ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Volume 11 Issue 12 December 2024

Faculty Assessment of Innovative University Management Practices and Student Value Conception: Inputs to a Marketing Program

[1] Wang Lihua*, [2] Rowena M. Libo-on

[1][2] Central Philippine University, Lopez Jaena St., Jaro, Iloilo City, Philippines
Email: [1] lihua.wang-21@cpu.edu.ph, [2] rmlibo-on@cpu.edu.ph

Abstract*— This study explores the impact of innovative university management practices on faculty assessment and student value conception within the context of marketing programs. Previous research suggests that faculty assessment improves teaching effectiveness and indirectly influences student values. The study adopted a descriptive-correlational research design, surveying 235 faculty members and 341 students from a higher education institution in China. Findings show that faculty members, primarily in their late thirties with Master's degrees, have been with the university for 6-15 years. Students aged 21-23 come from various academic programs. Faculty rated the university's innovative management practices as "Very Good" across all areas. However, no significant differences were found in student value conceptions, nor any correlation between faculty assessments and students' values. The study concluded that while faculty assessments varied in some areas, there was no relationship between these assessments and student values, underscoring the importance of effective management practices in university marketing.

Index Terms*— Faculty Assessment, Innovative University Management Practices, Student Value Conception, Marketing Program

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of globalisation and the knowledge economy has created challenges and opportunities for higher education institutions, prompting universities to adopt innovative management practices to enhance education quality and competitiveness. University teachers' innovation capabilities and professional development play a critical role in the overall quality of higher education. At the same time, students' value formation is closely linked to the educational environment. Marketing plans are essential in improving the university's reputation, increasing enrolment, and enhancing social influence. Universities must adapt to changing market demands and students' personalised development needs through innovative management practices [31]; [14]. [30] highlights that innovation is critical to higher education reform and stresses the importance of cooperation and exchange in fostering this innovation. Scholars like [21] and [1] emphasised that practical teacher evaluation and targeted marketing strategies significantly shape student values and improve teaching quality. [30] and [26] argue that successful marketing plans increase visibility, attract high-quality students, and enhance the school's long-term competitiveness and social recognition. This study aims to examine the impact of innovative university management practices on teacher evaluation and student value formation, as well as how these factors can guide the development of effective marketing strategies.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Innovative university management practices, which include organisational culture, leadership, employee participation, and resource allocation, are crucial for enhancing a university's influence and competitive advantage [17]. Faculty assessment in universities is influenced by age, gender, educational background, teaching experience, and departmental affiliation, which shape professional competence and performance [19]; [11]. The academic background of teaching staff significantly impacts their role positioning and decision-making ability in the innovation management practice of universities [27]. Teaching experience is closely related to teaching quality and student learning outcomes, with experienced teachers providing more effective teaching support [3]; [13]. Departmental affiliation affects teachers' working environment and performance, influencing their attitude and participation in educational innovation [32]; [10]. Students' significant subjects play a vital role in their academic career and career development, reflecting their interests and talents and potentially affecting their future career choices [20]. Leadership and vision are critical factors in driving innovation in university management, with leaders setting clear goals and building environments conducive to innovation [22]; [12]. Effective collaboration and communication among internal and external team members ensure the successful execution of marketing plans, promoting information sharing and problem-solving [2]. Project-based management has become a routine institutional arrangement in higher education, with public resources allocated through national budget transfer payments, demonstrating governance advantages through resource restructuring [6]. Innovative teaching methods, organisational forms, and the construction of a new lifelong learning system are essential for deepening teaching reform and optimising the educational service supply [9].

III. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this study was integrated into multiple critical theories to explore innovation in university management. It was drawn on Innovation Management Theory, building on [5] insights regarding the role of innovation in leadership and organisational adaptation, and [16] application of this theory to higher education, which emphasised strategies for fostering innovation within universities. Additionally, the framework was incorporated into Student Development Theory, referencing [24], who explored the evolving nature of student development, and Liu [18], who highlighted the significance of student values and innovation in education. This study also integrated marketing plans and consumer behaviour theory, notably [14] exploring how understanding consumer behaviour is crucial for developing effective marketing strategies that can be applied to university marketing. Finally, Fu's [8] Theory of Value Conception

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Volume 11 Issue 12 December 2024

was used to interpret the dual meaning of "value" in teacher evaluation and student values, combining both intrinsic and evaluative perspectives.

