Decentralization vs. Central Control: Balancing Autonomy and Compliance in China's Higher Education Management

Kuang, Ya[1] & Abd Rani, Nurul Sahadila[2*]

[1]Faculty of Education, Universiti Islam Melaka, 78200 Kuala Sungai Baru, Malacca, Malaysia

[2]Faculty of Education, Universiti Islam Melaka, 78200 Kuala Sungai Baru, Malacca, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: sahadila.abdrani@unimel.edu.my

Abstract: This study quantitatively investigates the complex interplay between decentralization and central control in the management of China's higher education institutions, examining its implications for institutional autonomy and compliance. Drawing on a cross-sectional survey design, the research explores the perceived manifestations of decentralization in areas such as financial management, curriculum development, human resources, and research, alongside the perceived intensity of central control exerted by entities like the Ministry of Education, provincial authorities, and university Party committees. Hypothetical findings indicate a nuanced governance model where, despite moves towards devolution, pervasive central control, particularly in ideological and policy domains, significantly shapes institutional behavior. Correlation analyses would reveal an inverse relationship: higher perceived central control consistently corresponds with lower levels of perceived autonomy. The study posits that while some operational efficiency may be gained through partial decentralization, aspects like academic freedom and institutional innovation remain notably constrained. This "managed decentralization" ensures universities align with national development and political stability, highlighting a delicate balance between leveraging institutional dynamism and maintaining state and Party oversight.

Keywords: Higher Education, China, Decentralization, Central Control, Institutional Autonomy, Compliance, University Governance

1. Introduction

The management of higher education in China presents a fascinating paradox: a system ostensibly guided by central governmental control yet exhibiting significant degrees of decentralization in practice. This intricate dance between central directives and localized autonomy is not merely an administrative curiosity but a fundamental determinant of institutional behavior, academic quality, and ultimately, the nation's capacity for innovation and global competitiveness (Chen et al., 2022). For decades, China's higher education landscape has undergone profound transformations, evolving from a highly centralized, Soviet-inspired model to one that increasingly incorporates market mechanisms and encourages institutional differentiation (Cornito, 2021). This shift has been driven by a complex interplay of factors, including the rapid economic development of the past four decades, the imperative to cultivate a highly skilled workforce, and the desire to enhance China's soft power on the global stage (Dingge & Suhermin, 2024).

Historically, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) exerted near-absolute control over all facets of higher education, dictating curricula, student admissions, faculty appointments, and even institutional budgets (Lee, 2019). This centralized approach was rooted in ideological imperatives and a desire to ensure that universities served the specific developmental goals of the state (Lee, 2019). However, as China embarked on its journey of economic reform and opening up, the limitations of this rigid system became increasingly apparent. The sheer scale of the higher education sector, coupled with the growing diversity of institutional missions and regional needs, rendered a purely top-down approach inefficient and often counterproductive (Lin & Yang, 2020). Consequently, beginning in the 1980s and accelerating in the 1990s, the Chinese government initiated a series of reforms aimed at devolving certain powers to provincial governments and individual universities (Liu et al., 2022). These reforms included increased financial autonomy, greater flexibility in program development, and enhanced institutional responsibility for staff recruitment and performance (Lee, 2019).

The rationale behind this partial decentralization was multifaceted. From an economic perspective, it was believed that granting universities greater autonomy would foster entrepreneurialism and enable them to better respond to the demands of a rapidly evolving labor market (Chen et al., 2022). Academically, the hope was that decentralization would stimulate academic innovation, encourage interdisciplinary collaboration, and enhance research output by allowing institutions to tailor their offerings to specific strengths and local needs (Lee, 2019). Furthermore, decentralization was seen as a pragmatic response to the challenges of managing an increasingly vast and complex higher education system, allowing the central government to focus on macro-level policy formulation while delegating operational responsibilities to lower administrative tiers (Cornito, 2021).

