

Assessing the Implementation Mechanism of International Educational Aid

Qin Hou

Adamson University, 900 San Marcelino St, Ermita, Manila, 1000 Metro Manila, Philippines

Abstract: This research evaluated the implementation framework of international educational assistance for foreign students in China, concentrating on access and fairness, infrastructure and resources, policy and governance, sustainability, and monitoring and evaluation. The mixed-methods research encompassed 200 international students from several universities around China. Quantitative data were obtained by structured surveys and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, and qualitative data were acquired through casual interviews. Findings indicated that respondents favorably assessed access and equity, observing diminished educational obstacles. Nevertheless, apprehensions were expressed regarding inequitable budget allocation and inadequate research infrastructure. Policy and governance were perceived as transparent although inconsistent in resource distribution, whereas sustainability garnered moderate evaluations, with students voicing apprehensions over post-graduation assistance. Monitoring and evaluation were assessed as mediocre, indicating a necessity for more regular program assessments. Notable evaluation disparities arose based on the students' characteristics, especially concerning infrastructure and governance. Identified challenges encompassed bureaucratic delays, insufficient transparency, inequitable resource allocation, cultural impediments, and inadequate non-academic assistance. Notwithstanding these problems, the scholarship program favorably influenced students' academic prospects, research competencies, and social connections. Nonetheless, apprehensions over the enduring viability of the assistance were widespread.

Keywords: International Educational Aid; Access and Fairness Infrastructure and Resources; Policy and Governance; Sustainability; Monitoring and Evaluation.

1. Introduction

China's approach to international education assistance is essential to its overall foreign aid strategy, which aims to promote development cooperation, strengthen its influence, and support global education projects. The China International Development Cooperation Agency (CIDCA) is responsible for supervising, formulating strategy, establishing policy, and authorizing assistance programs. The meticulous

coordination and execution of plans are overseen by many ministries, such as the Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) and the Ministry of Education (MOE), to ensure that initiatives are in line with China's strategic objectives (Center for Global Development, 2024). This framework enables a synchronized approach to the distribution of assistance and the management of projects, which aligns with a centralized form of administration (Emerald Insight, 2023).

Table A. Reliability Measurement – Assessment of the Elements that Contribute to the Growth and Success (Cronbach's Alpha)

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Item/s Deleted	No. of Item/s Retained
Access and Equity	0.92	0	10
Infrastructure and Resources	0.93	0	10
Policy and Governance	0.93	0	10
Sustainability	0.91	0	10
Monitoring and Evaluation Processes	0.91	0	10

Table A delineates the trustworthiness of the scale in the execution mechanism of foreign educational assistance. The elements encompass access and equity, infrastructure and resources, policy and governance, sustainability, and monitoring and evaluation methods. Cronbach's alpha (CA) was utilized to evaluate internal consistency assessments. Nunnally (1978) and Fornell and Larker (1981) assert that a coefficient alpha (CA) value of 0.70 or greater indicates high-quality items and internal consistency. The calculated coefficient alpha (CA) values range from 0.91 to 0.93, indicating that all items exhibit high quality and considerable internal consistency.

The p-values obtained from the Shapiro-Wilk test and Levene's test, beyond 0.05, signify that the scores are normally distributed and exhibit homogeneity. Therefore, to ascertain whether a significant difference exists in the

respondents' evaluation of the implementation mechanism of international educational aid based on their profiles, parametric tests, including the independent sample t-test and analysis of variance, was employed.

Data Gathering Procedures

A planned and organized method was used to collect data for this project from foreign students in China, ensuring the data was complete and accurate. To begin, permission was asked for from schools all over China so that the study could be done, and access to their foreign student groups was granted. Afterward, the carefully tested and approved self-made questionnaire was sent to the chosen people using random sampling to ensure a good mix of responses.

Table B. Normality Test (Shapiro-Wilk)

	W	p
Mechanism of International Educational Aid	0.95	0.109

Note. A low p-value suggests a violation of the assumption of normality

Homogeneity of Variances Test (Levene's)

	F	df	df2	p
Mechanism of International Educational Aid	0.43	1	299	0.513

Note. A low p-value suggests a violation of the assumption of equal variances

The investigation was conducted online and in-person to accommodate the students' schedules and interests. Participants were clearly told how to fill out the form, that their answers would be kept private, and that their participation was completely free. To encourage more people to fill out the form, those who hadn't done so by the due date were sent warnings.

Along with filling out the form, a small group of participants was also asked to participate in focus group talks (FGDs) and in-depth interviews. These qualitative data sources gave us more information about students' thoughts and feelings. The focus groups and interviews were set up at times and places that were handy for everyone involved. The participants could meet in person or online, based on their schedules and interests. With the subjects' permission, each session was taped and typed up so that themes could be found.

Several steps were taken to ensure that ethical concerns were met during the data collection process. Some of these steps were getting educated permission, keeping information private, and making sure that involvement was voluntary. The material was kept safely, and only the study team could access it. Using both numeric and qualitative data together gave researchers a complete picture of how foreign educational aid is implemented, which was very helpful for the study.

Statistical Treatment

The study data was carefully analyzed statistically to ensure the results were correctly interpreted. The study's goals were fully met using the proper statistical methods and theme analysis to look at numeric and qualitative data. Descriptive statistics were used to look at quantitative data and describe the respondents' gender, area of study, and place of birth, among other things. Frequency distributions summed up the demographics, and the respondents' opinions on the implementation mechanisms, such as fairness and access, infrastructure and resources, capacity building, policy and governance, sustainability, and monitoring and evaluation processes, were shown by measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) and dispersion (standard deviation and range).

Statistical reasoning methods were used to look into differences and connections in the data. Independent sample t-tests were used to examine the average scores of two groups, male and female students. ANOVA, or Analysis of Variance, was used to investigate the average scores of people from different groups, such as study paths or places of origin. The significance levels were set at 0.05, and effect

sizes were calculated to determine how significant the differences or connections were in real life.

Thematic analysis was used to examine the recordings of in-depth conversations for the qualitative data. The texts were coded to find repeating themes and patterns as part of this process. These were then put into more prominent themes that covered essential parts of the student's experiences and views on the implementation processes. To help understand the context better, narrative analysis was used to create complete stories that showed the participants' real-life experiences and focused on personal details and the factors in their environment that affected how they felt about the help methods.

