

## Research on the Construction Path of Academic Communities in University Think Tanks: A Post-print Analysis Based on the Development Experience of 6 National High-End University Think Tanks

**Authors:** Fang Ying

**Date:** 2017-10-27T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

**Abstract:** [Purpose/Significance] In the context of China's higher education reform and development, the construction of university think tank academic communities provides a "testing ground" for the return of "universities as academic communities." A university think tank academic community refers to an academic community that, by leveraging the advantages of disciplinary accumulation and talent concentration in universities, brings together faculty and researchers from diverse disciplinary fields, integrates basic and applied research, and conducts interdisciplinary policy research and talent cultivation oriented toward national, regional, and industry development strategic issues and practical problems. It is characterized by four features: relative independence, practical relevance, interdisciplinary nature, and educational function. [Method/Process] This study analyzes the construction paths of university think tanks using the construction experience of six first-batch national high-end university think tanks as case studies, conducting in-depth examination of governance structure, research agenda, disciplinary domains, and talent cultivation. [Result/Conclusion] Through establishing governance structures dominated by academic power, conducting policy consulting research focused on real-world issues, engaging in interdisciplinary research and dialogue with society, and implementing talent cultivation and other construction paths, university think tanks have successfully built university think tank academic communities and provided a "testing ground" for the return of universities as academic communities.

## Full Text

### Preamble

#### Research on the Construction Path of the Academic Community of University-affiliated Think Tanks

—An Analysis Based on the Experience of Six National High-end University-affiliated Think Tanks

Fang Ying

Research Department, Shanghai Customs College, Shanghai 201204

### Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Amidst the reform and development of higher education in China, the construction of university-affiliated think tank academic communities offers a “testing ground” for universities to return to their essence as academic communities. A university-affiliated think tank academic community is an academic entity that draws upon universities’ disciplinary foundations and concentrated talent pools, assembling faculty and researchers from diverse fields to conduct interdisciplinary policy research and cultivate talent, oriented toward strategic and practical issues at the national, regional, and industry levels, while integrating basic and applied research. It is characterized by four attributes: relative independence, practical relevance, interdisciplinarity, and educational commitment. [Method/Process] This study examines the construction pathways of university-affiliated think tanks through an in-depth analysis of six first-batch national high-end university-affiliated think tanks, focusing on governance structures, research agendas, disciplinary domains, and talent cultivation mechanisms. [Result/Conclusion] By establishing governance structures dominated by academic power, conducting decision-making consultation research focused on real-world problems, promoting interdisciplinary research and societal dialogue, and implementing integrated talent cultivation, these think tanks have successfully forged university-affiliated think tank academic communities, thereby providing a “testing ground” for the return of universities as genuine academic communities.

**Keywords:** university-affiliated think tank; academic community; academic power; construction path

As an important component of new-type think tanks with Chinese characteristics, university-affiliated think tanks leverage their disciplinary foundations and talent concentration to play an irreplaceable role. In 2015, the General Office of the CPC Central Committee and the State Council issued the *Opinions on Strengthening the Construction of New-Type Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics*, which called for “deepening the reform of university-affiliated think tank management systems, innovating organizational forms, integrating high-quality resources, and focusing on building a batch of new-type think tanks that the Party and government can trust and utilize.” Against this favorable pol-

icy backdrop, the construction of university-affiliated think tanks has entered a new stage of development.

Alongside the vigorous development of university-affiliated think tanks, research on these institutions has gradually become an important academic topic, particularly at the micro-level, yielding fruitful empirical studies. These include comparative studies of foreign university-affiliated think tanks, research on their developmental positioning, studies on construction pathways for new-type university-affiliated think tanks with Chinese characteristics, and typological research. Scholarly reflections on the “think tank fever” phenomenon have also emerged. Some researchers argue that think tank construction must properly handle its relationship with universities’ core functions—talent cultivation, scientific research, social service, and cultural inheritance. Others express concerns about potential “motivational deviations” toward fame and profit, “action deviations” of reckless expansion, and “evaluation deviations” of armchair theorizing. Some even contend that universities running think tanks may be “overheating” and represents a misalignment of university priorities.