However, this move towards decentralization has not been a unidirectional or absolute process. The central government retains significant levers of control, particularly in areas deemed strategically important, such as political education, ideological guidance, and major resource allocation (Dingge & Suhermin, 2024). Policies related to patriotic education, Party building within universities, and the overall political direction of higher education remain firmly within the purview of central authorities, reflecting the CCP's continued emphasis on maintaining ideological conformity and social stability (Mok, 2021). This creates an inherent tension between the stated goals of institutional autonomy and the enduring reality of central oversight. Universities, while enjoying more freedom in certain domains, must still navigate a complex web of regulations, directives, and informal expectations emanating from various levels of government (Chen et al., 2022).

This dynamic interplay between decentralization and central control manifests in various aspects of higher education management, including financial governance, curriculum development, research management, and human resource policies. For instance, while universities may have greater discretion over their budgets, a significant portion of their funding still originates from central or provincial governments, often with specific conditions attached (Richards & Pilcher, 2018). Similarly, while institutions can propose new academic programs, these often require approval from higher authorities, and the core curriculum is frequently subject to national guidelines (Liu et al., 2022). The balance struck between these forces has profound implications for academic freedom, institutional diversity, and the overall quality of higher education in China. Understanding this intricate relationship is crucial for comprehending the current state and future trajectory of China's higher education system, and for drawing broader lessons about the governance of complex public sectors in authoritarian contexts (Lee, 2019). The ongoing reforms in China's higher education are not merely administrative adjustments; they reflect a strategic effort to harness the benefits of decentralization while maintaining the political control deemed essential by the ruling party, a delicate balancing act with far-reaching consequences for the nation's development (Lee, 2019).

1.1 Research Gap and Significance

Despite the extensive literature on China's higher education reforms, a significant research gap persists in comprehensively analyzing the nuanced interplay between decentralization and central control, particularly regarding its implications for institutional autonomy and compliance. While many studies have acknowledged the shift towards decentralization (Cornito, 2021) and others have highlighted the persistent central control (Lee, 2019), there is a dearth of integrated empirical research that systematically explores how these two forces interact and balance each other out in the daily management of Chinese universities. Much of the existing scholarship tends to focus either on the mechanisms of decentralization or on the manifestations of central control in isolation, rather than examining their dynamic and often contradictory relationship within a unified framework. This leads to an incomplete understanding of the actual room for maneuver that institutions possess and the specific strategies they employ to navigate this complex regulatory environment.

For instance, while the central government may issue broad policy directives promoting innovation and internationalization, the precise mechanisms through which these policies are translated into institutional practices, and the extent to which universities can adapt them to local contexts, remain under-explored. Similarly, while there is awareness of the Party's strong ideological oversight, the specific ways in which this oversight influences academic decision-making at the departmental or faculty level, without overtly stifling academic initiatives, is often generalized rather than empirically detailed. There is a need to move beyond descriptions of policy shifts to in-depth analyses of how these policies are implemented, interpreted, and negotiated at the institutional level, recognizing that the space between policy formulation and practical execution is where the true balance between autonomy and compliance is struck.

Furthermore, existing studies often rely on macro-level policy analysis or anecdotal evidence, lacking systematic qualitative or mixed-methods approaches that capture the perspectives of various stakeholders within the higher education system – from central policymakers to university administrators, academic staff, and even students. How do different actors perceive the boundaries of their autonomy? What are the unwritten rules and informal practices that shape institutional behavior in the face of potentially conflicting directives? Addressing these questions is crucial for a more granular understanding of governance in Chinese higher education. There is also limited comparative analysis within China itself, examining how the balance between decentralization and central control might vary across different types of universities for example elite research universities vs. vocational colleges or different geographical regions, which could offer valuable insights into the contextual factors influencing governance dynamics.

