities) with WM = 2.95 (SD = 0.668) and IS1 (adequate academic and administrative support) with WM = 2.83 (SD = 0.990). These suggest that engagement and support exist but are not uniformly strong. If I interpret this in a realistic campus context, a student may be welcomed and handled well during admission and registration, yet struggle later with finding research opportunities, understanding course expectations, or navigating consultation systems. Those are common "second semester" problems that survey respondents often pick up indirectly.

The lowest-rated item is IS3 (exchange and mobility programs provide meaningful academic and cultural experiences) with WM = 2.38 (SD = 0.798, Rank 5), interpreted as Disagree and Slightly Evident. This is an important finding because it suggests that exchange experiences, which are often highlighted as flagship internationalization activities, may not consistently feel meaningful on the ground. Some programs may be too short, overly structured, or limited to ceremonial visits. Others may be disrupted by administrative constraints, credit transfer issues, or limited academic immersion. It also might reflect that "meaningful" experiences are harder to deliver than "organized" experiences.

Overall, Table 5 suggests that respondents agree international students contribute to competitiveness and that inclusivity is formally supported, yet the practical depth of exchange and mobility experiences appears weaker. The contrast between high perceived value and weaker perceived experience quality is the interesting pattern here. The results may suggest a need for foreign affairs offices and academic departments to focus not only on recruitment and policy statements but also on the academic design of mobility

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

programs, mentoring structures, and everyday integration practices that make international student participation genuinely developmental.

- *On the Significant Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on the Roles of Chinese Universities Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration when their Profile is Taken as Test Factor.*

Table 6 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in Terms of Sex

Indicator (Foreign Affairs Office Roles)	**Sex**	**Mean**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Decision on Ho**	**Interpretation**
Government Regulators	Male	2.622	0.561	249	0.575	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	2.585					
Foreign Partner Institutions	Male	3.294	-0.642	249	0.521	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	3.320					
Faculty	Male	3.146	0.164	249	0.870	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	3.140					
International Students	Male	2.901	0.244	249	0.807	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	2.885					
Overall Foreign Affairs Office Roles	Male	2.991	0.204	249	0.838	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	2.982					

Table 6 presents the results of the independent samples t-test examining whether male and female respondents differ significantly in their assessment of the roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices in public administration. Across all indicators, the computed p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that no statistically significant differences exist between the two groups. For instance, perceptions of the role of government regulators yielded mean scores of 2.622 for males and 2.585 for females, with a t-value of 0.561 and $p = 0.575$. Although the male mean is slightly higher, the difference is minimal and does not suggest a meaningful divergence in perception. This closeness of scores may imply that regulatory frameworks and policy-related interactions are experienced similarly by respondents regardless of sex. A comparable pattern is observed in the assessment of foreign partner institutions, where males reported a mean of 3.294 and females 3.320, with $p = 0.521$. Both means fall within the "Agree" range, suggesting that respondents, irrespective of sex, recognize the contribution of foreign partners to international academic collaboration. The absence of a significant difference here may reflect the standardized nature of partnership agreements and collaboration mechanisms, which are often mediated through institutional offices rather than shaped by individual demographic characteristics. In practical terms, male and female respondents may be engaging with the same structures, policies, and partnership outcomes, leading to largely convergent evaluations.

When examining perceptions related to faculty roles, the results remain consistent. Male respondents reported a mean of 3.146, while female respondents reported 3.140, with a p-value of 0.870, the highest among the indicators in this table. This near-identical evaluation suggests a shared understanding of faculty involvement in internationalization efforts, including research collaboration, academic exchanges, and institutional linkages. It appears that faculty engagement, as facilitated by foreign affairs offices, is viewed as an institutional function rather than one filtered through gendered experiences. This finding aligns with the broader trend in higher education where faculty participation in international activities is governed more by academic discipline and institutional support than by sex.

Assessments related to international students also reveal no significant difference, with males reporting a mean of 2.901 and females 2.885 ($p = 0.807$). Both values indicate agreement that international students play a role within the scope of foreign affairs office functions, though not at a particularly high level. The similarity of responses may suggest that support structures, integration policies, and student services are perceived uniformly across respondents. It is possible that interactions with international students occur through formal channels such as admissions, orientation, or academic programs, which are standardized and thus less likely to generate differentiated perceptions based on sex.

Overall, the overall foreign affairs office role assessment further confirms this pattern, with means of 2.991 for males and 2.982 for females, and $p = 0.838$. The consistency across all indicators suggests that sex does not function as a differentiating factor in how respondents perceive the roles of foreign affairs offices in public administration. From an analytical standpoint, this uniformity may indicate that institutional internationalization practices are sufficiently systematized to produce shared experiences across demographic groups. Consequently, any strengths or weaknesses identified in earlier descriptive analyses are likely structural rather than demographic in nature.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

Table 7 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in terms of Age

Indicator (FAO Roles)	Age Group	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Government Regulators	21–30	2.578	1.218	0.304	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	2.575				
	41–50	2.576				
	Above 50	2.748				
Foreign Partner Institutions	21–30	3.267	0.524	0.666	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	3.319				
	41–50	3.324				
	Above 50	3.324				
Faculty	21–30	3.128	0.267	0.849	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	3.157				
	41–50	3.128				
	Above 50	3.167				
International Students	21–30	2.853	0.929	0.427	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	2.866				
	41–50	2.900				
	Above 50	3.010				
Overall FAO Roles	21–30	2.956	0.943	0.421	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	2.979				
	41–50	2.982				
	Above 50	3.062				

Table 7 presents the one-way ANOVA results examining whether respondents' assessments of the roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices differ significantly when grouped according to age. Across all dimensions of foreign affairs office roles, the computed p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that age does not significantly influence respondents' perceptions. For example, assessments of government regulators yielded an F-value of 1.218 with $p = 0.304$, despite observable variations in group means, particularly among respondents aged above 50 years old ($M = 2.748$) compared to younger groups whose means cluster around 2.57–2.58. While older respondents appear slightly more favorable, the difference is not statistically meaningful, suggesting that perceptions of regulatory roles remain broadly consistent across age cohorts.

A similar pattern is evident in the assessment of foreign partner institutions, where the F-value of 0.524 ($p = 0.666$) confirms the absence of significant age-based differences. Mean scores remain relatively stable across all age groups, ranging from 3.267 among respondents aged 21–30 to 3.324 among those aged 41–50 and above 50. These consistently high means indicate general agreement regarding the positive role of foreign partners, regardless of age. The narrow spread of values may suggest that engagement with foreign institutions, whether through joint programs or institutional partnerships, is experienced in largely similar ways across generations, possibly due to standardized partnership frameworks managed centrally by universities.

When considering faculty-related roles, the results again show no statistically significant difference ($F = 0.267$, $p = 0.849$). Mean scores across age groups range from 3.128 to 3.167, all falling within the "Agree" category. This consistency may indicate that respondents of varying ages share comparable views on faculty participation in international activities and the support provided by foreign affairs offices. It is plausible that faculty engagement mechanisms, such as research collaboration and academic exchanges, are sufficiently institutionalized to minimize generational differences in perception. Even respondents with longer professional experience do not appear substantially more critical or more favorable than their younger counterparts.

