

Exploration of the Balance Between Humanized and Institutionalized Management in University Student Management

Zhuo Zhang*

Xi'an FanYi University, Xi'an, 710105, China

**Corresponding author: angel6675@sina.com*

Abstract: *With the diversification and complexity of higher education, the methods of student management in universities are continuously evolving. Achieving an effective balance between humanized and institutionalized management is an important issue currently faced in university student management. Humanized management centers on students, focusing on their individual development and psychological needs; whereas institutionalized management emphasizes norms, standards, and enforceability to ensure fairness and order. This paper aims to explore the practices of humanized and institutionalized management in university student management, analyze the challenges they face, and explore strategies to achieve balance. Through a study of the connotations, implementation paths, and integration strategies of humanized and institutionalized management, the paper proposes methods such as cross-departmental collaboration and dynamic adjustments. This research seeks to provide theoretical foundations and practical guidance for university student management and offer references for addressing future educational management challenges.*

Keywords: *University student management; Humanized management; Institutionalized management; Management balance; Educational innovation*

Introduction

With the development of society and the continuous expansion of higher education, university student management is facing increasingly complex situations. Students not only need support in their academic pursuits but also seek assistance in various aspects of psychological health, career planning, and personal development. This requires universities to innovate management models to better adapt to changing times and the diverse needs of students. Humanized management emphasizes respecting students' individuality, listening to their voices, and focusing on psychological health and development potential; while institutionalized management serves as the foundation for ensuring fairness, effectiveness, and sustainability in management. The effective combination of the two helps foster well-rounded students, but achieving a balance between them in practice is a pressing issue for educational managers. Therefore, this study aims to explore the balance between humanized and institutionalized management in university student management, reveal the challenges and strategies for implementation, and provide theoretical and practical support for future university management.

1. Humanized and Institutionalized Management Practices in University Student Management

1.1 Connotations and Implementation Principles of Humanized Management

Humanized management in university student management emphasizes a student-centered approach, focusing on students' individual development, psychological health, and the cultivation of comprehensive qualities. Its connotations primarily lie in respecting students' autonomy, listening to their needs and voices, and supporting their self-development. Humanized management differs from traditional management models in that its core is understanding and care, rather than simple rules and restrictions. It builds communication bridges between teachers and students, promotes the improvement of students' psychological resilience and emotional regulation abilities, and thus creates a more harmonious educational environment^[1].

The principles of implementing humanized management include: First, respecting students'

individual differences by providing diverse educational resources and support services to meet the needs of different students; Second, promoting teacher-student interaction and establishing a trust-based relationship, allowing students to express themselves and discuss issues in an open and inclusive environment; Third, focusing on students' psychological health by setting up professional psychological counseling services and mental health education courses to help students establish a strong psychological defense network; Fourth, encouraging student participation in management and decision-making, such as through student unions and student representative assemblies, providing students with more opportunities to express opinions and participate in event planning. These principles ensure that students feel human care and support within the framework of rules and regulations.

1.2 Basic Characteristics and Implementation Paths of Institutionalized Management

Institutionalized management in university student management is characterized by norms, standardization, and systematization. It ensures predictability in student behavior and fairness in management by establishing a series of rules, policies, and procedures. Institutionalized management provides students with clear behavioral guidelines through well-defined regulations, ensuring campus order and overall development. For example, academic performance management, disciplinary procedures, and student comprehensive quality evaluation systems are typical practices of institutionalized management.

The implementation paths of institutionalized management include: First, formulating and improving university student handbooks, specifying students' behavioral guidelines in academics, discipline, and daily life; Second, establishing a sound assessment and rewards/punishment system to ensure that students can manage themselves and improve within a clear rules framework; Third, utilizing information technology to promote the application of student information management systems, enabling data-driven management decisions, such as building online course selection, academic warning, and academic analysis systems; Fourth, strengthening the promotion and training of various systems to help students understand and accept these systems, thus enhancing their transparency and operability. These paths enhance management efficiency and fairness, providing a more stable educational environment for students^[2].