The conceptual framework of this study highlighted the importance of innovative university management practices in shaping teacher evaluations and student values, which, in turn, influence marketing plans. The research suggested that faculty profile (age, sex, educational background, teaching experience, and department affiliation) and student profile (age, sex, major) directly affect the dependent variables of innovative management practices and student values. It posited that innovative management practices, including leadership, decision-making, resource allocation, and collaboration, influence the development of leadership and vision. At the same time, the educational environment shapes student values, such as personal, moral, and ethical values. The study emphasised that faculty assessments and student values, influenced by innovative practices like instruction and external partnerships, can affect university marketing strategies. Through empirical data and refined techniques, this research aimed to explore how these management practices and student values contribute to the success of marketing plans and the broader educational environment.

IV. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The research findings offer valuable guidance for various stakeholders. University administrators can use the results to enhance management strategies and marketing plans, improving the university's reputation and competitiveness. For students, the study highlights how innovative management practices can enrich their educational experiences by aligning with their core values and offering more flexible courses and personalised support. Teachers can benefit from the study by updating their educational concepts and expanding their teaching skills to remain relevant in a changing environment. Alumni can deepen their connection with their alma mater, while industry partners can foster deeper collaborations with universities, benefiting from talent development and innovation. Lastly, the Education Commission can use the findings to inform policy decisions that promote innovation and improve education quality.

V. OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The study aims to determine the faculty assessment of innovative university management practices and student value conception as inputs to a marketing program. Specific objectives include examining faculty and student profiles, including sex, age, educational background, teaching experience, department affiliation for faculty, and sex, age, and student significance. The study aims to assess innovative university management practices in various dimensions, such as leadership, decision-making, student engagement, and interdisciplinary collaboration, among others, and to evaluate students' value conceptions regarding personal, moral, spiritual, ethical, and family values. Additionally, the study seeks to identify significant differences in faculty assessments of university management practices and students' value conceptions based on their demographic characteristics and explore potential relationships between these practices and students' values.

The study proposed three hypotheses: first, that no significant differences would exist in the assessment of innovative university management practices across various factors, such as leadership, decision-making, and student engagement, when classified by faculty demographics, including sex, age, educational background, teaching experience, and department affiliation; second, that no significant differences would be found in students' value conceptions (personal, moral, spiritual, ethical, and family values) based on their sex, age, and foremost; and third, that significant relationships would exist between faculty assessments of innovative management practices and students' value conceptions, particularly regarding leadership, student engagement, and other factors influencing both faculty and student perspectives.

VI. METHODOLOGY

6.1. Research Design

This study used a survey-correlational research method to explore the relationships between innovative university management practices and student value conception. According to [4], a descriptive approach effectively examined the impact of innovative management practices on student values, making it suitable for this study's objectives of understanding faculty assessments and student values. As described by [23], the descriptive-correlational research design outlined the existing relationships between variables and predicted potential future outcomes based on these correlations. The study investigated how these variables relate to developing effective marketing plans in university settings. Through this design, the researchers seek to gather data and explore how innovative management practices influence faculty and student perspectives and marketing strategies.

6.2. Respondents of the Study

This study included 341 stakeholders, including 235 senior students of public college and faculty respondents. It used random sampling to identify respondents.

The following are the criteria for student respondents:

Inclusion Criteria. The following respondents were:

1. 22-24 years old
2. Male or Female
3. A senior student at a university in Ordos, China

The following are the criteria for faculty respondents:

1. 30-65 years old
2. Male or Female
3. A faculty at a university in Ordos, China, serving in the university for at least 5 years

Exclusion Criteria. Those who did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded from the study.

6.3. Research Instrument

This study utilised a survey questionnaire developed by the researchers, which consisted of four sections. The first two sections collected demographic data on students and faculty, including age, sex, and academic background. The third section assessed innovative university management practices. At the same time, the fourth part, adapted from the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) by Schwartz (1987), evaluated students' value conceptions, covering personal, moral, spiritual, and family values.

6.4. Data-Gathering Procedure

The researchers obtained permission from relevant university departments and offices in the Philippines and China to conduct the study, and informed consent was secured from all participants to ensure ethical standards were met. The proposal and questionnaires underwent a plagiarism test and were reviewed by the university's Research Ethics Review Board for approval. The questionnaire was emailed with a link to the digital survey, and the researchers examined the completed forms for completeness and consistency.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Volume 11 Issue 12 December 2024

6.5. Data-Processing and Analysis

After data retrieval, survey responses were coded, counted, tabulated, and processed using appropriate statistical methods for analysis and interpretation. The study employed statistical tools such as frequency counts, percentage analysis, means, standard deviations, t-tests for independent samples, One-Way ANOVA, and Pearson's r. A 0.5 alpha level was used to determine the acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses.

