A Multidimensional Empirical Analysis of University Undergraduates' Satisfaction: A Case Study of BeiSe University in China

[1*]Lihong Chen   [2]Dongyun Chen   [3]Li Cheng
[1]Baise University [2]Hezhou University [3]Binzhou Polytechnic
[*]lihong503@qq.com

Abstract

Against the backdrop of the undergraduate teaching and educational assessment at BeiSe university in China, a satisfaction survey questionnaire developed by the Ministry of Education of China was employed to conduct a university undergraduate satisfaction survey at BeiSe university. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS software. In order to understand students' needs for school teaching resources, teacher instruction, communication and collaboration, and skills enhancement, and to improve teaching quality. The results show that: 1. There are significant differences in overall satisfaction and gender in five dimensions. females' evaluation of each variable is higher than that of males. 2. Different grades have significant differences in five dimensions of university education and teaching, and the evaluation of higher students is higher than those of lower grades. 3. students with different scores have significant differences in five dimensions of university education and teaching, and the evaluation of the higher score students is lower than those with poor academic performance. 4. Different dimensions of satisfaction evaluation are related to the overall satisfaction of the university, and there is a positive linear relationship.

1. Introduction

With the increasing scale of higher education in China, the total number of higher education students exceed 44.3 million by 2020. At the same time, the higher education enrollment rate has increased from 30 percent in 2012 to 57.8 percent in 2021, achieving a historic leap. With the expansion of the scale of China's higher education, students have more choices to enroll, which brings some difficulty to the enrollment of universities(The Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2020). Therefore, universities constantly innovate in the mode of education, school-running mode, management system, guarantee mechanism and other aspects.

Higher education is increasingly recognizing it as a service industry with more emphasis on meeting student expectations and needs (Cheng & Tam, 1997). Students are no longer regarded as simple learners, believing that students are the consumers of school services, and consumers have a great say in a good product. Therefore, the measurement of student satisfaction can test the quality of school education management. In addition, the quality of higher education is also related to the growth of students. The effectiveness of higher education

services is very important in the 21st century, and higher authorities are increasingly willing to understand students' expectations, academic preferences and their views on the quality of the educational environment. So the study proposes that universities are providing educational services according to students' needs and requirements.

Numerous studies show that student satisfaction directly affects the public image and reputation of schools (Ijazet al., 2011). The education satisfying the people reflects the people-centered government philosophy of the Party and the government, which has appeared in many places in the party Congress reports and government work reports in recent years, and has become an important value orientation and goal for the development of education in China. Student satisfaction is the basis and premise of people's satisfaction education, and is an important measure of the quality of education. The satisfaction survey of higher education directly reflects the students' satisfaction with the teaching management of university education, and also reflects the implementation of the national macro higher education management policy from the side. It is an important way and tool for the quality guarantee and improvement of higher education, and the evaluation of the policy effect(Kanwar & Sanjeeva, 2022).

University students are satisfied or not satisfied with the school education, how the satisfaction degree, which aspects are satisfied and not satisfied, and how the satisfaction appears all affect the quality of school education and teaching, in order to improve the teaching quality and realize the connotation development, it is very necessary to carry out the satisfaction survey of students.

According to Hunt (1977), satisfaction is the evaluation of the whole service process and outcome experience after purchase. It is a state that has reached or exceeded emotional reactions, consumer requirements, wishes and expectations that have been met or exceeded in the process of service experience. Student satisfaction is the application of customer satisfaction to students and schools, which is the expectation of students with different educational backgrounds and experiences for effective learning and achieving career goals (Elliott & Healy, 2001).

Student satisfaction refers to the degree of subjective evaluation of various outcomes and experiences related to education (Oliver & DeSarbo, 1989). Furthermore, the campus environment appears to be an interconnected network of experiences that overlap and influenced overall student satisfaction. What happens to a student in the classroom is not only experiences related to campus life. De Oliveira Santini et al. (2017) found that global satisfaction with the university was driven by student assessment of course quality and other course-related factors relevant to the university. The research also concluded that the possibility of students recommending universities to friends and relatives largely implied the degree of interaction between students and university staff. To study the evaluation of students' satisfaction with schools, it is beneficial to improve the quality of education. Understanding students' satisfaction with the school can help educators find the problems and deficiencies in the process of education, so as to take corresponding measures to improve the quality of education. The second is to promote the development of students. Students' satisfaction with the school is closely related to their learning motivation, academic performance and mental