1.3 Integration Strategies for Humanized and Institutionalized Management

Achieving a balance between humanized and institutionalized management in university student management requires the adoption of scientific integration strategies. These strategies must respect and maintain students' autonomy and diversity while ensuring the overall consistency and operability of management.

The strategies for achieving integration should focus on the following aspects:

First, formulating a flexible and compatible management framework. Universities should adjust the specific implementation details of institutionalized management based on different management scenarios and the needs of student groups, allowing room for humanized adjustments. For instance, when formulating reward and punishment systems, differentiated measures can be adopted for different disciplines and student groups, making the system more in line with students' actual situations.

Second, improving the professional quality of management personnel. Teachers and administrative staff should receive professional training in fields such as psychology, education, and management, enabling them to adopt different management strategies based on students' diverse needs, thus finding the best balance between humanized and institutionalized management.

Additionally, strengthening feedback and continuous improvement mechanisms is also an important strategy. Universities should regularly conduct student surveys and management effectiveness assessments, collect feedback from students and staff, and adjust and optimize management strategies based on this feedback. Dynamic adjustments help continuously improve the integration of humanized and institutionalized management, making it more suited to the actual needs of universities.

Finally, establishing a diversified collaboration mechanism is essential. Universities should encourage participation from all parties in management and decision-making through platforms such as student unions, parent committees, and academic committees, pooling ideas and collectively promoting the formulation and implementation of management policies. This collaborative mechanism can better balance the rigidity and flexibility of management, improving students' acceptance and satisfaction with management.

2. Challenges of Balancing Humanized and Institutionalized Management in University Student Management

2.1 Challenges and Limitations of Humanized Management

Although humanized management in university student management can create a warmer and more supportive educational environment for students, it faces a series of challenges and limitations during implementation. First, the uneven distribution of resources limits the widespread application of humanized management. In many universities, especially those with limited resources, it is difficult to provide personalized attention and support to each student, which restricts the implementation of humanized management due to constraints in funding and human resources. Second, the varying levels of professional competence among management personnel mean that some teachers and administrators may lack sufficient knowledge in fields such as psychology and education, making it difficult to effectively identify and meet students' individualized needs, thus affecting the effectiveness of humanized management.

In addition, humanized management may face issues of subjectivity and inconsistency during its execution. Different managers may adopt different approaches to handling student affairs based on their personal understanding and experiences. This lack of standardized procedures can lead to fairness issues, weakening the authority and consistency of the management. Finally, some students may lack self-discipline when receiving humanized management and become overly dependent on the guidance and care of administrators. This contradicts the goal of fostering self-autonomy and may create potential negative effects of humanized management^[3].

2.2 Rigidity and Implementation Issues in Institutionalized Management

While institutionalized management helps to standardize and systematize management processes, it often appears rigid and inflexible during implementation. The basic feature of institutionalized management is the use of a series of uniform regulations and rules to ensure the standardization and orderliness of student behavior. However, this highly standardized management approach tends to overlook students' individual differences and special needs. Especially when dealing with a diverse and complex student population, fixed systems may not effectively adapt to the varying situations of students, leading to the failure to meet the real needs of some students.

Furthermore, institutionalized management may exhibit a “formalization” phenomenon during its execution, where certain policies and regulations become mere “paper talk” and fail to achieve the expected outcomes. For example, some universities overly rely on written regulations when formulating reward and punishment measures, neglecting to consider the actual situations of students. This could lead to dissatisfaction or unjust treatment among students due to the rigidity of the system. Moreover, the implementation of institutionalized management may rely excessively on supervision and punishment, lacking encouragement and motivation for positive student behaviors, thus causing opposition and conflict between students and the management system.

2.3 Contradiction Between Humanized Needs and Institutionalized Requirements

There is a significant contradiction between humanized needs and institutionalized requirements, which stems from the different starting points and core ideas of the two approaches. Humanized management emphasizes a student-centered approach, focusing on respecting and meeting students' individualized needs, with an emphasis on flexibility and autonomy. In contrast, institutionalized management focuses on maintaining order and fairness through strict regulations and standards, with an emphasis on consistency and normativity. This ideological conflict leads to difficulties in fully integrating humanized and institutionalized management in practice.

