

Investigation and Research Report on the Integrity of “Micro-Power” Operation in the Student Union of the School of Foreign Languages and Cultures

Zhang Jian

Date of Submission: 09-07-2026

Date of acceptance: 20-07-2026

I. Research Background and Objectives

Background: To implement the requirements for integrity culture construction in higher education institutions, promote the healthy development of student union organizations, and enhance the integrity self-discipline awareness and service effectiveness of student backbone members, this specialized investigation and research is hereby organized and conducted.

Objectives:

1. Clarify the current status: Systematically review the institutional procedures and actual operations of the School of Foreign Languages and Cultures' student union in personnel selection, activity approval, fund management, material usage, award evaluation, and information disclosure.
2. Identify risks: From the perspective of “micro-power” operation, proactively identify potential procedural loopholes, insufficient transparency, or links with integrity risks.
3. Collect opinions: Understand the views and suggestions of the general student body regarding student union work, particularly concerning rights allocation and resource utilization.
4. Promote standardization: Based on research findings, formulate institutionalized and standardized improvement recommendations to advance more open, fair, and equitable student union operations and enhance organizational credibility.
5. Self-education: Through participation in the research process, deepen student union cadres' understanding of the nature of power, boundaries of responsibility, and integrity requirements, achieving the goal of “learning through research and improving through self-examination.”

II. Core Research Questions

Institutional Level: Are the student union's various rules and regulations sound, clear, and easily accessible? Are key procedures (such as reimbursement, procurement, and selection) explicitly standardized and effectively implemented?

Operational Level: In actual work, is the exercise of “micro-power” (such as quota allocation, preliminary review and recommendation, and small-value procurement) strictly conducted in accordance with institutional provisions? Is there arbitrariness?

Supervisory Level: What is the transparency of student union work, particularly regarding financial matters and decision-making? Have effective internal supervision and external (student) feedback channels been established?

Perceptual Level: How do ordinary students perceive the fairness and impartiality of student cadres' exercise of power? What are their primary concerns?

III. Research Methods and Steps

Phase One: Preparation and Initiation (approximately 1–2 weeks)

Establish a core research team: Led by the presidium of the university (school) student union, with backbone members drawn from various departments, and 1–2 ordinary student representatives concerned with student union construction may be invited to participate.

Convene an initiation and training meeting:

Clarify significance: Elucidate that the purpose of self-examination research lies in “promoting development, preventing risks, and enhancing trust,” rather than accountability.

Introduction to research methods: Briefly explain methods such as textual analysis, questionnaire surveys, interviews, and case review.

Emphasis on ethics and confidentiality: Stress the objectivity of the research process, the principle of anonymity and confidentiality in interviews, and that data will be used solely for work improvement.

Phase Two: Data Collection (approximately 2–3 weeks)

Institutional Text Collection and Analysis (led by the Office, with assistance from all departments):

Comprehensively collect the charters, management regulations, and work rules of this student union and its subordinate departments.

Produce a “Checklist of Regulations and Core Procedure Comparison Table,” with key nodes of power operation highlighted.

Anonymous Questionnaire Survey (designed by the Academic Affairs Department, with promotion assisted by all cadres):

Design the questionnaire: “Anonymous Survey on Student Union Work Transparency and Fairness.”

Key content points: satisfaction with various services, understanding of institutional procedures, evaluation of cadre conduct, demands for information disclosure, willingness and channels for feedback when encountering problems, etc.

Distribution targets: all students in the school, disseminated extensively through official channels.

In-depth Internal Interviews and Symposia (organized by the Organization Department):

Interview subjects: student cadres from different departments and positions (department heads and staff members) selected for one-on-one or group interviews.

Interview outline: focusing on confusions encountered in actual work, perceived unreasonable procedures, views on internal supervision mechanisms, and suggestions for enhancing organizational integrity.

External symposiums: small-scale symposia may be held with class committee members and ordinary student representatives to gather external perspectives.

Typical Case Review (led by the Publicity Department):

Review specific events from the past academic year that were controversial or attracted high attention (such as a particular award evaluation, procurement item, or activity arrangement). Without involving specific individuals, review and map out the process and analyze optimizable links.

Phase Three: Data Analysis and Report Writing (responsibility of the Academic Affairs Department)

Data Organization:

Conduct simple percentage statistics on questionnaire data and categorize major opinions.

Synthesize key points and extract themes from interview and symposium records.

Integrate results from institutional analysis and case review.

Report Writing:

Title: Research Report on the Self-Examination of “Micro-Power” Operation by the Student Union of [XX] School

Structure:

I. Research Overview (background, methods, and process)

II. Major Findings (presenting objective findings across four dimensions—institutional, operational, supervisory, and perceptual—with extensive use of data and supportive descriptions)

III. Identified Major Risks and Opportunities for Improvement (listed in a constructive manner)

IV. Specific Improvement Recommendations and Action Plans (highly targeted, with clearly designated responsible departments and timelines)

V. Appendices (questionnaire samples, interview outline summaries, etc.)

Phase Four: Application of Findings and Feedback (ongoing)

Internal Notification and Discussion: Submit the research report to the plenary meeting of student union cadres for discussion and consensus formation.

Formulation of Improvement Plans: Based on the report, revise relevant regulations, optimize key procedures, and establish or improve information disclosure platforms (such as regular publication of financial summaries and important decisions).

Feedback to Students: Through announcements and push notifications, provide a summary to all students in the school regarding core problems identified through self-examination and forthcoming improvement measures, demonstrating a responsible attitude.

Establishment of Long-Term Mechanisms: It is recommended that such self-examination research be institutionalized as a standing task of the student union, conducted regularly every 1–2 years, to foster a culture of continuous self-renewal.

V. Expected Outcomes

A comprehensive self-examination research report.

A set of revised and improved student union work regulations and procedures.

An enhanced information disclosure and communication mechanism.

A profound collective integrity education and competence development experience for student union cadres.

Significantly enhanced student trust in and satisfaction with the student union.

VI. Precautions

Maintain proper mindset: Self-examination is for better development; an open, candid, and responsible attitude should be maintained.

Objective documentation: Ensure that collected information is authentic and comprehensive, avoiding subjective filtering.

Promote rectification: The value of research lies in improvement; the core team must continuously promote the implementation of recommendations.