health. Research shows that students with higher satisfaction tend to have higher learning motivation and better academic performance. In addition, students with higher satisfaction are more likely to maintain a positive attitude in the face of frustration and stress, which is conducive to their mental health. Third, to improve the reputation of the school. Students' satisfaction with the school is an important indicator to measure the quality of school education and service level. Schools with higher satisfaction tend to attract more excellent teachers and students and improve the reputation and competitiveness of the schools. Fourth, to optimize the allocation of resources through the study of students' satisfaction with the school, educators can learn which resources and services are welcomed by students, and which resources and services need to be improved or increased. This helps schools to allocate resources reasonably and improve the efficiency of resource utilization. Fifth, it provides a basis for policy formulation. The study of students' school satisfaction can provide a basis for the government and education departments to formulate relevant policies. For example, the government can adjust the education input and improve the school hardware facilities according to the research results; the education department can adjust the curriculum according to the research results to meet the needs of students.

Moreover, researchers contend that individual factors also contribute to satisfaction. Individual factors include age, gender, employment status, preferred learning method, and student GPA, while institutional factors encompass the quality of teaching, timeliness of teacher feedback, clarity of expectations, and teaching style(Appleton-Knapp & Krentler ,2006).

In short, the study of students' satisfaction with schools is of great significance to improving the quality of education, promoting the development of students, improving the reputation of schools, optimizing the allocation of resources, and providing the basis for policy making.

The survey of university satisfaction has been widely paid attention to and implemented at home and abroad, especially in some developed countries such as the UK and the United States, which has become an important index and reference basis for universities to evaluate and improve the service quality of higher education. In 1993, the United States established the "college Student Survey" measurement index system. In 1994, the United States conducted the first nationwide student satisfaction survey. Subsequently, different educational institutions in the United States conducted 13 surveys. The United States has formed a management model based on the student satisfaction survey to improve the quality of teaching by changing the student satisfaction. In 1995, the first student satisfaction inventory (SSI) scale to measure student satisfaction was designed by Laur and Stephanie. The measures of the scale include: campus atmosphere, campus support services, personal attention, education effectiveness, security, service quality, academic service, campus life and other contents. In 2006, the UK conducted the widest range of student satisfaction survey, involving more than 279,000 students (Yang, 2008). In addition, many universities in the UK organize self-assessment in order to better identify and solve problems, and to improve the quality of teaching services.

Although the introduction of satisfaction surveys in China started relatively late, higher education institutions are increasingly aware of the importance of conducting student satisfaction surveys for school management, and many scholars are also keen on this research. For example, some studies have developed questionnaires, investigating the service satisfaction of university students in China; Chen and Zhang (2019) focus on the measurement and influencing factors of university student satisfaction, via the empirical data and Herzberg's two-factor theory, which has examined the association between relevant variables and student self-reporting ability development and student institution satisfaction; The China Higher Education Research Group implemented the third round of national Higher Education satisfaction survey in 2021, which fully reflects the implementation of the macro-policy of higher education; In 2021, the Ministry of Education issued the Implementation Plan for the Examination and Evaluation of Undergraduate Education and Teaching in Regular Institutions of Higher Learning (2021-2025) (namely "Examination and Evaluation"). The program represents an indicator of students (postgraduates and undergraduates) satisfaction with learning and growth, and the establishment of this index represents the student satisfaction survey becomes one of the important criteria for Chinese universities to judge the teaching quality. Based on above, the study takes a university in Guangxi participating in examination and evaluation as a sample, with the Ministry of Education to carry out the student satisfaction survey tool. In order to better understand the university course teaching, teachers' teaching, teaching resources, communication and cooperation, quality promotion construction, the study aims to provide the basis for management decision in universities, improve teaching quality, realize the connotation development, and to provide reference for similar universities.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Participants

This study was conducted on Beijing Normal University in China, with questionnaires distributed among students via the internet. In total, 6,850 questionnaires were collected, with 5,762 being deemed valid. This questionnaire includes demographic information and satisfaction scale two parts. The demographic information includes gender, grade, ranking, and others. Satisfaction scale includes: course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, cooperation and communication, and the improved ability of quality, with a total of 33 items. The topic design use five-point scale of Likert. There were 1,929 boys students, accounting for 33.5%, and 3,833 girls, accounting for 66.5%. The participants were 2,729 freshmen accounting for 47.36%, 1,410 sophomores accounting for 24.47%, 1,300 juniors accounting for 22.56%, and 323 seniors accounting for 5.6%. The top 10 students were 1070, accounting for 18.57%; the middle students were 3992, accounting for 69.28%; the bottom 10 students were ranked in 700 students, accounting for 12.15 students.