Assessments related to international students also demonstrate no significant age-based variation, with an F-value of 0.929 and $p = 0.427$. While respondents aged above 50 reported a slightly higher mean (3.010) compared to younger groups, whose means range from 2.853 to 2.900, the differences remain statistically insignificant. This pattern may suggest that perceptions of international student support and integration are shaped more by visible institutional policies and services than by respondents' age or generational standpoint. Older respondents may view international students somewhat more positively, perhaps due to longer exposure to institutional internationalization efforts, yet this inclination does not rise to a level of statistical distinction.

The same conclusion is reinforced by the results for the overall foreign affairs office roles, which produced an F-value of 0.943 with $p = 0.421$. Although the highest mean again appears among respondents aged above 50 ($M = 3.062$), the overall pattern suggests that age does not meaningfully differentiate perceptions. Taken together, Table 10-A indicates that evaluations of foreign affairs office roles are broadly shared across age groups. This uniformity may imply that internationalization policies and administrative practices are communicated and implemented in ways that generate relatively consistent experiences, regardless of respondents' stage in their professional or personal life cycle.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

Table 8 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in terms of Civil Status

Indicator (FAO Roles)	Civil Status	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Government Regulators	Single	2.583	0.442	0.723	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	2.593				
	Widow/er	2.726				
	Separated	2.639				
Foreign Partner Institutions	Single	3.259	1.257	0.290	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	3.345				
	Widow/er	3.316				
	Separated	3.303				
Faculty	Single	3.143	0.025	0.995	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	3.139				
	Widow/er	3.158				
	Separated	3.148				
International Students	Single	2.861	0.263	0.852	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	2.901				
	Widow/er	2.947				
	Separated	2.935				
Overall FAO Roles	Single	2.961	0.378	0.769	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	2.994				
	Widow/er	3.037				
	Separated	3.006				

Table 8 presents the results of the one-way ANOVA testing whether respondents' assessments of the roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices differ significantly when grouped according to civil status. Across all indicators, the computed p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that civil status does not significantly influence respondents' perceptions. For example, assessments of government regulators yielded an F-value of 0.442 with p = 0.723, despite some variation in group means. Widow/er respondents reported a relatively higher mean (2.726) compared to single (2.583) and married respondents (2.593), yet these differences are statistically negligible. This pattern suggests that perceptions of regulatory support and policy frameworks are largely independent of respondents' marital or familial circumstances.

A similar trend is evident in the assessment of foreign partner institutions, which recorded an F-value of 1.257 and p = 0.290. Mean scores across civil status categories range from 3.259 among single respondents to 3.345 among married respondents, with widow/er and separated respondents reporting means of 3.316 and 3.303, respectively. All values fall within the "Agree" range, indicating a broadly positive evaluation of foreign partner contributions regardless of civil status. The relatively narrow spread of means may suggest that engagement with foreign institutions, often mediated through formal agreements and institutional offices, does not substantially differ based on respondents' personal life situations.

The assessment of faculty-related roles shows even greater uniformity across civil status groups. The ANOVA results yielded an F-value of 0.025 with p = 0.995, indicating almost no variation attributable to civil status. Mean scores are clustered tightly around 3.14, suggesting a shared perception that faculty play a consistent and visible role in internationalization efforts. This near-identical evaluation may reflect the highly institutionalized nature of faculty participation in international activities, where expectations, incentives, and support mechanisms apply equally across respondents, regardless of marital status.

In the case of international students, the analysis again reveals no significant difference (F = 0.263, p = 0.852). Although widow/er respondents reported a slightly higher mean (2.947) compared to single (2.861) and married respondents (2.901), these variations remain minor. The findings suggest that perceptions of international student support, integration, and engagement are shaped more by observable institutional practices than by respondents' civil status. This consistency may indicate that international student services are delivered through standardized systems that generate similar impressions across demographic categories.

The same conclusion is reinforced by the results for the overall foreign affairs office roles, which produced an F-value of 0.378 with p = 0.769. Despite the highest mean being reported by widow/er respondents (3.037), the overall pattern suggests no meaningful differentiation by civil status. Taken together, Table 8 indicates that civil status does not significantly affect respondents' assessments of foreign affairs office roles. This uniformity may suggest that institutional internationalization practices are experienced in broadly similar ways across personal life contexts, underscoring the structural rather than demographic nature of perceived strengths and limitations.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

Table 9 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration in terms of Educational Qualification

Indicator (FAO Roles)	Educational Qualification	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Government Regulators	Tech-Voc	2.740	1.361	0.255	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	2.624				
	Masteral	2.542				
	Doctoral	2.492				
Foreign Partner Institutions	Tech-Voc	3.320	1.805	0.147	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	3.287				
	Masteral	3.374				
	Doctoral	3.217				
Faculty	Tech-Voc	3.127	0.941	0.421	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	3.120				
	Masteral	3.190				
	Doctoral	3.175				
International Students	Tech-Voc	2.980	0.697	0.555	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	2.896				
	Masteral	2.894				
	Doctoral	2.775				
Overall FAO Roles	Tech-Voc	3.042	0.696	0.555	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	2.982				
	Masteral	3.000				
	Doctoral	2.915				

Table 9 presents the ANOVA results examining whether respondents' assessments of foreign affairs office roles differ significantly according to educational qualification. Across all indicators, the p-values remain above the 0.05 level, indicating no statistically significant differences among respondents with technical vocational, college, masteral, or doctoral qualifications. For government regulators, the analysis yielded an F-value of 1.361 with $p = 0.255$, despite a noticeable decline in mean scores from 2.740 among technical vocational graduates to 2.492 among doctoral graduates. While higher educational attainment appears associated with slightly more critical assessments, this trend is not strong enough to establish a statistically meaningful difference.

A similar pattern emerges in the evaluation of foreign partner institutions, which produced an F-value of 1.805 with $p = 0.147$. Mean scores range from 3.217 among doctoral graduates to 3.374 among masteral graduates, with technical vocational and college graduates reporting means of 3.320 and 3.287, respectively. All groups fall within the "Agree" category, suggesting broad recognition of the value of foreign partners regardless of educational background. The slightly lower mean among doctoral respondents may reflect higher expectations or greater exposure to international academic standards, though such interpretation remains tentative in the absence of statistical significance.

Assessments of faculty roles show even less variation across educational levels, as reflected in an F-value of 0.941 and $p = 0.421$. Mean scores across all groups cluster closely around 3.14, indicating consensus that faculty play a significant role in internationalization efforts. This consistency suggests that perceptions of faculty engagement are not strongly influenced by respondents' academic attainment. Instead, faculty roles may be sufficiently visible and standardized across institutional contexts to generate shared evaluations among respondents with different educational backgrounds.

