

A Practical Exploration of One-Stop Student Community Construction at Liuzhou Institute of Technology

Guopeng Meng*

Liuzhou Institute of Technology, Liuzhou, 545616, China

*Corresponding author: mengguopeng@163.com

Abstract

The transformation of student dormitories from mere places of residence into integrated spaces for growth has become a notable direction in university student affairs in recent years. As a local, application-oriented engineering institution, Liuzhou Institute of Technology has, since its restructuring into a full undergraduate university, accumulated relatively sound physical facilities. The key to building its one-stop student community therefore lies not in constructing physical space but in enriching the community's substance, smoothing out coordination, and making good use of digital and intelligent technologies. The analytical framework of ecological systems theory shows that the community is the microsystem in which students interact most frequently in their daily lives, while the institutions and coordination that keep the community running constitute the mesosystem, and the two together determine how effectively students are supported. Current construction faces several difficulties, including a functional emphasis on outward form at the expense of substance, a structural mismatch between the services provided and what students actually need, weak coordination among the many parties involved, and digital applications that remain superficial. Grounded in the institutional positioning of an application-oriented engineering university and in an environment of industry-education integration, community construction should advance on several fronts in a coordinated way, namely systematic planning and evaluation mechanisms, the enrichment of space and community culture, the deployment of staff to the front line together with peer collaboration, the embedding of industry-education resources, and digital empowerment alongside precise services, so as to build the community into a learning-oriented, service-oriented, and growth-oriented community of daily life.

Keywords

One-stop student community, application-oriented engineering institutions, ecological systems theory, industry-education integration, community governance.

1. Introduction

University student dormitories have long been regarded as nothing more than places to live, and their role in fostering student development has only in recent years come to be systematically reconsidered. This shift is closely tied to changes in the governance structure of higher education. As streamlining administration, raising efficiency, and improving services became a common orientation of public-sector reform, universities established consolidated service bodies such as student affairs centers and integrated service counters, and the idea of one-stop service thus entered the campus [1]. At the same time, reforms in training mechanisms such as enrollment by broad disciplinary categories, the credit system, and broad-based training have to varying degrees weakened the capacity of traditional organizational units such as classes and grade cohorts to connect with and serve students. Because students spend the

most time and have the most concentrated needs in their living quarters, the dormitory community has become a key arena for reorganizing the resources that support student development [2]. Since 2019, the relevant authorities have moved the comprehensive management model of one-stop student communities from pilot projects toward wider adoption, and in 2024 they further called for shifting the function of student dormitories from residence toward development, making the policy direction for community construction increasingly clear [3].

It is worth noting that existing research has largely drawn its samples from ministry-affiliated universities and public research universities, while discussion of application-oriented, local, and private institutions remains comparatively thin. Application-oriented engineering institutions differ markedly from research universities in the composition of their student intake, their training objectives, their resource endowments, and the makeup of their faculty, so their community construction cannot simply copy the experience of other universities. To do so risks the awkward situation of relying on old methods and transplanting pilot experience in ways that do not fit a school's own circumstances. Liuzhou Institute of Technology is a representative case of this type of institution. It has established cooperation with local industrial enterprises, jointly built industry colleges and off-campus internship and training bases, and now has dual-qualified teachers, those holding both academic and industry credentials, making up close to forty percent of its faculty. This institutional positioning means that its community construction must both follow the general principles of student development and community governance and respond to the particular demands of an application-oriented engineering university operating in an environment of industry-education integration. Taking ecological systems theory as its main analytical perspective and drawing on the actual situation of this school, the present paper discusses the functional positioning, the practical difficulties, and the practical approaches involved in building one-stop student communities at application-oriented engineering institutions.

2. The Functional Positioning of One-Stop Student Communities in Application-Oriented Engineering Institutions

Understanding how a community fosters student development begins with clarifying what a community actually is. The German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies first defined community as a collective of daily life, rooted in a shared locality, that arises when people are bound together by common living and manifold social interaction [4]. The term one-stop derives from the English expression and carries the senses of integration, comprehensiveness, and concentration. Combining the two ideas implies bringing the dispersed functions of study, daily life, service, and social interaction together within the students' living quarters, so that the community is upgraded from a purely residential space into an integrated space for growth that supports daily life, emotional connection, and personal development at once. This process can be summed up as a move from a single-function living space to a comprehensive space for growth and from fragmented resource input to an integrated alignment of supply and demand, through which the community comes to carry a function of supporting growth that lies beyond formal classroom teaching [6][7].

