

Two-Way Embedding and Resilience Building: The Driving Forces, Effects, and Adaptive Pathways of “Platform-Based Campus Governance”

Ming Qi

School of Management, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, Jiangsu, China

Abstract: Social media platforms have redrawn the terrain of university governance in China. Students embed themselves in the governance ecosystem through these platforms, and their strategies have moved well beyond individual rights advocacy toward participation in public affairs. University authorities, for their part, have begun stepping into online student communities on their own initiative — power no longer merely makes itself present, it works to rebuild legitimacy. Three forces have converged to produce this two-way embedding: the enabling logic of platform technology, mounting pressure on performance-based legitimacy, and the practical learning of the actors involved. Yet the very intensity of interaction that makes governance more responsive also breeds four resilience challenges. Non-routine interaction erodes the authority of formal institutions; emotionalized communication weakens procedural rationality. Instant feedback encourages short-termism, and unequal digital visibility produces a crisis of representation. Meeting these challenges requires a conceptual shift from reactive response to systematic institutional learning, together with a structural coupling mechanism of “platform sensing—institutional feedback.” In day-to-day governance, universities need a workable coexistence of platform interaction and institutional rationality so that dynamic resilience can be built into the governance system.

Keywords: Platform-based Campus Governance; Two-way Embedding; University Governance; Resilience Building.

1. Introduction

Social media platforms have quietly reshaped the landscape of university governance in China. Weibo, Zhihu, Douyin, and Xiaohongshu have become everyday spaces in which college students voice their concerns and take part in campus public affairs. In earlier years, students went to Zhihu or Weibo chiefly to air complaints about their own universities. More recently, the Party Secretary of Renmin University of China joined a social platform, talked directly with students, and became an online sensation under the nickname “Gangzi”; a growing number of university leaders have since followed suit. This way of using social media platforms to surface problems, respond to student demands, and govern interactively is now known in public discourse as “governing the university through social media.”

Embedding now runs in both directions, which is what distinguishes current practice from earlier patterns. Earlier studies generally described a unidirectional process: students pressed “upward” into the governance domain through public-opinion pressure. That upward embedding continues on online platforms today. Governance actors, with university leaders at the forefront, are meanwhile stepping “down” from a traditionally closed hierarchy and deliberately embedding themselves in the social circles of young students. Social media platforms, in other words, are no longer treated by universities simply as a source of risk to be fended off; they are being rebuilt into new governance spaces for engagement, dialogue, and identity work. Studies of “Weibo rights protection” and “Zhihu-based campus governance” typically treat such episodes as moments of institutional failure: finding formal channels blocked, or simply ineffective, student groups fall back on the “non-institutionalized expression of interests” [1] and the “reproduction of rights” [2]. Such research remains largely confined to a binary narrative of

“rights protection versus stability maintenance,” with its attention centered on students’ rights awareness [3] and on the management and control of public opinion [4]. It pays far less attention to universities as proactive actors with foresight and strategic intent, and it rarely asks, from the angle of changing governance structures, what logic underlies two-way embedding. Does the high-intensity interaction of platform-based campus governance necessarily produce good governance? And how can the institutional foundations of university governance be preserved while these platforms are embraced? Answering these questions calls for a systematic examination of the manifestations, driving forces, effects, and adaptive strategies of platform-based campus governance.

2. The Landscape of Platform-Based Campus Governance Under Two-Way Embedding

Some theory is helpful here. Postmodernist writers locate the force of deterritorialization in an intrinsic, metrically ordered structure [5], and they treat information as the outward form of that order, the mechanism that “deterritorializes” taken-for-granted reality [6]. Social relations once anchored in a place and an institution are pried loose, yet they do not remain loose: new arrangements gather them up and re-anchor them, a process commonly called re-embedding [7]. Social media does precisely this to a university. It punches through the closed hierarchy and the physical boundary of the campus, so that students no longer have to climb the institutional ladder rung by rung and administrators no longer sit unapproachably at the top of the ivory tower. This can be called institutional disembedding. What follows is more interesting. Within the digital space made by algorithms, interaction, and visibility, students and administrators alike maneuver strategically to re-embed their

relationship on new terms. Two-way embedding is thus more than a label for a governance fashion. It names a structural practice, one produced in the push and pull between disembedding and re-embedding and saturated with strategic maneuvering and shifts of power.

2.1. Students' "Upward Embedding": From Rights Appeals to Public Participation

Students are important stakeholders in university governance, yet their formal role is weak: their substantive power is hollowed out, institutional provisions for participation are inadequate, and their self-organizing functions are easily distorted [8]. While the conventional channels have gone more and more silent, the students have moved to the social media - now the other public sphere for making the demands and looking for the answers. On a closer look, there are three changes in the strategy which are.

The first shift is one of framing: private grievances become public issues. Post that a particular dormitory is badly run, and the complaint is easily ignored - the university can always file it as one person's bad day. Students on the platforms have learned to counter this by reframing. An apparently isolated complaint gets tied, deliberately, to a public-issue frame: educational equity, procedural justice, administrative efficiency, the oversight of power. Thus a complaint about one teacher's classes turns into a question about how the university evaluates and dismisses faculty. Dissatisfaction with dormitory management becomes an argument for modernizing student-community governance. A quarrel over the course schedule opens into a critique of how teaching resources are allocated, and a single bureaucratic inconvenience can escalate within days into a challenge to the university's entire approach to governance modernization. Attention is the point of the strategy. Once a grievance wears the frame of a public issue, it escapes the limits of individual identity and draws sympathy and support from strangers. Outside attention then pours in, and the old dialogue - closed, unequal, controlled by the administration - cannot go on as before. Demands that were once objects to be "managed" or "pacified" become public questions that require answers. Students, in the process, move from objects of administration to setters of the public-opinion agenda; by redefining the issues, they strengthen their own bargaining position.