6.6. Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were critical in the research, particularly when involving human participants, and this study adhered to principles of informed consent and confidentiality. Participation was voluntary, with respondents required to sign an informed consent form outlining the confidentiality of their data by the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The researchers had no conflict of interest and presented the findings objectively, while the study underwent ethical review by the University Research Ethics Committee. The study demonstrated a negligible risk to participants, as the questions were not sensitive, and participants had the right to withdraw at any point without repercussions. Participants' anonymity was maintained by assigning unique identifiers, and all data were securely stored and used exclusively for research purposes. After the study, all data were permanently deleted to ensure confidentiality. The study also aimed to contribute to local capacity building by providing evidence-based insights to enhance guidance programs and promote student well-being in the community.

VII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

7.1 Profile of the Faculty

The average age of faculty members was 39.4 years, with a standard deviation of 6.22 years. The majority held a Master's degree (59.1%), followed by Bachelor's (26.4%), Doctorate (11.1%), and others (3.4%). Nearly half (47.2%) had served between 6-15 years, 35.7% between 16-25 years, and 17% for 5 years or less. Faculty members were predominantly from Social Sciences (23.8%), Medical and Health (21.3%), and Engineering and Technology (20.9%).

7.2 Profile of the Students

Students were predominantly aged 21-23, 58.8% male and 42.0% female. They were evenly distributed across various academic programs, with significant representation from Social Sciences (23.8%), Natural Sciences (16.2%), Engineering and Technology (20.9%), Medicine and Health (21.3%), and Others (17.9%).

7.3 Assessment of the University Management Innovative Practices by Faculty grouped according to Age, Sex, Education, Years of Service, and Department

- Age: Results showed that the overall assessment of the university management's innovative practices was generally rated as "Very Good" (mean = 3.54 to 3.79).
- Sex: The findings showed that the mean scores for assessing the university management's innovative practices were rated as "Very Good" (mean = 3.64 to 3.67, SD = 1.63 to 1.64). This finding indicated that male and female participants viewed the assessment of the university management's innovative practices similarly.
- Education: The findings showed that all dimensions were rated as "Very Good" across faculty by education level.
- Years of Service: The findings showed that faculty members rated the university's management's innovative practices as "Very Good" (mean = 3.41 to 4.20) regardless of their years of service.
- Department: The findings showed that faculty assessments of management's innovative practices were generally rated as "Very Good" (mean = 3.58 to 3.78), indicating that faculty across departments viewed the assessment of the university management's innovative practices similarly.

7.4 Value Conception among the Students taken as an Entire Group

Table 1 shows the level of value conception among students. The data indicated that regardless of students' profiles, such as age, sex, and significant field, the level of value conception was rated as "Very Good." This conception meant that the value conception among students was similar.

Table 1. Value Conception among Students Grouped by Profile Indicators

Variables	Value Conception		
	SD	Mean	Description
Age			
18-25	0.76	3.45	Very Good
Sex			
Male	0.77	3.44	Very Good
Female	0.75	3.47	Very Good
Major Field			
Mechanical Engineering	0.70	3.64	Very Good
Chemical Engineering	0.78	3.44	Very Good
Clothing & Design Engineering	0.78	3.39	Very Good
Electrical/Automation Engineering	0.75	3.54	Very Good
Tourism	0.76	3.41	Very Good
Hotel Management	0.75	3.23	Very Good
Overall	**0.76**	**3.45**	**Very Good**

Legend: 1.0-1.80 = Poor; 1.81-2.60 = Fair; 2.61-3.40 = Good; 3.41-4.20 = Very Good; 4.21-5.0 = Excellent

When profile categories further analysed the students' responses, the data showed that their rating still fell on "Very good," with small variations in their responses. Please see Table 1.1.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Volume 11 Issue 12 December 2024