The numeric and qualitative data were combined using mixed-methods analysis. This method looked at and combined the outputs of both types of data to find proof that overlapped and explain any results at odds with each other. This gave a complete picture of how well the implementation methods worked. Using these statistical methods, the study looked at the data carefully and thoroughly. This led to significant results and valuable ideas for improving how international educational aid for Chinese students from other countries is implemented.

Table 1. Interval Data analysis

Interval	Description	Interpretation
1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low
1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
2.51-3.50	Agree	Average
3.51-4.00	Strongly Agree	High

Ethical Considerations

Conflict of Interest

The data collection process for this study adopted strict confidentiality measures for both the participants and their affiliated institutions, ensuring that no harm came to the reputation of the educational institutions or the privacy of the foreign students involved. The research was conducted outside of regular academic hours, ensuring that it did not interfere with students' academic commitments or institutional activities.

Privacy and Confidentiality

Participant confidentiality was strictly enforced throughout the study. Any personally identifiable information was kept separate from the study data, and all data collected was

anonymized to protect the identities of participants. Only authorized researchers had access to the data, and the identity of participants was protected in all published reports or presentations.

Informed Consent Process

All foreign students participating in the study received clear and comprehensive information about the study's objectives, methods, potential risks, benefits, and their rights as participants before participation. Informed consent was obtained to ensure that participants fully understood their role and could make an educated decision about whether or not to participate.

Vulnerability and Possible Risk

Given the possible power dynamics and pressures that foreign students might have faced, especially those reliant on international educational assistance, additional measures were taken to protect vulnerable individuals. If minors or students with particular vulnerabilities participated, parental consent was required, and additional support was provided as needed.

Recruitment

This study was conducted with the voluntary participation of foreign students, with the consent of both educational institutions and the participants themselves. If any participant felt uncomfortable during the study, they were free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Assent

This study did not involve minors or other vulnerable populations unless consent was obtained from their guardians.

Benefits

The goal of the study was to improve the well-being of foreign students by better understanding the effectiveness of international educational assistance. If the study identified areas in need of improvement, these findings were shared with key stakeholders to encourage positive changes in academic support systems.

Compensation, Incentives, or Reimbursements

This study was conducted voluntarily, with no financial compensation or incentives provided to the participants. However, if any participant experienced discomfort during the research process, appropriate assistance, including medical aid, was provided as necessary.

Community Considerations

The significance of this study lay in providing data-driven recommendations for educational institutions to improve the implementation of international educational assistance programs. These improvements enhanced the reputation of institutions and contributed to the overall academic and personal growth of foreign students, increasing their overall satisfaction and well-being.

2. Results, Analysis, and Interpretation

This chapter displays the data in a structured tabular manner and offers a thorough explanation and analysis of the material. The conclusions in this section are based on a statistical analysis performed using jamovi 2.3.28.

Profile of the Respondents

Table 2. Frequencies and Percentage of Demographic Factors

Sex	Counts	% of Total
Female	140	47 %
Male	161	53 %
Course		
Arts and Humanities	23	8 %
Business	65	22 %
Engineering	57	19 %
Law	14	5 %
Medicine	22	7 %
Natural Sciences	35	12 %
Social Sciences	85	28 %

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentages of demographic data for certain students, encompassing their assigned sex and course. The data indicates that 47% of participants were female and 53% were male, demonstrating that the majority of respondents are female students.

Regarding their course enrollment, 8% were in arts and humanities, 22% in business, 19% in engineering, 5% in law, 7% in medicine, 12% in natural sciences, and 28% in social sciences. The tabulated data reveals that the majority of students are studying social sciences.

Assessment of the Respondents of the Implementation Mechanism of International Educational Aid

Table 3 provides an evaluation of the implementation mechanism of foreign educational assistance concerning accessibility and equity. The composite mean score was 3.24 with a standard deviation of 0.28, indicating an average evaluation. The respondents concur that the educational assistance has improved their capacity to obtain a high-quality education ($M = 3.37$), that students have equitable access to educational resources irrespective of their background ($M = 3.37$), and that the funding program has effectively mitigated barriers to education for international students ($M = 3.36$). Conversely, they contend that access to extracurricular activities funded by the support is not uniformly available to

all (M = 1.85).

Table 3. Assessment of the Implementation Mechanism of International Educational Aid in terms of Accessibility and Equity

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. The educational assistance has enhanced my ability to get a high-quality education.	3.37	0.48	Average	3.5
2. The scholarships offered via the assistance program are divided relatively among overseas students.	3.70	0.46	High	1
3. Students have equal access to educational materials, regardless of their background.	3.37	0.48	Average	3.5
4. The funding program has successfully reduced obstacles to education for overseas students.	3.36	0.49	Average	5
5. The allotment of financial assistance among students from various nations is equitable.	2.96	0.92	Average	7
6. The assistance has enhanced my prospects for achieving academic achievement.	3.35	0.52	Average	7
7. Non-native speakers are appropriately supplied with language assistance services.	3.35	0.51	Average	9
8. The help program caters to the unique requirements of students from various ethnic backgrounds.	3.69	0.47	High	2
9. Participation in extracurricular activities sponsored by the assistance is equally accessible to everyone.	1.85	1.00	Low	10
10. The funding program aims to foster gender parity in educational opportunities.	3.35	0.51	Average	7
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.24	0.28		

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.51-2.50: Disagree (Low); 2.51-3.50; Agree (Average); 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree (High)

The highest composite mean score (M = 3.37) means that most respondents agree that foreign educational aid has made it easier for them to get a good education and that all students, no matter where they come from, have equal access to academic resources. This means that the main goals of foreign programs that help with education, like making it easier for more people to get a good education and lowering inequality, are mostly being met. Recent research supports the idea that the positive review shows that foreign students see the help they receive as essential to overcoming socioeconomic barriers and leveling the playing field. According to a study by the OECD (2020), financial aid plays a crucial role in ensuring everyone has equal access to higher education, especially students from areas that aren't well-represented. This shows that funding programs like these can help close education access gaps.

Also, the students who answered agreed that the funding program has effectively reduced barriers to education for international students (M = 3.36), which supports the idea that foreign educational aid is doing what it's supposed to do by getting rid of things that might otherwise make it hard to go to school. This fits with previous research by Li et al. (2021), which shows that well-structured financial aid programs can help foreign students do better in school and drop out less often by handling issues like financial insecurity and other hurdles to entry.

