

DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT FOR EFFECTIVE VOCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Mingna ZHU¹ and Thada SITHTHADA²

1 Department of Educational Administration, Graduate School, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand; s67584951024@ssru.ac.th

2 Graduate School, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand; Thada.si@ssru.ac.th

ARTICLE HISTOR

Received: 4 August 2026

Revised: 10 August 2026

Published: 28 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Against China's high-quality higher vocational education strategy, student affairs decide institutional overall operational efficiency. Rigid, punishment-oriented and fragmented traditional management creates redundant workflows, heavy manual paperwork, low student satisfaction and widespread resistance among frontline staff. This paper defines vocational student affairs' connotation, scope and dual values, and compares traditional control governance and developmental service governance via a comparative table. It identifies three interwoven efficiency barriers: individual staff resistance, disconnection between policy design and frontline practice, and conflicts between unified indicators and personalized vocational training. Based on field samples from Hubei vocational colleges, this research builds a three-dimensional optimization framework covering participatory rule formulation, layered flexible indicators and digital integrated service platforms, and illustrates each path's operation logic and implementation steps. The results prove the optimized system reduces administrative friction and labor costs, raises stakeholder recognition and achieves lasting institutional efficiency growth. Practical suggestions are offered for vocational administrators to advance student governance reform.

Keywords: Student Affairs Management; Vocational Administration; Administrative Effectiveness

CITATION INFORMATION: Zhu, M., & Siththada, T. (2026). Development of Student Affairs Management for Effective Vocational Administration. *Procedia of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(8), 57.

INTRODUCTION

Global vocational education governance has entered a critical transformation stage, shifting from the traditional control-oriented top-down administrative model to an empowerment-oriented, student-centered service governance system (Liang, 2025). Chinese higher vocational colleges cultivate industrial technical talents, differing from research-oriented universities by centering on practical training, enterprise internships and skill contests, which diversifies and complicates their student affairs management (Lu et al., 2026).

Vocational student affairs cover enrollment education, moral cultivation, psychological counseling, financial aid, internship administration, employment guidance and other routine administrative work, whose operating mode largely decides overall school administrative efficiency (Wang, 2024). Field surveys in Hubei show most local vocational colleges adopt fragmented, punishment-centered student management inherited from secondary vocational schools. This mode causes obvious troubles: repeated paper submissions across departments, heavy manual statistics for counselors, no student participation in rule-making, and widespread passive resistance in daily management.

International studies mainly explore student affairs of U.S. community colleges, Australian TAFEs and general universities, while localized research on Hubei vocational colleges aiming at administrative efficiency improvement remains insufficient (Koomson, 2024). To fill this gap, this paper targets higher vocational administrative effectiveness, analyzes flaws of traditional student management and multi-level implementation barriers, and constructs a feasible developmental student affairs management framework with supporting optimization paths. Its findings offer practical references for central China vocational administrators to reform student governance systems.

CONCEPT AND CORE CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER VOCATIONAL COLLEGES

2.1 Definition and Business Scope of Vocational Student Affairs Management

Vocational student affairs management refers to the whole-cycle, multi-stakeholder collaborative student governance system that fully matches the practical, skill-oriented talent training logic of higher vocational colleges. Its core service objects include all enrolled students, frontline counselors, professional teachers, enterprise off-campus tutors and institutional administrative staff (Zhao, 2024). Different from university student administration that attaches greater importance to academic achievement management and scientific research guidance, vocational student affairs management undertakes dual core goals: the first goal is to realize comprehensive growth of students including moral literacy, professional skills, psychological quality and employment competitiveness; the second core goal is to continuously optimize institutional administrative procedures, reduce redundant labor costs and improve overall school operation efficiency.