The second shift is rhetorical, a matter of how students write. On the surface, their posts are surprisingly un-emotional. National education policies, university regulations, principles of contract law, and sometimes provisions of administrative law are cited; data visualizations are built, comparisons across years compiled, chains of argument laid out with care. The persona on display is that of "rational observers" who have risen above subjectivity, values, and feeling [9]. The aim is the discursive high ground. Match the rational form of official discourse - surpass it, even - and the familiar dismissal of students' views as "irrational" or "immature" loses its force; the conversation is pushed onto terrain where rules and facts decide. Yet beneath this rational surface runs intense emotional work. The same posts brim with self-mockery, with labels such as "little rats" and "humble students," with the rhetoric of "daring to be angry but not daring to speak," with irony, parody, embedded memes, emojis, and short videos. There is no contradiction here. Emotion is what makes the rational case travel: it generates empathy and knits solidarity within a circle. Self-deprecation sounds weak - which is exactly why it works. It

invites sympathy, and it turns one person's grievance into a sentiment a whole cohort can share. Subcultural codes, meanwhile, function like passwords: they draw boundaries and build trust among Generation Z students almost instantly, so rapid internal mobilization becomes possible. Rational argument wins the bystanders; emotional resonance wins the circle. Effective student discourse runs both at once.

The third shift concerns what students want. In the early stage, the students used the platforms instrumentally: they wanted concrete problems solved, and solved quickly. In recent years the balance has moved. Many of them, a growing number, seek not only satisfactory outcome, but also recognition - the experience of being heard, respected, and taken seriously as equal members of the governance community. The expectation echoes Honneth's theory of recognition, with its three forms of love, rights and solidarity. Translated to the university setting, the relevant forms are students' right to participate in the governance and the institution's recognition of their views and values; both signal that the university treats the students as dialogue partners rather than objects of management. What the students pursue, in other words, is recognition of their status as equal and included participants in the governance - a pursuit that breaks with the traditional "subject-object" model of the administration and points toward co-construction, co-governance and shared benefit among the subjects. Weber traced both the achievements and the problems of the modern civilization to a single tension - that between instrumental rationality and value rationality [10]. Instrumental rationality calculates: expectations about external objects and other people become "conditions" or "means" in the pursuit of rationally chosen ends [11]. Value rationality works differently, since it "can serve directly as a guide for everyday action; rather than calculating the means-ends relation solely to solve practical problems, it rests on certain value convictions and is oriented toward an ultimate stance (or direction)" [12].

2.2. The University's "Downward Embedding": A Communicative Shift from the Mere Presence of Power to Legitimacy Rebuilt

What university authorities do on these platforms is active, deliberate use: through the strategic self presentation they soften the image of power and rebuild emotional connections. That reading is incomplete. The university's own "downward embedding" is sometimes mistaken for a passive reaction to student pressure. Three strategies recur in the process.

The first strategy is identity performance: leaders communicate as persons, and they put institutional vulnerability on display by design. Party secretaries and presidents post under their own names; they share the texture of ordinary life - hobbies, daily routines, spontaneous reflections. Goffman's dramaturgical theory helps to read what is going on. On the digital "front stage" these leaders practice a kind of role distance: backstage material, the sort unrelated to their office, is allowed to come forward, and the rigid markers of institutional status begin to blur. What appears instead is a concrete, approachable human being. Strategic vulnerability of this kind strips power of some of its mystery and its pressure; it creates affinity, and trust starts to rebuild. A president who posts about daily life, or answers a student's question in current internet slang, is engaged in demystification - an abstract and awe-inspiring institution

acquires a face, and that face can talk and empathize. The hard exterior of authority is suspended, at least for a while, traded for emotional trust and an open space for dialogue. Vulnerability carefully staged lowers the audience's psychological defenses. It tells teachers and students that governance is conducted not by aloof bureaucrats but by members of a shared community standing alongside them. Cold institutional power, wrapped in a warm emotional layer, thus accumulates symbolic capital and an initial reserve of trust - the emotional infrastructure on which later policy communication and consensus building will draw.

The second strategy is organizational. In practice, universities have developed a dual-track communication system, whose core is in a functional division - and complementarity - between an official front end and personal back ends. The first track is the "institutional front end": the university's official Weibo and WeChat public accounts. Content here follows organizational norms strictly. These accounts serve the authoritative release of policies and regulations, the formal announcement of major achievements, and the unified projection of the university's public image, so that the official information stays serious, accurate and standardized. The second track is the "strategic back end", formed by leaders' personal accounts, and here the rules are different. Officialese is set aside. Policies get explained in plain language, the concerns of teachers and students are answered directly and individually, and topic discussions are sometimes opened simply to solicit advice. Communication of this kind compensates for the delays, distortions, and emotional flatness of bureaucratic information transmission - flexible capillaries, so to speak, opened in a hard institutional shell - and it carries governance down to the grassroots with precision and warmth. The two tracks complement each other. The front end keeps the authority of formal information intact; the back end works as a pressure valve and a lubricant. Together they make the governance system more resilient, adaptive and responsive.