The analysis of international students again reveals no significant difference ($F = 0.697$, $p = 0.555$), although technical vocational graduates reported a slightly higher mean (2.980) compared to doctoral graduates (2.775). This gradual decline in mean scores with increasing educational level may suggest that more highly educated respondents apply more critical criteria when evaluating student support and integration. Nevertheless, the absence of statistical significance indicates that such differences are not systematic. Respondents across all educational levels appear to share similar views regarding the strengths and limitations of international student-related services.

Finally, the overall foreign affairs office roles assessment produced an F-value of 0.696 with $p = 0.555$, confirming that educational qualification does not significantly differentiate respondents' perceptions. While technical vocational graduates reported the highest mean (3.042) and doctoral graduates the lowest (2.915), the differences remain modest. Overall, Table 9 suggests that educational background may subtly influence the tone of respondents' evaluations, with higher qualifications associated with slightly more critical perspectives, but these differences do not reach statistical significance. This pattern reinforces the view that perceptions of foreign affairs office roles are largely shaped by institutional realities rather than respondents' academic credentials.

➢ *On the Assessment of Respondents on the International Academic Collaboration in Terms of the Joint Research, Academic Exchanges, and Foreign Faculty Recruitment*

Table 10 Assessment on the International Academic Collaboration in Terms of Joint Research

Indicator	**WM**	**SD**	**QD**	**VI**	**Rank**
Joint research initiatives strengthen the global reputation and visibility of Chinese universities	3.51	0.883	Strongly Agree	Highly Evident	1
International research partnerships enhance innovation and knowledge-sharing in higher education	3.35	0.836	Agree	Evident	2
Chinese universities provide adequate support for faculty involvement in international joint research projects	2.97	0.647	Agree	Evident	3
Collaborative research activities address global and societal issues through shared expertise	2.78	0.752	Agree	Evident	4
Joint research collaborations between Chinese universities and foreign institutions produce significant academic outputs such as publications and patents	2.19	0.740	Disagree	Slightly Evident	5
Overall Mean	**2.96**	**0.627**	**Agree**	**Evident**	

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Evident); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Evident)

Table 10 reports an overall mean of 2.96 with a standard deviation of 0.627, interpreted as Agree and Evident. Joint research is viewed positively overall, but the variability is noticeable, suggesting that not all respondents observe the same level of success across joint research activities. In many institutions, joint research outcomes are concentrated in a few strong research groups, while other departments engage in collaboration in lighter, less output-oriented ways, so a mixed perception is not surprising.

The highest-rated indicator is JR4 (strengthens global reputation and visibility) with WM = 3.51 (SD = 0.883, Rank 1), interpreted as Strongly Agree and Highly Evident. Respondents appear to connect joint research with reputational gain, which aligns with how universities often frame international research partnerships in rankings, branding, and institutional reports. Still, the SD indicates unevenness; some may see these reputational benefits clearly through high-profile publications or international grants, while others may not feel the visibility extends to their unit or discipline.

The next strongest is JR2 (enhances innovation and knowledge-sharing) with WM = 3.35 (SD = 0.836, Rank 2), followed by JR3 (adequate support for faculty involvement) with WM = 2.97 (SD = 0.647, Rank 3). This combination suggests that respondents perceive intellectual benefits and some institutional support, but support does not score as high as the reputational and knowledge-sharing benefits. This may indicate that joint research is happening and is seen as valuable, yet resources such as seed funding, research administration support, ethics review assistance, or time allocation may still be uneven.

A particularly interesting contrast appears in the lowest-rated item: JR1 (produces significant outputs such as publications and patents) with WM = 2.19 (SD = 0.740, Rank 5), interpreted as Disagree and Slightly Evident. This looks like a gap between perceived reputational value and perceived tangible outputs. One plausible explanation is that respondents may observe collaboration activity and reputation signaling, such as MoUs, conferences, and research visits, but fewer concrete outputs that they can point to, like indexed publications, patents, or jointly funded projects. Another possibility is timing. Outputs often lag behind partnerships, and respondents may be answering based on current visibility rather than multi-year results.

Overall, Table 10 suggests that joint research is believed to enhance reputation and knowledge-sharing, but it is not consistently perceived as generating strong measurable outputs across the system. This finding is useful because it separates “collaboration exists” from “collaboration produces results.” The results may suggest that foreign affairs offices, research offices, and departments might focus more on output pathways, such as co-authorship planning, shared data protocols, patent support, and structured project management, so that joint research efforts translate into outcomes that stakeholders can clearly recognize.

Table 11 Assessment on the International Academic Collaboration in Terms of Academic Exchanges

Indicator	**WM**	**SD**	**QD**	**VI**	**Rank**
Exchange programs are well-organized and provide meaningful experiences for participants	3.16	0.765	Agree	Evident	1
Student exchange initiatives contribute to building international networks and partnerships	3.02	1.095	Agree	Evident	2
Academic exchange programs provide valuable opportunities for cultural and intellectual learning	2.97	0.901	Agree	Evident	3

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

Academic exchanges foster mutual understanding and strengthen global collaboration in education	2.58	0.798	Agree	Evident	4
Faculty exchanges improve teaching practices and curriculum development in Chinese universities	2.55	1.043	Agree	Evident	5
Overall Mean	**2.86**	**0.592**	**Agree**	**Evident**	

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Evident); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Evident)

Table 11 presents an overall mean of 2.86 with a standard deviation of 0.592, interpreted as Agree and Evident. Academic exchanges are viewed positively, but the ratings are moderate, suggesting that exchanges may be present but not consistently strong in quality or impact. In many institutional settings, exchange programs are easier to implement than joint research because they can be scheduled as short-term mobility or visit programs, yet their academic depth depends heavily on planning, advising, and host readiness.

The highest-rated item is AE4 (well-organized and meaningful experiences) with WM = 3.16 (SD = 0.765, Rank 1). This suggests respondents generally acknowledge functional organization and some level of participant benefit. Still, the SD indicates that "meaningful experiences" are not uniform. In real terms, one cohort might receive structured lab exposure, seminars, and integration into classes, while another cohort might experience mostly campus tours and formal meetings with limited academic immersion.

The next items show very close ratings. AE2 (student exchange builds networks) is WM = 3.02 (SD = 1.095, Rank 2) and AE1 (cultural and intellectual learning) is WM = 2.97 (SD = 0.901, Rank 3). What stands out is the very high SD for AE2, above 1.0, which implies strongly mixed responses. Some respondents may have seen exchanges build durable networks that continue through joint supervision or later graduate study. Others may have seen exchange students come and go with little sustained connection, which can happen when programs lack follow-up mentoring, alumni tracking, or structured networking activities.

The lowest-rated indicators are AE3 (faculty exchanges improve teaching and curriculum) with WM = 2.55 (SD = 1.043, Rank 5) and AE5 (fosters mutual understanding and global collaboration) with WM = 2.58 (SD = 0.798, Rank 4). These are still within "Agree," but they are lower and carry substantial variability. This may suggest that exchange programs are perceived as beneficial at the participant level, but the institutional learning loop, especially curriculum change and teaching improvement, is weaker. Faculty exchanges may occur, but unless the returnees are supported to redesign syllabi, share teaching materials, or run faculty workshops, the broader teaching impact may not be widely felt.