How should we understand the significance of university-affiliated think tank construction within the context of China’ s higher education reform and development? What should be the central focus of such construction? These questions require further reflection and exploration.

To address these issues, this paper proposes the concept of the “university-affiliated think tank academic community” to conduct an in-depth analysis of university-affiliated think tanks. First, based on a review and synthesis of relevant research on “university academic communities,” it proposes the concept and characteristics of the “university-affiliated think tank academic community.” Second, it analyzes the construction pathways of these communities, arguing that their development provides a “testing ground” for universities to return to their status as academic communities. Third, from the perspective of the “university-affiliated think tank academic community,” it conducts an in-depth analysis of the successful experiences of six first-batch national high-end university-affiliated think tanks. This paper argues that these six institutions have successfully constructed university-affiliated think tank academic communities that demonstrate academic power, providing valuable experience for the development of university-affiliated think tanks in China.

## 2. The University as an “Academic Community”

**Author Bio:** Fang Ying (ORCID: 0000-0003-0000-3511), Assistant Researcher, Research Department, Shanghai Customs College; Ph.D. Candidate. E-mail: fangyingscc@126.com.

In recent years, alongside the deepening of China’ s higher education reform and the call to “accelerate the establishment of a modern university system with Chinese characteristics,” voices advocating for universities to return to their essence as academic communities have grown stronger. Most researchers believe

that, in essence, a university is an academic community. Analyses of the origins and development of Western universities reveal that medieval universities initially gained autonomy precisely through their identity as academic communities. However, as times have changed, universities as “academic communities” have gradually been lost, primarily for two reasons: first, the deepening institutionalization of disciplines has created disciplinary barriers, leading to loose academic organizational structures and the fragmentation of academic power; second, the proliferation of administrative power has accelerated the disintegration of the university academic community.

Researchers argue that only by constructing a governance structure centered on academic power, strengthening the service functions of university administrative power, giving full play to the leading role of academic committees, coordinating the relationship between administrative and academic power, and highlighting academic logic can universities return to their status as academic communities.

## 2.1 The Connotation of the University Academic Community

The concept of “community” was first proposed by German scholar Ferdinand Tönnies, who stated that “wherever people are organically united and mutually affirmed by their wills, there is always a community in one form or another.”

Universities exist in the form of a community. As Karl Jaspers noted: “If one word were to be used to describe the unique methods by which universities carry out their multiple tasks of teaching, research, and service, that word would be ‘community’.” Academic nature is the essential attribute of universities. “A university is essentially a place for scholarship,” and “university training should be exploration at the edge of the unknown, and even in known fields, it should embody a spirit of doubt and exploration.” Fundamentally, a university is an academic community.

Talent cultivation, scientific research, and social service are widely recognized as the three major functions of universities. From the perspective of the “academic community,” all three functions are carried out within the “university academic community,” and they are not separate but rather intrinsically and profoundly connected.

First, talent cultivation is conducted through scientific research. The university academic community includes not only faculty but also students. Talent cultivation takes place within a “teacher-student academic community,” where instructors not only impart existing knowledge but also inspire students to explore unknown fields. Scientific research plays a crucial role in talent cultivation. As early as the early 19th century, Humboldt, who was instrumental in founding the University of Berlin, proposed the principle of “teaching through research.” The fundamental principle of integrating research and teaching is manifested not only in using research as a primary pathway for cultivating students but also in making the teaching process itself a research process, thereby turning teaching into a means of promoting research.

Second, social service is delivered through scientific research. Researchers point out that universities' social service and problem-solving capabilities rely on their academic resources and disciplinary advantages—their core competitiveness. Universities should step out of the “ivory tower” but not abandon it; rather, while continuously preserving and elevating the “ivory tower,” they should transform its spirit into the material and spiritual civilization of real society. In other words, by paying close attention to real-world social problems, universities translate the practical challenges and unknown issues encountered in social development into “academic questions,” which they then address through scientific research within the academic community, leveraging disciplinary resources to contribute academically and serve social development.