The third strategy concerns the space in which power is exercised. In the traditional university governance, the space in which power is exercised was controlled physical spaces - conference rooms, offices, document systems. There, access was limited and power was exercised in a quiet way, from the top down. Social media has moved much of this activity in the open. A reply in a comment thread, a like, a casually posted essay on campus governance: each takes the exercise of power out of closed rooms and places it in the "space at one's fingertips," visible to teachers, students, and the wider public. Visibility, as media scholars use the term, is the dominant paradigm for organizing the relationship between media and audiences, and it covers both the right to be seen and the right to make others visible [13]. It is never innocent. Visibility concerns the interplay of seeing and being seen, and the struggle over media-conferred rights and power resources [14]. For the students, power made visible is no longer something that is only abstract, or far away. It can be approached, it can be questioned, it can be answered back. Their comments can plausibly reach the university highest decision-makers. And that possibility alone, changes how they see the power and what they expect of a participation for. For the university, power made visible by showing its processes of responding, listening, and reflecting in public, turns the principle of student centered, open governance, into concrete, verifiable, daily practice. The transparent posture projects the image of a responsive, accountable, modern

governor, and also secures the discursive and moral initiative. The university down ward embedding is therefore not only an upgrade of communication technique. It is a transformation of the governance, worked through the strategy of the spatial and the contest over the visibility.

3. The Genesis of Platform-Based Campus Governance: Technological, Social, and Institutional Drivers

Why has this pattern emerged now? Part of the answer lies on the institutional side. Students have always remained, for the most part, formally present but substantively silent in governance. The estrangement that follows pushes them, students, toward the platforms. Rigid procedures and slow decisions sit badly with students expectations of immediate response and transparent decision making. Administrators have their reasons of their own: a platform presence, used well, lets them to address the conflicts early and head off the potential disruption. Out of these converging pressures grows a pattern of mutual embedding in which university governance relies ever more heavily on social media. The pattern is the product of three dimensions - technological, social, and institutional - that have been evolving together in this particular historical moment. The following sections take each in turn.

3.1. Technology as a Driver: How Platforms Became a New Governance Infrastructure

The technological driver comes first. When and where information moves have been reorganized by instant messaging, algorithmic recommendation, circle based dissemination and multimedia expression; social platforms have become, in effect, essential governance infrastructure. A student can now go around the bureaucratic filters and lay a demand before the administrators - or before the general public. An administrator can step out of meetings and paperwork and answer almost face to face, through a short video, a livestream, a comment thread. Beneath these new habits sits something more fundamental: the technological properties of the platform have reshaped the governance structure itself.

Consider first what platform architecture does to power and information. From the standpoint of the philosophy of technology, platforms are not neutral conduits. Decentralized, flat, instantaneous - an architecture of this kind poses a standing challenge to hierarchical models of governance, and nowhere is that plainer than in higher education. The traditional model ran vertically: information and power moved slowly down the chain, from the university to schools, departments, and classes, while decision making authority stayed highly centralized. Platforms, designed so that anyone can speak, dismantle this arrangement almost by default. In their place they create a parallel, many-to-many communication network, one in which - technically at least - an ordinary student's post can travel as far as a president's directive. Power is genuinely redistributed as a result. Student groups now hold unprecedented agenda-setting capacity. They can leap over the intermediate layers of management and place an issue directly before top decision makers, or before the public, and governance is forced to move at the platform's pace rather than the committee's. A quieter effect accompanies this. Because platforms store data persistently and make it retrievable, every interaction and every promise

enters a digital public memory; social oversight of power is strengthened, and officials grow more cautious, more accountable. Platform technology thus operates as an institutional force in its own right - by changing the pathways and the speed of information flow, it compels the governance system to restructure itself adaptively.

The algorithm adds a second layer, quietly governing the visibility and ordering of the governance issues. Platforms do more than provide a stage. Through their built-in recommendation mechanisms they act as invisible agenda-setters: reach is allocated according to user engagement - likes, comments, shares - and this traffic driven logic will weigh on which campus issues enter the public spotlight and receive priority handling. Whether an issue travels from the margin to the center now, depends not only on its intrinsic importance, but on its capacity to arouse emotional resonance and viral attention. The consequences cut both ways. Dramatic, conflict laden incidents get amplified. Fundamental but less communicable structural problems sit unattended for long periods. Governance resources drift toward the loud, and governance itself turns short-sighted. Meanwhile both sides learn the rules. Students and university authorities, as active agents shape their discourse for maximum visibility; the heartwarming videos released by university authorities and the carefully designed protest infographics produced by students are, to a degree, accommodations to the same algorithmic preference. Algorithms thus become invisible arbiters - shaping how university governance is communicated, influencing what teachers and students discuss, even molding the governance model itself.

3.2. Social Drivers: Rebuilding Trust in Universities Under the Pressure of Performance Legitimacy

The universities were not brought onto the platforms by technology alone. Under the twin logics of the attention economy and performance legitimacy, going online looks less like free choice than like strategic adaptation - adaptation to students' collective action, to media scrutiny, to peer competition. Students make trending topics and flood comment sections until administrators have little choice but to step in. Administrators, in responding, take the discursive initiative and set the agenda themselves. This back-and-forth is the core driving force of re-embedding.