2.2 Research Tool

This study is based on a new round of undergraduate education and teaching audit and evaluation proposed by the Ministry of Education in 2021. In order to grasp the situation of education and teaching in various universities, the Ministry of Education has compiled a satisfaction questionnaire. Using this questionnaire as an instrument, with good reliability and validity, therefore, it was not tested in this study. The 33 items in this questionnaire all use the Likert 5-point scale, and 1-5 represent "completely dissatisfied, relatively dissatisfied, general, relative

ly satisfied and completely satisfied" respectively. The higher the score, the better the evaluation of the satisfaction of the university.

2.3 Statistical Method

In this study, SPSS 2.0 software is used to conduct data statistics and analyze the nature of educational services of higher education institutions; understanding whether the evaluation of school satisfaction is different by different gender, grade and student performance, to understand the overall influence of each dimension of satisfaction on satisfaction, so as to provide decision-making basis for the later teaching management of the school.

3. Research Analysis

3.1 Test and Analysis of Male and Female Students in Each Dimension of Satisfaction

According to Table 1, students of different genders have significant differences in course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, cooperation and communication, and the improved ability of quality. And the evaluation of males on each variable is higher than that of females.

Table 1

Verification of Gender Differences in each Dimension

Dimension	Male		Female		t	Difference Comparison
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
course teaching	2.049	0.690	2.132	0.593	-4.495	significance
teacher teaching	1.922	0.657	2.012	0.606	-5.025	significance
teaching resources	2.189	0.810	2.292	0.686	-4.825	significance
cooperation and communication	2.141	0.648	2.257	0.568	-6.685	significance
the improved ability of quality	2.015	0.371	2.096	0.595	-4.521	significance

3.2 A Single Factor Analysis of Different Dimensions of University Satisfaction in Different Grades

According to Table 2, students in the senior, junior, sophomore and freshman grades have significant differences in the four dimensions of course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, communication and cooperation, and quality and ability. Further use of Tamhane method for ex post comparisons shows that senior students are more satisfied with these four dimensions than juniors, sophomores and freshmen.Senior, junior, sophomore and freshmen students are significant in the overall satisfaction of the university. After the comparison, the overall satisfaction evaluation of the university was higher than that of the junior, sophomore and freshman students.

Table 2

A Single Factor Analysis of each Dimension in Different Grades

Dimension	Grade	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	Post-hoc
course teaching	senior	323	2.291	0.676	13.467***	senior> junior, senior>sophomore, senior> freshman
	junior	1300	2.136	0.646		
	sophomore	1410	2.096	0.603		
	freshman	2729	2.070	0.622		
teacher teaching	senior	323	2.158	0.713	15.823***	senior> junior, senior>sophomore, senior> freshman
	junior	1300	2.021	0.630		
	sophomore	1410	1.997	0.608		
	freshman	2729	1.934	0.615		
teaching resources	senior	323	2.497	0.840	16.648***	senior> junior, senior>sophomore, senior> freshman
	junior	1300	2.303	0.733		
	sophomore	1410	2.225	0.703		
	freshman	2729	2.214	0.725		
cooperation and communication	senior	323	2.299	0.648	3.051***	senior> junior, senior>sophomore, senior> freshman
	junior	1300	2.189	0.572		
	sophomore	1410	2.220	0.572		
	freshman	2729	2.222	0.618		
the improved ability of quality	senior	323	2.322	0.743	29.804***	senior> junior, senior>sophomore, senior> freshman
	junior	1300	2.126	0.627		
	sophomore	1410	2.070	0.599		
	freshman	2729	2.011	0.606		
satisfaction	senior	323	2.299	0.641	18.834***	senior> junior, senior>sophomore, senior> freshman
	junior	1300	2.139	0.565		
	sophomore	1410	2.106	0.544		
	freshman	2729	2.067	0.559		