On the other hand, the question about accessing leisure events paid for by the support got the lowest overall score (M = 1.85). This result shows a big problem with how the help mechanism is being used when it comes to ensuring that everyone can take part in non-academic chances like extracurricular activities. These events are essential for student growth because they help with social skills, leadership, and health (Huang & Chang, 2019). The low mean

shows that although foreign students are helped in the classroom, they may feel left out in social and developmental settings because they can't participate in extracurricular activities. This could make their total educational experience less enriching.

Because academic and recreational support is different, while students' basic educational needs are being met, help programs must broaden their focus to provide support quickly. Knight (2022) says that giving foreign students access to academic and leisure resources is essential for cultural and social integration. With this access, students may get a healthy and satisfying education abroad. Crossman and Clarke (2020) found that foreign students often need help integrating when they can't participate in outside school activities. This lack of non-academic chances may make them feel alone or less interested in school.

In conclusion, the best and lowest mean scores show that foreign educational support programs in China primarily work to improve access to good education and remove financial barriers. Still, they need to do more to ensure everyone has the same chances to participate in extracurricular activities. This gap could make it harder for these programs to help people grow in the ways they're meant to. For foreign students to have a better, more inclusive experience, future changes should focus on providing help outside schoolwork.

Table 4 encapsulates the evaluation of the implementation mechanism of international educational assistance concerning infrastructure and resources. The composite mean score is 3.12, reflecting an average rating with a standard deviation of 0.37. The data indicates that the majority concur that the assistance has resulted in improved maintenance and repair of educational facilities (M = 3.33), that the technological resources provided sufficiently fulfill their academic needs

(M = 3.23), and that the educational support has elevated the quality of classroom amenities (M = 3.22). According to their feedback, item number 10 attained the greatest average score

of 3.33, but item number 2 (The aid program has improved laboratory and research facilities) received the lowest average score of 2.95.

Table 4. Assessment of the Implementation Mechanism of International Educational Aid in terms of Infrastructure and Resources

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. The educational assistance has enhanced the caliber of classroom amenities.	3.22	0.67	Average	3
2. The assistance program has improved laboratory and research facilities.	2.95	0.91	Average	10
3. The provision of help has led to an increase in the accessibility of textbooks and learning materials.	3.07	0.86	Average	7.5
4. The technological resources offered by the help adequately meet my academic requirements.	3.23	1.06	Average	2
5. The assistance program has enhanced the quality and availability of library materials and services.	3.08	0.87	Average	5.5
6. The assistance has led to enhancements in the institution's physical infrastructure.	3.02	0.97	Average	9
7. The assistance has guaranteed that students use contemporary teaching materials and technology.	3.08	0.86	Average	5.5
8. The assistance has successfully supplied resources for online learning.	3.07	0.86	Average	7.5
9. The funding program has enabled students to access study areas and academic support facilities easily.	3.12	0.82	Average	4
10. The assistance has led to enhanced maintenance and repair of educational facilities.	3.33	0.95	Average	1
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.12	0.37	Average	

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.51-2.50: Disagree (Low); 2.51-3.50; Agree (Average); 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree (High)

The general opinion of the facilities and resources is average, with a mean score of 3.12 and a standard deviation of 0.37. There is some variation in the answers. This shows that even though many people agree that things are improving, there may still be problems with how consistent or good these tools are.

"The assistance has resulted in improved maintenance and repair of educational facilities" (M = 3.33) got the most votes, which suggests that respondents can see real benefits in keeping educational institutions' structures in good shape. This result agrees with the study of Zhang et al. (2020), which found that well-kept school environments make learning easier for foreign students. Better repair can also indirectly help students learn by giving them a stable and reliable physical setting and reducing disruptions caused by problems with the building.

The availability of technological tools also got a pretty high score; respondents thought it met their academic goals well (M = 3.23). This is a promising finding because technology is becoming increasingly important for modern education, especially for international students who may rely more on digital tools. Wang and Chen (2021) say that having enough access to technology is vital for students to do well in school, especially now that many classes and activities need students to connect and do study online. The grade of "satisfactory" here means that the help programs are keeping up with the needs of technology. However, changes could be made to these tools to make them more satisfying.

However, it's important to note that "The aid program has improved laboratory and research facilities" (M = 2.95), the

item with the lowest score, shows that support isn't seen as very successful in this area. This lower score could mean that while the help has helped with more significant infrastructure problems, more specific facilities like labs and research centers should be needed. Li et al.'s research from 2021 shows how necessary good research and lab facilities are for encouraging students to do well in school, especially those from other countries who study science or technology. The low score shows room for change in ensuring that these specialized academic spaces are updated and have everything they need to support rigorous study.

The difference between improving lab and study spaces (M = 2.95) and maintaining general educational buildings (M = 3.33) could be due to the use of resources. This means that while regular maintenance and classrooms are getting attention, places that need more resources or are more specialized, like research labs, might get less attention. The study by Qiu et al. (2020) also found that it can be challenging for international students to get to well-equipped research centers. This could make it harder for them to do well in school and get involved, especially in STEM areas.

In conclusion, Table 3's results show that international programs that help with education have done a great job of maintaining schools and giving students access to technology. However, they have not yet fully met the needs for specialized academic infrastructure like labs and research spaces. Getting rid of these holes could make the aid programs work better generally and better meet the different academic needs of foreign students.

Table 5. Assessment of the Implementation Mechanism of International Educational Aid in terms of Policy and Governance

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. The regulations regulating the assistance program are easily understood and open to scrutiny.	3.11	0.81	Average	3
2. The governance arrangements for assistance management are efficient.	3.07	0.74	Average	4.5
3. The institution has explicit rules on the distribution of assistance resources.	3.13	0.76	Average	2
4. The decision-making procedures regarding assistance include inclusive student involvement.	3.19	0.70	Average	1
5. The assistance program is efficiently administered and structured.	2.92	0.83	Average	6
6. Accountability is included in the use of assistance funding.	2.88	0.91	Average	7
7. The institution's policies facilitate the efficient execution of the assistance.	2.85	0.91	Average	8
8. The administration of the assistance program guarantees a fair allocation of resources.	2.01	0.96	Low	10
9. Students are adequately informed about policy changes regarding the assistance.	3.07	0.75	Average	4.5
10. The assistance program is under the institution's overarching strategic objectives.	2.55	0.89	Average	9
COMPOSITE MEAN	2.88	0.33	Average	

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.51-2.50: Disagree (Low); 2.51-3.50; Agree (Average); 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree (High)

Table 5 presents an assessment of the implementation mechanism of international educational assistance concerning policy and governance. The study indicated a composite mean score of 2.88 and a standard deviation of 0.33, denoting an average assessment. This means that they all agree that the decisions made about assistance involve all students ($M = 3.19$), that the school has clear rules for how to distribute assistance resources ($M = 3.13$), and that the rules that govern the assistance program are clear and can be looked over ($M = 3.11$). Nonetheless, they contend that the management of the assistance program does not provide an equitable distribution of resources ($M = 2.01$).

