



# An Analysis of Local Education Policies and Social Supervision on the Governance of Intercultural Communication Behavior of International Students in China

Qiling Li

*Faculty of Education, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130000, China*

15834868668@163.com

**Abstract:** In the process of local education governance, there are problems of non-standard cultural communication behavior and weak governance awareness, which inhibit the improvement of local education governance environment. At the same time, the lack of interpretation of education governance policies by social communities, and the imperfection of laws and regulations on cultural behavior governance, all limit the role of local governments in education governance. Therefore, this paper proposes three hypotheses: whether the guidance of local governments to the judiciary and the community can play the role of legal protection, standardize community supervision behavior, and promote inter-departmental collaboration; whether the improvement of laws and regulations affects the implementation of the public's rights and interests in supervision, as well as the in-depth interpretation of the content of education policies, and has a positive impact on the cognition of social governance and the standardization of cross-cultural communication behaviors; The public and the community can monitor the implementation of educational policies and make recommendations on the governance of cultural communicative behaviour. The results show that the clarification of the responsibilities of the local government can promote the cooperation between the judiciary, the community and the administrative department, improve the local laws and regulations, and play the role of community policy interpretation. Laws and regulations provide guarantees for the implementation and supervision of education governance policies, and promote policy supervision by the community and the public; The supervision of cultural communication behavior by the community and the general public can provide suggestions for the enrichment and adjustment of the content of the government's education policy, and meet the needs of social governance. Therefore, the government, the judiciary and the community are the guarantee for the implementation of local education governance policies, the public can promote the rationalization of policies, and laws and regulations can improve the effect of education governance, standardize cultural communication behaviors, and form a good governance environment.

**Key words:** local education governance, laws, regulations, communities, the public, policy interpretation, cross-cultural communication behavior, governance cognition

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

At present, the state attaches great importance to cultural communication behavior, and encourages local governments to strengthen the governance of cultural communication behavior, and actively use local educational resources to carry out comprehensive optimization of cultural behavior (Lo, 2021). At the same time, the local government has introduced education governance policies, combined with the means and forms of education governance, to create an educational environment. Local education policies can guide cross-cultural communication behaviors, but the differences between policies and

local governance needs are found, but there is a lack of policy and inter-departmental cooperation, and the role of governance policies cannot be effectively played (Cora, 2021). Therefore, the government allows the community to carry out policy publicity and excavation, strengthen the policy interpretation of the public, let the public understand the content of cultural communication behavior governance, as well as the implementation goals of local education governance policies, and create an objective education governance environment (Corradini et al., 2022). The judiciary has introduced laws to strengthen the protection of cultural communication behaviors, optimize existing educational behaviors, enrich educational content, and meet the needs of comprehensive education governance policies (Do Vale, 2021). In the process of intercultural behavior education, the government should clarify its responsibilities and obligations, guide the community and the judiciary to carry out auxiliary governance, improve the public's understanding of cultural communication governance, and deepen the content of existing policies (De La Rosa et al., 2023). At the same time, the judiciary has introduced interim management measures to meet the governance needs of the community and the general public, so as to ensure the standardization of intercultural communication behavior and optimize the existing governance structure (Malická, 2021). With a clear understanding of its responsibilities, the government has joined forces with the community and the judiciary to form a governance system for intercultural communication (Desille, 2022). The education governance policy should be combined with the resources of cross-cultural communication behavior in the region, and the policy content should be continuously adjusted to improve the effectiveness of education governance (Haeberlin et al., 2022). The government and the community listen to the feedback of the public, understand and grasp the implementation effect of education governance policies, and adjust governance strategies in response to the governance of cultural communication behaviors (Dieudé et al., 2022). Through the public's perception of governance, the community promotes the community to fulfill its publicity responsibility, grasps and understands the implementation effect of education policies, provides prompts for the enrichment of policy content and the adjustment of strategies, and makes it rational, so as to provide a basis for the governance of local cultural communication behaviors (Dovrat et al., 2021). On the basis of the above analysis, this paper comprehensively analyzes local education policies, relevant laws and regulations, and communities, and analyzes the governance effects based on cross-cultural resources and the governance cognition of the public, aiming to promote the rationalization of local education policies and improve the local education governance environment.

### **1.2 The current situation of the reform and development of English professional education under local autonomy**

Through the in-depth study of the education governance policy in the region, the analysis of the role of the community in policy interpretation, and the in-depth analysis of the imperfections of laws and regulations, it is of theoretical significance to the improvement of local education governance policy for the improvement of public governance awareness, the creation of governance environment, and the performance of community implementation functions (Eriksen et al., 2022). At the same time, taking cross-cultural educational behavior as the research object, combined with the utilization of local educational resources and the level of public awareness, this paper analyzes the implementation effect of education governance policies, clarifies the guiding direction and goals of governance policies, optimizes the social governance structure, and improves the coordination between communities and judicial institutions, so as to realize the governance of cross-cultural communication behaviors, which has obvious practical guiding significance (Ermini et al., 2021). Therefore, on the basis of cross-cultural communication behavior governance, enriching and adjusting the content of local

education governance policies, and giving full play to the role of social supervision and community interpretation, can effectively improve the governance effect of the region and create a good educational environment.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 The impact of educational governance policies on judicial promotion and norms of communicative behavior**