3.3 Variance Analysis of Different Achievements in Different Dimensions of Satisfaction

According to Table 3, there are significant differences among the top ten, middle and bottom ten students in course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, communication and cooperation, and quality and ability. Further using Tamhane method compares the top ten students, in the middle and lower ten of each variable. There were significant differences in the overall satisfaction of the top ten, middle and last ten students. The Tamhane method was used to compare the satisfaction of the top 10 scores less than the middle and the bottom ten students.

Table 3

A Single Factor Analysis of Different Ranking for Variables

Dimension	Ranking	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	Post-hoc
course teaching	the top ten students	1070	2.062	0.660	5.286***	the top ten students<the middle students, the top ten students<the bottom 10 students
	the middle students	3992	2.105	0.612		
	the bottom 10 students	700	2.261	0.662		
teacher teaching	the top ten students	1070	1.929	0.651	6.744***	the top ten students<the middle students, the top ten students<the bottom 10 students
	the middle students	3992	1.986	0.607		
	the bottom 10 students	700	2.038	0.679		
teaching resources	the top ten students	1070	2.236	0.781	0.975***	the top ten students<the middle students, the top ten students<the bottom 10 students
	the middle students	3992	2.258	0.711		
	the bottom 10 students	700	2.286	0.768		
cooperation and communication	the top ten students	1070	2.085	0.606	8.622***	the top ten students<the middle students, the top ten students<the bottom 10 students
	the middle students	3992	2.214	0.578		
	the bottom 10 students	700	2.445	0.639		
the improved ability of quality	the top ten students	1070	2.028	0.660	5.348***	the top ten students<the middle students, the top ten students<the bottom 10 students
	the middle students	3992	2.069	0.604		
	the bottom 10 students	700	2.127	0.658		
satisfaction	the top ten students	1070	2.050	0.595	11.869***	the top ten students<the middle students, the top ten students<the bottom 10 students
	the middle students	3992	2.106	0.549		
	the bottom 10 students	700	2.183	0.594		

3.4 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix between Variables

As can be seen from Table 4, course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, cooperation and communication, quality and ability are significantly and positively correlated

with overall satisfaction. The above correlation analysis shows that students' satisfaction with the university increases with the enhancement of students' satisfaction with the course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, cooperation and communication, quality and ability.

Table 4
Correlation Analysis of the Study Variables

Dimension	1	2	3	4	5	6
course teaching	-					
teacher teaching	0.837***					
teaching resources	0.781***	0.746***				
cooperation and communication	0.531***	0.481***	0.464***			
the improved ability of quality	0.864***	0.867***	0.852***	0.510***		
satisfaction	0.926***	0.922***	0.886***	0.642***	0.958***	-

4. Conclusion and Suggestion

4.1 Overall Satisfaction and the Five Dimensions with Significantly Different in Gender

The results show that there are significant differences between males and females in the evaluation of school education and teaching, course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, communication and cooperation, quality and ability, and the evaluation of school education and teaching is significantly better than that of males. Females have high satisfaction with teachers' teaching, course teaching, teaching resources and communication and cooperation. This may be because females usually pay more attention to details and are more sensitive to teachers' teaching methods, teaching content and interactions with classmates. In addition, females may be more likely to get help from teaching resources, such as books and experimental equipment, so as to improve their satisfaction with school education and teaching.

On the other hand, males have higher satisfaction in teaching resources, communication and cooperation than other variables, which may be because males usually pay more attention to practical operation and skill training, and are more satisfied with the practical activities and skill training in the school. At the same time, due to personality reasons, males may have relatively weak mastery and application ability of theoretical knowledge. Therefore, males have certain challenges in course learning, resulting in low satisfaction with course teaching.

In short, the differences between male and female students in the evaluation of school education and teaching satisfaction and course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, communication and cooperation, quality and ability are mainly due to the differences in gender characteristics and interests and hobbies. Therefore, universities should fully consider these differences and take targeted measures to improve the satisfaction of education and teaching of all students.