Overall, Table 11 suggests that academic exchanges are generally functioning and appreciated, but their deeper academic and institutional contributions are less consistently perceived. The interesting pattern is that organization is rated highest, while academic transformation elements such as curriculum improvement are rated lowest. This may suggest that universities are managing the logistics reasonably well, but may need stronger academic integration strategies, for example credit-bearing exchange modules, co-taught seminars, structured reflection outputs, and post-exchange dissemination sessions that translate mobility into lasting educational benefits.

Table 12 Assessment on the International Academic Collaboration in Terms of Foreign Faculty Recruitment

Indicator	WM	SD	QD	VI	Rank
Collaboration with foreign faculty strengthens the global competitiveness of Chinese universities	2.78	0.752	Agree	Evident	1
Foreign faculty members bring diverse perspectives that enrich classroom learning	2.77	0.748	Agree	Evident	2
Chinese universities provide adequate support and incentives to attract and retain foreign faculty	2.58	1.189	Agree	Evident	3
The recruitment of foreign faculty enhances the quality of teaching and research in Chinese universities	2.58	0.494	Agree	Evident	4
The presence of international faculty promotes a multicultural and inclusive academic environment	2.19	0.740	Disagree	Slightly Evident	5
Overall Mean	**2.58**	**0.656**	**Agree**	**Evident**	

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Evident); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Evident)

Table 12 shows an overall mean of 2.58 with a standard deviation of 0.656, interpreted as Agree and Evident, though it is the lowest overall mean among the Part 3 constructs. This suggests respondents view foreign faculty recruitment as present and somewhat beneficial, but less convincing or less developed compared to joint research and academic exchanges. In practical settings, recruiting foreign faculty usually requires long-term funding, visa and employment support, housing arrangements, and clear career pathways, so

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

moderate ratings can reflect the difficulty of sustaining these systems.

The highest-rated indicator is FFR4 (collaboration with foreign faculty strengthens global competitiveness) with WM = 2.78 (SD = 0.752, Rank 1), followed closely by FFR3 (diverse perspectives enrich classroom learning) with WM = 2.77 (SD = 0.748, Rank 2). These results suggest respondents recognize the conceptual value of having international faculty, especially in terms of competitiveness and learning enrichment. The scores are not high enough to suggest strong endorsement, but they do show that the perceived benefits are real. In a classroom context, even a single foreign faculty member can influence teaching approaches, introduce different academic norms, and broaden students' exposure to global disciplinary debates.

Two items tied at WM = 2.58 indicate more cautious agreement: FFR1 (recruitment enhances teaching and research quality) with SD = 0.494 and FFR2 (adequate support and incentives to retain foreign faculty) with a very high SD = 1.189. The large SD for FFR2 is the most notable feature in the table. It likely suggests that support and incentives are inconsistent. Some universities may provide competitive packages and strong administrative assistance, while others may rely on short-term arrangements with limited benefits. This unevenness is common in systems where international faculty hiring is partly centralized in policy but decentralized in funding realities across institutions.

The lowest-rated item is FFR5 (presence promotes multicultural and inclusive academic environment) with WM = 2.19 (SD = 0.740, Rank 5), interpreted as Disagree and Slightly Evident. This is an important nuance. Respondents appear to separate the academic value of foreign faculty from the broader cultural climate outcomes. In other words, hiring international faculty may help competitiveness and classroom diversity, but it does not automatically create a multicultural environment unless the institution also supports intercultural engagement, inclusive governance practices, and social integration for both faculty and students. Without those structures, foreign faculty may remain professionally active but socially peripheral.

Overall, Table 12 suggests that foreign faculty recruitment is seen as beneficial in principle but weaker in creating broader cultural and inclusion outcomes. The interesting finding is the contrast between the "competitiveness" rating at the top and the "multicultural environment" rating at the bottom. This may suggest that institutions are emphasizing strategic advantages of international faculty but may not be investing enough in the social and institutional supports that turn international staffing into a genuinely inclusive academic culture. If foreign affairs offices are part of this process, the results may support focusing on retention supports, onboarding systems, and campus integration mechanisms, not just recruitment targets.

- *On the Significant Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on the International Academic Collaboration when their Profile is Taken as Test Factor*

Table 13 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on International Academic Collaboration in Terms of Sex

Indicator (International Academic Collaboration)	Sex	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Joint Research	Male	2.981	0.573	249	0.567	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	2.935					
Academic Exchanges	Male	2.872	0.363	249	0.717	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	2.844					
Foreign Faculty Recruitment	Male	2.594	0.360	249	0.719	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	2.564					
Overall International Academic Collaboration	Male	2.815	0.477	249	0.634	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	2.781					

Table 13 examines whether male and female respondents differ in their assessment of international academic collaboration, specifically in terms of joint research, academic exchanges, foreign faculty recruitment, and overall collaboration. Similar to the findings in Table 9-A, all p-values exceed the 0.05 threshold, indicating that sex does not significantly influence respondents' evaluations. For joint research, male respondents reported a mean of 2.981, while female respondents reported 2.935, yielding a t-value of 0.573 and p = 0.567. Although males rated joint research marginally higher, the difference is statistically negligible. This may suggest that both groups observe comparable levels of research collaboration outcomes and institutional support.

In the case of academic exchanges, the mean scores were 2.872 for males and 2.844 for females, with p = 0.717. Both means fall within the "Agree" range, indicating general approval of exchange programs. The lack of a significant difference may imply that the perceived benefits and limitations of academic exchanges, such as short-term mobility, cultural exposure, or curriculum alignment, are shared experiences rather than gender-specific ones. It is

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

likely that respondents evaluate exchange programs based on program structure and outcomes rather than personal demographic positioning.

The assessment of foreign faculty recruitment also reveals no significant difference, with males reporting a mean of 2.594 and females 2.564, and a p-value of 0.719. These relatively moderate means suggest cautious agreement regarding the effectiveness of foreign faculty recruitment. The similarity of responses may indicate that respondents, regardless of sex, encounter similar institutional challenges related to hiring, retention, and integration of foreign faculty. This could include issues such as contractual arrangements, language barriers, or limited long-term incentives, which are systemic rather than individually experienced.

When considering overall international academic collaboration, the mean scores again remain closely aligned, at 2.815 for males and 2.781 for females, with p = 0.634. This finding reinforces the idea that perceptions of international collaboration are broadly shared across sexes. Rather than reflecting divergent expectations or experiences, the results suggest a common institutional narrative regarding the extent and quality of collaboration activities. Respondents appear to evaluate collaboration based on observable outcomes such as partnerships, exchanges, and research outputs, which are visible to all stakeholders.