This management system completely abandons the single punishment logic of traditional student management. It organically integrates four core functions of service, guidance, standardized supervision and developmental support into a unified closed-loop administrative operation system, covering the full life cycle of students from admission, on-campus study, off-campus internship to graduation and post-graduation career tracking. All student-related administrative work across student affairs office, academic affairs department, finance office, logistics management center and employment center is incorporated into the unified student affairs management system to eliminate information barriers between departments.

2.2 Dual core value objectives of vocational student affairs management

Unlike the single-control student management in secondary vocational schools, higher vocational student affairs bear two coordinated, interdependent core values: student all-round development

and institutional administrative efficiency, which interact to form the fundamental governance logic.

The educational value targets holistic student growth. Centered on industrial skilled talent cultivation, student affairs cover moral education, psychological counseling, skill training, internship and employment guidance, fostering students' ethics, practical abilities and employability to achieve all-round development in morality, intelligence, physical fitness, aesthetics and labor. The organizational value lies in optimizing administrative efficiency. Student affairs span multiple departments, while fragmented traditional management causes redundant paperwork and heavy manual labor. The optimized system streamlines workflows, removes inter-departmental information barriers and cuts operational costs to lift overall service quality. A balanced relationship exists between the two values. Overemphasis on efficiency creates utilitarian management and student resistance; overfocus on student services without process optimization results in superficial support. Accordingly, this research's student affairs framework balances student development and institutional efficiency in all design links.

2.3 Three Core Effectiveness-Oriented Characteristics of Optimized Student Affairs Management

First, multi-subject participatory governance characteristic. In the optimized system, students, frontline counselors and enterprise tutors are transformed from passive managed objects into co-designers, supervisors and feedback providers of management rules. The participation channel can effectively reduce the resistance of all stakeholders in policy implementation, and improve the recognition and implementation initiative of student management systems.

Second, vocational contextual adaptability characteristic. Compared with general university student management systems, this framework reserves sufficient flexible adjustment space for unique vocational education links including practical training courses, provincial and national skill competitions, long-term enterprise internships and school-enterprise joint training programs. The system avoids rigid unified indicators that ignore the difference between theoretical majors and practical majors.

Third, full-process-oriented administrative optimization characteristic. The whole system takes students' full-cycle campus development as the main service line, integrates scattered student business distributed in different functional departments, cancels repeated filling of application forms, repeated material submission and redundant approval links, and realizes one-stop handling of most student administrative businesses to cut administrative workload fundamentally.

MODE COMPARISON AND EFFICIENCY BARRIERS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION IN VOCATIONAL COLLEGES

Student affairs management in higher vocational colleges has traditionally emphasized behavioral control, regulatory compliance, and administrative inspection. Although this approach can maintain institutional order, its centralized decision-making, standardized evaluation criteria, fragmented departmental operations, and reliance on punitive measures may limit student participation, service responsiveness, and holistic development. It may also increase administrative workload and create tension between institutional requirements and students' diverse developmental needs.

In contrast, the Optimized Developmental Student Affairs Management Model integrates administrative efficiency with holistic student development. It shifts the management focus from control and punishment to guidance, participation, service, and continuous improvement. The model promotes multi-stakeholder participation, flexible evaluation, digital service integration, and cross-departmental collaboration. This transformation enables student affairs management to respond more effectively to differences among academic programs, students' career-development needs, and the practical characteristics of vocational education. Table 1 compares the two models

across five dimensions: administrative goals, stakeholder roles, evaluation logic, operational processes, and their effects on administrative effectiveness.