The data provides an assessment of the implementation mechanism of international educational assistance in relation to policy and governance, showing a composite mean score of 2.88 with a standard deviation of 0.33. This score reflects an average evaluation of the assistance program, indicating that while certain aspects of the program's policy and governance mechanisms are effective, there are notable areas requiring improvement.

The highest-rated item, "The decisions made about assistance involve all students" ($M = 3.19$), suggests that respondents generally agree that the decision-making process regarding the distribution of educational assistance is inclusive. This finding is consistent with existing studies, such as those by Lee and Edwards (2020), which emphasize the importance of participatory governance in education programs to ensure that the needs of all students, especially international students, are adequately represented. Inclusivity in decision-making fosters trust and transparency, which are crucial to the perceived fairness and effectiveness of assistance programs.

Another relatively high mean score was associated with the item, "The school has clear rules for how to distribute assistance resources" ($M = 3.13$). This suggests that respondents are satisfied with the transparency and clarity of the rules governing the allocation of resources. Transparent

guidelines can help reduce confusion or perceptions of favoritism, a finding echoed by Wang et al. (2021), who highlighted that clear policy frameworks are fundamental in managing educational resources effectively, particularly in multicultural academic environments.

Similarly, respondents rated "The rules that govern the assistance program are clear and can be reviewed" at a mean of 3.11, suggesting general agreement that the program is governed by clear policies that are accessible to stakeholders. Clear governance structures, as noted by Brown and Carney (2019), are vital for building accountability within educational assistance programs, ensuring that students are aware of their rights and how to seek support if necessary.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated item, "The management of the assistance program does not provide an equitable distribution of resources" ($M = 2.01$), highlights a critical gap in the perceived fairness of resource distribution. This score suggests that respondents believe there is inequity in how resources are allocated, potentially favoring certain groups of students over others. This finding is particularly concerning as it reflects an inconsistency in the program's goals of promoting equity. According to Huang and Li (2022), unequal resource distribution can exacerbate existing disparities among students, undermining the overall effectiveness of educational assistance programs. Ensuring equitable access to resources, as they argue, is fundamental to the success of any assistance initiative aimed at fostering inclusion and academic success for all students, including international ones.

The gap between the clarity of policy ($M = 3.11$) and the equitable distribution of resources ($M = 2.01$) suggests that while the rules are transparent, they may not be implemented in a way that ensures fairness across the student body. This may be due to resource constraints or mismanagement, issues that have been documented in other educational assistance programs worldwide. According to research by Kim et al. (2020), programs that do not address these disparities in

resource distribution tend to face long-term challenges in achieving their objectives, as students who feel excluded from equitable access to resources are less likely to benefit from the assistance provided.

In conclusion, the results indicate that while the policy and governance mechanisms of international educational

assistance programs are generally seen as inclusive and transparent, there are significant issues regarding the equitable distribution of resources. Addressing these disparities should be a priority to enhance the overall effectiveness and fairness of the assistance provided.

Table 6. Assessment of the Implementation Mechanism of International Educational Aid in terms of Sustainability

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. The assistance program yields enduring effects over an extended period.	2.65	1.02	Average	9
2. The assistance program has implemented ways to provide ongoing support beyond the initial allocation of funds.	2.96	0.92	Average	6
3. The emphasis is on cultivating local capability to maintain the advantages of help.	2.97	0.91	Average	5
4. The assistance has facilitated the sustained enhancement of educational quality.	2.93	1.07	Average	7
5. Continued financial resources and assistance are being arranged for the relief projects.	2.76	0.95	Average	8
6. The help program encourages the implementation of sustainable practices inside the institution.	3.05	0.81	Average	4
7. The assistance program balances addressing urgent needs and achieving long-term objectives.	1.80	0.68	Low	10
8. The assistance has resulted in enduring enhancements to the educational infrastructure.	3.25	0.69	Average	2
9. The partnerships forged via the assistance program exhibit long-term viability.	3.15	0.65	Average	3
10. The institution has established procedures to preserve the advantages of the assistance.	3.42	0.74	Average	1
COMPOSITE MEAN	2.90	0.41	Average	

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.51-2.50: Disagree (Low); 2.51-3.50; Agree (Average); 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree (High)

Table 6 assesses how international educational aid is implemented in relation to the sustainability of specific students. The study indicated a composite mean score of 2.90 and a standard deviation of 0.41, reflecting an average assessment. This indicates their consensus that the institution has implemented procedures to maintain the benefits of the assistance ($M = 3.42$), that the assistance has led to lasting improvements in the educational infrastructure ($M = 3.25$), and that the partnerships developed through the assistance program demonstrate long-term sustainability ($M = 3.15$). Conversely, they contend that the assistance program fails to reconcile immediate needs with long-term goals ($M = 1.80$).

Table 5 looks at how foreign educational aid has been implemented and how long the benefits for students will last. The results show that sustainability methods are evaluated on average, with a mean score of 2.90 and a standard deviation of 0.41. This means that while some parts of the help programs are seen positively, important things need to be fixed.

"The institution has put in place procedures to maintain the benefits of the assistance" ($M = 3.42$), shows that respondents agree that educational institutions have put procedures in place to ensure that the benefits of the assistance last. Recent studies, like those by Green and McCann (2021), agree with this finding. They say that the long-term effects of educational assistance programs rely on policies that focus on keeping changes going after the initial support period. By keeping the benefits of the help, the schools can positively impact the

student's academic experiences and success.

"The assistance has led to lasting improvements in the educational infrastructure" ($M = 3.25$) is another item with a high score. This shows that people think the program worked to improve the level of physical and digital infrastructure in schools. This result backs up what Zhao et al. (2022) found: well-run assistance programs often leave an ongoing legacy in the form of better infrastructure that helps students even after the original help has been given. Foreign aid can help educational institutions grow over time by improving buildings, improving classes, and giving them access to more technology.

In the same way, "The partnerships developed through the assistance program demonstrate long-term sustainability" ($M = 3.15$) shows that people feel good about the partnerships formed through the assistance programs. International groups, host schools, and states must work together as partners to ensure that benefits keep coming. Chang and Sun (2020) say that these relationships often provide ongoing resources and skills beyond the aid program's time range. Long-term relationships help donors and receivers align their goals so that good things happen in the long term.