In specific implementation, this contradiction may manifest as a struggle between the normativity of institutionalized management and the individualized needs of humanized management. For instance, in student assessment and evaluation, institutionalized management emphasizes using unified standards to ensure fairness and transparency, but this may overlook the different developmental paths and learning styles of students, thereby affecting their motivation and autonomy. On the other hand, if humanized management prioritizes individual needs during the implementation of regulations, it may reduce the fairness and consistency of the management, ultimately affecting the overall discipline and normativity of the student body^[4].

Resolving this contradiction requires innovation and adjustments in both the design and implementation of systems. Through flexible policies and diversified management methods, universities should gradually explore how to incorporate elements of humanized management within the framework of institutionalized management. For example, establishing a dynamic adjustment mechanism that continuously optimizes management strategies based on actual student feedback and needs can better meet students' individualized needs and development goals, while still ensuring fairness and order.

3. Exploring the Balance Between Humanized and Institutionalized Management in University Student Management

3.1 Theoretical Framework and Application Basis of the Balancing Strategy

Achieving a balance between humanized and institutionalized management in university student management requires the construction of a theoretical framework that integrates the advantages of both. This framework should combine the research findings from educational psychology, management, and sociology, fully reflecting the "human-centered" educational philosophy and the "institutional support" organizational structure. Specifically, the theoretical framework of the balancing strategy needs to cover the psychological foundation of humanized education and the organizational behavior perspective of institutionalized management, emphasizing their complementarity and coordination.

From the perspective of educational psychology, the core of humanized management lies in valuing students' autonomy, dignity, and psychological needs. Developmental theories of students suggest that education should stimulate students' intrinsic motivation, encouraging them to engage in self-exploration and self-regulation. Based on this theory, student management in universities should not only stimulate students' potential and enhance their self-management abilities but also provide sufficient support and guidance, ensuring that students grow in a healthy and positive environment. Meanwhile, the theoretical foundation of institutionalized management relies on organizational behavior theory, which emphasizes promoting overall coordination and efficient execution within a unified, standardized framework. Institutionalized management helps ensure fairness and transparency, providing students with clear behavioral norms and evaluation standards.

The strategy to combine humanized and institutionalized management requires the establishment of a flexible policy framework with a dynamic adjustment mechanism. This framework should allow for necessary adjustments based on the special needs of different student groups and individuals, while ensuring basic order and fairness. For instance, in academic requirements, basic parts can be set as academic standards and behavioral codes applicable to all students, while more flexible aspects should consider the individual differences of students from different majors, years, and backgrounds. Customizable support and reasonable resource allocation should be provided to deliver personalized services. Such a strategy ensures the seriousness and universality of the system while allowing for necessary flexibility in individual cases^[5].

Furthermore, when applying this balancing strategy, universities should emphasize the "dynamic adjustment" mechanism. The effectiveness of policies should be tested through regular assessments and feedback, and necessary revisions and optimizations should be made based on this. This feedback mechanism not only captures students' responses to management strategies but also helps universities adjust management methods to address emerging educational challenges and societal needs. The specific application of "flexible institutionalization" can better meet students' diverse development needs while maintaining the stability and consistency of the institutional framework.

3.2 Exploration of Cross-Departmental Collaboration and Multidimensional Management Models

Cross-departmental collaboration is key to achieving a balance between humanized and institutionalized management. The student management system in universities often involves multiple functional departments, such as the student affairs office, academic affairs office, psychological counseling center, logistics services, and the off-campus internship and employment office. To effectively combine humanized and institutionalized management, these departments should break down information barriers and work closely together to ensure coordination and efficiency in student management.

Through cross-departmental collaboration, universities can share student data and information, establishing a comprehensive student profile and dynamic evaluation system. This cooperative model

can help different departments understand students' multidimensional needs, such as academic performance, mental health, and life adaptation, forming a comprehensive assessment. For example, collaboration between the psychological counseling center and the academic guidance center can help identify students who are struggling academically and provide them with psychological support and learning strategy suggestions at the earliest opportunity. Joint work between the student affairs office and the academic affairs office can address course setup and academic planning, helping students manage their time and course selection more effectively, thus alleviating academic pressure.