Third, talent cultivation must align with social needs. University talent cultivation is discipline-based. Disciplines, on the one hand, draw nourishment from academic fields, and on the other hand, adjust and reform according to changes in social demand. In essence, disciplines connect academic fields with social needs at both ends. This means that talent cultivation within the university academic community must also enhance its alignment with social needs through continuous dialogue and exchange between the academic community and society.

Based on the above discussion, we can grasp the concept of the “university academic community” as follows: It is an academic community composed of faculty and students, oriented toward meeting the needs of society and future development, relying on disciplinary resources to create new knowledge, cultivate talent, and seek truth.

## 2.2 Characteristics of the University Academic Community

Through a review of literature on university academic communities, we have identified the following characteristics:

First, independence, autonomy, and academic freedom. As an academic community, a university should make judgments and take actions within the scope of professional self-discipline. Academic freedom is both the working method of the university academic community and a necessary guarantee for its independent engagement in academic research. However, due to administrative intervention in university autonomy and the proliferation of administrative power within universities, genuine independence, autonomy, and academic freedom have not been effectively guaranteed.

Second, conducting dialogue and exchange between disciplines. The sociology of knowledge demonstrates that science is established through a process of negotiation—that is, through the interpretation of cultural resources in social interaction. Within the university academic community, faculty and researchers drive disciplines to find new vitality and growth points and promote knowledge innovation and development through full dialogue. However, disciplinary differentiation in universities has created fragmentation, resulting in 隔膜 (barriers)

and chasms in internal academic communication.

Third, conducting talent cultivation within the academic community. Within the university academic community, faculty and students construct knowledge and grow together through interaction and collaborative research. On the one hand, instructors discover new problems in the teaching process, thereby advancing scientific research; on the other hand, they share research thinking and the latest findings with students, inspiring innovative thinking. However, the dominance of administrative power and the quantitative, external, administration-led evaluation system for research achievements have led to a disconnect between teaching and research in the university academic community, with research being prioritized over teaching.

Existing literature and the above discussion present a fundamental proposition: From a normative perspective, universities exist as academic communities where talent cultivation, scientific research, and social service are carried out, and these three functions should be organically connected. However, from an empirical perspective, the university academic community has been lost, primarily manifested in three aspects: first, university independence, autonomy, and academic freedom are not guaranteed; second, exchange and dialogue between disciplines are extremely lacking; and third, there is a disconnect between teaching and research, with research' s role in talent cultivation being diminished.

We now further explore the significance of university-affiliated think tank construction for the university academic community. We argue that by constructing university-affiliated think tank academic communities, think tanks provide a “testing ground” for universities to return to their status as academic communities.

### **3. The University-affiliated Think Tank Academic Community**

#### **3.1 Connotation and Characteristics**

From the perspective of academic communities, we can define the university-affiliated think tank academic community as an academic entity that leverages universities' disciplinary foundations and talent concentration, assembling faculty and researchers from different fields to conduct interdisciplinary policy research and talent cultivation oriented toward national, regional, and industry development strategic issues and practical problems, while integrating basic and applied research.

The university-affiliated think tank academic community has four characteristics:

First, relative independence. Relative independence is a crucial feature and fundamental value of think tanks. University-affiliated think tanks also possess “relative independence” due to their general think tank characteristics and ad-

herence to the tradition of university academic autonomy. Furthermore, only by safeguarding this “relative independence” can university-affiliated think tank academic communities uphold academic values and research principles, providing relatively independent research findings, new ideas, and knowledge to government and society.

Second, practical relevance. Practical relevance is the expression through which university-affiliated think tanks demonstrate their social service function. Based on the shared value orientation of university intellectuals’ “patriotic sentiment,” these communities maintain high attention to real-world issues. On the one hand, they closely monitor strategic issues and urgent problems in national, regional, or industry development, actively engaging in exchange and dialogue “outside the ivory tower.” On the other hand, they transform practical problems into academic questions and, relying on universities’ unique disciplinary and talent advantages, provide specialized, high-quality research products for national, regional, or industry needs.