The item with the lowest score, "The assistance program fails to reconcile immediate needs with long-term goals" ($M = 1.80$), shows a significant problem with how the assistance programs are run. Respondents gave this number because they think there is a disconnect between meeting short-term wants and making plans for long-term survival. Huang and

Wei (2021), for example, found that many educational aid programs focus on meeting immediate needs, like giving money or fixing short-term infrastructure problems, without planning well for how these interventions will be kept up in the long term. This issue has been talked about a lot in the literature. This imbalance can hurt the program's long-term success because short-term wins might only lead to long-term changes if the program's long-term viability is adequately thought through.

The big difference between the high scores for institutional procedures and partnerships ($M = 3.42$, $M = 3.15$) and the low scores for balancing immediate and long-term needs ($M = 1.80$) suggests that there are ways to keep the benefits going. Still, there isn't enough strategic planning to ensure that these

benefits align with both short-term and long-term goals. Wilson and Tanner (2019) say that for aid programs to work, they need to take a whole-person approach that balances instant actions with long-term solutions so that the benefits don't fade after the original help ends.

In conclusion, the results show that international programs that help with education have put in place steps to keep their benefits and built partnerships that will help them last for a long time. However, immediate needs and long-term goals must be aligned. Institutions need to do a better job of planning their long-term goals to ensure that help programs keep working and fit in with bigger goals for education and growth.

Table 7. Assessment of the Implementation Mechanism of International Educational Aid in terms of Monitoring and Evaluation Processes

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. The assistance program is equipped with explicit monitoring and assessment procedures.	3.07	0.80	Average	5
2. Periodic evaluations are carried out to measure the effectiveness of the assistance.	2.82	0.95	Average	10
3. The reporting of the results of the assistance program is transparent.	2.91	0.88	Average	9
4. Consistently, student input is gathered and used to enhance the help program.	2.93	0.90	Average	8
5. The assessment mechanisms guarantee that the assistance program achieves its goals.	3.00	0.80	Average	7
6. Accountability is included in the monitoring and assessment of the assistance program.	3.29	0.92	Average	1
7. The assessments' outcomes are used to shape forthcoming help activities.	3.26	0.71	Average	2
8. The institution offers frequent updates about the progress of the assistance program.	3.17	0.71	Average	3
9. The monitoring and evaluation methods include the participation of all stakeholders.	3.06	0.74	Average	6
10. The assistance program consistently adjusts its approach in response to assessment results.	3.11	0.76	Average	4
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.06	0.60	Average	

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.51-2.50: Disagree (Low); 2.51-3.50; Agree (Average); 3.51-4.00: Strongly Agree (High)

Table 7 presents an evaluation of the foreign educational aid implementation mechanism's monitoring and evaluation processes, resulting in an average composite mean score of 3.06 and a standard deviation of 0.60. This means that everyone agrees that accountability should be a part of monitoring and evaluating the assistance program ($M = 3.29$), that assessment results should be used to guide future support activities ($M = 3.26$), and that the institution should give regular updates on the progress of the assistance program ($M = 3.17$). The analysis of their replies revealed that item 6 achieved the highest mean score of 3.29, but item 2 (periodic reviews are conducted to assess the efficiency of the help) received the lowest mean score of 2.82.

The data shows that most people are positive about the current tracking and evaluation systems, with an average combined mean score of 3.06 and a standard deviation of 0.60. However, some areas need improvement. The item that got the most votes, "Accountability should be a part of monitoring and evaluating the assistance program" ($M = 3.29$), shows that people agree on how important it is for the assistance program to be accountable. This conclusion is

backed up by research on managing foreign aid, which often stresses responsibility as a critical part of making educational aid programs work and be transparent. Bloom and Edwards (2021) say that robust accountability systems ensure that donors and recipients track how resources are used clearly and effectively. This increases trust and trustworthiness in the way that aid programs are run.

Another item that got a lot of votes, "Assessment results should be used to guide future support activities" ($M = 3.26$), shows that people think that evaluation results should be used to plan future aid activities. This point of view is similar to what Kopp and Martin (2020) found. They say that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes should be cyclical, meaning that the results of reviews should be used to improve programs, both now and in the future. Without this feedback process, programs that help students in school might stop working because they can't change to meet the needs of new students or adapt to new school settings.

Respondents also agreed that "The institution should give regular updates on the progress of the assistance program" ($M = 3.17$), which shows how important it is for the program to

be open and transparent. Giving and receiving help is more likely to be supported and engaged when partners are regularly updated on its progress and effects. Shields and Bailey (2019) say that transparent reporting helps stop bad management and ensures that help programs are responsible to the larger educational community.

"Periodic reviews are conducted to assess the efficiency of the help" ($M = 2.82$) was the least liked item, which shows that the help program is not being evaluated enough. People understand how important it is to be accountable and open, but this low score suggests that the regular checks on how well the program works may not be consistent or thorough enough. This is a problem because, as Thomas and Lopez (2022) say, educational aid programs might only find places to improve if they are reviewed more often and carefully. This could mean resources are wasted, and students must get the best results. For M&E methods to work, they must collect data and look it over regularly to ensure the aid is being used effectively and quickly.

The difference between the item with the highest rating ($M = 3.29$) and the item with the lowest rating ($M = 2.82$) shows a gap between how important responsibility is seen to be and how often it is put into practice. Karam and Huxley (2020) say that this disconnect could be caused by a lack of resources or administrative ability to do regular and thorough assessments. Organizations might need to put more money into making their monitoring and evaluation systems stronger. They should ensure that regular reviews are part of how the program works and are used to help make decisions.

In conclusion, the results show that respondents value responsibility, openness, and using evaluation results to guide future support activities. However, they believe that periodic reviews could be more frequent and thorough. By strengthening these steps, foreign educational aid programs could be more useful and flexible overall.

3. Conclusion

1. The predominance of male responders, mainly from the social sciences, commerce, and engineering, indicates that the aid program possesses widespread appeal; yet, it may necessitate additional focused initiatives to achieve gender parity and equal participation in other disciplines, such as the arts and humanities.

2. The assistance program is perceived as beneficial in enhancing access and fairness; nonetheless, issues regarding the disproportionate allocation of resources, especially in infrastructure, policy, and governance, suggest that the program's advantages are not uniformly experienced among all student demographics.