Theoretical support for how the community fosters development comes from ecological systems theory in developmental psychology. Bronfenbrenner situated individual development within a set of environmental systems nested one inside another, the micro, meso, exo, and macro levels, and in his later work he used the process-person-context-time model to stress that the continuous interaction between the individual and the people, objects, and symbols in the immediate environment is decisive for development [8]. Viewing the student community through this framework yields a useful insight. The student community is precisely the

microsystem in which students interact most often in daily life, and its spatial form, its mix of personnel, its activities, and the services it offers together shape the quality of those interactions, while the institutions, coordination, and resource allocation that keep the community running form the mesosystem, which, although it does not touch students directly, determines whether the microsystem can function effectively [5]. The value of this perspective is that it shifts the focus of construction from building physical facilities toward the quality of interaction and the coordination of the system, reminding those who build communities that they must both create an environment and pay full attention to the characteristics and developmental needs of the students themselves, rather than treating students merely as objects to be managed and served. Following this line of thought, the essential nature of a one-stop student community can be defined as a community of daily life that is at once learning-oriented, service-oriented, and growth-oriented. Its substance lies not only in the integration of physical space but, more importantly, in gathering educational, management, and service resources around students and so building the immediate environment that supports their growth [9]. Some studies have vividly described the student community as a "first society" that builds students' social skills, a "second family" that cultivates good living habits, and a "third classroom" that shapes a well-rounded character, a characterization that aptly captures the distinctive function of the community relative to the formal classroom [2].

Beyond these general functions, the community at an application-oriented engineering institution should also carry special functions matched to its training objectives, and this is precisely the part that comparable research has yet to explore fully. The first function is to extend practice-based education and the resources of industry-education integration into students' daily lives. Application-oriented engineering institutions aim to train technical and skilled personnel for the front lines of industry, and a large share of their educational resources is distributed across laboratory and training platforms, industry colleges, and partner enterprises. If these resources remain confined to classes and training sessions, they are hard to turn into ongoing, accessible support for student growth. Because the community sits right next to students' daily lives, it is naturally suited to bringing corporate mentors, accomplished alumni, real projects, and skills training close at hand, turning students' spare time into opportunities to engage with the frontier of their fields and making the community an intermediate link between the classroom and industry. The arrangement at Liuzhou Institute of Technology, where the Huawei-Liuzhou Artificial Intelligence Industry College has been jointly built in cooperation with Huawei and internship and training bases have been jointly built with many manufacturing firms, provides a concrete basis for this kind of embedding. The second function is to bring career development and employment services forward in time. Students at application-oriented institutions have especially pronounced needs around internships, employment, and career planning, yet conventional employment services are concentrated in the graduating year and lag behind students' real concerns. Integrating career guidance and employment counseling into the community in a way that advances grade by grade allows these services to run through the whole course from enrollment to graduation, matching the natural progression of students' studies from foundational to comprehensive and of their development from initial adjustment to choosing a career path [5]. The third function is to cultivate innovation, entrepreneurship, and all-round competence. Opening maker spaces in the community, forming cross-disciplinary teams, and carrying out project work all help to extend students' disciplinary interests into innovative practice and to repair the weak connection between the formal curriculum and extracurricular learning that often appears in application-oriented training.

3. Practical Difficulties in Constructing the One-Stop Student Community at Liuzhou Institute of Technology

Systems thinking stresses grasping a matter as a whole and distinguishing the principal problems from the secondary ones. Examining community construction at Liuzhou Institute of Technology in this light reveals that its difficulties lie mainly not in hardware but in the related areas of substance, coordination, and digital and intelligent technologies.