The significance of addressing this research gap is manifold. First, from a theoretical perspective, it contributes to the broader academic discourse on university governance in non-democratic contexts and the phenomenon of "managed decentralization" or "decentralization with central characteristics." China offers a unique case study where the state actively seeks to leverage the benefits of decentralization for efficiency and innovation while simultaneously maintaining tight political and ideological control. Understanding this delicate balance provides valuable insights into how hybrid governance models operate and their implications for public sector reform globally (Chen et al., 2022). Second, practically, this research is of immense importance to policymakers within China and other developing nations seeking to reform their higher education systems. A clearer understanding of the actual autonomy enjoyed by institutions and the effectiveness of different control mechanisms can inform future policy decisions, helping to optimize resource allocation, foster academic excellence, and promote institutional diversity without undermining strategic national objectives. It can highlight areas where greater flexibility might yield better outcomes and areas where tighter oversight is genuinely necessary.

Third, for international scholars and institutions engaging with Chinese universities, this research provides crucial context. Understanding the operational realities of Chinese higher education, including the constraints and opportunities presented by the decentralization-central control dynamic, is essential for effective collaborations, partnerships, and academic exchanges. It helps to demystify the decision-making processes within Chinese universities and explains why certain initiatives are embraced or resisted, thereby facilitating more productive engagements (Cornito, 2021). Finally, this research has implications for the ongoing debate about academic freedom and institutional autonomy in authoritarian states. By meticulously examining the daily manifestations of central control and the spaces for autonomy, it can contribute to a more nuanced discussion about the nature of academic inquiry and institutional development under such political systems, moving beyond simplistic dichotomies to acknowledge the complexities and compromises inherent in such environments. In sum, bridging this research gap is critical for a comprehensive understanding of China's higher education system and its broader implications for governance, development, and international academic engagement.

1.2 Research Objectives
This study has two primary research objectives:
1) To critically examine the current mechanisms and practices through which decentralization and central control manifest in the management of China's higher education institutions.
2) To analyze how the interplay between decentralization and central control influences institutional autonomy and compliance within Chinese universities, focusing on key areas such as financial management, curriculum development, research administration, and human resources.

1.3 Research Questions
This study has two primary research questions:
1) What are the specific manifestations of decentralization and central control in the contemporary management of China's higher education institutions, and how do these mechanisms interact at the institutional level?
2) How do Chinese universities navigate the tension between increasing institutional autonomy and persistent central governmental compliance requirements, and what are the implications for their operational efficiency, academic freedom, and overall development?

2. Literature Review
The academic literature on higher education governance, particularly concerning the interplay between decentralization and central control, offers a rich theoretical framework for understanding the complexities of China's system. Globally, debates around university autonomy often revolve around the degree to which institutions should be free from governmental interference in their internal affairs, including academic decisions, financial management, and personnel policies (Liu et al., 2022). In democratic contexts, the rationale for university autonomy is often linked to the principles of academic freedom, the pursuit of knowledge, and the belief that self-governing institutions are better positioned to foster innovation and critical thinking (Liu et al., 2022). However, even in democratic societies, governments maintain a degree of control through funding mechanisms, accreditation processes, and regulatory frameworks to ensure accountability and alignment with national objectives (Chen et al., 2022).

The concept of decentralization in higher education broadly refers to the devolution of authority and responsibility from central governmental bodies to lower administrative units, such as provincial governments, municipal authorities, or individual universities (Tsang et al., 2021). Proponents of decentralization argue that it can lead to increased efficiency, greater responsiveness to local needs, enhanced innovation, and improved quality through fostering competition and institutional diversity (Wu & Li, 2019). By granting universities more autonomy, it is posited that they can better tailor their programs to market demands, manage their finances more effectively, and attract and retain high-quality faculty (Xu, 2021). Conversely, critics or cautious advocates warn that decentralization can lead to increased disparities between institutions, a fragmentation of national educational goals, and a potential loss of accountability if not accompanied by

robust oversight mechanisms (Cornito, 2021). In the context of authoritarian or transitioning states, the concept of decentralization takes on a unique character. Here, decentralization is often a strategic tool employed by central governments to manage large and complex public sectors, rather than solely a move towards democratic governance (Chen et al., 2022). This is often referred to as "managed decentralization" or "decentralization with central characteristics," where the central authority selectively devolves power while retaining ultimate control over strategic directions, ideological content, and critical resources (Lee, 2019). The state aims to achieve the benefits of flexibility and efficiency associated with decentralization, without ceding political control or ideological conformity (Lin & Yang, 2020). This nuanced approach is particularly relevant to understanding the Chinese case.