3. The finding that evaluations of the aid program vary considerably according to student profiles, especially regarding infrastructure and governance, suggests that the program may need to be adequately customized to address the diverse requirements of students across various fields or demographics, underscoring the necessity of developing flexible and adaptable aid programs to different student populations' distinct needs, ensuring that support remains pertinent and practical for all groups.

4. The recognition of issues such as bureaucratic delays, insufficient transparency, cultural and linguistic barriers, and

inadequate non-academic support indicates multiple operational deficiencies within the aid program, suggesting a necessity for administrative reform to enhance the efficiency and clarity of aid processes, alongside the provision of comprehensive support services that cater to the holistic needs of international students, including cultural integration, mental health, and housing assistance.

5. The assistance program has benefited students by enhancing academic possibilities and cultivating essential research and social networks, yet questions over long-term sustainability suggest that it lacks mechanisms for ongoing support post-graduation.

4. Recommendations

1. Institutions must establish focused outreach initiatives to promote engagement from underrepresented genders and academic disciplines. This may be accomplished through awareness campaigns, scholarships targeted at these groups, and establishing mentorship opportunities that foster inclusion in both genders and different academic fields, such as the arts and humanities.

2. To mitigate concerns about the inequitable allocation of resources, organizations must adopt a more open and data-driven methodology for providing assistance. This may entail defining explicit criteria for resource allocation that are conveyed to all students. Systematic audits and student feedback systems must be implemented to guarantee that all departments, regardless of size or discipline, have equal access to financial assistance, scholarships, research funding, and infrastructural enhancements.

3. Given that students from various backgrounds evaluate the assistance program differently, it is crucial to customize the aid mechanism to address the distinct demands of varied student populations. Institutions might create tailored aid packages for several disciplines, providing specialized resources and support that correspond to those subjects' distinct academic and research requirements. Furthermore, systematic evaluations must determine the program's effectiveness in addressing the diverse needs of students from various demographics and educational backgrounds.

4. Institutions should prioritize the administrative efficacy of the aid program by minimizing bureaucratic delays and streamlining application processes. This may entail digitizing the assistance process, establishing explicit timelines for aid distribution, and guaranteeing that information regarding eligibility and application criteria is lucid and prompt. A transparent framework for assessing and allocating help must be developed, encompassing the dissemination of explicit principles and decision-making protocols to foster confidence and reduce ambiguity among students.

5. Given the difficulties foreign students face, especially in overcoming cultural and linguistic obstacles, institutions should provide more comprehensive orientation programs to facilitate students' adaptation to the academic and social milieu. This may encompass linguistic assistance services, cultural assimilation courses, and therapeutic counseling services. Furthermore, the assistance program must be augmented to offer more extensive help in non-academic necessities, including housing, mental health, and social integration.

Table 8. The "Holistic Educational Aid and Student Success Program"

Areas of Concern /	Enhanced Program Name	Features	Objectives	Plan of Implementation	People Involved	Budget in Yuan	Monitoring	Success Indicator
Unequal Resource Distribution	Balanced Access and Opportunity Program	- Centralize the resource allocation system for transparency. - Conduct regular reviews and audits for equitable distribution. - Develop a mobile and web platform to track resource allocation.	- Ensure equitable access to scholarships, grants, and academic resources. - Improve efficiency in resource distribution. - Increase transparency and accessibility across all departments.	- Launch a centralized platform for resource tracking. - Conduct biannual resource distribution audits. - Train department heads to promote equitable access.	Financial aid office, Department heads, IT team	95,000 Yuan (system development and audits)	Quarterly reports and satisfaction surveys with all departments.	90% of students report satisfaction with resource allocation and fairness.
Insufficient Infrastructure for Research	Innovation and Research Development Program	- Establish research development funds. - Upgrade laboratories and research facilities. - Increase access to advanced research technologies.	- Improve student research quality and output. - Enhance infrastructure for research across all departments. - Foster innovation and cross-disciplinary collaboration.	- Set up dedicated research funds. - Upgrade laboratory equipment in high-demand areas. - Partner with industry professionals to provide modern research tools.	University administration, Facility management, Research departments	260,000 Yuan (equipment, research grants)	Annual review of student research quality and infrastructure usage.	75% increase in student research output and improved satisfaction with infrastructure.
Bureaucratic Delays / Lack of Communication and Transparency	Clear Pathways Information System	- Launch an online aid tracking and communication portal. - Publish clear aid guidelines and criteria. - Conduct workshops on aid application and process navigation.	- Ensure students are well-informed about aid processes. - Simplify the aid application system. - Enhance transparency and communication.	- Implement a digital aid tracking system. - Publish FAQs and updates on available aid. - Host biannual workshops on the aid process.	Financial aid office, Communications team, IT team	65,000 Yuan (platform development and training materials)	Monthly tracking of aid disbursement and student feedback.	95% of students report improved understanding of the aid process.
Concerns About Post-Graduation Support	Graduate Success Support Program	- Establish a mentorship network with professionals. - Provide post-graduation job placement services. - Create an alumni networking platform for continued support.	- Support students in the transition from academic to professional life. - Provide career guidance beyond graduation. - Foster lifelong connections between students and alumni.	- Partner with industry leaders for mentorship. - Host career fairs and job readiness workshops. - Develop an alumni platform for networking.	Career services office, Alumni relations, Industry partners	125,000 Yuan (mentorship and career services)	Track graduate employment rates and monitor alumni engagement.	80% of graduates secure employment or pursue further studies within six months of graduation.
Inadequate Support for Non-Academic Needs	Student Life Enrichment Program	- Provide mental health services. - Offer subsidized housing and meal plans. - Create wellness programs to address emotional and social needs.	- Improve students' well-being through mental health, housing, and social support. - Enhance overall student life experience. - Address non-academic challenges students face.	- Partner with local housing providers. - Expand wellness and mental health services. - Develop a subsidy plan for housing and meals.	Student affairs, Housing services, Counseling services	185,000 Yuan (counseling services, housing subsidies, wellness)	Biannual assessment of student well-being and service usage.	85% of students report improved well-being and satisfaction with non-academic support.
Cultural and Language Barriers / Concerns About Long-term Sustainability	Global Integration and Continuity Program	- Offer language and cultural adaptation support. - Provide alumni career guidance and mentorship. - Maintain access to academic journals and research tools post-graduation.	- Support international students in adapting to the local culture and language. - Ensure the benefits of aid extend beyond graduation. - Sustain alumni engagement through career and academic resources.	- Develop language and cultural support programs. - Extend post-graduation access to research tools and career services. - Provide continued mentorship for graduates.	Alumni relations, Student affairs, Career services office	110,000 Yuan (language support, post-graduation resources)	Regular follow-ups with international students and alumni on progress and engagement.	75% of alumni continue accessing resources and report professional growth.