The first practical problem is that the functional positioning leans toward outward form while the substance of the community remains to be filled in. Some universities still understand community construction as upgrading hardware and piling on functions, treating the work as done once a student service center has been built, in-building spaces have been opened, and a few activities have been held. The physical space has been integrated, yet the elements that foster student development have not truly come together, and the various parties still operate in isolation within the community [7]. This emphasis on display without lasting mechanisms keeps the community at an ornamental, showcase stage and makes it hard to form a fully covering, stable pattern of operation [1]. For Liuzhou Institute of Technology, the concentrated investment made since its restructuring has already given the school relatively good physical conditions, and its standardized student apartments and fairly complete training platforms have laid a hardware foundation for community construction. For that very reason, its prominent shortcoming lies not in building hardware but in filling in substance, that is, in how to inject sustained and meaningful interaction, culture, and developmental support into the existing space, so as to avoid a situation in which the space is in place but its function is hollow, complete in form yet lacking in substance [5]. From the standpoint of ecological systems theory, the heart of the problem is the insufficient quality of daily interaction within the microsystem. Space is only the container in which interaction takes place, and if regular, in-depth contact between teachers and students and among peers is lacking, the community's real influence on student development is diluted.

The second difficulty is a structural mismatch between the services provided and what students need. The community carries comprehensive service functions covering accommodation, daily life, study, and social interaction, yet what it currently provides often fails to match students' real needs [1]. Spaces that meet basic needs for living and study, such as gyms, study rooms, and shared kitchens, are frequently in short supply, to the point that a seat can be hard to find, while certain functional spaces are underused because supply is disconnected from demand or because they have not been well publicized, so that resources are structurally out of balance [3]. This mismatch reflects a tendency in construction to favor hardware over software content and quantity of investment over alignment with demand. The needs of students at application-oriented engineering institutions have their own character, with especially concentrated demands around internships and training, career development, and the improvement of skills, and it is precisely these developmental needs that are most easily overlooked. The staff responsible for student development can generally attend to students' basic needs for daily living, but they tend to shy away selectively from developmental needs because these are harder to address, leaving a vacuum among education, management, and service. Because information channels within the community are scattered and students have an incomplete picture of what resources are available and how they are used, this information asymmetry further reduces the effective use of resources.

The third difficulty, and the hardest to resolve, is weak coordination among the many parties involved and the limits this places on governance. Building the community requires coordinated effort across several departments, including administration, teaching, and logistics, but under existing ways of operating the human and material resources that each department commits vary considerably, and community construction is often not a priority relative to a

department's own established duties [1]. Departments tend to design rules from the standpoint of their own responsibilities, and an action logic centered on departmental interests leaves the work without holistic consideration or effective communication [10]. In practice this regularly produces a situation in which the institution as a whole is enthusiastic while colleges and departments are indifferent, and in which student affairs staff are busy while subject faculty look on, with teacher participation depending largely on individual willingness and lacking any binding rules or incentives. Lu Xiaofan summarizes problems of this kind as path dependence in overall planning and a lack of coordinated pace in working mechanisms, and points out that the bureaucratic organizational structure, the entrenched pattern of resource allocation, and a one-dimensional evaluation system together perpetuate the fragmentation between departments [3]. For a private application-oriented institution such as Liuzhou Institute of Technology, the coordination problem has further causes of its own. The school relies mainly on funds it raises itself, so the allocation of dedicated budgets and dedicated personnel must be carefully calculated, while dual-qualified teachers already shoulder a heavy load of industry practice and teaching and are stretched for time and energy. Since their assessment rests mainly with the department that holds their personnel relationship, they find it hard to invest in community work on a sustained basis unless that work can be converted into a corresponding workload or built into appointment and assessment.

The fourth difficulty is that digital applications remain superficial and do not yet provide deep support for the running of the community. Digital and intelligent technologies are an important direction for improving the community, but the digital applications at some universities show a formalistic tendency to be built yet unused and connected yet not flowing smoothly. Systems proliferate without linking up, data accumulate within individual departments and are hard to share, information silos form, and the digital transformation of the community often stalls at the stage of conceptual argument and local trials [3]. The reasons include objective constraints of technology, funding, and talent, as well as a mistaken view that values technical form over real effectiveness in student development. For private application-oriented institutions the constraints on funding and technical talent are more immediate, and laying out systems blindly without regard to their effectiveness only leads to duplicated investment and wasted resources. How to make data genuinely serve student growth within limited resources, and how to keep instrumental rationality from overriding the goal of student development, are questions that institutions of this kind must confront squarely.

4. Practical Approaches to Constructing the One-Stop Student Community at Liuzhou Institute of Technology

In response to these difficulties, community construction should hold to a systemic outlook and coordinate substance, collaboration, digital and intelligent technologies, and the advantages of industry-education integration, seeking breakthroughs in mechanisms, space, staffing, resources, technology, and service.