Third, interdisciplinarity. Interdisciplinarity is manifested in both interdisciplinary research and interdisciplinary dialogue. On the one hand, it involves boundary-crossing research to solve complex real-world problems. This research is oriented toward practical issues and represents innovation based on the integration of disciplinary knowledge and research paradigms. As noted, “the rise and development of interdisciplinary research is mainly driven by two forces: the emergence of comprehensive theories and the need to solve complex real-world problems, with the latter being the soul and vitality of interdisciplinary research.” The issues addressed by university-affiliated think tank academic communities lie “outside the ivory tower,” exhibiting comprehensive and complex characteristics that cannot be resolved through single-discipline research, necessitating interdisciplinary approaches. On the other hand, it involves active dialogue and exchange from different disciplinary perspectives focused on real-world problems, helping to break down disciplinary barriers and promote collision and integration.

Fourth, educational commitment. The educational function reflects the inherent requirement of universities’ talent cultivation mission. Faculty and researchers in university-affiliated think tank academic communities typically also bear teaching responsibilities. Beyond conducting scientific and policy research, they integrate research and teaching to correct the disconnect between these functions. On the one hand, through teaching, they impart research methods, thinking paradigms, and findings to students, subtly influencing them with the think tank’ s focus on major real-world issues and its sense of national responsibility. On the other hand, they achieve “teaching and learning from each other,” further discovering and refining research questions through student inquiries to advance think tank research.

### 3.2 Relationship with the University Academic Community

From a normative perspective, the university-affiliated think tank academic community and the university academic community share the same fundamental spirit in three ways:

First, both take academic nature as their essential attribute. Whether university academic communities or university-affiliated think tank academic communities, both fundamentally shoulder the mission of knowledge production, innovation, and dissemination.

Second, both maintain practical relevance. Serving society is one of the three major functions of university academic communities. Universities bear the responsibility and mission of social service and should integrate this concept into talent cultivation and scientific research, serving society through knowledge innovation and talent development. University-affiliated think tank academic communities should consistently pay close attention to real-world problems and policy issues, constructing a positive interaction between knowledge production and social service.

Third, both emphasize interdisciplinary exchange and dialogue. Promoting dialogue between disciplines to generate new knowledge through exchange, negotiation, and interaction is inherent to university academic communities. Interdisciplinary exchange and dialogue are also essential paths for university-affiliated think tank academic communities to conduct research serving real-world problems and provide solutions, forming a solid foundation for practical policy research.

From an empirical perspective, due to the proliferation of administrative power and disciplinary barriers resulting from disciplinary institutionalization, the university academic community has increasingly been lost. The construction of university-affiliated think tank academic communities, however, provides a “testing ground” for universities to return to their status as academic communities.

Despite these commonalities, there are several differences:

First, regarding academic nature, university academic communities emphasize theoretical innovation and the pursuit of “profound scholarship,” while university-affiliated think tank academic communities focus more on providing solutions to practical problems.

Second, regarding practical relevance, university academic communities’ concern for reality emphasizes long-term attention to social reality and development, whereas university-affiliated think tank academic communities particularly stress immediate attention and timely response to current issues.

Third, regarding interdisciplinary exchange, university academic communities advocate interdisciplinary dialogue to break down barriers and promote knowledge production and innovation. For university-affiliated think tank academic communities, interdisciplinary exchange and research are urgent requirements

—only through such approaches can they provide solutions to comprehensive real-world problems.

### 3.3 Construction Paths

Based on the characteristics of university-affiliated think tank academic communities, we can identify the following construction pathways:

First, establishing governance structures dominated by academic power. To safeguard “relative independence,” these communities must construct governance structures where academic power is dominant and administrative power serves academic power. Only when university-affiliated think tank academic communities establish such governance structures can they ensure that internal talent cultivation, research teams, research organization, evaluation, and resource allocation are all determined by academic power.