6. To mitigate concerns regarding the sustainability of assistance beyond graduation, schools have to establish programs that provide support beyond students' academic tenure. This may entail establishing mentoring programs that connect graduates with industry leaders, providing continuous career services like job placement aid, and fostering alumni networks that enable students to sustain academic and professional relationships. Ensuring ongoing access to academic materials and professional development opportunities post-graduation will facilitate a more seamless transition into the workforce.

7. Institutions must implement a formal mechanism for regularly monitoring and assessing the aid program's efficacy. This may encompass regular evaluations to determine the program's effectiveness in achieving its objectives and addressing students' particular needs. Student input must be actively obtained and utilized to implement data-driven modifications to the curriculum. This will guarantee that the aid system stays attuned to changing student requirements and consistently provides fair and efficient assistance.

5. Output of the Study

Holistic Educational Aid and Student Success Program Rationale

The "Holistic Educational Aid and Student Success Program" is meant to address the main problems and issues that respondents brought up, such as unequal resource distribution, a lack of research infrastructure, bureaucratic delays, poor communication, not enough support for non-academic needs, cultural and language barriers, and the need for long-term sustainability. The program aims to make the school environment more fair, open, and helpful for all students. It does this by making sure that aid funds are distributed fairly and easily for everyone, and by helping students grow academically, personally, and professionally during and after their time in school. The program aims to help students do well in school and when they start working by managing all of their resources, giving them more chances to do research, making communication systems better, offering mental health and fitness services, and giving them help after they graduate. The program wants to have a lasting effect by meeting both short-term and long-term needs. This way, the program can make sure that students continue to use education and career tools after they graduate.

General Objectives

- To make resource sharing clear and organized so that all students, regardless of school or field of study, have equal access to scholarships, grants, and academic help.
- To help students do better research and come up with new ideas by giving them research funds, improving lab tools, and setting them up with professionals in the field.
- To make the aid process more accessible, cut down on paperwork, and make sure that students know all about the aid options and how to apply for them.
- To help students with their social, emotional, and personal needs as well as their academic problems by providing mental health therapy, subsidized housing, and fitness programs.

- To help students make the jump from college to work life by setting up training programs, career counseling services, job placement programs, and chances for graduates to network
- To set up language and cultural support services so that foreign students can easily get used to their new school and social situations, which will improve their general experience.
- To give alumni more access to academic tools like study databases and to offer job counseling and mentoring so that they can continue to get help from the institution as they move up in their careers.

References

- [1] Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2018). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(3), 261-273.
- [2] Anderson, R., Li, X., & Kim, J. (2020). Perceptions of international educational aid: A comparative analysis of stakeholder experiences. *Journal of Global Education Policy*, 18(3), 145-162.
- [3] Bloom, J., & Edwards, S. (2021). Accountability in educational assistance: Building transparency and trust. *Journal of International Education Development*, 42(3), 193-208.
- [4] Brown, R., & Carney, S. (2019). Transparency in governance: A critical factor in educational assistance programs. *International Education Journal*, 25(3), 234-246.
- [5] Chan, R. Y. (2019). Understanding the challenges of international students in higher education: An overview. *International Education Studies*, 12(2), 123-130.
- [6] Chang, S., & Sun, J. (2020). Sustainability through partnerships: A case study of international educational assistance. *Journal of Education and Development*, 19(3), 145-160.
- [7] Crossman, J. E., & Clarke, M. (2020). International students' engagement in extracurricular activities and their outcomes. *Journal of International Education Research*, 16(3), 104-118.
- [8] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- [9] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [10] Davis, R., & Smith, T. (2020). Gender and equity in international educational aid programs. *Journal of Global Education Studies*, 28(3), 123-135.
- [11] De Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2021). Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for future. *International Higher Education*, 102, 2-4.
- [12] Deardorff, D. K., & Charles, H. (2020). Assessing intercultural competence in international education: Theories, tools, and approaches. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 13(1), 44-58.
- [13] Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2019). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- [14] Doyle, W. R. (2019). The role of international educational aid in developing countries. *Journal of International Education Research*, 15(3), 221-234.
- [15] Fink, A. (2019). *How to Conduct Surveys: A Step-by-Step Guide* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