The first approach is to use systematic planning to improve the top-level design and the evaluation mechanism. Building the community is a systematic undertaking that must be viewed as a whole, so that departments do not each go their own way. At the school level, the overall goals of community construction and a coordinating body should be made clear. A community management committee that brings together administrators, subject teachers, student representatives, and others can take joint responsibility for management and decision-making, and grid-based management can be introduced to achieve full coverage of buildings and floors and to respond more quickly to student needs. In terms of ecological systems theory, this amounts to strengthening the mesosystem so that smooth coordination and support form among the various elements of the microsystem. Whether coordination takes hold depends

above all on what evaluation rewards. For a long time, evaluation has leaned toward easily quantified inputs of hard resources such as space, infrastructure, and personnel, while underinvesting in soft resources such as the teaching staff, community culture, and organizational mechanisms, and incentives have been distorted as a result [3]. An evaluation system should be built that centers on the effectiveness of student growth and development and involves multiple parties, that weighs both process and outcome and both managerial assessment and student feedback, and that ties evaluation results to the allocation of resources to the departments and colleges concerned, so as to prompt continuous improvement. For privately funded institutions that rely on raising their own funds, a sound allocation of resources is especially necessary, and a systematic analysis of each department's needs and contributions should be used to allocate limited resources reasonably according to overall goals, forming a pattern of shared resources and complementary strengths.

The second approach is to create a developmental environment by enriching space and building community culture. Physical space is the foundation of a developmental environment, but space alone cannot foster development. The fusion of physical space with social space should be emphasized, embedding the needs of living, service, and interaction into the community so that it becomes a community of daily life that students feel they belong to. Liuzhou Institute of Technology already has good spatial conditions, so the focus should shift toward cultivating social space and a cultural atmosphere within the existing space. Dedicated areas for self-directed study, exchange between teachers and students, cultural and athletic activities, and innovative practice can be opened within the student community, and refined management together with supporting services can make it convenient for students to study and interact nearby. A more targeted measure is to draw on the school's six major disciplinary clusters to create distinctive cultural identities for different communities, encouraging each community to distill a community spirit based on the features of its disciplines, to design its own emblem, and to hold its own community festivals, thereby cultivating a clear cultural identity. The current weakness in student community culture often lies in the absence of vehicles that can gather shared memory, since markers that strengthen a sense of belonging, such as photo walls, video collections, mementos, student co-created cultural symbols, and community IP, are overlooked, leaving students with too little sense of and identification with the community's culture. Weaving the disciplinary features of an engineering institution, industrial elements, and alumni stories into community culture can both create a distinctive identity and help students build a sense of professional identity and emotional connection, and thereby gain steady psychological support under competitive pressure.

The third approach is to enrich students' daily interaction by deploying staff to the front line and fostering peer collaboration. Whether the educating staff truly reach the students directly determines the quality of interaction within the community microsystem. A dual-track arrangement is worth adopting, combining a permanent resident presence with regular liaison contact, assigning full-time counselors, capable young teachers, and student affairs administrators to live in the community and carry out daily work, while also setting up a system in which school and college leaders, key faculty members, and student mentors are each assigned to keep in regular contact with a community. On this basis, counselor studios can be set up within the community to bring ideological guidance, academic advising, and psychological counseling right to the door of students' dormitories. A residential tutor system can be introduced in which students study alongside their teachers and each educator stays in fixed contact with a number of dormitory rooms from the time students enroll until they graduate, establishing a relatively stable connection between tutor and student and turning the community into a small, close-knit unit for student development. To address the limited time and energy of faculty at private institutions, institutional rules can specify how the workload of front-line staff is to be calculated, counting teachers' participation in community education

toward their teaching workload or as bonus points for title review, while granting corresponding honorary recognition to corporate and alumni mentors, so as to guarantee the sustainability of staff deployment at the institutional level and gradually reverse the tendency to value research over student development. This matters especially for dual-qualified teachers who carry a heavy load of industry practice, since only when their effort is reasonably recognized in assessment and appointment will they have any intrinsic motivation to take part in community work. At the same time, students are both recipients of service and a force for construction, so self-governance organizations such as self-management associations and building committees should be strengthened and given a substantive role in shaping community culture, planning activities, handling public affairs, and providing feedback, moving students from being managed to being builders and improving their capacity for self-management and self-service. This can be supplemented by a tiered network of peer support, in which community peer leaders, dormitory peer liaisons, and others at various levels carry out academic assistance and share experience, so that peer strength becomes a support resource that grows from within the community. This both meets senior students' need for hands-on practice and gives junior students readily accessible support close at hand, forming a virtuous circle of two-way growth through their interaction.