Table 1.1. Value Conception among Students Grouped by Profile Indicators

Variables	Personal		Moral		Spiritual		Ethical		Family	
	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean
Age										
21-25	0.77	3.46	0.80	3.45	0.88	3.44	0.81	3.44	0.83	3.46
Sex										
Male	0.77	3.45	0.83	3.48	0.89	3.40	0.82	3.41	0.85	3.47
Female	0.77	3.47	0.75	4.41	0.86	3.50	0.79	3.47	0.80	3.45
Major Field										
ME	0.72	3.66	0.78	3.63	0.83	3.61	0.79	3.59	0.74	3.62
CE	0.78	3.43	0.81	3.46	0.96	3.39	0.86	3.43	0.92	3.48
CDE	0.80	3.39	0.81	3.40	0.85	3.44	0.80	3.39	0.85	3.38
EE	0.77	3.53	0.75	3.55	0.84	3.47	0.80	3.56	0.84	3.58
Tourism	0.76	3.45	0.80	3.38	0.85	3.46	0.78	3.35	0.80	3.40
Hotel Mgt	0.75	3.24	0.84	3.23	0.84	3.24	0.77	3.22	0.77	3.24
Overall	0.77	3.46	0.80	3.45	0.88	3.44	0.81	3.44	0.74	3.46
Overall	0.80		0.80	3.63	0.75	3.67	0.70	3.69	0.70	3.53

Legend: 1.0-1.80 = Poor; 1.81-2.60 = Fair; 2.61-3.40 = Good; 3.41-4.20 = Very Good; 4.21-5.0 = Excellent

7.5 Differences in the Assessment of Innovative University Management Practices by the faculty according to:

Age

Results showed significant differences in the aspects of leadership and vision (F=3.158, p=0.44), integration of technology (F=6.093, p=0.003), student engagement and support (F=4.232, p=0.016), interdisciplinary collaboration (F=3.158, p=0.044), and accessibility and inclusivity (F=4.763, p=0.009). Therefore, the null hypotheses in these regards were rejected. The findings showed no significant difference (p>0.05) in the rest of the aspects, and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 2. University Management Innovative Practices as Assessed by Faculty Grouped by Age

Variables	Mean			F	df	p-value	Decision
	25-35	36-45	46-55				
Leadership and vision	3.49	3.79	3.57	3.158	2	0.044*	Reject H_0
Decision-making processes	3.52	3.60	3.66	2.938	2	0.055	Accept H_0
Collaboration and communication	3.55	3.80	3.63	2.221	2	0.111	Accept H_0
Resource allocation	3.65	3.78	3.58	1.194	2	0.305	Accept H_0
Professional development	3.58	3.75	3.50	1.887	2	0.154	Accept H_0
Experimentation and risk-taking	3.50	3.77	3.59	2.142	2	0.120	Accept H_0
Integration of technology	3.34	3.78	3.52	6.093	2	0.003*	Reject H_0
Student engagement and support	3.52	3.84	3.50	4.232	2	0.016*	Reject H_0
Interdisciplinary Collaboration	3.53	3.83	3.55	3.158	2	0.044*	Reject H_0
Transparency	3.56	3.75	3.65	1.358	2	0.259	Accept H_0
Recognition and Rewards	3.60	3.82	3.64	1.545	2	0.216	Accept H_0
External Partnerships	3.60	3.80	3.63	1.415	2	0.245	Accept H_0
Sustainability and Responsibility	3.53	3.79	3.63	2.273	2	0.105	Accept H_0
Accessibility and exclusivity	3.47	3.82	3.54	4.763	2	0.009*	Reject H_0
Instruction	3.60	3.77	3.58	1.371	2	0.256	Accept H_0
Research	3.56	3.78	3.54	2.243	2	0.108	Accept H_0
Community Extension	3.62	3.81	3.56	2.035	2	0.133	Accept H_0
Overall	**3.541**	**3.793**	**3.577**	**2.960**	**2**	**0.054**	**Accept H_0**

**Significant at 5% level*

The Tucky HSD posthoc tests (as shown in Table 2.1) on the five dimensions of innovation practices as assessed by faculty grouped by age show that the differences lie between 26-35 and 36-45 years old. This result means that the younger group of faculty viewed these dimensions differently than older ones.

Table 2.1. Tukey HSD Post-Hoc Test on the Assessment of the University Management Innovative Practices by Faculty Grouped by Age

Variables	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
Leadership and vision Between 26-35 and 36-45	0.301	0.125	0.044*
Integration of technology Between 26-35 and 36-45	0.441	0.128	0.002*
Student engagement and support Between 26-35 and 36-45	0.321	0.131	0.040*
Interdisciplinary Collaboration Between 26-35 and 36-45	0.306	0.2=121	0.033*
Accessibility and exclusivity Between 26-35 and 36-45	0.351	0.122	0.012*

**Significant at 5% level*

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Volume 11 Issue 12 December 2024

Sex

Table 3 shows the test results on assessing the university management's innovative practices when faculty members are grouped by sex. The findings indicate that all the dimensions did not significantly vary by sex. This result means that male and female faculty members viewed the assessment of the university management's innovative practices similarly.