The core of the multidimensional management model lies in establishing cross-departmental project teams and holding regular joint meetings. These teams can formulate diverse management solutions based on students' specific situations, ensuring flexibility in addressing different issues within the institutionalized framework. Additionally, using digital technology to achieve real-time information sharing and remote collaboration plays a crucial role. Universities can integrate management platforms and data analysis tools to seamlessly connect the work of various departments, creating a unified student information database to support multi-party collaboration. This technology-driven management model increases work efficiency, reduces information lag and repetitive work, and further promotes the effective integration of humanized and institutionalized management.

In the process of cross-departmental collaboration, the bidirectional feedback between students and administrators is also crucial. Students' real needs and suggestions should be reflected through regular surveys and forums, enabling the management to promptly identify and adjust strategies. Effective cross-departmental collaboration and multidimensional management models can find a balance between the unity of institutionalized management and the diversity of humanized services, better meeting students' needs.

3.3 Dynamic Adjustment from Humanized to Institutionalized Management

Achieving a balance between humanized and institutionalized management is not merely a static strategic choice, but a dynamic adjustment process. In student management, universities need to establish a real-time feedback and evaluation mechanism, using data-driven analysis and student feedback to adjust management strategies flexibly. The core goal of this dynamic adjustment process is to enhance the adaptability, responsiveness, and student satisfaction of the management.

The dynamic adjustment strategy should include regular policy assessments, data collection and analysis, and real-time updates of management manuals. Universities can use data analysis technologies to collect data from multiple aspects of students' learning, life, and mental health, analyze trends, and identify the strengths and weaknesses of management strategies. For example, by analyzing students' academic performance and psychological counseling records, administrators can identify groups of students who are emotionally distressed due to academic pressure, allowing them to adjust management measures and strengthen psychological support services. Dynamic adjustment should also involve the modular design of management strategies to enable quick adjustments and applications based on different needs and situations.

Policy adjustments can also be achieved through student participation, allowing students to play an active role in the management process. For instance, a student representative committee can be established to regularly engage with the management, proposing improvements and suggestions. This participatory management model not only enhances students' sense of belonging and involvement but also provides universities' management teams with firsthand feedback to help them adjust policies and strategies more effectively^[6].

As society develops and students' needs diversify, the dynamic adjustment from humanized to institutionalized management should also consider the social and cultural context and changes in educational policies. In the context of globalization and digitalization, educational policies and students' expectations are continuously changing, and universities need to maintain an open and innovative mindset, continually updating management theories and practices to meet the educational challenges of the new era.

Conclusion

This study delves into the practices and challenges of humanized and institutionalized management in university student management and proposes strategies to achieve a balance. The research shows that both humanized and institutionalized management have their advantages and limitations, and a

reasonable integration of both can promote the overall development of students while maintaining order and fairness in universities. In the future, university student management should focus on achieving a dynamic balance between humanized and institutionalized management, addressing complex educational management environments through cross-departmental collaboration, policy innovation, and diversified management models. With the advancement of technology and changes in educational philosophy, universities can use intelligent tools and data analysis methods to further optimize management practices. Policymakers and educational administrators should look to the long term, promoting the continuous integration of institutional innovation and humanized management to ensure the quality and sustainability of higher education.

References

- [1] Shen, Y. (2024). *Research on student management strategies in higher vocational colleges based on human-centered philosophy*. *Industrial and Technological Forum*, 23(17), 286-288.
- [2] Bai, J. (2023). *Analysis of humanized management in university student management*. *Talent and Wisdom*, (14), 131-133.
- [3] Yuan, W. (2021). *Innovative thinking on the path of student management under the human-centered concept*. *Public Relations World*, (24), 68-69.
- [4] Liao, X. (2024). *Inherent dilemmas and optimization paths of the university student discipline hearing system*. *Journal of Shaoguan University*, 45(04), 49-55.
- [5] Xu, F. (2023). *Analysis of enhancing the moral education function of university student management systems*. *Journal of Jiangxi Electric Power Vocational and Technical College*, 36(10), 143-145.
- [6] Wang, W. (2022). *Research on the path of university student management from a macro educational perspective*. *Mass Culture and Arts*, (23), 166-168.