Second, conducting decision-making consultation research oriented toward practical problems. These communities must leverage their disciplinary strengths to closely monitor real-world issues in national and social development. On the one hand, they should conduct targeted research on strategic and practical problems at the national, regional, or industry levels, forming new policy ideas and becoming “incubators” of policy thought. On the other hand, they should develop effective policy recommendations, providing decision-makers with alternative solutions and operational measures.

Third, conducting interdisciplinary research that synthesizes multidisciplinary knowledge. American scholar Michael Gibbons and colleagues identify two modes of knowledge production: Mode 1 is based on single disciplines, innovating disciplinary knowledge with the notable characteristic of separating theoretical research-oriented single-discipline knowledge production from application; Mode 2 involves transforming existing knowledge for new contexts through interdisciplinary collaboration, characterized by problem-oriented integration of interdisciplinary knowledge production and application. University-affiliated think tank academic communities engage in problem-oriented research, inevitably requiring interdisciplinary knowledge integration and collaborative research. Therefore, they must comprise faculty and researchers from different disciplines who focus on specific problems to promote interdisciplinary research and exchange.

Fourth, implementing interdisciplinary talent cultivation. University-affiliated think tank academic communities bear responsibilities for both think tank research and talent cultivation. By integrating interdisciplinary research with interdisciplinary teaching, they cultivate urgently needed interdisciplinary talent for society. Through scenario-based settings and case teaching, they develop students’ comprehensive abilities. This interdisciplinary approach to talent cultivation also adapts to future social development needs.

In December 2015, the first batch of national high-end think tank pilot units

was announced, with 25 think tanks selected nationwide, including six university-affiliated think tanks: the National School of Development at Peking University, the Institute for Contemporary China Studies at Tsinghua University, the National Academy of Development and Strategy at Renmin University of China, the China Institute at Fudan University, the Institute of International Law at Wuhan University, and the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Development Research Institute at Sun Yat-sen University.

The practice of national high-end university-affiliated think tank construction has benchmark value and inspirational significance. Through in-depth analysis of these six think tanks, we conclude that they have successfully constructed university-affiliated think tank academic communities that demonstrate academic power, providing valuable references for think tank construction and development in China.

#### **4.1 Academic Committee Construction Guided by “Professor-led Governance”**

The six national high-end university-affiliated think tanks have strengthened academic committee construction guided by the principle of “professor-led governance,” ensuring overall coordination and relative autonomy in academic affairs such as research organization, faculty appointment, and fund allocation, thereby providing institutional guarantees for building academic communities that demonstrate academic power. For example, the National School of Development at Peking University embodies the institutional spirit of “professor-governed school” that integrates democracy and inclusiveness, with academic committee authority covering all academic-related rules and regulations, including curriculum design, talent cultivation programs, and faculty evaluation mechanisms. The National Academy of Development and Strategy at Renmin University has eliminated tenure in faculty appointments, allocating personnel, funds, and other research conditions on a project basis and continuously adjusting them according to research needs and quality. Sun Yat-sen University has formulated the *Sun Yat-sen University High-end Think Tank Construction Plan* and the *Sun Yat-sen University Implementation Plan for Strengthening Decision-making Research* to promote institutional construction and mechanism guarantees for its high-end think tanks.

#### **4.2 Focus on Major Strategic Issues of National Urgency**

As “pacesetters” and “demonstrators” among new-type think tanks with Chinese characteristics, national high-end think tanks emphasize “national urgency, distinctive features, institutional innovation, and leading development,” making it imperative to focus on major national strategic issues. All six think tanks have accurately identified hot-button and frontier issues in China’s reform and development process, conducting forward-looking research based on their existing disciplinary characteristics and strengths. For instance, the National School of Development at Peking University, centered on China’s reform process and

leveraging its advantages in economics and management, has forward-looking proposed numerous major strategies, institutions, and policies on issues ranging from early rural land reform and exposure of “rat trading” to state-owned enterprise reform, telecommunications reform, healthcare reform, and urbanization plans, achieving significant influence. The Institute for Contemporary China Studies at Tsinghua University covers three research areas: global trends, national conditions, and regional situations. Its national conditions research examines China’s basic national conditions, the drivers and constraints of modernization, and the relationship between national conditions and development path selection. Its global trends research studies China’s development strategy in the context of globalization and China’s interaction with the world. Its regional situation research focuses on summarizing local innovation experiences and evaluating local development performance.