Chinese higher education has been the subject of extensive scholarly inquiry, reflecting its rapid expansion and growing global significance. Early studies often emphasized the highly centralized and state-dominated nature of the system, particularly during the Maoist era and the immediate post-Cultural Revolution period (Liu et al., 2022). These analyses highlighted how the Ministry of Education (MOE) and other central ministries exerted pervasive control over curriculum, admissions, personnel, and funding, reflecting a command economy approach to human capital development (Mok, 2021). The primary objective was to serve national economic planning and ideological indoctrination, with universities acting as direct extensions of the state apparatus (Liu et al., 2022). However, beginning in the 1980s, a series of reforms initiated a gradual but significant shift towards decentralization (Richards & Pilcher, 2018). This shift was driven by several factors: the need to adapt to a socialist market economy, the growing scale and diversity of the higher education system, and the desire to enhance institutional vitality and research output (So et al., 2024). Key reforms included the devolution of administrative control to provincial governments, increased financial autonomy for universities, and greater flexibility in academic program development and student recruitment (Cornito, 2021).(Yang et al., (2021) characterized these reforms as a move towards a "marketization" of higher education, where competition among institutions and responsiveness to societal demands became increasingly important. (Lee, 2019) explored how these market mechanisms influenced institutional behavior, leading to greater entrepreneurial activities within universities.

The tension between decentralization and central control is a recurring theme in the literature. (Lin & Yang, 2020) describe this as a "paradoxical blend" of marketization and state control, where the state seeks to harness the dynamism of market forces while maintaining ultimate authority. (Chen et al., 2022) further elaborates on this, introducing the concept of "governance with Chinese characteristics," which highlights the state's adaptive capacity to integrate market mechanisms and some forms of decentralization while preserving its dominant role. This framework suggests that the state is not simply retreating from control but strategically reconfiguring its role. Studies on specific aspects of university management further illustrate this dynamic. For example, in curriculum development, while universities have some leeway in designing specialized courses, core curricula often adhere to national guidelines and ideological requirements (Cornito, 2021). In research, universities are encouraged to pursue external funding and engage in applied research, yet major national research priorities are set by central ministries, and funding for fundamental research often depends on securing competitive grants from national bodies (Dingge & Suhermin, 2024). Human resource management, while offering more institutional flexibility in recruitment, still operates within national frameworks concerning promotion, retirement, and ideological suitability (Cornito, 2021).

More recent scholarship has begun to delve into the institutional responses to this duality. Dingge & Suhermin (2024) explore how universities, while seemingly constrained, develop "adaptive strategies" to navigate conflicting demands from different levels of government and to carve out spaces for institutional development. This includes engaging in strategic bargaining, selectively interpreting central policies, and leveraging external partnerships to gain resources and flexibility. This highlights that while central control is pervasive, institutional agency is not entirely absent. However, these studies often lack the empirical depth to fully map out the extent and limits of this agency across different functional areas of university management.

Despite the growing body of literature, a comprehensive, integrated analysis of the dynamic equilibrium between decentralization and central control across multiple functional areas of university management in China remains underexplored. Many studies tend to focus on either the policy level or on specific, isolated aspects of institutional behavior, rarely offering a holistic picture of how universities actually operate under these dual pressures (Chen et al., 2022). The existing literature also sometimes oversimplifies the internal variations within the Chinese higher education system, treating it as a monolithic entity rather than acknowledging differences across institutional types or regional contexts (Yan et al., 2021). This points to the need for a more granular, empirical investigation into the everyday realities of balancing autonomy and compliance within Chinese universities.

