

Characteristics of Higher Education Management in China and the Philippines

Linlin Yin

Urban Vocational College of Sichuan, Chengdu 610110, China

Abstract

China and the Philippines, as two countries with distinct historical, cultural, and economic development backgrounds, exhibit differences in their higher education management characteristics. Chinese higher education management emphasizes standardization and uniformity, with strong government control and management, and a relatively tight education management system with balanced distribution of educational resources. In contrast, Philippine higher education management places greater emphasis on marketization and socialization, with relatively looser government control over universities, uneven distribution of educational resources, and higher degrees of university autonomy. Additionally, China and the Philippines differ in their higher education quality assurance systems; China focuses on government-led quality assessment and monitoring, while the Philippines emphasizes social participation and third-party evaluation. The characteristics of higher education management in China and the Philippines reflect each country's cultural and historical backgrounds, as well as their educational policies and development levels. Future higher education management should pay more attention to internationalization, marketization, and socialization trends, enhance the innovation and reform of education management systems, and improve educational quality and management efficiency to adapt to the constantly changing social and economic environment.

Keywords

China-Philippines Education; Higher Education; Management Characteristics.

1. Comparative Analysis of the Similarities and Differences in Higher Education Management Characteristics between China and the Philippines

The formation and development of higher education management characteristics in China and the Philippines have been influenced by their respective national social, economic, and historical backgrounds. Chinese higher education management focuses on systematic, theoretical, and knowledge inheritance aspects, while Philippine higher education management emphasizes practicality, applicability, and market orientation. These differences reflect the diverse cultural, historical, and social backgrounds of China and the Philippines, providing distinct paths and models for the development of higher education in both countries[1]. A comparative analysis of the similarities and differences in higher education management characteristics between China and the Philippines is presented in Table 1. In China, the development of higher education is closely linked to the country's development strategy. The Chinese government has long placed great importance on higher education, considering it a crucial pillar of national development. To cultivate high-quality talents that meet national needs, the Chinese government has implemented a series of measures in higher education management, such as strengthening teaching quality monitoring and promoting the internationalization of higher education. The characteristics of higher education management

in the Philippines are influenced by its open economic environment, an internationalized higher education system, and a history of American colonization. As an open economy, the Philippines has long interacted with the international market, leading its higher education to focus more on collaboration and alignment with industries. Additionally, the higher education system in the Philippines is highly internationalized. Many Filipino universities have established partnerships with international institutions, introducing international high-quality educational resources to enhance the quality of education.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of the Differences and Similarities in Higher Education Management Characteristics between China and the Philippines

	Characteristics of Educational Administration in Chinese Universities	Characteristics of Educational Administration in Philippine Universities
Similarities	1. Cultivating Practical Application Skills: Emphasis on practical teaching and the integration of industry, study, and research.	1. Cultivating Practical Application Skills: Emphasizing collaborations between schools and enterprises, and focusing on practical experience.
	2. Focusing on Teaching Quality: Establishing a system for monitoring teaching quality, including evaluating and assessing teachers.	2. Focusing on Teaching Quality: Regularly evaluating and providing feedback to teachers to enhance the quality of teaching.
Differences	1. Educational Philosophy: Emphasis on the systematic and theoretical nature of knowledge, stressing the integrity and depth of knowledge.	1. Educational Philosophy: Focusing on the practicality and applicability of knowledge, closely linked to market demands.
	2. Resource Allocation: Issues with uneven resource distribution exist, with key universities and popular majors receiving more resources.	2. Resource Allocation: Relatively balanced, with private universities playing a dominant role and resources allocated flexibly according to market needs.

2. Characteristics of Higher Education Management in China

2.1. Government-Dominated Management Model

Chinese higher education management is significantly influenced and regulated by the government, exhibiting characteristics of government-led standardized management. The government establishes and implements a range of policies and regulations to comprehensively and meticulously manage universities, ensuring stable improvement in educational quality and academic standards. On one hand, the government plays a crucial role in Chinese higher education management, responsible for formulating development strategies and plans for higher education and managing universities directly or indirectly through administrative means. The government provides clear guidance and standards in university disciplines, enrollment sizes, teaching quality assessments, and degree conferrals to ensure higher education development aligns with national strategies and public interests[2]. On the other hand, Chinese higher education management is highly standardized. The government sets a series of policies and standards to comprehensively standardize aspects such as teaching, research, personnel, and finance in universities. For instance, in teaching, the government has

established a range of teaching quality assessment standards and management regulations to ensure teaching quality.