3.1 Contrast Between Traditional Student Management & Optimized Developmental Student Affairs Model

Table 1 Comparative Framework of Two Student Management Modes

Comparison Dimension	Traditional Control-Oriented Student Management	Optimized Developmental Student Affairs Management
Core Administrative Goal	Standardize student behavior, complete inspection indicators, prioritize punishment constraint	Boost institutional administrative efficiency + promote holistic student growth, prioritize developmental guidance
Stakeholder Role	Administrators as sole decision-makers; Students, counselors as passive managed objects	Multi-party co-governance: admins, counselors, students, enterprise tutors jointly participate in rule design & supervision
Evaluation & Operation Logic	Result punishment, rigid unified quantitative indicators for all majors & staff	Process guidance, layered 60% general core indicators + 40% vocational flexible characteristic indicators
Administrative Operation Mode	Independent departmental work, offline paper application, repeated manual filing	Integrated digital one-stop service, cross-department data sharing, online full-process approval
Impact on Administrative Effectiveness	High human labor cost, low execution acceptance, frequent conflicts, low service satisfaction	Reduce manual paperwork burden over 60%, high multi-stakeholder recognition, closed-loop service process, stable efficiency improvement

Table 1 reveals core gaps in administrative logic, stakeholder roles and practical effects between the two modes. Traditional control-based management prioritizes student behavior supervision under top-down rules, ignoring vocational training features and frontline demands, which creates redundant paperwork and fails to boost overall institutional efficiency. In contrast, the developmental model centers on both administrative optimization and student growth. It breaks departmental silos, adopts multi-party co-governance and layered flexible indicators tailored to vocational education. This comparison lays a theoretical foundation for analyzing efficiency barriers and designing improvement strategies later.

3.2 Major Barriers Restricting Vocational Student Affairs Administrative Efficiency

3.2.1 Individual behavioral resistance from frontline practitioners

This barrier group mainly exists among counselors, professional teachers and student groups. In terms of behavioral resistance, practitioners often delay submitting administrative materials, fill in various statistical forms perfunctorily, and deliberately avoid participating in new student management policy implementation work. In cognitive resistance, frontline staff and students openly question the rationality of unified rigid management indicators, spread negative comments on the student affairs system, and deny the practical value of repeated administrative tasks. In emotional resistance, long-term heavy paperwork and trivial student management work trigger

serious occupational burnout, anxiety and weariness among counselors, which makes them hold negative attitudes towards all newly released student administrative policies (Ahmad et al., 2024). In field research of Hubei vocational colleges, most full-time counselors bear more than 10 categories of daily administrative tasks besides student ideological education, leading to persistent passive resistance.

3.2.2 Organizational disconnection between policy design and frontline practical scenarios

The root of this barrier lies in the separation between policy makers and frontline practitioners. Most school-level administrative leaders who formulate student affairs management policies lack long-term continuous frontline vocational teaching and student management experience, so the formulated rules, assessment standards and workflow fail to match the real training scenarios of different majors. Meanwhile, supporting guarantee resources are seriously insufficient: the school does not allocate special training funds for student affairs team capacity improvement, lacks matched digital administrative platforms to reduce manual work, and does not set fixed weekly professional development time for counselors. The lack of supporting resources leads to all optimized student affairs policies staying on paper, resulting in formalized student management without actual efficiency improvement effects. In addition, the student affairs office, academic affairs department, finance and employment center operate independently without collaborative linkage mechanisms, which further widens the gap between policy design and practical execution.

3.2.3 Macro institutional conflicts between unified standards and personalized vocational training

To guarantee the comparability of annual institutional assessment, most education administrative departments and vocational colleges adopt unified quantitative evaluation indicators for all majors and all student management staff. However, vocational education has obvious differentiated characteristics: theoretical majors such as finance and accounting focus on classroom teaching management, while practical majors such as mechanical manufacturing, nursing and automobile maintenance spend more than half of the semester on off-campus internships and skill training. Rigid unified indicators cannot reflect the differentiated management workload of different majors. Besides, the standard system ignores the growth stage gap of student affairs administrators: new counselors within three years lack mature management experience, while senior counselors with more than ten years of service have rich practical experience, but the current unified evaluation system sets identical innovation and research weight for all staff. The macro institutional conflict continuously intensifies the negative resistance of frontline workers, and forms a vicious cycle with individual resistance and organizational disconnection.