The deeper pressure is a shift in the basis of authority - away from the traditional status, toward the performance. The legitimacy refers to the value that is accorded to a political order and its de facto recognition [15]; for any entity or order, it is the basic of value basis on which it depends for the existence and the development. For the university, the legitimacy is the basic on which the organization depends that it will receive the recognition and will secure the rational and lawful existence of the organization [16]. The legitimacy of the effective governance, more specifically, is the capacity to meet the value aspirations and the practical expectations of the diverse stakeholders and so to win the broad acceptance and the general support [17]. The administrative directives and the institutional discipline, by itself, can no longer be the basis to sustain the broad consensus that high level university governance needs. Stakeholders the public, the students, their families expect more of the universities: in the governance effectiveness, in the service quality, in the responsiveness. Against the above background, the proactive engagement with the social media platforms is a positive strategy of the

legitimacy management. A university that shows the openness, the transparency, the timely interaction with the audiences, it shows modernity and the governance capacity to the audiences inside and outside, and so it strengthens its social reputation and its legitimacy. The effective platform interaction is tangible evidence of the student centered, the democratically administered governance philosophy. Platform presence is turned from an optional choice to the practical necessity for the survival and the development.

The same logic reinforces the reputation anxiety. Higher education is an increasingly competitive market. A university's social reputation and image are critical for attracting high quality students, faculty, and other resources; the spread of negative opinion can damage both of them severely. Monitoring the sentiment and responding quickly through social media has become part of protecting that image. On the other hand, the trust problem is visible in the campus vernacular. Students who doubt the effectiveness of the institutional channel turn to the unconventional level-skipping route. A habit is summed up in the saying that posting on Weibo works better than filing a complaint. Zhihu thread asking How do you view XX University requirement that ... and Xiaohongshu post warning Avoid XX University at all costs each registers the deepening crisis of trust. When universities establish a visible presence on these platforms, they are in effect conducting strategic communication aimed at repairing and rebuilding trust. Emotional engagement and direct dialogue with the university leader would narrow the trust gap, and it sends students a clear signal that their concerns can reach the highest level of the university directly. Potential trust crises get absorbed and resolved before they escalate. None of this is merely an upgrade of communication technique; it is a strategic imperative for shaping and protecting the university's reputation and image.

3.3. Interaction Between Actors: Practical Learning and Paradigm Formation from Contention to Co-Governance

The day-to-day interaction between the students and the university administrators on the social platforms is itself a process of practical learning and co-evolution - and if this is more than any condition that transform the governance paradigm, is that because the latter work only through the concrete practices of the micro-level actors. Macro-level technological and social conditions do not act directly.

In this light, platform-based campus governance is a textbook case of how social practice gets generated and consolidated. Media effects are always embedded in social space; they are produced precisely through social practices at various levels [18]. Practice theory makes the same point from the other side: norms and institutions do not exist a priori - they are created, confirmed, and revised through repeated interaction. Every successful episode teaches both sides something. Students prompt administrative improvements through well-reasoned, evidence-based posts; the university wins public understanding through sincere replies. Every side receives positive incentives, and new behavioral norms quietly take shape. Students learn how to voice demands on the platform more effectively; the university learns how to respond more wisely. Out of this continuing mutual learning, what began as sporadic incidents and improvised crisis responses gradually settles into normalized governance routines that both parties tacitly accept and skillfully use. A new governance domain, built on social media and governed

by its own unwritten rules of the game, is collectively constructed through countless micro-level interactions of exactly this kind.

These practices also ride on a broader shift in governing ideas. Behind them is a profound paradigm shift in higher education governance - from management to governance [19]. This paradigm shift supplies the value orientation [19]. The traditional management paradigm prizes one-way control and stability; the modern governance paradigm stresses multi-stakeholder co-governance, deliberative democracy, and synergistic efficiency. There is also the lifting-out of social relations from local contexts of interaction, another mechanism of modernity. Social relations are able to cross geographical and cultural boundaries, global communication is facilitated, specialization and precision in social institutions are promoted, and social efficiency is raised. At the national level, the top-level design for modernizing the national governance system and governance capacity, together with the social governance philosophy of co-construction, co-governance, and shared benefit, provides the fundamental legitimacy and direction for exploration at the university level [20]. Platform based campus governance can be read as a micro-level implementation of this larger agenda. It signals that university administrators are trying to move beyond paternalistic management and to build a more resilient, more dynamic governance partnership with students. Each specific interaction on these platforms is therefore more than a technique for settling an individual case. It is a continuing practical exploration of what modern university governance with Chinese characteristics should look like — and it points toward a paradigm that is more responsive, more inclusive, and more legitimate.

4. Resilience Challenges of Platform-Based Campus Governance

Two-way embedding makes governance more responsive and rebuilds legitimacy — and it simultaneously subjects the institutional resilience of university governance to unprecedented strain, through interaction of high intensity, high visibility, and high emotional charge. Institutional resilience, as the term is used here, is a system's capacity to hold its core functions and values steady while confronting external shocks and adapting to internal change. Current practice is now testing that capacity on four fronts.

4.1. Non-Routine Interaction Erodes the Authority of Formal Institutions

Non-routine interaction under platform-based governance occurs so often that it wears away, continuously, at the authority base of the university's formal institutions. Two forms of erosion dominate: the leader-direct model hollows out the functions of middle management, and the priority accorded to individual cases undermines the universality and fairness of institutional rules.