Table 3. University Management Innovative Practices as Assessed by Faculty Grouped by Sex

Variables	Mean		t	df	p-value	Decision
	Male	Female				
Leadership and vision	3.69	3.59	0.937	233	0.350	Reject H_0
Decision-making processes	3.67	3.65	0.200	233	0.832	Reject H_0
Collaboration and communication	3.63	3.73	0.978	233	0.329	Reject H_0
Resource allocation	3.68	3.70	0.150	233	0.881	Reject H_0
Professional development	3.65	3.63	0.177	233	0.859	Reject H_0
Experimentation and risk-taking	3.72	3.55	1.483	233	0.139	Reject H_0
Integration of technology	3.64	3.51	1.174	233	0.242	Reject H_0
Student engagement and support	3.63	3.69	0.594	233	0.553	Reject H_0
Interdisciplinary Collaboration	3.68	3.65	0.233	233	0.816	Reject H_0
Transparency	3.69	3.64	0.497	233	0.620	Reject H_0
Recognition and Rewards	3.70	3.71	0.040	233	0.968	Reject H_0
External Partnerships	3.74	3.65	0.767	233	0.444	Reject H_0
Sustainability and Responsibility	3.69	3.65	0.356	233	0.722	Reject H_0
Accessibility and exclusivity	3.66	3.63	0.281	233	0.779	Reject H_0
Instruction	3.68	3.66	0.215	233	0.830	Reject H_0
Research	3.65	3.65	0.019	233	0.985	Reject H_0
Community Extension	3.68	3.70	0.213	233	0.832	Reject H_0
Overall	**3.67**	**3.64**	**0.285**	**233**	**0.350**	**Reject H_0**

**Significant at 5% level*

Education

Table 4 shows the test results on assessing innovative university management practices when faculty members are grouped by education. The findings indicate that all the dimensions did not significantly vary by education. This finding means that faculty viewed the assessment of university management's innovative practices similarly regardless of their education.

Table 4. University Management Innovative Practices as Assessed by Faculty Grouped by Education

Variables	F	df	p-value	Decision
Leadership and vision	0.182	3	0.909	Reject H_0
Decision-making processes	0.073	3	0.974	Reject H_0
Collaboration and communication	0.568	3	0.636	Reject H_0
Resource allocation	0.228	3	0.977	Reject H_0
Professional development	0.562	3	0.640	Reject H_0
Experimentation and risk-taking	0.389	3	0.761	Reject H_0
Integration of technology	0.199	3	0.897	Reject H_0
Student engagement and support	0.186	3	0.905	Reject H_0
Interdisciplinary Collaboration	0.397	3	0.755	Reject H_0
Transparency	0.541	3	0.655	Reject H_0
Recognition and Rewards	0.287	3	0.835	Reject H_0
External Partnerships	0.409	3	0.747	Reject H_0
Sustainability and Responsibility	0.175	3	0.913	Reject H_0
Accessibility and exclusivity	0.213	3	0.887	Reject H_0
Instruction	0.374	3	0.772	Reject H_0
Research	0.243	3	0.866	Reject H_0
Community Extension	0.578	3	0.630	Reject H_0
Overall	**0.136**	**3**	**0.938**	**Reject H_0**

**Significant at 5% level*

Years of Service

Table 5 shows the test results on assessing the university management's innovative practices when faculty members were grouped by years of service. The findings show that the faculty assessment differs in the aspect of Leadership and Vision (F=7.836, p=0.001), Collaboration and Communication (F=3.449, p=0.033), Professional Development (F=4.195, p=0.016), Experimentation and Risk-taking (F=6.305, p=0.002), Integration of Technology (F=8.547, p=0.000), Student Engagement and Support (F=5.061, p=0.007), External Partnerships (F=3.791, p=0.002), Sustainability and Exclusivity (F=5.002, p=0.007). Overall, their perspectives differ with F=4.707, p=0.010. This finding means that the assessment of the university management's innovative practices is viewed differently by faculty in terms of education.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Volume 11 Issue 12 December 2024