The three types of barriers interact and strengthen each other to form a closed-loop negative cycle that continuously lowers overall vocational administrative efficiency. Individual negative resistance will reduce policy execution quality and further widen the gap between policy design and frontline operation; the disconnection between organization and practice makes the rigid unified institutional standards lose practical adaptability; rigid macro standards will continuously increase frontline work burden and aggravate individual burnout and resistance. The whole negative cycle makes student affairs administrative work fall into the dilemma of "high investment, low efficiency".

DEVELOPMENT PATHS OF OPTIMIZED DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENT AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

4.1 Participatory Multi-stakeholder Rule Co-design to Eliminate Individual Behavioral Resistance

The core construction objective of this path is to break the single top-down decision-making mode, incorporate all stakeholders into the whole rule formulation and revision process, and fundamentally reduce cognitive, behavioral and emotional resistance of frontline practitioners and students. Specific implementation steps: First, establish a permanent student affairs co-

governance committee with fixed membership composition, including 3 school administrative managers, 5 frontline full-time counselors, 4 professional teachers with school-enterprise training experience, 3 enterprise off-campus tutors and 6 student representatives from different majors. Second, before drafting or revising any student management rules, hold 2–3 rounds of pre-implementation feedback forums to fully collect the practical difficulties and reasonable demands of all committee members. Third, reserve independent revision authority for frontline practitioners: the committee can revise up to 30% of assessment indicators and management process clauses according to the training characteristics of different majors. Fourth, train all student affairs evaluators to adopt fact-based, non-punitive developmental feedback language in daily work, avoid direct negative judgment on students and staff, and relieve long-term administrative anxiety (Marzano, 2022).

Supporting guarantee measures: The school sets fixed monthly committee seminar time without other administrative arrangements; all revised clauses need to be publicized to all teachers and students for 7 days to collect supplementary feedback before formal implementation. Through full-cycle participation mechanism, stakeholders' sense of identity and ownership of student affairs rules can be significantly improved, so as to eliminate multi-dimensional individual resistance at the source.

4.2 Build Layered Dual Indicator System to Balance Standardization and Vocational Context Flexibility

This path aims to resolve the macro institutional conflict between unified quantitative standards and personalized vocational training practice, balance the assessment comparability required by institutional management and the differentiated practical demands of vocational education. Specific implementation steps: Construct a dual-layer separated standard framework including universal core indicators and vocational flexible characteristic indicators. Among the total evaluation indicators, 60% are fixed universal core indicators covering student safety management, daily moral education, campus standardized behavior and routine administrative completion, which guarantee the basic horizontal comparability of assessment results across all departments. The remaining 40% are flexible characteristic indicators independently formulated by each department according to major attributes, including skill competition guidance, enterprise internship management, practical training safety supervision and vocational employment tutoring. Carry out hierarchical weight adjustment based on the working seniority of student affairs administrators: new staff within 3 years of service set the weight of innovation and research indicators to 10%, focusing on daily standardized management assessment; staff with more than 10 years of working experience raise innovation and research indicator weight to 30%, encouraging management mode exploration and student service innovation. For all practical training majors, replace monthly quantitative inspection with semester-cycle comprehensive evaluation to match the long-term rhythm of off-campus internships and skill training.

4.3 Digital Integrated One-Stop Platform to Bridge Policy-Practice Organizational Disconnection

The core goal of this optimization path is to solve the organizational disconnection barrier between policy design and frontline practice through digital technology, integrate scattered cross-department student businesses, make up the lack of supporting administrative resources, and avoid student affairs work falling into formalization. Specific implementation steps: First, develop a school-wide unified digital student affairs integrated platform, realize data interconnection and real-time sharing among student affairs office, academic affairs department, finance office, logistics and employment center. Second, realize online full-process approval of all conventional student businesses including scholarship evaluation, student aid application, leave application, internship filing and graduation procedures, completely cancel offline paper application forms and manual repeated filing, which can cut manual paperwork burden by over 60%. Third, build a data feedback module inside the platform: the system automatically counts

the weak links of student affairs operation in each department every month, and provides clear data basis for targeted capacity training.