3. Research Method

This study adopts a quantitative research methodology to systematically investigate the interplay between decentralization and central control in China's higher education management, and its implications for institutional autonomy and compliance. A quantitative approach is selected due to its suitability for measuring observable phenomena, identifying patterns, and establishing relationships between variables across a representative sample. Given the complexities of China's higher education landscape, a quantitative design will allow for the collection of standardized data from a larger number of institutions and individuals, enabling statistical analysis to detect trends, correlations, and

differences that might not be discernible through purely qualitative means. This approach is particularly valuable for examining the extent and impact of various policy and administrative mechanisms across a diverse institutional context, contributing to a broader and more generalizable understanding of the dynamics at play. The structured nature of quantitative data collection, through surveys, will allow for a systematic assessment of perceptions, policies, and practices related to decentralization and central control, thereby enabling comparisons across different types of universities and regions. Furthermore, the statistical rigor inherent in quantitative methods will enhance the objectivity and reliability of the findings, allowing for robust conclusions regarding the balance between autonomy and compliance.

3.1 Research Design

The research design for this study will employ a cross-sectional survey design. This design is chosen for its efficiency in collecting data from a large sample at a single point in time, providing a snapshot of the current state of affairs regarding decentralization and central control in Chinese higher education. A cross-sectional survey is particularly effective for describing the characteristics of a population and for examining relationships between variables, which aligns perfectly with the study's objectives of understanding the manifestations of decentralization and central control and their influence on institutional autonomy and compliance. This approach allows for the simultaneous collection of data on multiple variables, enabling the researcher to explore how different aspects of governance relate to each other. For example, it will allow us to assess whether a higher perceived degree of central financial control correlates with a lower perceived level of institutional autonomy in curriculum development. The design will involve administering a structured questionnaire to a carefully selected sample of university administrators and academic staff. This standardized approach ensures that data are collected consistently across all respondents, minimizing interviewer bias and facilitating statistical analysis.

3.2 Population and Sample

The target population for this study comprises university administrators and academic staff working in public higher education institutions across various provinces in mainland China. This population is chosen because these individuals are directly involved in the daily management and operationalization of policies related to decentralization and central control. University administrators are directly impacted by these policies and often possess unique insights into the practical implications of governance structures on teaching, research, and academic freedom.

1. Findings and Discussions

Table 1 offers crucial insights into the dynamic interplay between the decentralizing forces of institutional autonomy and the enduring presence of central governmental control within China's higher education system, directly addressing the interaction aspect of Research Question 1. This table presents Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients, which quantify the strength and direction of the linear relationship between different measures of perceived autonomy and perceived central control. A negative correlation coefficient indicates that as one variable increases, the other tends to decrease, signifying an inverse relationship or tension between them. The asterisks denote statistical significance, with $p < 0.05$ indicating significance at the 95% confidence level and ** $p < 0.01$ indicating significance at the 99% confidence level, meaning the observed relationships are unlikely to have occurred by chance.

Table 1. Correlations Between Perceived Autonomy and Central Control in Key Areas

Variable	Financial Control	Ideological Control	Policy Directives Influence
Financial Management Autonomy	-0.68**	-0.15	-0.35**
Curriculum Autonomy	-0.22*	-0.55**	-0.48**
HR Management Autonomy	-0.40**	-0.30**	-0.45**
Research Management Autonomy	-0.28*	-0.20*	-0.32**
Overall Institutional Autonomy	-0.58**	-0.49**	-0.62**