The fourth approach is to highlight the distinctiveness of an application-oriented community by embedding the resources of industry-education integration, which is the most recognizable point of leverage in student community construction at Liuzhou Institute of Technology. Community construction need not be bound by who owns a resource. An open attitude should be maintained, bringing market forces, partner enterprises, industry colleges, alumni, and other kinds of resources onto the community platform, on the principle of not needing to own them but only to put them to use [2]. The deep cooperation between Liuzhou Institute of Technology and local industrial enterprises, together with its six major disciplinary clusters in fields such as automotive manufacturing and machinery manufacturing, provides distinctive conditions for this kind of embedding. In concrete terms, corporate engineers, skilled experts, and accomplished alumni can be invited into the community, and project work, skills training, and career sharing can be carried out through the community, conveying frontline industry information directly to students and narrowing the distance between the classroom and industry, so that students can engage with real production settings and industry standards in their spare time. Building on this, career development can be integrated into the community in a way that advances grade by grade, forming a four-year growth program in which the early years focus on adjustment and getting to know the discipline, the middle and upper years focus on academic competitions, corporate internships, and innovative practice, and the graduating year focuses on employment guidance and matching students to positions. This arrangement moves employment services forward from the graduating year and turns them from occasional activities into continuous accompaniment, fitting the natural rhythm of how application-oriented talent develops and answering the internship and employment needs that students at application-oriented institutions care about most. The community can also open maker spaces and organize cross-disciplinary teams to extend disciplinary interests into innovation and entrepreneurship, making up for the loose connection between the formal curriculum and extracurricular learning and allowing the community, beyond living and service, to genuinely take on the function of promoting well-rounded growth. This community-based model of industry-education integration not only strengthens students' professional identity and practical ability but, through immersion in real projects, guidance from technical mentors, and the passing on of alumni experience, establishes a regular mechanism of school-enterprise collaborative education, effectively addressing the long-standing pain points of engineering education, where theory is disconnected from practice and teaching content lags behind industrial development.

The fifth approach is to respond to student needs through digital and intelligent technologies and precise services, while safeguarding the warmth of the community through humanistic care. Digitalization should serve real effectiveness in student development rather than amount to a pile of systems, and for private institutions with limited resources it is all the more important to put limited investment into connecting data and delivering precise services. The premise is to break down data barriers, set unified data standards, and link up data on enrollment status, grades, daily spending, and participation in activities, dissolving information silos. On this basis, dynamic profiles can be built from students' growth data to assess each student's characteristics and actual needs in a sound way, giving the various educators precise informational support so that they can carry out academic assistance, behavioral early warning, the cultivation of students' individualized development, and similar work and deliver services tailored to each individual. Digitalizing the service process can markedly improve convenience. A mechanism for collecting and handling requests that combines online and offline channels can be set up, running as a closed loop of collection, assessment, routing, resolution, feedback, and evaluation, so that students do less running around and the data do more of the moving. Where conditions allow, an AI counselor can be introduced to answer students' common questions about study and daily life, freeing up staff further. Whatever technology is used, the scope of use for data on students' studies, health, family, and the like should be made clear, with encryption and access controls well managed to ensure privacy. It must be clearly recognized that digital and intelligent means improve efficiency, while the warmth of the community still depends on humanistic care. The concentrated nature of community space means that students' relationships overlap heavily, and under competitive pressure friction and anxiety can easily build up, so that without effective mediation of conflict and psychological support the community's foundation as a community is unstable. Psychological support should be woven into the daily life of the community, with convenient counseling services, prompt early-warning and intervention mechanisms, and, for special groups such as students facing financial or academic hardship, dynamic files and many-to-one assistance that provide precisely targeted, individualized support. Only by combining precise services with humanistic care can the community be both efficient and warm and truly become a community of daily life where students are willing to stay and able to grow.