Taken as a whole, Table 13 suggests that sex does not significantly differentiate respondents' assessments of international academic collaboration. This consistency may be interpreted as a positive indication that internationalization efforts are experienced inclusively, without clear demographic disparities. At the same time, it also implies that any limitations identified in earlier analyses, such as moderate ratings for foreign faculty recruitment or exchange impact, are likely rooted in institutional capacity and policy implementation rather than respondent characteristics. Consequently, improvement strategies should focus on systemic enhancements rather than targeted demographic interventions.

Table 14 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on International Academic Collaboration in Terms of Age

Indicator (IAC)	Age Group	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Joint Research	21–30	3.025	0.946	0.419	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	2.949				
	41–50	2.852				
	Above 50	3.014				
Academic Exchanges	21–30	2.867	0.488	0.691	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	2.876				
	41–50	2.783				
	Above 50	2.919				
Foreign Faculty Recruitment	21–30	2.528	0.544	0.652	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	2.597				
	41–50	2.548				
	Above 50	2.681				
Overall IAC	21–30	2.806	0.545	0.652	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31–40	2.808				
	41–50	2.728				
	Above 50	2.871				

Table 14 examines whether respondents' assessments of international academic collaboration differ significantly across age groups. Similar to the findings in Table 10-A, all ANOVA results yield p-values greater than 0.05, indicating no statistically significant differences by age. In the case of joint research, the analysis produced an F-value of 0.946 with p = 0.419, despite noticeable variation in group means. Respondents aged 21–30 reported the highest mean (3.025), while those aged 41–50 reported a lower mean (2.852). These differences, while numerically apparent, are insufficient to suggest systematic divergence in perception, implying that experiences of joint research collaboration are not strongly shaped by age.

For academic exchanges, the pattern remains consistent. The computed F-value of 0.488 (p = 0.691) indicates no significant difference among age groups. Mean scores range from 2.783 among respondents aged 41–50 to 2.919 among those above 50, with younger respondents reporting means near the overall average. This distribution suggests that academic exchanges are generally viewed as moderately effective across all age groups. Any perceived differences may reflect individual exposure to exchange programs rather than age-related attitudes. For instance, older respondents may have observed long-term institutional benefits, while younger respondents may focus on immediate experiential outcomes.

The assessment of foreign faculty recruitment also shows no significant age-based difference, with an F-value of 0.544 and p = 0.652. Mean scores gradually increase with age, from 2.528 among respondents aged 21–30 to 2.681 among those above 50, suggesting a slight tendency for older respondents to view foreign faculty recruitment more favorably. However, this trend remains statistically insignificant. One possible interpretation is that respondents with longer institutional memory may better appreciate the symbolic or reputational value of foreign faculty, even if

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

operational challenges persist. Younger respondents, by contrast, may be more attuned to practical issues such as teaching load, language barriers, or integration difficulties.

The same lack of significant difference is evident in the overall international academic collaboration assessment, which yielded an F-value of 0.545 with p = 0.652. Mean scores again show minor variation, with the highest mean reported by respondents above 50 years old (M = 2.871) and the lowest by those aged 41–50 (M = 2.728). Despite these fluctuations, the absence of statistical significance suggests that age does not fundamentally alter respondents' overall evaluation of international collaboration. Instead, perceptions appear to converge around shared institutional experiences and observable outcomes.

Overall, Table 14 indicates that age is not a determining factor in shaping respondents' views on international academic collaboration. The consistency across age groups may suggest that collaborative activities, such as joint research and academic exchanges, are experienced through institutional channels that transcend generational differences. At the same time, the slight upward trend in means among older respondents, although not significant, may hint at a broader appreciation of long-term collaboration benefits that emerge over time. Nevertheless, the findings support the conclusion that international academic collaboration is perceived in relatively uniform ways across age groups, reinforcing the notion that improvements in this area should focus on systemic enhancement rather than age-specific strategies.

Table 15 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on International Academic Collaboration in Terms of Civil Status

Indicator (IAC)	Civil Status	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Joint Research	Single	3.002	0.487	0.692	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	2.914				
	Widow/er	3.053				
	Separated	2.935				
Academic Exchanges	Single	2.880	0.193	0.901	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	2.837				
	Widow/er	2.926				
	Separated	2.832				
Foreign Faculty Recruitment	Single	2.570	0.048	0.986	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	2.578				
	Widow/er	2.632				
	Separated	2.587				
Overall IAC	Single	2.817	0.196	0.899	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	2.776				
	Widow/er	2.870				
	Separated	2.785				

Table 15 examines whether respondents' assessments of international academic collaboration differ significantly when grouped by civil status. As with all p-values exceed the 0.05 significance threshold, indicating no statistically significant differences across civil status categories. For joint research, the analysis yielded an F-value of 0.487 with p = 0.692, even though widow/er respondents reported a relatively higher mean (3.053) compared to single (3.002) and married respondents (2.914). While these differences may appear noteworthy numerically, they do not reflect systematic variation in perception attributable to civil status.

Assessments of academic exchanges also reveal no significant difference (F = 0.193, p = 0.901). Mean scores across civil status groups range from 2.832 among separated respondents to 2.926 among widow/er respondents, with single and married respondents reporting means of 2.880 and 2.837, respectively. These closely clustered values suggest that exchange programs are perceived similarly across respondents, regardless of marital status. It is likely that respondents evaluate exchange initiatives based on program design, duration, and academic relevance rather than personal life considerations.

The results for foreign faculty recruitment further support this pattern, with an F-value of 0.048 and p = 0.986, the highest p-value observed in this set of analyses. Mean scores show minimal variation, ranging from 2.570 among single respondents to 2.632 among widow/er respondents. Such uniformity may indicate shared perceptions regarding both the benefits and challenges of recruiting foreign faculty, including issues related to integration, contractual arrangements, and long-term retention. These concerns appear to transcend respondents' civil status, reinforcing the notion that they are systemic rather than individual in nature.

The assessment of overall international academic collaboration similarly shows no significant difference across civil status groups (F = 0.196, p = 0.899). Although widow/er respondents again reported the highest mean (2.870), the differences across groups remain statistically insignificant. This slight trend, while not meaningful in statistical terms, may suggest that respondents with fewer immediate family obligations perceive international collaboration somewhat more favorably, perhaps due to greater flexibility or long-term institutional engagement. However, such interpretations remain speculative given the lack of statistical significance.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

Overall, Table 15 indicates that civil status does not function as a differentiating factor in respondents' assessments of international academic collaboration. The consistency of responses across groups suggests that collaborative experiences and outcomes are shaped primarily by institutional policies, resources, and structures rather than personal demographic circumstances. Consequently, efforts to strengthen international academic collaboration are likely to benefit from system-wide improvements rather than targeted interventions based on civil status.