4.2 The Evaluation of University Education and Teaching and the Five Dimensions with Significantly Different

The results show that students in different grades have significantly different satisfaction in the five dimensions of school education, and senior students have higher satisfaction with school education than lower grade students. Senior students are more satisfied with curriculum teaching, teaching resources and communication and cooperation than other variables, which may be because with the accumulation of learning experience. Senior students are more sensitive to school curriculum, teaching content and communication and interaction with classmates, and can better understand and master knowledge. In addition, senior students may be easier to get help from teaching resources, such as books, experimental equipment, etc., to improve their satisfaction with school education and teaching. Junior students may be in the course teaching, teacher teaching has certain challenges, mainly due to students just from high school to university, the university courses, teacher teaching, teaching resources do not adapt. Universities should take strategic measures to improve students' adaptation to college life and course study, so as to improve students' satisfaction with the school.

To sum up, the differences in students' satisfaction of different grades with school education and teaching and the five dimensions are mainly due to the differences in learning experience and interests. Therefore, universities should fully consider these differences and take targeted measures to improve the satisfaction of education and teaching of all students.

4.3 Analysis of School Teaching and Five Dimensions of Students with Different Ranking

The results show that the students' academic performance has a significant impact on the teaching evaluation of the university, but the better the student performance, the lower the satisfaction evaluation of the school.

There may be several possible reasons that below:

1. Students with high scores have higher requirements for university education and teaching. Students with high scores usually have higher academic expectations and standards, and they may have higher requirements on the quality of teaching, curriculum, teacher level, etc. Therefore, even if the university does well in these areas, high-score students may give lower satisfaction ratings because of their high expectations.

2. High score students pay more attention to personal development. Students with high score students tend to pay more attention to their academic and personal development, and they may think that university education and teaching should focus more attention on cultivating students' innovative and critical thinking skills, rather than just imparting knowledge. Therefore, if the university does not do well in these areas, high score students may give lower satisfaction ratings.

3. Students with high scores may have different evaluation standards for school education and teaching: different students may have different evaluation standards for school education and teaching. Students with high scores may pay more attention to teaching quality and curriculum setting, while students with low scores may pay more attention to teachers' attitude, classroom atmosphere and other aspects. Therefore, the high score students gave

lower satisfaction ratings than the achievement students.

In conclusion, students' academic performance has a significant impact on the evaluation of school education and teaching, but the low score of students' school satisfaction may be due to their higher expectations of school education and teaching, personal development, and easily susceptible to other factors.

4.4 Analysis on the relationship between dimensions and general satisfaction

The results show that the five dimensions (curriculum teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, communication and cooperation, and quality and ability) have a significant positive prediction effect on the overall satisfaction of students.

First, curriculum teaching is one of the important factors affecting students' overall satisfaction with the university. A quality curriculum and teaching method can improve students' learning effect and interest. Therefore, universities should focus on the design and improvement of the curriculum, and provide diverse and challenging teaching content to meet the learning needs of different students.

Second, teacher teaching is also an important factor affecting the overall students' satisfaction. Excellent teachers can stimulate students' enthusiasm for learning, provide personalized guidance and support, and help students to make progress. Therefore, universities should strengthen teacher training and development, and improve teachers' teaching ability and professional quality.

Third, teaching resources also have a significant positive impact on overall student satisfaction. Adequate teaching resources can provide students with the required learning materials and equipment to create a good learning environment. Therefore, universities should invest enough resources to improve teaching facilities and teaching tools to ensure that students can make full use of these resources to learn.

Fourth, exchanges and cooperation also play an important role in the overall satisfaction of students. Universities should encourage cooperative learning and communication among students and provide opportunities to engage students in various academic and cultural activities. This can enhance students' social skills and teamwork spirit, and improve their satisfaction with the university.

Finally, literacy ability is an important predictor of students' overall satisfaction with the university. Universities should pay attention to cultivating students' comprehensive quality, including thinking ability, innovation ability, communication ability and so on. This can help students to better adapt to the future social development and improve their satisfaction with the university.

To sum up, the five dimensions course teaching, teacher teaching, teaching resources, communication and cooperation, and quality and ability have a significant positive effect on predicting students' overall satisfaction.Universitie should strengthen the development of these aspects, constantly improve the quality of education and teaching, and improve students' satisfaction.