- [16] Green, K., & McCann, E. (2021). Maintaining the benefits of international educational aid: Long-term impacts on infrastructure and policy. *International Review of Education*, 67(1), 89-102.
- [17] Groves, R. M., Fowler Jr, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2018). *Survey Methodology* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- [18] Harper, C., & Davis, J. (2020). Enhancing educational access and quality through international aid. *Global Education Review*, 7(1), 45-59.
- [19] Horta, H. (2019). Research and international academic collaboration in a changing environment: The case of China. *Research Policy*, 48(1), 1-8.
- [20] Huang, L., & Wei, F. (2021). Addressing short-term needs and long-term sustainability in educational aid programs. *Global Education Studies*, 43(2), 211-225.
- [21] Huang, W., & Chang, K. (2019). The role of extracurricular activities in international students' integration and well-being. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 71, 102128.
- [22] Huang, W., & Li, X. (2022). Equity in resource distribution in international educational assistance: A case study. *Journal of Comparative Education*, 57(2), 177-191.
- [23] Johnson, K., Lee, A., & Park, M. (2019). Resource allocation in educational aid programs: A gender-neutral perspective. *International Education Development Review*, 16(4), 204-218.
- [24] Johnson, R. (2020). The impact of bureaucratic processes on educational aid effectiveness. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 28(5), 1-23.
- [25] Karam, N., & Huxley, L. (2020). Capacity challenges in monitoring and evaluation of educational aid programs. *International Journal of Educational Policy*, 38(2), 123-135.
- [26] Kim, S., Park, J., & Lee, K. (2020). Inequity in resource allocation in international student aid programs. *Educational Policy and Management Review*, 38(1), 42-55.
- [27] Knight, J. (2022). Holistic development in international education: Beyond academic support. *Global Studies in Education*, 28(4), 215-230.
- [28] Knight, J. (2020). Updated definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 95, 2-3.
- [29] Kopp, M., & Martin, P. (2020). Effective monitoring and evaluation in education aid: Lessons from international programs. *Global Education Policy Journal*, 15(1), 91-107.
- [30] Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. (2018). Question and Questionnaire Design. In P. Marsden & J. Wright (Eds.), *Handbook of Survey Research* (2nd ed., pp. 263-314). Emerald Group Publishing.
- [31] Kumar, S. (2022). Monitoring and evaluation of international educational aid programs. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(2), 308-325.
- [32] Lavrakas, P. J. (2018). *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. Sage Publications.
- [33] Lee, H. (2018). Barriers to effective implementation of international educational aid. *Comparative Education Review*, 62(4), 589-610.
- [34] Lee, S., & Choi, Y. (2020). Sustainability and gender in educational aid: An analysis of perceptions. *Journal of Education and Policy*, 35(1), 56-71.
- [35] Lee, Y., & Edwards, S. (2020). Participatory governance in international student programs: Key to inclusivity and effectiveness. *Journal of Global Education*, 13(2), 123-138.
- [36] Li, H., Zhao, W., & Wang, Y. (2020). Resource allocation and infrastructure in international educational aid: A cross-group analysis. *Educational Development Review*, 42(4), 299-312.
- [37] Li, X., Zhao, Z., & Chen, Y. (2021). Financial assistance and academic outcomes for international students: Evidence from Chinese universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 40(6), 1234-1248.
- [38] Li, X., Zhao, Z., & Chen, Y. (2021). International students' access to research facilities: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(2), 156-172.
- [39] Li, X., & Chen, W. (2021). The role of government in promoting international education in China: Policies and impacts. *Journal of Education Policy*, 36(2), 255-271.
- [40] Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1-55.
- [41] Liu, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Evaluating the long-term impact of educational aid in China. *Journal of Education and Development*, 23(3), 303-319.
- [42] Luo, N., & Zhang, H. (2022). The impact of internationalization on Chinese higher education: An empirical study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 23(3), 359-371.
- [43] Marginson, S. (2018). The global construction of higher education: Strategies, practices, and outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 58, 1-12.
- [44] Mazzarol, T., & Soutar, G. N. (2020). Revisiting the global student market: Demand and supply dynamics in international education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 74(4), 311-329.
- [45] Miller, D. (2020). Addressing inequities in international educational aid distribution. *Journal of Global Education*, 14(4), 67-89.
- [46] Montgomery, C. (2019). Meeting the needs of international students: A study of the challenges and responses in Chinese universities. *Journal of International Students*, 9(2), 567-588.
- [47] OECD. (2020). *Education at a glance 2020: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- [48] Oppenheim, A. N. (2000). *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*. Continuum.
- [49] Qiang, Z., & Hu, S. (2021). Policy responses to international student mobility in China: A critical analysis. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 19(5), 619-635.
- [50] Qiu, J., Huang, W., & Wang, L. (2020). The role of infrastructure in international students' academic success. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 70, 102117.
- [51] Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2019). *Designing and Conducting Survey Research: A Comprehensive Guide* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- [52] Rumbley, L. E., & Altbach, P. G. (2021). The realities of internationalization: Managing the challenges and opportunities in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(8), 1563-1574.
- [53] Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach* (7th ed.). Wiley.
- [54] Shams, F., & Huisman, J. (2020). The role of institutional culture in internationalization of higher education: The case of China. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(2), 272-284.
- [55] Shields, T., & Bailey, C. (2019). Reporting transparency in educational aid programs: A framework for monitoring progress. *Education Review*, 37(4), 267-282.
- [56] Smith, A. (2021). Sustainability challenges in educational aid programs. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 84, 102354.

- [57] Tan, H., & Goh, C. (2021). Equitable access to educational resources in international aid programs. *International Journal of Educational Policy*, 37(2), 184-200.
- [58] Thomas, J., & Lopez, A. (2022). The role of periodic assessments in the efficiency of educational assistance programs. *Educational Evaluation Journal*, 18(2), 105-118.
- [59] Thompson, J., & Perez, L. (2021). Governance in international education aid: Does gender matter? *Policy and Education Journal*, 22(2), 89-100.
- [60] Tian, M., & Lowe, J. (2021). Intercultural adaptation challenges among international students in China: Evidence from a longitudinal study. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 22(1), 33-53.
- [61] Tourangeau, R., Rips, L. J., & Rasinski, K. (2000). *The Psychology of Survey Response*. Cambridge University Press.
- [62] Wang, L., & Jiao, X. (2022). Evaluating the impact of international educational aid on higher education in China: Lessons learned and future directions. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 17(1), 1-15.
- [63] Wang, X. (2023). Addressing research gaps in international educational aid: The case of China. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 24(1), 1-15.
- [64] Wang, J., Zhang, L., & Chen, Y. (2021). Governance structures in educational assistance programs: Transparency and equity. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(4), 367-385.
- [65] Wang, Y., & Chen, L. (2021). The impact of technological resources on international students' learning experiences. *Journal of Technology in Higher Education*, 12(4), 243-257.
- [66] Williams, G., & Chang, L. (2019). Monitoring and evaluation in educational aid: Accountability across genders. *Global Educational Review*, 11(3), 98-112.
- [67] Willis, G. B. (2005). *Cognitive Interviewing: A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*. Sage Publications.
- [68] Wilson, T., & Tanner, D. (2019). Balancing short-term goals with long-term sustainability in educational assistance. *Journal of International Development*, 31(4), 398-413.
- [69] Yang, R. (2018). Transnational higher education in China: The changing landscape. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 60, 1-10.
- [70] Zhang, Z., & Kenny, R. F. (2010). Learning in an Online Distance Education Course: Experiences of Three International Students. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 11(1), 17-36.
- [71] Zhang, Z., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Managing international student recruitment: Challenges and strategies in Chinese universities. *Higher Education Policy*, 33(2), 267-284.
- [72] Zhang, H., Xu, R., & Li, G. (2020). Educational infrastructure and its impact on student performance: An international perspective. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(5), 913-928.
- [73] Zhao, Y., & Li, G. (2021). Sustainability in educational aid programs: A case study of international partnerships. *International Journal of Educational Policy*, 56(2), 211-227.
- [74] Zhao, Y., Li, H., & Chen, X. (2022). Infrastructure and sustainability in international education aid: Long-term outcomes. *Higher Education Policy Journal*, 56(2), 321-335.
- [75] Zhao, Y., & Kwok, P. (2019). Cultural and linguistic challenges for international students in China. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 72, 1-12.
- [76] Zhou, Y., & Todorova, N. (2019). International students' experiences in China: Challenges and coping strategies. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 12(2), 193-208.