Table 16 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on International Academic Collaboration in Terms of Educational Qualification

Indicator (IAC)	Educational Qualification	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Joint Research	Tech-Voc	2.967	0.656	0.580	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	2.960				
	Masteral	2.897				
	Doctoral	3.108				
Academic Exchanges	Tech-Voc	2.873	0.233	0.873	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	2.841				
	Masteral	2.855				
	Doctoral	2.950				
Foreign Faculty Recruitment	Tech-Voc	2.613	0.129	0.943	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	2.564				
	Masteral	2.613				
	Doctoral	2.542				
Overall IAC	Tech-Voc	2.818	0.147	0.932	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	College	2.789				
	Masteral	2.788				
	Doctoral	2.867				

Table 16 examines whether respondents' assessments of international academic collaboration differ significantly when grouped by educational qualification. As in previous analyses, all p-values exceed 0.05, indicating no statistically significant differences across groups. For joint research, the ANOVA yielded an F-value of 0.656 with p = 0.580, despite doctoral graduates reporting the highest mean (3.108) compared to masteral (2.897) and college graduates (2.960). This pattern may suggest that respondents with doctoral training perceive joint research more favorably, possibly due to closer involvement in research activities. However, the lack of statistical significance cautions against drawing firm conclusions.

The assessment of academic exchanges similarly shows no significant difference (F = 0.233, p = 0.873). Mean scores across educational levels range from 2.841 among college graduates to 2.950 among doctoral graduates, indicating moderate agreement across all groups. These findings suggest that academic exchanges are evaluated in comparable ways regardless of respondents' educational background. It is possible that exchanges are perceived primarily as institutional programs rather than as activities whose value varies sharply with academic attainment.

In the case of foreign faculty recruitment, the analysis produced an F-value of 0.129 with p = 0.943, reflecting almost no variation across groups. Mean scores range narrowly from 2.542 among doctoral graduates to 2.613 among technical vocational and masteral graduates. This uniformity suggests shared perceptions regarding both the benefits and limitations of foreign faculty recruitment, such as enhanced diversity alongside challenges in integration and sustainability. These issues appear to be broadly recognized across educational backgrounds.

The assessment of overall international academic collaboration further confirms this pattern, with an F-value of 0.147 and p = 0.932. Mean scores show only slight variation, with doctoral graduates reporting the highest mean (2.867) and college graduates the lowest (2.789). Although these differences are numerically visible, they are statistically insignificant, indicating that educational qualification does not meaningfully shape overall perceptions of international collaboration.

Taken together, Table 16 suggests that educational qualification does not significantly influence respondents' evaluations of international academic collaboration. While subtle trends hint that higher academic attainment may be associated with slightly more favorable views of research-oriented collaboration, these patterns are not strong enough to establish systematic differences. Overall, the findings reinforce the conclusion that perceptions of international academic collaboration are largely shared across educational levels, pointing again to institutional structures and practices as the primary drivers of respondents' evaluations rather than individual academic backgrounds.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

➢ *On the Significant Relationship in the Assessment of Respondents Between the Roles of Chinese Universities Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration and International Academic Collaboration*

Table 17 Correlation in the Assessment of Respondents Between the Roles of Chinese Universities' Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration and International Academic Collaboration

Foreign Affairs Office Roles	International Academic Collaboration Variables	Computed r	Sig.	Decision	Interpretation
Government Regulators	Joint Research	0.534	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate Positive Relationship
	Academic Exchanges	0.516	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate Positive Relationship
	Foreign Faculty Recruitment	0.693	0.000	Reject Ho	Strong Positive Relationship
	Overall IAC	0.645	0.000	Reject Ho	Strong Positive Relationship
Foreign Partner Institutions	Joint Research	-0.414	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate Negative Relationship
	Academic Exchanges	0.029	0.648	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Foreign Faculty Recruitment	0.406	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate Positive Relationship
	Overall IAC	0.014	0.824	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Faculty	Joint Research	0.531	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate Positive Relationship
	Academic Exchanges	0.811	0.000	Reject Ho	Strong Positive Relationship
	Foreign Faculty Recruitment	0.859	0.000	Reject Ho	Very Strong Positive Relationship
	Overall IAC	0.811	0.000	Reject Ho	Very Strong Positive Relationship
International Students	Joint Research	0.259	0.000	Reject Ho	Weak Positive Relationship
	Academic Exchanges	0.449	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate Positive Relationship
	Foreign Faculty Recruitment	0.814	0.000	Reject Ho	Very Strong Positive Relationship
	Overall IAC	0.567	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate to Strong Positive Relationship
Overall FAO Roles	Joint Research	0.334	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate Positive Relationship
	Academic Exchanges	0.569	0.000	Reject Ho	Moderate to Strong Positive Relationship
	Foreign Faculty Recruitment	0.883	0.000	Reject Ho	Very Strong Positive Relationship
	Overall IAC	**0.663**	**0.000**	**Reject Ho**	**Strong Positive Relationship**

Table 17 clearly indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between the roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices and international academic collaboration, particularly when examined at both component and overall levels. The correlation between overall foreign affairs office roles and overall international academic collaboration yielded a strong positive relationship ($r = 0.663$, $p = 0.000$). This finding suggests that improvements in the effectiveness, coordination, and support functions of foreign affairs offices are likely associated with stronger outcomes in joint research, academic exchanges, and foreign faculty recruitment. The strength and consistency of this relationship provide empirical support for the central role of administrative internationalization structures in enabling academic collaboration.

At the component level, the role of government regulators shows moderate to strong positive correlations with all dimensions of international academic collaboration, including joint research ($r = 0.534$), academic exchanges ($r = 0.516$), foreign faculty recruitment ($r = 0.693$), and overall IAC ($r = 0.645$), all significant at $p = 0.000$. These results may suggest that when regulatory frameworks are perceived as supportive, clear, and facilitative, universities are better

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

positioned to engage in substantive international collaboration. This aligns with governance-oriented literature, which emphasizes that enabling policy environments reduce institutional risk and encourage cross-border academic engagement.

The role of faculty emerges as one of the strongest correlates of international academic collaboration. Very strong positive relationships were found between faculty roles and academic exchanges (r = 0.811)**,** foreign faculty recruitment (r = 0.859), and overall IAC (r = 0.811), all statistically significant. These findings reinforce the view that faculty members are not merely participants but key drivers of international collaboration. When faculty are institutionally supported and actively engaged, collaborative activities appear to intensify and diversify. This pattern is consistent with prior studies emphasizing faculty agency as a critical mediator between administrative structures and tangible academic outcomes.

The international student dimension also shows meaningful associations with international academic collaboration, particularly with foreign faculty recruitment (r = 0.814) and overall IAC (r = 0.567). While the correlation with joint research is weaker (r = 0.259), it remains statistically significant. This suggests that international students may contribute more directly to exchange- and faculty-related dimensions of collaboration than to research output alone. One plausible interpretation is that international students often serve as cultural and academic bridges, strengthening institutional attractiveness to foreign faculty and reinforcing exchange networks, even if their direct involvement in research is limited.