Table 5. University Management Innovative Practices as Assessed by Faculty Grouped by Years of Service

Variables	Mean			F	df	p-value	Decision
	<=5	6-15	16-25				
Leadership and vision	3.19	3.78	3.67	7.836	2	0.001*	Reject H_0
Decision-making processes	3.41	3.72	3.69	2.321	2	0.100	Accept H_0
Collaboration and communication	3.36	3.73	3.75	3.449	2	0.033*	Reject H_0
Resource allocation	3.43	3.78	3.70	2.523	2	0.082	Accept H_0
Professional development	3.33	3.77	3.62	4.195	2	0.016*	Reject H_0
Experimentation and risk-taking	3.21	3.75	3.70	6.305	2	0.002*	Reject H_0
Integration of technology	3.08	3.70	3.65	8.547	2	0.000*	Reject H_0
Student engagement and support	3.28	3.79	3.66	5.061	2	0.007*	Reject H_0
Interdisciplinary Collaboration	3.43	3.74	3.68	2.139	2	0.120	Accept H_0
Transparency	3.39	3.72	3.72	3.130	2	0.056	Accept H_0
Recognition and Rewards	3.43	3.78	3.70	2.332	2	0.099	Accept H_0
External Partnerships	3.40	3.82	3.68	3.791	2	0.002*	Reject H_0
Sustainability and Responsibility	3.31	3.76	3.71	4.395	2	0.013*	Reject H_0
Accessibility and exclusivity	3.28	3.75	3.67	5.002	2	0.007*	Reject H_0
Instruction	3.40	3.75	3.69	2.895	2	0.057	Accept H_0
Research	3.36	3.74	3.67	3.153	2	0.045	Accept H_0
Community Extension	3.50	3.78	3.69	1.765	2	0.173	Accept H_0
Overall	3.34	3.75	3.66	4.707	2	0.010*	Reject H_0

**Significant at 5% level*

The Tuky posthoc tests (Table 5.4.1) show that differences in the assessment of faculty members of the university's innovative practices lie between those groups that have been in the university for 5 years or less and those who served the university for 6 to 15 years. One plausible reason for the difference is that those who have been with the university for five or fewer years may have different perspectives on the management innovative practices than those with more years working there.

Table 5.1. Tuky Post-Hoc Tests on the University Management Innovative Practices as Assessed by Faculty Grouped by Years of Service

Variables	F	df	p-value	Decision
Leadership and vision Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.592	0.150	0.000*	Reject H_0
Collaboration and communication Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.372	0.154	0.043*	Reject H_0
Professional development Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.443	0.154	0.012*	Reject H_0
Experimentation and risk-taking Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.544	0.157	0.002*	Reject H_0
Integration of technology Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.623	0.155	0.000*	Reject H_0
Student engagement and support Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.509	0.160	0.005*	Reject H_0
External Partnerships Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.415	0.151	0.018*	Reject H_0
Sustainability and Responsibility Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.402	0.161	0.036*	Reject H_0
Accessibility and exclusivity Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.466	0.149	0.005*	Reject H_0
Overall Between <=5 years and 6-15 years	0.415	0.136	0.007	Reject H_0

**Significant at 5% level*

Department

Table 6 shows the test results on assessing the university management's innovative practices when faculty members were grouped by the department to which they belonged. The findings indicated that the faculty assessment was similar in all aspects of management's innovative practices. This result meant that faculty across departments evaluated the university management's innovative practices similarly.

Table 6. University Management Innovative Practices as Assessed by Faculty Grouped by Department* Significant at 5% level

Legend: SS – Social Sciences; NS – Natural Sciences; ET – Engineering/Technology; MH – Medical/Health; O Other department

7.6 There were differences in students' conceptions of value regarding personal, moral, spiritual, ethical, and family values varied.

Results showed that there were no significant differences across student profile indicators. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 7. Differences in the Value Conception among Students Grouped by profile indicators

Variables	Value Conception		
	F/t	p-value	Decision
Age	-	-	-
Sex	0.014	0.451	Accept H_o
Major Field	1.690	0.134	Accept H_o
Overall	1.451	0.124	Accept H_o

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Volume 11 Issue 12 December 2024

7.7 Relationships between the Faculty Assessment of Innovative University Management Practices and Student Value Conception

Table 8 shows the results of the analysis of the relationship between faculty assessment of innovative university management practices and students' value conception. The findings indicated no significant relationship between innovative university management practices and students' value conception. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. Please see Table 8 below.