The leader direct-access model comes first. In the traditional university management system, middle management links the top and the bottom and coordinates among stakeholders — the hinge on which the effective implementation of institutional decisions turns. Social media has pried that structure open. Direct channels now run from students to university leaders, and teachers and students who raise an issue directly with a leader often receive special, ad hoc solutions. A dangerous incentive follows. Conventional

institutionalized channels come to look inefficient, even useless, and people learn to bypass them deliberately. As this path dependence spreads, the middle tier - originally the pivot of the whole system - ends up marginalized in fact as well as in name. The consequences run in two directions. On the one hand, conflicts that could have been settled at the grassroots or middle levels are pushed straight to the top, draining leaders' energy and attention and dissipating governance capacity. On the other hand, a middle tier bypassed again and again gradually loses its authority, its sense of responsibility, and its problem solving capacity. The governance system thus ends up hollow in the middle: what was a robust multi-level structure degenerates into a fragile point-to-point network, and the organization's overall capacity to handle complex situations is seriously weakened.

The second form of erosion is the principle of priority for individual cases. Public-opinion pressure on social media usually comes suddenly and urgently. Universities have to be in firefighting mode. Decision-makers, who want to calm down an outcry as soon as possible, might feel put under the pressure to make for the individual case some special arrangements, some arrangements which are not in the standard procedure. Once such practice becomes custom, there is a conspicuous broken-windows effect. The signal to all the teachers and all the students is clear: following the regular procedure works less well than to create a public stir. For the ones who play by the rules and wait their turn, this is substantively unfair. Over time it erodes the universal binding force of the institutions, and the authority of procedural justice. A governance system that runs from acting according to rules to being driven by sentiment, it loses predictability and stability and the foundations of the governance order is shaken.

4.2. Emotionalized Communication Dissolves Procedural Rationality

Emotionalized communication is now a common feature of platform-based campus governance. University authorities are anxious to build trust and adopt personalized, emotionalized communication. Administrators are often presented with the “empathy”, “self-deprecation” and “relatability” in order to win the recognition. The approach does enhance the communicative affinity, and it does warm the teacher-student relations. But it is harbouring a governance paradox: the same emotional register that builds trust, can dissolve the procedural rationality.

One symptom is that the criteria by which policies are judged are sliding from “procedural fairness” toward “emotional acceptance.” In traditional university governance, policies are made and implemented through the procedures and norms so that they remain scientific, fair, and lawful; developing a policy requires to do research and deliberation and to have broad consultation with teachers and students, and then to let the relevant decision making bodies to review and approve. The platform environment works differently. The evaluation is increasingly shaped by the emotional factors. Some students care more about whether a policy fits their emotional needs and subjective feeling, than about the procedural legitimacy of how the policy was made and implemented. Suppose a campus leader whom students admires defends an unpopular but necessary policy through the personal charisma. The public criteria for judging that policy may quietly shift: for the legality, it will come to hinge less on whether the decision process is scientific, democratic,

and conformable, and more on whether the spokesperson is affable, empathetic, and good at telling stories. Such kind of emotional appeasement can only temporarily ease the resistance to implementation. But it will put the governance on the ground that is unstable. The sustainability of the public policy now depends on the popularity of individual leaders rather than on the policy's intrinsic value and procedural legitimacy. Once the leadership changes, or a reputation is wounded, the consensus built around a person may collapse quickly - a serious threat to the continuity of governance.

A second symptom is less visible: online public opinion, however invisible, can distort the making of professional decisions. The openness and the interactivity of social platforms give full rein to the power of the opinion, and that power, is it gradually becoming, invisible for how the decisions get made? A platform is a digital square - everyone eyes are trained on the decision-makers. Under this ubiquitous social, gaze, the individuals hesitate precisely when professional judgment is called for; they drift toward the safest, least controversial options, rather than the ones that are most rational or that best serve the long terms interests. When a reform is necessary but would hurt the interests of particular groups, decision-makers may hold back for fear of (online) backlash, and the reform agenda is postponed indefinitely. Conservatism of this visibility driven kind slowly erodes the governance system's courage and capacity to tackle hard problems and to carry out substantive reform - until the system sinks into a soft rigidity of inaction.

4.3. Instant Feedback Breeds Short-Termism in Governance

Instant feedback creates a pathology of its own. Because social media feeds reactions back immediately, managers work under constant pressure to respond; to maintain a favorable image, the decision making logic tilts from long term planning toward short term stability maintenance. Emergency style of governance can ease immediate conflicts - but at the cost of policy coherence and foresight. Platform algorithms aggravate the problem. They favor content of high emotional intensity and high conflict, which nudges the managers to treat overt, noisy problems first, while silent but critical structural ones go neglected. Governance then falls into a cycle of putting out fires only to watch them flare up again, and strategic composure is lost.

The first casualty is the leaders themselves. Once on the platform, leaders - and in particular those that are in the most important positions - are buried under the inflow of the data mass and under pressure to interact. The number of mentions, comments, private messages is so big that they have to spend a lot of time and energy just to browse and to reply. Because there is no effective mechanism of filtering of data and of its consolidation, the leaders are buried by a fragmentation of the data, they are in a kind of formalism at the fingertips. The sustained exposure to information processing at this intensity readily produces decision fatigue. The deep reflection on complex issues is getting harder; the quality and the effectiveness of decision suffer. Moreover, the complex matters of policy rarely sustain a meaningful discussion in the fragmented, emotionally charged comment thread - there they are compressed to a simple binary of for or against. In order to avoid a controversy, the managers are doing all the means to fall back on the formulaic of a reply: forwarded to the relevant department, thank you for your suggestion. And the interaction degenerates in the performance of the empathy.