An interesting and more nuanced finding appears in the foreign partner institutions dimension. While moderate positive relationships exist with foreign faculty recruitment (r = 0.406, p = 0.000), the correlation with joint research is negative (r = -0.414, p = 0.000), and relationships with academic exchanges and overall IAC are not statistically significant. This pattern may suggest that partnerships with foreign institutions do not automatically translate into balanced research collaboration outcomes. In some cases, partnerships may be asymmetrical or focused more on teaching, mobility, or symbolic affiliation rather than joint knowledge production. This finding highlights the importance of critically examining the nature and depth of international partnerships, rather than assuming uniformly positive outcomes across all collaboration dimensions.

Overall, Table 23 provides strong empirical evidence that the roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices are significantly linked to international academic collaboration, particularly through faculty engagement, regulatory support, and institutional facilitation. The results suggest that strengthening administrative capacity, policy alignment, and faculty support mechanisms within foreign affairs offices may lead to more coherent and impactful international academic collaboration. At the same time, the mixed results associated with foreign partner institutions point to the need for more strategic, outcome-oriented partnership management to ensure that collaboration extends beyond formal agreements to substantive academic productivity.

III. DISCUSSIONS

➢ *Summary of Findings*

- Profile of the Respondents. The respondents represent a diverse yet academically grounded group, dominated by early to mid-career professionals aged 21–40, with a near-balanced sex distribution and a majority holding college and masteral degrees. This profile suggests respondents are sufficiently exposed to institutional internationalization processes, while the presence of older and more highly educated participants introduces perspectives shaped by longer professional and academic experience.
- Assessment of the Roles of Foreign Affairs Offices. Overall, the roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices are assessed at an Agree / Evident level. Among the components, foreign partner institutions and faculty-related roles received relatively higher mean scores, while government regulatory support and international student-related roles were evaluated more moderately. This pattern suggests that operational and academic-facing functions are more visible to respondents than policy-level or student integration mechanisms.
- Assessment of International Academic Collaboration. International academic collaboration is likewise assessed at an Agree / Evident level across joint research, academic exchanges, and foreign faculty recruitment. Joint research and academic exchanges show moderate evaluations, while foreign faculty recruitment consistently registers the lowest means, indicating persistent challenges in attracting, integrating, and sustaining international faculty despite overall positive collaboration efforts.
- Differences in Assessment by Profile Variables. No significant differences are found in respondents' assessments when grouped according to sex, age, civil status, or educational qualification. Across all foreign affairs office roles and international academic collaboration indicators, p-values consistently exceed the 0.05 level. This uniformity suggests that perceptions of internationalization are shaped more by shared institutional experiences than by individual demographic characteristics.
- Relationship between Foreign Affairs Office Roles and International Academic Collaboration. Correlation analysis reveals a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between the overall roles of foreign affairs offices and overall international academic collaboration (r = 0.663, p = 0.000). This finding indicates that more effective administrative coordination, facilitation, and support are closely associated with stronger collaborative outcomes in research, exchanges, and faculty mobility.
- Key Drivers and Nuanced Findings from Correlation Results. Faculty-related roles and government regulatory support emerge as the strongest correlates of international

academic collaboration, highlighting internal institutional capacity as a primary driver of successful internationalization. In contrast, the mixed and sometimes negative relationships involving foreign partner institutions, particularly with joint research, suggest that partnerships alone do not guarantee productive collaboration and must be strategically managed to yield substantive academic outcomes.

➢ *Conclusion*

- The respondents represent a sufficiently diverse and academically prepared population, whose demographic composition supports a balanced assessment of internationalization practices. The dominance of early to mid-career professionals, combined with a substantial proportion of graduate-degree holders, suggests that the evaluations are informed by both practical engagement and academic exposure to international higher education initiatives.
- The roles of Chinese universities' foreign affairs offices in public administration are generally perceived as evident and functional. Respondents particularly recognize the contributions of faculty engagement and institutional partnerships, while regulatory support and international student-related functions are viewed as moderately effective, indicating areas where policy clarity and implementation consistency may still be strengthened.
- International academic collaboration is likewise assessed at a generally positive level, particularly in terms of joint research and academic exchanges. However, foreign faculty recruitment emerges as a comparatively weaker area, suggesting that while collaborative intent exists, structural and institutional barriers continue to limit the full realization of faculty internationalization.
- Respondents' assessments do not significantly differ when grouped according to sex, age, civil status, or educational qualification. This consistency indicates that perceptions of both foreign affairs office roles and international academic collaboration are shaped primarily by shared institutional experiences rather than individual demographic characteristics.
- A statistically significant and strong positive relationship exists between the roles of foreign affairs offices and international academic collaboration. This finding confirms that effective administrative coordination, regulatory facilitation, and institutional support are closely associated with stronger outcomes in research collaboration, academic exchanges, and faculty mobility.
- Faculty engagement and regulatory support emerge as the most influential drivers of international academic collaboration, while the presence of foreign partner institutions alone does not guarantee productive outcomes. This suggests that successful internationalization depends less on symbolic partnerships and more on strategic governance, sustained faculty involvement, and the operational capacity of foreign affairs offices.

➢ *Recommendations*

- Chinese universities should strengthen the institutional capacity of foreign affairs offices by clarifying mandates, streamlining coordination mechanisms, and ensuring adequate staffing and resources.
- Strong relationship between foreign affairs office roles and international academic collaboration.
- Enhancement on faculty-centered internationalization strategies, including structured incentives, workload recognition, and sustained professional support for international research and exchange activities.
- Maintain faculty engagement with international academic collaboration, universities should position faculty not merely as participants but as central actors in internationalization planning and implementation.
- Policymakers and university leaders are encouraged to align regulatory frameworks more closely with institutional needs, particularly in areas related to joint research approval, funding access, and cross-border academic mobility.
- The positive relationship between regulatory support and collaboration outcomes suggests that clearer, more facilitative policies may reduce administrative barriers and encourage deeper international engagement.
- Universities should reassess and strategically manage partnerships with foreign institutions, moving beyond symbolic agreements toward outcome-oriented collaborations.
- Interventions should be developed to strengthen foreign faculty recruitment and retention, such as improved onboarding systems, competitive incentive packages, and stronger academic integration support.
- Future internationalization initiatives should adopt a system-wide rather than demographic-specific approach,
- Focus on improving institutional processes, governance coherence, and implementation quality to ensure that international academic collaboration is experienced consistently and effectively across all stakeholder groups.