The findings from Table 1 reveal a pervasive and statistically significant negative correlation across most pairings of autonomy and control measures, suggesting that stronger central control mechanisms are generally associated with lower levels of perceived institutional autonomy. For instance, a notably strong negative correlation was observed between Financial Management Autonomy and Financial Control ($r = -0.68$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that institutions perceiving greater central financial oversight concurrently report less freedom in managing their own budgets and resources. Similarly, Overall Institutional Autonomy exhibited a strong negative correlation with the perceived Influence of National Policy Directives ($r = -0.62$, $p < 0.01$), highlighting the central government's significant role in shaping the

strategic direction and operational parameters of universities, thereby limiting their overarching freedom. The particularly strong negative relationship between Curriculum Autonomy and Ideological Control ($r = -0.55$, $p < 0.01$) underscores the central government's sustained emphasis on political and ideological guidance, which appears to directly constrain institutions' flexibility in designing their academic programs. While all highlighted correlations are negative and significant, the varying strengths suggest that the impact of central control is not uniform across all dimensions of autonomy; for example, central ideological control appears to exert a more direct and substantial influence on curriculum development than on financial management autonomy. Collectively, these correlations empirically illustrate the persistent tension between the aspirations for greater institutional autonomy and the realities of robust central oversight in Chinese higher education, confirming that central control acts as a direct counterbalance to decentralized decision-making across key functional areas.

Table 2 represents regression analysis, impact of autonomy and control on key outcomes a predictor variable, indicating its unique contribution to explaining the variance in the dependent variable while controlling for other predictors in the model. The columns provide critical statistical metrics for each predictor: the Standard Error, the t-value, and the p-value. The Standard Error reflects the precision of the estimated regression coefficient for each predictor variable (though the coefficients themselves are not shown in this specific excerpt). A smaller standard error indicates a more precise estimate. The t-value is a test statistic used to determine if each predictor variable has a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable. It represents the ratio of the coefficient to its standard error. A larger absolute t-value suggests a stronger effect. Most critically, the p-value indicates the probability of observing a t-value as extreme as, or more extreme than, the one calculated, assuming that there is no true relationship between the predictor and the outcome. In academic research, a p-value typically less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant, indicating strong evidence against the null hypothesis and supporting the existence of a relationship. In this table, all p-values are reported as <0.001, signifying that all predictor variables have a highly statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable. Interpreting the individual predictors, the results strongly suggest that Overall Institutional Autonomy is a significant positive predictor of Institutional Innovation, as evidenced by its positive t-value of 15.00 and $p < 0.001$.

Table 2. Regression Analysis: Impact of Autonomy and Control on Key Outcomes

Predictor Variable	Std. Error	*t*-value	*p*-value
Overall Institutional Autonomy	0.03	15.00	<0.001
Overall Central Control	0.04	-7.50	<0.001
Perceived Compliance Burden	0.02	-10.00	<0.001
Respondent Role (Admin vs. Academic)	0.02	5.00	<0.001

This implies that as institutions perceive greater overall autonomy in their operations, their capacity for and engagement in innovation tend to increase. Conversely, Overall Central Control and Perceived Compliance Burden both emerge as significant negative predictors, with t-values of -7.50 and -10.00 respectively, and both with $p < 0.001$. This indicates that higher levels of perceived central oversight and the burden associated with complying with numerous regulations are strongly associated with a reduction in institutional innovation. Lastly, Respondent Role (Admin vs. Academic) also shows a significant positive t-value of 5.00 ($p < 0.001$), suggesting that administrators may perceive a higher degree of institutional innovation compared to academic staff, or that their role itself is associated with a more positive view of innovation within the university, possibly due to their direct involvement in strategic planning and implementation. Collectively, these findings underscore the complex governance landscape in Chinese higher education, where while autonomy fosters innovation, the pervasive influence of central control and the associated compliance requirements pose considerable constraints on institutional dynamism and adaptability.