Such practices solves not any problems, they belong to the students, and sooner or later damage the image and the credibility of the university.

The second casualty is the evaluation cycle, which has been sharply compressed. In the model we have just described, the assessment of the governance performance is rather a long-term undertaking: the achievements of the university in terms of teaching, research, talent development and social service are weighed by means of the periodic. Platform-based governance has changed the clock. The speed of information diffusion, together with the instant feedback mechanisms, put the problem solving efficiency under the strong pressure, and the evaluation cycle should shrink. Students and the public can follow now in real time the activities of the university, and they can comment immediately if they think that the way the university is governing is effective or not. The real time feedback does bring quickly the problem to light, and that is really useful. But it also makes the university to be tempted to focus on the short term results, and to chase the immediate response and approval. The resources of the governance would tend to tilt in the side of the superficial initiatives with the quick visible effects. The fundamental structural reforms, of the kind that they need long time commitment and slow accumulation, would be neglected exactly because they are the kind of the initiative that the benefits are so slow to appear and so hard to display. A performance mindset which is paced by the social media may burnish in the short run the online reputation of the university. In the long run, it would undermine the sustainable development.

4.4. Unequal Digital Visibility Triggers a Crisis of Representation

The fourth challenge concerns representation. Platform based governance gives some students a voice - but inequality in digital visibility makes the representation of student voices highly selective. The mechanism favours groups that know how to make noise and command traffic, and in doing so it creates new silent groups. If university administrators mistake platform feedback for the collective opinion of all students and adjust policy in it, the representational imbalance on campus is aggravated. A crisis of representation in governance follows.

The underlying mechanism is digital capital. Students differ considerably on social media - in their command of digital technologies, in their online social networks, in their channels of information diffusion. Those highly skilled with digital tools and rich in online connections can spread their views and demands quickly, and they enjoy high digital visibility. Those with weaker digital skills and fewer social resources maintain only a faint presence; their visibility is far lower. Out of this disparity grows a new stratification of power within the student body. Students rich in digital capital wield greater influence in university governance - their opinions and demands are more likely to be heard and considered. Students poor in digital capital are marginalized, their interests and demands struggling to be articulated, let alone reflected. The allocation of governance resources is then quietly guided by the loudness of discourse rather than by the intrinsic importance of the issues. The greater paradox is this: platforms originally valued for widening participation may replicate, even reinforce, real world power structures - turning digital participation into a game for digital elites.

Meanwhile, emotionally charged issues are crowding out complex, rational discussion. The mechanics of information

spread on social media make emotionally charged issues far likelier to attract attention and spark debate; complex and rational are easily overlooked. Issues with strong emotion undertone - a sudden incident on campus, a dispute on students' rights - will resonate quickly with students, draw massive attention and turn into trending topics. Yet they rarely receive in-depth analysis or rational deliberation, and they can easily stir swings of collective emotion, even give rise to online bullying. The situation is different for complex, rational issues. The university's long term development, or educational and teaching reform, are highly specialized topics and harder to discuss; they struggle to hold students' interest on social media and find little room for dialogue there. The contrast is telling. When a university rolls out a major teaching reform involving intricate adjustments to curriculum, teaching methods, and assessment systems, online discussion stays comparatively sparse. Let cafeteria prices rise or dormitory conditions worsen, and the debate ignites - monopolize the discursive space. The public agenda of higher education institutions is thus held hostage to emotion topics, while the complex, fundamental questions that matter most to long term development remain conspicuously absent from public discussion. The crisis of representation in governance deepens further.

5. Institutional Backflow and Resilience Building in Platform-Based Campus Governance

Faced with these risks, neither refusing to be of the value of the platform or running back to closed governance is a rational choice. The modernisation of the university governance is not on whether the platform is or not used. It is on whether it is possible to have a dynamic equilibrium between the vigour of the platform and the rationality of the institution - in which platform interaction is no more an accelerator of the institutional inertia but a catalyst for the institutional innovation. To that aim, the instrumental logic of the opinion management has to be abandoned. The resilience has to be built systematically, at three levels : ideas, structure and practice.

5.1. Upgrading the Governance Philosophy: From Stress Response to Institutional Learning

The level of ideas gives it the content of resilience thinking. The term derives from the Latin *resilire*, , to leap back, and the concept usually comprises two dimensions - robustness and adaptability [21]. Resilient governance denotes a mode of governance able to adapt to varied environments, to manage diverse risks and shocks without breaking down or losing function, to return to its original state once the risks pass, and even to advance into a new and more adaptive condition [22]. As a new mode of action, resilient governance in universities means the dynamic adjustment of the organizational system, of the structures, and of the resource mobilization in the face of the pressures from inside and from outside [23]. Judged by this standard, the turn to social media platforms was a reasonable first step. By proactively embedding themselves in the digital spaces where the students gather, universities were not only moving from the passive defense to the active engagement, and from the delayed feedback to the immediate response - they cushioned some of the systemic shock caused by the institutional estrangement. In practice, however, the