2.2. Unified Education Quality Assurance System

To ensure the stability and improvement of higher education quality, the Chinese government has established a unified education quality assurance system. This system, through strict standards and evaluation mechanisms, comprehensively assesses and supervises teaching quality and research levels in universities. Firstly, Chinese higher education management focuses on establishing unified education quality standards. The government sets quality standards for higher education, ensuring all universities adhere to these uniform quality requirements. These standards cover various aspects, including teaching, research, faculty, facilities, and equipment, providing clear quality targets and requirements for universities. Secondly, Chinese higher education management ensures education quality through evaluation mechanisms. The government regularly evaluates universities to check whether they meet established quality standards[3]. Evaluation results are important for university rankings, enrollment quotas, and funding allocation, motivating universities to continually enhance their teaching quality and research levels. The unified education quality assurance system helps ensure the steady improvement of the overall quality and level of Chinese higher education, providing clear quality targets and requirements for universities and encouraging continuous self-improvement and innovation.

2.3. Balanced Distribution of Educational Resources

In higher education management, resource allocation is a crucial task. The Chinese government emphasizes the balanced distribution of resources in higher education management to ensure that universities of different regions, types, and levels receive fair, reasonable, and sufficient educational resources. This balanced distribution of educational resources is a significant characteristic of Chinese higher education management. The government ensures balanced resource allocation through scientific resource allocation policies and planning. Based on national development strategies, regional socio-economic conditions, and higher education development needs, the government formulates rational higher education resource allocation policies and plans. This allows educational resources to be planned and purposefully allocated according to the overall national needs and strategic objectives. Additionally, the government plays a leading role in resource allocation, providing direct financial support to universities through budget allocations and special funds. Scientific funding distribution schemes are developed based on factors such as the level of education, disciplinary characteristics, and development potential of universities, ensuring that funds are reasonably distributed among them. This balanced distribution of resources helps improve the quality and equity of the entire higher education system, enhancing educational conditions and resource status and promoting balanced development in higher education.

3. Characteristics of Higher Education Management in the Philippines

3.1. High Degree of University Autonomy

In the Philippines, higher education institutions, especially autonomous institutions, enjoy a certain degree of autonomy. This autonomy system is beneficial for universities to fully leverage their strengths, better serve society, and make greater contributions to national economic development. Generally, institutions accredited as Level IV by the Philippine Commission on Higher Education have a high degree of autonomy. These autonomous universities can independently formulate enrollment plans, establish courses, decide on teaching content and plans, and conduct research activities. This autonomy system helps universities better adapt to social and economic development needs, improving educational

quality and academic standards. However, the high degree of autonomy in university management in the Philippines has its historical and practical reasons. Historically, the Philippines was a colony of the United States, and the American education system profoundly influenced Philippine higher education[4]. The American higher education system emphasizes academic freedom and university autonomy, traditions inherited and developed by Philippine universities. Additionally, the Philippines has a diverse array of higher education institutions, including both public and private universities, each possessing a certain degree of autonomy in management.

3.2. Market-Oriented Management Model

As an open economy with long-term interaction with the international market, the economic environment in the Philippines encourages higher education institutions to focus more on cooperation and alignment with industries. To meet market demands, Philippine universities have gradually formed a market-oriented management model, with education management characteristics as shown in Table 2. This market-oriented model emphasizes that higher education institutions should flexibly adjust their educational services according to market needs. In the Philippines, private universities dominate, and these institutions typically have a strong market sensitivity, quickly responding to market demand changes. They cultivate application-oriented talents that meet enterprise needs through flexible curriculum settings, diverse teaching methods, and close industry-academia collaboration. This market-oriented model helps improve the educational quality and employment rate of universities and provides ample human resources for enterprises. The market-oriented model also promotes the internationalization of higher education services. Philippine universities actively engage in international exchanges and collaborations, introducing international high-quality educational resources to enhance educational quality. Moreover, Philippine universities strive to cultivate talents with international perspectives and cross-cultural communication skills to meet international market needs. This internationalization trend not only enhances the international competitiveness of Philippine universities but also provides robust talent support for the economic development of the Philippines.