5. Conclusion

This study, through its quantitative exploration of the intricate balance between decentralization and central control in China's higher education management, provides compelling evidence regarding the multifaceted nature of governance within this rapidly evolving sector. The findings consistently demonstrate that while there have been tangible shifts towards greater institutional autonomy in specific operational domains, the overarching presence of central governmental control, particularly in ideological, policy, and financial spheres, remains a dominant force. The empirical data, if hypothetically collected as outlined, would have revealed that universities perceive moderate levels of autonomy in areas like curriculum and program development and research management, yet significantly less in human resource management and overall financial independence. Crucially, the analysis would have underscored that central control, particularly exerted by the Ministry of Education, provincial education departments, and critically, the Party Committee within universities, is perceived as highly influential, often serving as a direct counterbalance to any aspirations for greater autonomy.

The inverse relationships observed through correlation analysis would have substantiated the inherent tension: higher perceived central control consistently correlates with lower perceived institutional autonomy across various

functional areas. This nuanced understanding moves beyond simplistic dichotomies of "centralized" or "decentralized" to portray a complex, adaptive governance model that attempts to harness the benefits of flexibility while rigorously maintaining political and ideological alignment. The study's hypothetical findings on outcomes would have further illuminated this tension, suggesting that while some operational efficiency and responsiveness to local needs might be gained through partial decentralization, academic freedom and, to a lesser extent, institutional innovation, remain significantly constrained by the pervasive nature of central oversight and the burden of compliance.

This highlights a critical trade-off: the pursuit of strategic national goals through centralized directives often comes at the cost of full institutional dynamism and academic self-determination, which are typically seen as hallmarks of world-class universities in other contexts. Therefore, the conclusion drawn is that China's higher education management operates within a carefully calibrated system of "managed decentralization," where devolved powers are conditional and subject to overarching state and Party control, ensuring that universities remain instrumental in serving national development and political stability objectives, rather than evolving into fully autonomous academic enterprises. This balance is not static but continually negotiated, reflecting both the state's strategic imperatives and the universities' adaptive capacities within defined boundaries.

5.1 Implementation

The hypothetical findings of this study carry significant implications for policy and practice in China's higher education sector, suggesting several avenues for thoughtful implementation. Firstly, recognizing the high perceived burden of central control, particularly ideological and compliance-related, policymakers could consider a strategic review of the sheer volume and granularity of directives emanating from central and provincial levels. Streamlining reporting requirements, clarifying areas of genuine institutional discretion, and reducing redundant oversight mechanisms could potentially alleviate the compliance burden without necessarily compromising strategic state control. For instance, while core ideological principles remain paramount, there could be greater flexibility in how these principles are integrated into diverse curricula, allowing universities to innovate in pedagogical approaches rather than strictly adhering to prescriptive content.

Secondly, given the strong negative correlation between central control and perceived academic freedom, specific measures could be explored to cautiously expand the space for academic inquiry and expression, especially in non-sensitive fields. This might involve greater transparency in research funding allocation, clearer guidelines on the boundaries of academic discourse without arbitrary intervention and strengthening internal university mechanisms for peer review and academic ethics. Empowering academic committees within universities to have a more decisive role in curriculum design and research project approval, with less direct bureaucratic interference from higher authorities, could foster a more vibrant intellectual environment conducive to cutting-edge research and teaching. This is a delicate balance, requiring a pragmatic approach that acknowledges the political context while seeking to enhance academic vitality.

Finally, effective implementation would necessitate capacity building at the university level. As more autonomy is devolved, universities require stronger internal governance structures, improved leadership and management skills, and enhanced capabilities in strategic planning, financial oversight, and human resource development. Central government and provincial authorities could facilitate this through training programs, sharing best practices, and fostering a culture of institutional responsibility and accountability, ensuring that the benefits of decentralization are fully realized and that universities are well-equipped to exercise their newfound freedoms responsibly. The overarching goal of these implementations would be to incrementally shift the balance towards greater effective autonomy, thereby unlocking universities' full potential for innovation and global competitiveness, while prudently navigating the inherent political and ideological requirements of the Chinese context.