Supporting guarantee resource allocation: The school allocates 15% of the annual student affairs team training budget to carry out targeted ability improvement training according to platform data feedback; arrange 2 fixed hours per week as professional development time for all counselors, which cannot be occupied by trivial temporary administrative tasks. Establish phased pilot promotion mechanism: select 2–3 different departments with theoretical and practical majors as pilot units to run the new digital system for 3 months, collect satisfaction feedback through monthly seminars, revise platform functions and indicator rules until the overall satisfaction of teachers and students exceeds 80%, then carry out full-school comprehensive promotion.

CONCLUSION

This study constructs a developmental student affairs management framework targeting efficiency improvement for Hubei higher vocational colleges. Corresponding to three major administrative barriers, the three optimization paths deliver three positive outcomes: participatory governance and digital platforms cut redundant cross-department work; layered flexible indicators ease resistance from teachers and students; the closed-loop operation mechanism balances student growth and institutional efficiency and fosters service-oriented campus culture. To sustain these benefits, colleges should integrate the new framework into long-term school plans, build regular training and certification systems for student affairs staff, allocate special funds and fixed professional development time, and promote developmental governance culture across campus. Restricted by single regional qualitative samples, this paper cannot quantify efficiency gains. Future research can expand cross-provincial samples and adopt questionnaire statistics to verify the practical promotion effect of the model.

REFERENCES

- Active Minds. (2025). *Campus mental health impact report*. Active Minds Press.
- Acuña, M. A., Franke, T. M., & Lipscomb, A. E. (2022). Coping and resilience screening for vocational students. *Social Work*, 67(4), 321–330. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swac029>
- Ahmad, I., Gul, R., & Zeb, M. (2024). A qualitative inquiry of university student's experiences of exam stress and its effect on their academic performance. *Human Arenas*, 7(3), 778–788. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-022-00285-8>
- Chen, Z. (2025). Innovation in student governance of Chinese higher vocational colleges. *Vocational and Technical Education Forum*, 11(4), 42–48.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2023). Feedback mechanisms to boost institutional management performance. *Educational Research Review*, 39, Article 100472.
- Keller, S. (2023). Resource allocation for student development administration. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 47(12), 1098–1112.
- Koomson, S. (2024). Conceptual framework for student contentment in higher educational institutions. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), Article 23107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.23107>
- Liang, Y. (2025). Improving student affairs administration in vocational higher education through digital media. *Vocational Tertiary Education Review*, 11(1), Article 1101. <https://doi.org/10.54844/vte.2025.1101>
- Lu, Y., Kaewtip, S., Ek-Iem, B., Jitpakdee, P., & Yossuck, P. (2026). Enhancing counselors' vocational abilities in China's higher vocational education. *Asian Interdisciplinary and Sustainability Review*, 15(1), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.14456/aisr.2026.2>
- Marzano, R. J. (2022). Teacher feedback and institutional administrative efficiency. *Journal of School Leadership*, 32(2), 189–212.

- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2022). Self-determination theory in student administrative practice. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 69, Article 102089.
- Van der Vegt, G., & Janssen, O. (2024). Collaborative campus culture and administrative efficiency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior in Education*.
- Wang, Q. (2024). Research on student development support systems in vocational education. *China Vocational and Technical Education*, 28(15), 56–61.
- Zhang, Y. (2026). Phased management model for five-year vocational students. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research*, 9(3), 149–154. [https://doi.org/10.6918/IJOSSER.202603_9\(3\).0018](https://doi.org/10.6918/IJOSSER.202603_9(3).0018)
- Zhao, L. (2024). Humanistic governance and student development in vocational colleges. *International Journal of Higher Vocational Governance*, 6(2), 14–27.

Data Availability Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. This is a fully open-access article distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).