Table 8. Relationship between Faculty Assessment of the University Innovation Practices and Students' Value Conception.

Variables	*Personal*		*Moral*		*Spiritual*		*Ethical*		*Family*	
	r	*p-value*	*r*	*p-value*	*r*	*p-value*	*r*	*p-value*	*r*	*p-value*
LV	0.05	0.415	0.06	0.337	0.11	0.082	0.02	0.759	0.02	0.658
DP	0.03	0.581	0.03	0.601	0.05	0.415	0.06	0.927	0.03	0.603
CC	0.04	0.487	0.04	0.542	0.06	0.310	0.03	0.959	0.02	0.981
RA	0.00	0.985	0.01	0.865	0.04	0.511	0.05	0.433	0.03	0.586
PD	0.03	0.635	0.04	0.463	0.05	0.434	0.02	0.742	0.02	0.971
ER	0.07	0.234	0.06	0.353	0.08	0.202	0.02	0.678	0.23	0.130
IT	0.05	0.398	0.05	0.439	0.02	0.697	0.01	0.810	0.02	0.721
SES	0.07	0.913	0.00	0.898	0.03	0.647	0.05	0.442	0.08	0.187
IC	0.03	0.553	0.03	0.613	0.05	0.428	0.01	0.053	0.06	0.072
T	0.05	0.398	0.05	0.439	0.03	0.433	0.23	0.091	0.04	0.535
RR	0.01	0.865	0.00	0.985	0.01	0.108	0.05	0.433	0.08	0.874
EP	0.03	0.557	0.02	0.674	0.08	0.202	0.00	0.910	0.03	0.627
SR	0.09	0.163	0.07	0.230	0.03	0.536	0.01	0.093	0.03	0.124
AE	0.06	0.353	0.05	0.308	0.04	0.435	0.05	0.613	0.07	0.799
I	0.03	0.622	0.00	0.098	0.04	0.474	0.01	0.792	0.06	0.305
R	0.05	0.374	0.04	0.473	0.10	0.324	0.01	0.672	0.02	0.356
CE	0.00	0.993	0.00	0.889	0.04	0.537	0.04	0.503	0.17	0.237
O	0.05	0.425	0.03	0.571	0.20	0.342	0.10	0.340	0.30	0.876

Legend: LV=Leadership & Vision; DP= Decision-making processes; CC=Collaboration & communication; RA=Resource allocation, PD=Professional development, ER=Experimentation & risk-taking, IT=Integration & technology, SES=Student engagement & support, IC=Interdisciplinary collaboration = IC, T=Transparency, RR=Recognition & Rewards, EP=External Partnership, SR=Sustainability & Responsibility, I=Instruction, R=Research, CE=Community engagement, O=Overal

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study revealed that significant differences existed in faculty assessments of university innovative management practices, particularly in areas such as leadership, vision, information technology integration, student engagement, and interdisciplinary collaboration, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis in these aspects. However, no significant differences were found in other areas of faculty assessment, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Additionally, the study found no significant differences in student value conceptions regarding personal, moral, spiritual, ethical, and family values, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Lastly, there was no significant relationship between faculty assessments of innovative management practices and students' value conceptions, which also resulted in the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, several recommendations were made for various stakeholders. University administrators were advised to incorporate faculty perspectives on leadership, vision, technology integration, student engagement, and collaboration when designing marketing programs to ensure effective communication and strategy implementation. For students, innovative management practices could enhance their educational experience by offering flexible course designs and personalised support, aligning with their core values. Teachers were encouraged to update their educational approaches and improve their teaching skills to maintain relevance and influence in a changing academic landscape. Alumni could use the study's results to strengthen their connection with their alma mater and foster mutually beneficial relationships. At the same time, industry partners were urged to deepen collaboration with universities to benefit from talent development, innovation, and social responsibility initiatives. Finally, the Education Commission could leverage the study's findings to inform policy decisions and foster innovative education quality.

REFERENCES

[1]. Brown, A. (2020). *Marketing higher education: The role of targeted strategies in shaping student values*. Journal of Marketing in Education, 45(2), 123–135.

[2]. Brown, A., & Williams, C. (2019). Effective Communication Strategies for Marketing Plan Implementation. Marketing Research Quarterly, 25(3), 78–91.

[3]. Brown, R., & Lee, S. (2018). "The Impact of Teaching Experience on Faculty Performance: An Empirical Study." Journal of Educational Research, 110(4), 567–582.