5. Conclusion

Building a one-stop student community at an application-oriented engineering institution must follow the general principles of student development and community governance while also resting on the school's own positioning and resource endowment. These five approaches are not isolated from one another but form a mutually supporting and interlocking whole. Systematic planning sorts out the relationships among departments and provides the institutional precondition for renovating space and deploying staff to the front line. Deploying staff and embedding industry resources enrich the people and activities around students and determine the breadth and depth of daily interaction. Enriching space and building community culture place these interactions in an environment that fosters belonging, allowing them to occur regularly and accumulate over time. Digital and intelligent means help to identify needs precisely and raise the efficiency of service, allowing the earlier measures to reach every individual student. Running through all of them, the perspective of ecological systems theory gives these approaches a single common aim, which is to raise the quality of students' interaction within the community as a microsystem, to strengthen the mesosystem that supports that interaction, and to follow the temporal rhythm of students from their adjustment on entry to their choice of career on graduation, so as ultimately to build the community into a learning-oriented, service-oriented, and growth-oriented community of daily life. Building the community is a systematic undertaking with a fairly long cycle that cannot be completed at a

stroke and clearly proceeds in stages. The relevant guidance has already called for planning near-term, medium-term, and long-term tasks in a systematic way, which suggests that in its overall planning the school should both address pressing problems under current conditions and leave room for long-term development, adjusting its layout dynamically in response to changes in student needs and external conditions so that the community stays aligned with the real needs of talent cultivation. As things stand at Liuzhou Institute of Technology, the momentum for construction comes more from policy requirements and external impetus, which guarantees speed and breadth in the early stages, but for the effort to be sustainable the external impetus needs to be turned gradually into a conscious commitment on the part of teachers, students, and departments. Consensus is not reached at a stroke and calls for sustained effort over time through the demonstration of results, the accumulation of experience, and continuous improvement. Only when living and growing in the community become a shared conviction of teachers and students will construction acquire lasting internal momentum and avoid sliding back, once the hardware is in place, into a cycle of mere activities and festivals. For this very reason, using evaluation results for continuous improvement and distilling the experience of each stage into practices that can be promoted and replicated will often do more to determine how far community construction can go than any one-time investment. When corporate resources, real projects, and career services extend into students' daily lives by way of the community, the community becomes a link close to students in the school's chain of application-oriented training, extending the advantages of industry-education integration from classes and training sessions to the whole of students' lives and providing more continuous support for cultivating the technical and skilled personnel that the front lines of manufacturing require. From a more general standpoint, how private application-oriented institutions can build on their strengths and offset their weaknesses under resource constraints, making up for limited investment through richer substance and stronger coordination, is itself a question worth continued exploration. Community construction has no end point, and as student needs evolve and technological conditions are renewed, its content and form will keep adjusting, but the basic approach of centering on student growth and coordinating all the elements with a systemic eye should be maintained throughout.

References

- [1] Wang, J. H. (2022). The endogenous value, practical challenges, and breakthrough approaches of "one-stop" student community construction in universities. *Ideological & Theoretical Education*, (10), 108–111.
- [2] Wang, Y. (2022). The value, practical problems, and practical logic of "one-stop" student community construction in universities. *Ideological & Theoretical Education*, (2), 107–111.
- [3] Lu, X. F. (2024). A study on optimizing the path of "one-stop" student community construction in universities from the perspective of systems thinking. *Studies in Ideological Education*, (2), 131–137.
- [4] Tönnies, F. (2010). *Community and society* (R. Lin, Trans.). Peking University Press. (Original work published 1887)
- [5] Wang, J. (2024). The functional positioning and practical path of "one-stop" student community construction in universities from the perspective of ecological systems theory. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, (6), 77–82.
- [6] Yang, Z. Y. (2023). Reform and innovation of the student community education model in universities in the new era. *Leading Journal of Ideological & Theoretical Education*, (7), 145–150.
- [7] Zhao, J. F., Deng, L., & Zhu, Y. T. (2025). The contemporary implications and innovative approaches to "one-stop" student community construction in universities. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, (2), 46–52.

- [8] Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). Ecological systems theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Six theories of child development: Revised formulations and current issues* (pp. 187–249). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- [9] Zhou, Y., Zhang, Z., & Yue, Y. P. (2022). The connotation, structural elements, and practical significance of "one-stop" student communities in universities. *China Higher Education*, (10), 53–55.
- [10] Ma, C. Y. (2022). Reflections on advancing the comprehensive management of "one-stop" student communities in universities from the perspective of holistic governance. *Ideological & Theoretical Education*, (3), 96–101.