4.5 Research Suggestions

Satisfaction survey is one of the measures in China to implement the student-oriented education concept and pay attention to students' needs. Students' satisfaction evaluation with the university changes with their educational experience, practical experience and job-hunting needs. Regular follow-up survey of the samples to test whether the improved services meet the needs of students, so as to gradually improve the university management, curriculum construction, teacher development, resource allocation, etc. In addition, it is necessary to consider the evaluation of university education and teaching by the characteristics of different majors, and clarify the commonness and differences of students' satisfaction in different majors, In order to effectively guide teaching management and better serve students.

Reference

Appleton-Knapp, S., & Krentler, K. (2006). Measuring student expectations and their efects on satisfaction: The importance of managing student expectations. Journal of Marketing Education, 28(3), 254–264. https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475306293

Chen, L. Q., & Zhang, W. G. (2019). Research on the measurement and influencing factors of college student satisfaction-empirical analysis based on Herzberg's two-factor theory. Educational Science Research, (3), 65-71.https://doi:10.13933/j.cnki.2096-2134.2019.04.021

Cheng, Y. C., & Tam, W. M. (1997). Multi-models of quality in education. Quality Assurance in Education, 5(1), 22–31. https://doi.org/10.1108/09684889710156558

De Oliveira Santini, F., Ladeira, W. J., Sampaio, C. H., & Da Silva Costa, G. (2017). Student satisfaction in higher education: a meta-analytic study. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 27(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2017.1311980

Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education,10(4), 1-11.https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v10n04_01

Higher Education Satisfaction Research Group (2023). Higher Education Satisfaction research group-based on the 2021 national higher education satisfaction survey analysis. Educational Sciences, 5, DOI:10.16382/j.cnki.1000-5560.2023.05.002

Hunt, H. K. (1977). CS/D-Overview and future directions, in Hunt, H.K. (Ed.), Conceptualization and Measurement of Consumer Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction (pp. 455-488). Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge.

Ijaz, A., Irfan, S. M., Shahbaz, S., Awan, M., & Sabir, M. (2011). An empirical model of student satisfaction: case of Pakistani public sector business schools. Journal of Quality and Technology Management, 7(2), 91-114. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268350598

Kanwar, A., & Sanjeeva, M. (2022). Student satisfaction survey: a key for quality improvement in the higher education institution. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-022-00196-6

Oliver, R. L., & Desarbo, W. S. (1989). Processing of the satisfaction response in consumption: a suggested frame work and research proposition, Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior, 2, pp. 1–16.

The Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2020), National Education Statistical Yearbook for 2020. http://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_sjzl/sjzl_fztjgb/202108/t20210827_555004.html

resolution/the_international_comparative_legal_guide_to_enforcement_of_foreign_judg
ments_2018.pdf?sfvrsn=d6d53a47_2

Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts. (2020). *2ⁿᵈ Edition of the SIFoCC Multilateral Memorandum on Enforcement of Commercial Judgments for Money*. https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Memorandum-on-Enforcement-2nd-Edition.pdf

The Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China. (2019). *Opinions of the Supreme People's Court on Further Providing Judicial Services and Guarantees by the People's Court for the Belt and Road Initiative[(2019)Fafa No.29]*. https://english.court.gov.cn/2021-10/23/c_761783.htm

The Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China. (2022). *Minutes of the National Symposium on the Foreign-related Commercial and Maritime Trial Work of Courts* [CLI.3.5114710(EN)]. https://pkulaw.com/en_law/bffd20e9aee35db2bdfb.html

Zhang, W. L. (2014). *Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in China:rule, practice and strategies*. Alphen aan den Rijn, The Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.

张先著. (2021). "一带一路"背景下外国民商事判决承认和执行中推定互惠原则的适用. *People's Judicature Application*, Vol.912, 63. https://kns.cnki.net/kcms2/article/abstract?v=RkYMyaebi8VANtEld9beLAAI2LRTUkc9ZszKYO4dkEQbZlgWj7wihN3wBeadLCYxIndQdEaI0B_sBLNOOR-Bxs7KLFTt5NkmqpGlodm9B501zEaIsCpdjflXETUyqirevYKlk6sQNAU=&uniplatform=NZKPT&flag=copy