[4]. Calderon, J., & Gonzalez, P. (2016). *Descriptive research methods in educational studies*. Journal of Educational Research, 12(2), 125-134.

[5]. Chen, X. (2021). *Innovation management in organisational leadership and adaptation*. Journal of Business Innovation, 45(3), 231–247.

[6]. Cui Mingzhe, (2023). Research on System Governance of Higher Education Projects Based on "Organization Power Resources", DOI:

[7]. Fu, Y. (2018). *The theory of value conception in education explores intrinsic and evaluative aspects*. Educational Philosophy Review, 32(2), 119–135.
[8]. Gao Xinfeng, Bai Yunqi, Chen Li, Zheng Qinhua The path and direction of the Internet to promote the innovation of educational service models -- Theoretical and policy research on the innovative development of "Internet plus education" (III) [J] Research on Electrified Education 2022 (04).
[9]. Garcia, M., & Martinez, J. (2019). "The Role of Department Affiliation in Faculty Performance: An Empirical Study." Journal of Academic Administration, 25(4), 567-582.
[10]. Jones, C., & Williams, D. (2019). "The Role of Educational Background in Faculty Performance: A Qualitative Analysis." Journal of Educational Administration, 45(3), 321–335.
[11]. Jones, M., Lee, S., & Kim, Y. (2022). The role of transformational leadership in fostering innovation in higher education. Journal of Leadership Education, 19(1), 17–35.
[12]. Kyndt, E., Gijbels, D., Grosemans, I., & Donche, V. (2020). Teachers' everyday professional development: Mapping informal learning activities, antecedents, and learning outcomes. Teaching and Teacher Education, 92, 1-15.
[13]. Li, J. (2020). *Marketing plans and consumer behaviour: Insights for universities*. Journal of Educational Marketing, 18(4), 205–220.
[14]. Li, X. (2020). *The knowledge economy and the market-oriented university education system*. Higher Education Management, 56(1), 78–89.
[15]. Li, Y. (2022). *Innovation management in universities: Strategies and challenges*. Higher Education Innovation, 30(1), 50–65.
[16]. [17] Liu Yang, (2021). Research on influencing Factors and Mechanism of Innovation Management Practice, Science Press, 187–196.
[17]. [18] Liu, D. (2021). *Student values and innovation: Enhancing educational practices*. Journal of Educational Theory, 28(1), 112–130.
[18]. Scott, J. T., & Morrison, M. A. (2018). "Educational background and career success: A longitudinal study." Journal of Vocational Behavior, pp. 92, 135–148.
[19]. Smith, A., & Johnson, B. (2021). "The Influence of Major on Career Development: A Review." Journal of Career Development, 48(3), 321–335.
[20]. Smith, J. (2019). *The impact of teacher evaluation on student values in higher education*. Journal of Educational Research, 67(4), 345–359.
[21]. Smith, J., Johnson, L., & Davis, K. (2021). Leadership for innovation in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. Jossey-Bass. [pp. 34–47]
[22]. Stagor, C., & Walinga, J. (2019). *Research design and methods for behavioural studies*. Academic Press.
[23]. Wang, H. (2021). *Developments in student development theory and its educational applications*. Journal of Educational Development, 39(5), 415–429.
[24]. Wang, Y., & Johnson, H. (2022). *Marketing strategies for higher education institutions: Enhancing brand influence and student outcomes*. International Journal of Educational Development, 28(3), 410-422.
[25]. Zhang Lili, (2020). University Innovation Management Practice: Coping with the Challenges of the New Economic Environment, Higher Education Press, 75–85.
[26]. Zhang Wei, (2020). "Deep Integration: Research on Interdisciplinary Integration within World Class Universities", Zhejiang University Press.
[27]. Zhang, Y. (2021). *Innovative management practices in higher education: Responding to global challenges*. Global Education Review, 39(5), 540–550.
[28]. Zhang, Y., & Chen, L. (2021). *The role of marketing in enhancing university competitiveness and attracting students*. Journal of Higher Education Marketing, 33(2), 178–193.
[29]. Zhiqiang, L. (2021). *Innovation in university management and development opportunities*. Journal of Educational Administration, 48(6), 102–115.
[30]. Zivkovic, D., Jeremic, V., & Boskovic, D. (2019). Building a sustainable organisational culture: A case of educational institutions. Sustainability, 11(8), 2345.