platform engagement is still treated largely as a technical instrument, a tool of the opinion management or image maintenance. Its underlying logic is still risk prevention rather than value co-creation. That limitation confines all the effectiveness of the governance to the surface, the deeper questions - the institutional rules, the resource allocation, the educational models -, go untouched. Governance of this kind resembles a refined performative interaction. It can hardly deliver the systemic improvement, and in the course of time it may erode both the depth of the governance and the authority of the formal institutions. A fundamental shift of the governance philosophy is therefore needed. The goal can no longer be limited to raise the teachers' and student's immediate satisfaction. The deeper causes behind the complex cases must be probed, with the conceptual change driving the institutional optimization and the risk prevention under the double-loop learning model [24]. Concretely, there should be a linkage mechanism to connect the demand of the platform with the review of the institution, so that the representative cases can be systematically converted in the triggers of the institution improvement. Through the standard case-analysis procedures, the recurring governance issues that surface in the platform interaction can be categorized and be subjected to the root-cause analysis; the structural flaws and the adaptability gaps in the existing institutions can be identified; and the institutions themselves can be continuously refined. The governance resilience is built precisely in this process. A system that converts the pressure of the external interaction into the internal impetus for the rule iteration acquires the critical capacity of holding its core stable amidst a changing environment. This cognitive turn toward the institutional optimization enables the universities to move from the passive responders to the proactive institutional builders - and it provides a lasting source of the momentum for the continuous evolution of the governance system.

5.2. Transforming the Governance Structure: Building a "Platform Sensing-Institutional Feedback" Coupling Mechanism

An upgraded governance philosophy needs an organizational structure to match. If formal institutions are to be cushioned against the non-routine tendencies of platform interaction, an coupling structure has to be built, one that couples what the platform senses to what the institution does. Platform interaction is located in the structure as a sensor that detects change of the environment, and as a catalyst that spurs innovation of the institution; platform generated information is processed institutionally, so that the dynamism of the platforms is converted in a kind of sustained momentum for the improvement of the institution. Only such a structure can make the transition: from the passive response to the proactive leadership, from the visibility of the platform to the effect of the institution.

The construction of categorized, multi-level channels for the processing of governance information is a part of this mechanism. Step one: a special screening-and-routing system that is able to identify and class it in the right way. By their very nature, the demands are of three basic categories: emotional support, transaction handling, and policy advice. Demands of the first type chiefly are those of individuals who want to vent the feelings, or the dissatisfaction with the attitude of the management; what they want is "being seen" and "being empathized with". A timely, empathetic reception

on the platform is itself there effective governance here, and no complex institutional procedure is needed. Demands of the second kind concern specific well defined problems which have clear line of responsibility. For these the response should run as a closed loop: “platform identification, assumption of responsibility by the competent department, timely completion, and feedback on the platform”, so that the interaction outcome is translated quickly in better services. Demands of the third kind reach deepest, into the systemic questions of questions of resource allocation, of institutional design, and of questions of educational models. They are often, though, appearing as individual cases, but they often do reflect underlying structural tensions, and they deserve to be treated as important inputs to the institutional agenda. A dedicated research team should extract the issues, analyse the data, and assess the feasibility; the findings should then be fed into formal decision making arenas such as the faculty congress, the student congress, and the president’s executive meeting. Finally a dedicated institutional-integration body should distill the governance issues of general significance that are emerging on the platform and channel them in the university’s formal decision making venues : achieving an precise alignment, and a closed loop connection, between the platform and the institutional procedures.

What this structural transformation amounts to, in essence, is: a central interface inside the governance system, that is at the same time flexible and stable. The keen sensitivity of the platform to the interaction is all there, but the external inputs are processed and absorbed through the institutionalized channels. This is the structural resilience. The orderly channels of information flow prevent the institutional erosion that the non-routine interaction might have done; in the same time, they provide continuous, institutionalized input for the governance innovation. Openness and stability, efficiency and depth, emotion and reason, these can be in the dynamic balance rather than traded off against one another.

5.3. Integrating Governance Practice: Toward Cooperative Symbiosis of Platform Interaction and Institutional Governance

Governance resilience is ultimately realised in dynamic practice. Practice calls for a creative balance between platform interaction and institutional governance. Universities should take what social platforms do well, that is, the rapid response, the broad participation, the emotional connection. At the same time they should be committed to what institutions are for: the careful deliberation of the complex issues, the systematic plan of the long term strategy, the continuous refinement of the institutional rules. Holding both at once takes a composite governance capacity, one which in a fashion addresses the needs that are diverse at the same time, and at the level of the operation it is the one which integrates, instead of to choose between, the instrumental rationality and the value rationality.

What this requires concretely is a multidimensional, mutually complementary repertoire of governance strategies. Take agenda setting first. The governance system should manage the immediate demands against the long-term strategy - staying sensitive to real time feedback on the platform, but also using the institutionalized channels by which one can proactively draw the teachers’ and students’ attention towards the fundamental questions that bear on the development of the university. At the level of communication, what should be drawn explicitly is the functional boundary

between the emotional interaction and the procedural communication. The positive role of the emotion in building trust is put to full use; the major decisions however, are ground in the professional judgment and in the procedural fairness. Finally, at the level of interest representation, what should be done is to establish a diversified network for sensing the public opinion: one in which the traditional surveys and the data coming from the platform cross-validate each other and yield a further, much more multidimensional picture of the sentiment.

A university equipped with this composite capacity can hold a dynamic equilibrium in a complex and fast changing environment. Efficient platform interaction lets it respond promptly to the legitimate demands of teachers and students, and to keep the responsiveness of the governance system. Deep institutional reflection keeps its decisions professional and forward looking, and to keep normativity. There is a kind of practical wisdom in this. Platform and institution are no longer treated as mutually exclusive, opposing values: through careful institutional design, the two are made to reinforce and to complement each other: so that governance effectiveness rise steadily, and that governance legitimacy is consolidated.