The six national high-end university-affiliated think tank communities have achieved fruitful results in interdisciplinary think tank research. They have promoted disciplinary dialogue and integration by focusing on national and regional practical needs while contributing to national and regional development through disciplinary synthesis. For example, the National School of Development at Peking University was renamed from the China Center for Economic Research, largely because its research questions could not be solved by economics alone; attention to economic issues also requires comprehensive perspectives and research paradigms from political science, sociology, and other disciplines. The Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Development Research Institute at Sun Yat-sen University has a long tradition of focusing on Hong Kong and Macao issues through interdisciplinary integration. Beyond in-depth interdisciplinary research and exchange, the six think tank academic communities have actively engaged in dialogue and exchange with government and society. The National School of Development at Peking University has created multiple think tank forum brands, including the “China Economic Outlook Forum,” “Peking University HSBC Economic Forum,” “CCER Forum,” and “Langrun • Gezheng Forum,” to dialogue with government, society, and media. The Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Development Research Institute at Sun Yat-sen University conducts collaborative research with the Hong Kong and Macao Research Institute of the Development Research Center of the State Council, the Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao Research Center of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, and leverages the role of Sun Yat-sen University’s Hong Kong and Macao alumni associations to engage in dialogue with academia and society.

All six national high-end university-affiliated think tanks are committed to conducting academic research, decision-making consultation, and talent cultivation within their academic communities. By integrating these three aspects, they create a mutually reinforcing dynamic. For example, the National School of Development at Peking University offers teaching programs covering multiple disciplines in economics and management, including master’s and doctoral programs in economics and the BiMBA program. The BiMBA program is the first Sino-foreign cooperative MBA program in China, training nearly 300 MBA and

EMBA students annually and delivering numerous senior management talents to the business sector.

For the National School of Development, these teaching programs not only help faculty obtain first-hand information about enterprises and cases for investigation and research but also partially solve funding issues for the think tank academic community, providing necessary material guarantees for independent research. The Institute for Contemporary China Studies at Tsinghua University integrates discipline construction, talent cultivation, and decision-making consultation, combining national conditions research, teaching, and think tank building. By involving postdoctoral fellows, doctoral students, and graduate students in national conditions research, it enhances students' comprehensive abilities and builds their academic and consulting foundations.

Ernest Boyer, former president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, insightfully pointed out that the greatest challenge facing American higher education is how universities can move from fragmentation to integration, and he believed the only feasible solution is to restore a series of connections within the university itself, including connections between disciplines. The six national high-end university-affiliated think tanks have created university-affiliated think tank academic communities by focusing on real-world problems, using interdisciplinary research as a pathway, and promoting the integration of teaching and research, thereby making possible the establishment of connections and dialogue between disciplines. The construction of these communities requires corresponding institutional guarantees—only by constructing governance structures that demonstrate academic power can genuine university-affiliated think tank academic communities be built, thereby promoting the organic integration of academic research, decision-making consultation, and talent cultivation.

As previously discussed, talent cultivation, scientific research, and social service are carried out within the university academic community, and the three should be organically connected. However, due to disciplinary differentiation, compartmentalization, and the proliferation of administrative power, the university academic community has gradually been “lost,” and the three functions have become disconnected. University-affiliated think tank construction is not only a reasonable extension of universities' three major functions but also, through the construction of think tank academic communities, makes possible the organic integration of these functions. In this sense, the construction of university-affiliated think tank academic communities provides a “testing ground” for the return of the university academic community.

It is particularly important to emphasize that problems exposed in the practice of university-affiliated think tank construction should not be equated with problems of think tanks themselves, nor should universities running think tanks be seen as the degeneration of the “ivory tower” or the utilitarianization of university social service. In fact, high-level think tank construction places very high demands on universities' disciplinary foundations, scientific research, and talent

cultivation. Moreover, the construction of problem-oriented university-affiliated think tank academic communities greatly benefits disciplinary integration and dialogue, innovation in talent cultivation models, and the integration of teaching and research.