REFERENCES

[1]. Cai, Changkun, Weiqi Jiang, and Na Tang. 2022. "Campaign-style Crisis Regime: How China Responded to the Shock of COVID-19." *Policy Studies* 43 (3): 599–619.
[2]. Chen, Longjin, and Liangsong Yang. 2022. "Government Size and Citizen Satisfaction in China: Evidence That Accommodates Two Contrasting Views." *Policy Studies* 43 (3): 522–537.
[3]. De Wit, H., & Altbach, P. (2020). Responding to COVID-19 with IT: A transformative moment? *International Higher Education*, *103*, 3–5.
[4]. Dellmuth, Lisa Maria Gustafsson, Maria-Therese, Kural Ece (2020), Global Adaptation Governance: Explaining the Governance Responses of International Organizations to New Issue Linkages
[5]. Edgell, Amanda B., Jean Lachapelle, Anna Lührmann, and Seraphine F. Maerz. 2021. "Pandemic Backsliding: Violations of Democratic Standards

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

During Covid-19." *Social Science & Medicine* 285: 114244.
[6]. Gaskell, Jen, Gerry Stoker, Will Jennings, and Daniel Devine. 2020. "Covid-19 and the Blunders of Our Governments: Long-Run System Failings Aggravated by Political Choices." *The Political Quarterly* 91 (3): 523–533.
[7]. Ha Thi Hai Do & Anh Ngoc Mai (2022) Role of the government in the establishment of world-class universities in China
[8]. Huili Si & Stephen Rayner (2025) Exploring institutional governance dynamics in China's transnational higher education (TNHE): a study of Sino-foreign joint institutes
[9]. Julia Fleischer & Nina Reiners (2021) Connecting International Relations and Public Administration: Toward A Joint Research Agenda for the Study of International Bureaucracy
[10]. Kim, Min-Hyu, Huafang Li, Marc Holzer, and Cheng F. Zhang. 2019. "Public Administration Research in Mainland China: A Systematic Review of Chinese Public Administration in English Language Journals
[11]. Li, Hui, and Jiasheng Zhang. 2021. "Chinese Public Administration Research in Mainstream PA Journals: A Systemtic Review (2022-2020).
[12]. Marginson, S. (2020). The relentless price of high individualism in the pandemic. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(7), 1392–1395.
[13]. Mok, K. H. (2021). Education market with the Chinese characteristics: The rise of minban and transnational higher education in China. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *75*(3), 398–417.
[14]. Wei Liu, et al (2022) Governance and public administration in China
[15]. Zhinf June Wang & Jianfu Chin (2025) China's Foreign-Related 'Rule of Law': The Evolution of an Idea

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

LETTER TO RESPONDENTS

Dear Respondents:

This researcher is a Doctor in Public Administration student at the Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila. As a pre-requisite for his graduation, he is required to conduct a research and to successfully defend the same in a panel of experts.

To comply with the requirements for graduation, he is now conducting a study, entitled: **"**POLICY ENHANCEMENT ON THE ROLES OF CHINESE UNIVERSITIES FOREIGN AFFAIRS OFFICES IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC COLLABORATION**".**

Please answer completely this survey instrument and rest assured that all your responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you very much for your kind cooperation in answering this survey questionnaire.

LI RONG

Researcher

Volume 11, Issue 3, March – 2026 International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology
ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar106

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Part I. Demographic Profile of Respondents

➢ *Direction: Please Check the Items that Best Apply to you.*

- *Age*

[ ] 21 – 30 years old
[ ] 31 – 40 years old
[ ] 41 - 50 years old
[ ] Above 50 years old

- *Sex*

[ ] Male
[ ] Female

- *Civil Status*

[ ] Single
[ ] Married
[ ] Widow/er
[ ] Separated

- *Educational Qualification*

[ ] Tech Vocational Graduate
[ ] College Graduate
[ ] Masteral Graduate
[ ] Doctoral Graduate

B. Part 2. Assessment on the Roles of Chinese Universities Foreign Affairs Offices in Public Administration

➢ *Direction*

Your assessment will be determined based on your beliefs and observations. Please check (/) the box for your deemed most appropriate response in each of the item using the scale below:

- Strongly Agree (SA),
- Agree (A),
- Disagree Agree (DA), and
- Strongly Disagree (SD)

Variables/Indicators	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Government regulators				
1. Government policies provide clear guidelines that support international academic collaboration in universities				
The Ministry of Education and other regulators actively facilitate partnerships between Chinese universities and foreign institutions				
3. Government regulations ensure transparency and accountability in international academic agreements				
4. Policy frameworks from regulators encourage innovation and flexibility in cross-border research collaborations				
5. Adequate support and resources are provided by government agencies to strengthen internationalization efforts in higher education				
Foreign partner institutions				
Foreign partner institutions contribute significantly to the success of joint academic programs with Chinese universities				
. Collaboration with international universities leads to mutual benefits in research and academic exchanges				
3. Foreign partner institutions demonstrate cultural sensitivity and respect in academic collaborations		).	.	.
4. Effective communication channels exist between Chinese universities and foreign partner institutions	.	.	.	.

5. International partners are committed to sustaining long-term academic collaboration	7.	8.	9.	0.
Faculty				
1. Faculty members actively participate in international research and academic exchange programs				
2. Chinese faculty view international collaboration as an opportunity for professional growth and innovation				
3. University faculty are provided with adequate institutional support for engaging in cross-border academic activities				
4. Collaboration with foreign faculty enhances the teaching and research quality of Chinese universities				
5. Faculty members play a critical role in strengthening institutional linkages with foreign universities				
International students				
1. International students are given adequate academic and administrative support in Chinese universities				
The presence of international students contributes to the diversity and global competitiveness of Chinese universities				
Exchange and mobility programs provide meaningful academic and cultural experiences for international students				
4. International students are actively engaged in collaborative academic activities such as research and conferences				
5. The policies of Chinese universities ensure inclusivity and integration of international students into the academic community				

C. Part 3. Assessment on the International Academic Collaboration

➢ *Direction:*

Kindly rate each statement based on your assessment on the international Academic collaboration. Your assessment will be determined based on your beliefs and observations. Please check (/) the box for your deemed most appropriate response in each of the item using the scale below:

Legend:

- Strongly Agree (SA)
- Agree (A)
- Disagree Agree (DA
- Strongly Disagree (SD)

Variables/Indicators	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Joint research				
1. Joint research collaborations between Chinese universities and foreign institutions produce significant academic outputs such as publications and patents				
2. International research partnerships enhance innovation and knowledge-sharing in higher education				
3. Chinese universities provide adequate support for faculty involvement in international joint research projects				
4. Joint research initiatives strengthen the global reputation and visibility of Chinese universities				
5. Collaborative research activities address global and societal issues through shared expertise				
Academic exchanges				
1. Academic exchange programs provide valuable opportunities for cultural and intellectual learning				
2. Student exchange initiatives contribute to building international networks and partnerships				
3. Faculty exchanges improve teaching practices and curriculum development in Chinese universities				
4. Exchange programs are well-organized and provide meaningful experiences for participants				
5. Academic exchanges foster mutual understanding and strengthen global collaboration in education				
Foreign faculty recruitment				
1. The recruitment of foreign faculty enhances the quality of teaching and research in Chinese universities				
2. Foreign faculty members bring diverse perspectives that enrich classroom learning				
3. Chinese universities provide adequate support and incentives to attract and retain foreign faculty				
4. Collaboration with foreign faculty strengthens the global competitiveness of Chinese universities				
5. The presence of international faculty promotes a multicultural and inclusive academic environment				