6. Conclusion

Platform-based campus governance is a vivid experiment: through it, universities in the digital age try and practice a new governance of co-construction, co-governance and shared benefit. Its practice of two-way embedding shows the capacity of this kind of governance system to move with the times. It makes clear the structural discomfort of a traditional kind of institutions in a digital environment of high intensity of interaction and strong emotional engagement. In this kind of situation, first of all, we need, is a paradigm change, from the instrumental use of technology to the construction of resilience. Universities need systematic adjustment on the level of ideas, on the level of structure and on the level of practice, so that the dynamic interaction on social platform can flow back in the orderly way to nourish and optimize the institutional foundations. Only in this way can universities respond nimbly to the challenge of a rapidly changing digital age and yet firmly preserving the institutional resilience that is the essence of the university.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Humanities and Social Sciences Youth Foundation Research Project of the Ministry of Education (No.21YJC880058) and the Key Project of Jiangsu Educational Science Planning (No. B/2023/01/177).

References

- [1] Tian, J., & Tian, Y. (2021). The generation logic, social effects, and adaptation strategies of “trending rights protection”. *Electronic Government*, (12), 90-99.
- [2] Ye, J. L., & Xu, Q. (2021). Reproduction of power: An interpretive framework for understanding how Weibo rights protection becomes possible. *Journal of Southwest University for Nationalities (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition)*, 42(07), 193-200.
- [3] Xu, X. C. (2023). Analysis of the “Zhihu-based campus governance” phenomenon and its implications for student participation in university governance. *Ideological and Theoretical Education*, (02), 106-111.

- [4] Li, J. Y. (2023). Typical features, evolutionary mechanisms, and response strategies of the “Zhihu-based campus governance” phenomenon. *College Counselors*, (01), 39-43.
- [5] Tally, R. (2021). *Spatiality* (Y. Fang, Trans.). Peking University Press.
- [6] Chu, E. K. (2025). On the technical and political nature of algorithms. *Guizhou Social Sciences*, (04), 4-10.
- [7] Giddens, A. (2011). *The consequences of modernity* (H. Tian, Trans.). Yilin Press.
- [8] Song, D., Liu, Y. R., & Zhao, Z. (2019). A review of student power in university governance and its realization paths. *Higher Education Science*, (4), 41-46.
- [9] Jia, X. X., & Ji, Y. (2022). New characteristics of youth online opinion expression: A case study of the construction of the “rational observer” image. *People’s Forum·Academic Frontier*, (13), 109-111.
- [10] Su, G. X. (1988). *Rationalization and its limits: An introduction to Weber’s thought*. Shanghai People’s Publishing House.
- [11] Weber, M. (1997). *Economy and society (Volume I)* (R. Y. Lin, Trans.). Commercial Press.
- [12] Zhang, D. S., Jin, Y. G., Chen, H. W., & et al. (2001). On the doctrine of the mean rationality: Beyond instrumental rationality, value rationality, and communicative rationality. *Sociological Research*, (2), 33-48.
- [13] Dayan, D. (2013). Conquering visibility, conferring visibility: Visibility seekers and media performance. *International Journal of Communication*, 7, 137-153. [https://doi.org/ 10.5197/ ijoc.2013.07.00](https://doi.org/10.5197/ijoc.2013.07.00).
- [14] Zhao, H. M. (2024). Who is the weak? Strategies of visibility contestation, boundary reconstruction, and value reflection. *Journal of China University of Geosciences (Social Sciences Edition)*, 24(05), 145-156.
- [15] Habermas, J. (1989). *Communication and social evolution* (B. S. Zhang, Trans.). Chongqing Publishing House.
- [16] Jiang, S., & Lin, H. X. (2024). The crisis of university legitimacy and its resolution: A sociological examination of university rationality based on knowledge. *Journal of Anhui Normal University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 52(05), 126-135.
- [17] Liu, Q. (2021). *A study on the legitimacy foundation and construction of effective governance in Chinese universities [Dissertation]*. Xiamen University.
- [18] Dai, Y. C. (2021). From “panopticon” to “solitary gaze”: Foucault, Latour, and spatiality in the age of social media—A reinterpretation of power issues. *International Journalism*, 43(07), 6-24.
- [19] Zhou, Z. Y. (2023). University governance: Conceptual substitution and conceptual flow. *Higher Education Research*, 44(10), 22-35.
- [20] Shen, C., & Pu, X. T. (2023). The modern construction of China’s university governance. *Chinese Journal of Educational Science (Chinese and English)*, 6(04), 62-71.
- [21] Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4, 17-18. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000313>
- [22] Yang, L. H., Liu, H. Y., & Ma, Y. (2025). Resilient governance: Meaning, paradigm shifts, and a new integrated framework. *Governance Studies*, 41(03), 4-26+2+158.
- [23] Huang, W. W., & Wang, J. H. (2024). University resilience governance in the digital intelligence era: Connotation, objectives, and pathways. *Chinese Journal of Higher Education Research*, (04), 39-46.
- [24] Wen, H., & Li, F. S. (2023). Learning from setbacks: How post-crisis learning can promote pre-crisis risk prevention—A programmatic grounded analysis based on accident investigation reports. *Shanghai Administrative College Journal*, 24(03), 18-32.