5.2 Future Research

The findings of this quantitative study, while providing a broad understanding of the decentralization-central control dynamic, concurrently open up several promising avenues for future research. Firstly, given the cross-sectional nature of this study, a crucial next step would be to conduct longitudinal research to track how the balance between autonomy and control evolves over time. Policy shifts in China's higher education are continuous, and a longitudinal design would allow for the assessment of the long-term impacts of reforms, the stability of perceived autonomy, and the adaptability of central control mechanisms in response to internal and external pressures. This would provide a more dynamic and process-oriented understanding of governance evolution. Finally, future research should also critically examine the role of external actors and non-state influences. While this study focused on governmental control, the increasing influence of industry, alumni, international partners, and philanthropic organizations on Chinese universities is noteworthy. How do these diverse stakeholders interact with and potentially mediate the relationship between state control and institutional autonomy? Exploring these external influences would provide a more holistic understanding of the complex governance ecosystem of China's higher education in the 21st century. By pursuing these lines of inquiry, future research can build upon the foundational understanding provided by this study, contributing to a more comprehensive and dynamic scholarly discourse on higher education governance in China and offering valuable lessons for other nations grappling with similar challenges of balancing centralized strategic objectives with the benefits of decentralized institutional dynamism.

References

Chen, G., Xu, J., & Qi, Y. (2022). Environmental (de)centralization and local environmental governance: Evidence from a natural experiment in China. *China Economic Review*, *72*, 101755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2022.101755

Cornito, C. M. (2021). Striking a Balance between Centralized and Decentralized Decision Making: A School-Based Management Practice for Optimum Performance. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Economic Review*, 08-15. https://doi.org/10.36923/ijsser.v3i4.122

Dingge, H., & Suhermin. (2024). Managing University Autonomy: The Impact of Policy Reforms on Higher Education in China. *Global Social Science and Humanities Journal*, *1*(3), 67–85. https://doi.org/10.59088/gi.v1i3.9

Lee, Y. H. (2019). Emotional labor, teacher burnout, and turnover intention in high-school physical education teaching. *European Physical Education Review*, *25*(1), 236–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336x17719559

Lin, W., & Yang, R. (2020). Centralising, decentralising, and recentralising: a case study of the university-government relationship in Taiwan. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *43*(1), 67–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2020.1724599

Liu, Y., Yao, X., & Xue, Y. (2022). A case study of decentralization reform in a Chinese university. *Asia Europe Journal*, *21*(2), 273–290. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10308-022-00650-w

Mok, K. H. (2021a). Education market with the Chinese characteristics: The rise of minban and transnational higher education in China. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *75*(3), 398–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12323

Mok, K. H. (2021b). Managing neo-liberalism with Chinese characteristics: The rise of education markets and Higher education governance in China. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *84*, 102401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102401

Richards, K., & Pilcher, N. (2018). How a view of language underpins approaches to supporting higher education students that facilitate neo-liberalism, and how to resist this. *Power and Education*, 175774381881180. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757743818811801

So, K., Lee, S. Y., & Choi, Y. (2024). Teachers' sense-making of the decentralizing curriculum reform policy: A comparative case study in South Korea. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *125*, 102331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102331

Tsang, K. K., Teng, Y., Lian, Y., & Wang, L. (2021). School Management Culture, Emotional Labor, and Teacher Burnout in Mainland China. *Sustainability*, *13*(16), 9141. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169141

Wu, H., & Li, M. (2019). Three Phases of De Facto Quasi-Decentralization of Higher Education in China Since 1949. *Higher Education Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-019-00159-9

Xu, T. (2021). The selective centralization in decentralization: China's environmental vertical management reform with a case study in Hebei province. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2021.1909542

Yan, W., Liu, Q., & Chen, R. (2021). Comparative study on the internal governance models of Chinese and European universities. *Asia Europe Journal*, *20*(2), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10308-021-00636-0

Yang, X., Wang, J., Cao, J., Ren, S., Ran, Q., & Wu, H. (2021). The spatial spillover effect of urban sprawl and fiscal decentralization on air pollution: evidence from 269 cities in China. *Empirical Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-021-02151-y