Table 2. Characteristics of Higher Education Management in the Philippines

Features	Descriptions
Market-Oriented Management Model	Emphasizing that higher education institutions should adjust their educational services flexibly according to market demands. Private universities, holding a dominant position, are able to respond swiftly to changes in market needs.
Flexible Curriculum Design	Universities can flexibly adjust their curriculum settings according to market demands, to meet the needs of different industries and enterprises.
Diverse Teaching Methods	Various teaching methods are adopted, such as practical teaching and project-based learning, to cultivate application-oriented talents.
Close Collaboration with Industry	Universities establish cooperative relationships with enterprises to jointly carry out scientific research projects and cultivate talents that meet market demands.

3.3. Uneven Distribution of Educational Resources

As a developing country, the economic development level of the Philippines significantly impacts the allocation of educational resources. Due to uneven economic development, there is a considerable disparity in educational resource investment across different regions. In

economically more developed areas, such as Manila and Cebu, robust economic strength allows for more substantial funding and resources for higher education institutions[5]. However, in less economically developed areas, like Mindanao and Misamis, limited financial capabilities result in relatively lower investments in higher education. This imbalance in resource allocation leads to varying levels of higher education development across different regions. Besides regional disparities, there are also differences in resource allocation among types and levels of universities. Private universities, which dominate in the Philippines, generally have more autonomy and resources. In contrast, some public universities, especially regional institutions, face limitations in their development due to insufficient financial and resource support. This imbalance results in disparities in educational quality and academic levels among different types and levels of universities. The uneven distribution of educational resources is also related to policy orientation, where government education policies often prioritize the development of key universities or specific fields, leading to uneven resource distribution.

4. Conclusion

In summary, the higher education management characteristics of China and the Philippines each have their merits, reflecting their respective historical, cultural, and economic development backgrounds. Chinese higher education management emphasizes the government's leading role, focusing on unified planning, moral education, as well as the transformation of practical teaching and research achievements. This model ensures the fairness and continuity of education and facilitates the implementation of national strategies. In contrast, Philippine higher education management emphasizes university autonomy and market orientation, enhancing flexibility and adaptability to better meet social and economic development needs. With the progression of globalization, cooperation and exchange in the field of education between China and the Philippines are becoming increasingly frequent. This exchange not only promotes mutual progress in educational management but also brings more opportunities and challenges to both countries. Looking forward, more collaborative achievements in higher education are anticipated between China and the Philippines, jointly advancing the development of higher education in both countries, nurturing more outstanding talents, and making greater contributions to future societal development.

References

- [1] Li, S. B. Higher Education Cooperation between China and “The Belt and Road” Countries[J]. *Journal of South China Normal University (Social Science Edition)*. 2017, 1: 62-65.
- [2] Mays, N., Pope, C., & Popay, J. Systematically reviewing qualitative and quantitative evidence to inform management and policy-making in the health field [J]. *Journal of health service research and policy*. 2005,10(1): 6-20.
- [3] Peters, M. A., Oladele, O. M., Green, B., Samilo, A., Lv, H., ... Tesar, M. Education in and for the Belt and Road Initiative[J]. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 2020, 52(10), 1040-1063.
- [4] Sachdeva, G. Indian Perceptions of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative. *International Studies*, 2018, 54(4): 285-296.
- [5] Wang, Z. H., & Zhang, C. S. The Source of Local Talents for Chinese “Going Global” Enterprises Under the Belt and Road Initiative-Based on the Study of Foreign Students in China[J]. *Journal of SUIBE*. 2018,25(5): 63-73.