## References

- [1] Du Baogui. Correctly Understanding Several Relationships in the Construction of University-affiliated Think Tanks in China[J]. Higher Education Management, 2014(2): 30-31.
- [2] Qin Huimin, Xie Shuiqing. Research on Related Issues and Countermeasures in the Construction of University-affiliated Think Tanks in China[J]. Chinese University Technology, 2014(4).
- [3] Wang Hongru. Are Universities Running Too Many Think Tanks? Criticized for Being Disconnected from National Needs and Problems[N]. China Economic Weekly, 2017-02-07(4-5).
- [4] Wang Chengkui. Chinese Universities: Looking Forward to the Return and Reshaping of the Academic Community[J]. Nanjing Social Sciences, 2009(8): 108.
- [5] Feng Xiangdong. The Practical Logic of University Academic Power[J]. Higher Education Research, 2010(4): 30-33.
- [6] Li Ligu. The Characteristics and Operating Mechanism of Academic Power[J]. Academics, 2004(1): 187-192.
- [7] Dong Yunchuan. On the Proliferation of University Administrative Power[J]. Higher Education Research, 2000(2): 63-67.
- [8] Qi ZhanYong. The Realistic Dilemma and Logical Direction of Academic Power-based Governance Structures in Higher Education Institutions[J]. Higher Education Research, 2011(2): 28.
- [9] Tönnies. Community and Society: Basic Concepts of Pure Sociology[M]. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2010: 58-65.
- [10] Karl Jaspers. The Idea of the University[M]. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2005: 19.
- [11] Abraham Flexner. The Modern University[M]. Translated by Xu Hui, Chen Xiaofei. Zhejiang: Zhejiang Education Press, 2001.
- [12] Hu Jianhua. University Scientific Research and Innovative Talent Cultivation[J]. Modern University Education, 2009(4): 1-4.
- [13] Ye Feifan. A Two-dimensional Model of University Grassroots Academic Organizations and Its Application[J]. China Higher Education Research, 2010(2): 60.

- [14] Michael Mulkey. Science and the Sociology of Knowledge[M]. Translated by Lin Juren, et al. Beijing: Oriental Press, 2001: 118.
- [15] Xu Jilin. Returning to the Intrinsic Value Scale of the Academic Community[J]. Journal of Tsinghua University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2014(4).
- [16] Jin Wulun. Introduction to Interdisciplinary Research[M]. Beijing: Central Compilation & Translation Press, 1997: 116.
- [17] Liu Min. Research on French University Governance Models and Autonomy Reform[M]. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press, 2015: 42.
- [18] Min Jie. Peking University National School of Development: Understanding China in Langrun Garden[EB/OL]. [2017-04-05]. <http://viewpoint.inewsweek.cn/detail-2729.html>.
- [19] Qu Yilin, Wang Simin, Yang Mi, et al. “China’ s Think Tank Construction Enters a New Era” : On the Occasion of the Launch of the National High-end Think Tank Construction Pilot Work[N]. Guangming Daily, 2015-12-3.
- [20] Min Jie. Peking University National School of Development: Understanding China in Langrun Garden[EB/OL]. [2017-04-05]. <http://viewpoint.inewsweek.cn/detail-2729.html>.
- [21] Hu Angang. New-type Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics[M]. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014: 67.
- [22] Official Website of Peking University National School of Development[EB/OL]. [2015-07-24]. <http://www.nsd.pku.edu.cn/index.html>.
- [23] Peking University National School of Development. Rational Social Construction and Public Enlightenment[EB/OL]. [2017-04-05]. <http://money.163.com/15/0429/19/AOD434RA002>
- [24] Hu Angang. New-type Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics[M]. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014: 25, 126.
- [25] Boyer. Lectures on American Education Reform[M]. Translated by Tu Yan, Fang Tong. Beijing: Educational Science Publishing House, 2002.

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: ChinaXiv –Machine translation. Verify with original.*