The local education governance policy is a way for the local government to exercise the administrative power of the jurisdiction, and its main purpose is to improve the effect of local judicial assistance, standardize the communication behavior of the public, promote the formation of a good cultural governance system, and strengthen the administrative communication between the government and the public (Esteve et al., 2022). In the process of adjusting education governance policies, the policy content is gradually optimized from extensive to specific, and is supported by laws and regulations to ensure that the government can exercise its governance power and promote the effective implementation of education governance policies (Garcia, 2021). In the process of communicative behavior norms, the government should clarify its own responsibilities and cooperate with local judicial departments to regulate and restrict communicative behaviors, so as to point out the direction for the governance of communicative behavior norms (Frediani et al., 2022). At the same time, communities and judicial institutions should continue to publicize laws and regulations, raise the public's awareness of the norms of communicative behavior, and ensure the public's participation in the process of education governance (García, 2023). In terms of policy content adjustment, as well as feedback on implementation effects, education governance policies and judicial institutions have a promoting and guiding effect on the community, so that they can interpret the policy content more deeply to the public (Gavin et al., 2023). In the communicative norms of behavior, educational governance policies have a long-term role, which can indicate the direction of governance of the norms of conduct, promote the exercise of rights by the judiciary and the community, and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the government (Gendzwill, 2021). The essence of education governance policy is to promote public understanding, governance physics, constrain communicative behavior, and enable the judiciary community to play its due responsibilities and form a good interactive system, and in the implementation of education governance policy, the existing governance resources, cross-cultural resources and the public should be fully utilized (Goinheix et al., 2021). Based on the above reasons, hypothesis 1 is proposed

Hypothesis 1: Whether the guidance of local governments to the judiciary and the community can play the role of legal protection, standardize community supervision behavior, and promote inter-departmental cooperation.

### **2.2 The role of laws and regulations in community responsibilities and public perception**

Laws and regulations are the main implementation content of the judiciary, and their perfection should be consistent with the needs of the public, so they should be constantly adjusted to meet the diverse needs of society (Kinsella et al., 2023). However, the judiciary needs to understand the public's perception and the laws and regulations issued by the government, and improve them to promote the implementation of governance policies and create a good environment (Klyszcz, 2023). The improvement of laws and regulations by the judiciary can protect the rights and interests of the public to participate in the governance of education, promote the community to fulfill its corresponding responsibilities, and increase the publicity of governance politics (Kotisova et al., 2023). In addition, the judiciary understands the governance needs of the public, and combines local educational resources

to improve laws and regulations to ensure the creation of a social governance environment (Ladner et al., 2021). At the same time, it is necessary to strengthen the constraints on educational culture and educational content, and promote the improvement of the comprehensive effect of governance policies. The improvement of laws and regulations should have the effect of adapting measures to local conditions, standardize cross-cultural communication behavior, and let the guarantee understand the content and implementation of governance policies (Ladner et al., 2023). In short, the improvement of laws and regulations should be targeted, enhance public awareness of society, and promote its development in a multi-angle direction (Li et al., 2022). Based on the above reasons, hypothesis 2 is proposed

Hypothesis 2: Whether the improvement of laws and regulations affects the implementation of the public's supervision rights and interests, and the in-depth interpretation of the content of education policies, and has a positive impact on the cognition of social governance and the regulation of cross-cultural communication behaviors.

### **2.3 Supervision and prompting of community and public education governance policies**

Communities and the public, as the main objects of supervision of political governance, should play an important supporting role (Matthews, 2022). The community should assume the responsibility of interpreting education governance policies, improve the public's understanding of the content of governance policies, and deepen their negative effects and influences on the judiciary and the government (Mukhtar-Landgren, 2021). Through the deepening of governance policies, the public can deeply grasp the content of governance policies, understand the purpose and direction of governance policies, supervise the implementation of policies, and make corresponding suggestions to judicial organs and local governments to promote the implementation of education governance policies (Mullin, 2023). Therefore, both the community and the public have a catalytic role in the governance of education and the implementation of education policies (Nordholm et al., 2022). At the same time, at the prompting of the public, the government has improved the content of education governance policies and adjusted its governance strategies, which can promote cross-cultural communication, standardize cultural communication behaviors, and deepen the existing cultural governance structure (Oprea et al., 2022). The community and the public combine cross-cultural resources to propose and judge the implementation effect of education governance policies, and provide feedback to higher authorities to strengthen the connection between local governments and the community and the public (Panara, 2022). Local governments grasp the content of cultural communication behaviors, carry out judicial reform and optimization according to existing resources and forms, and promote laws and regulations to provide corresponding protection for the community and the public, fulfill the rights and interests of fair supervision, and form a good atmosphere of social governance (Park et al., 2021). In the supervision of education governance policies, the public and the community can have an in-depth understanding and judgment of the implementation effect and implementation content of education governance policies, so as to promote more targeted laws and regulations, clarify the responsibilities and governance purposes of the government, and create a good political environment (Lin et al., 2022). Based on the above reasons, hypothesis 3 is proposed

Hypothesis 3: The public and the community can monitor the implementation of educational policies and make recommendations on the governance of cultural communicative behavior.

## **3. Research Methods**

### **3.1 Research Subjects**

400 questionnaires were distributed to the educational, judicial and administrative departments of the

region. Among them, 213 questionnaires were distributed by local administrative departments, 115 questionnaires were distributed by education departments, and 72 questionnaires were distributed by community departments. The recovery rate of each questionnaire was 100%, indicating that the integrity of the survey data was high. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were both greater than 0.7, indicating that the questionnaire met the actual survey needs. The construction of the questionnaire content is mainly to distribute the questionnaire to the experts, and screen it through content evaluation to ensure that the validity and reliability of the questionnaire meet the requirements. The questionnaire is divided into 3 sections, namely local administration, judiciary and community. Among them, local administration includes education governance policies and education governance content; Justice includes, intercultural regulations, laws for the protection of communicative behavior; The community includes the interpretation of local education policies, community and public awareness, and public supervision of education governance policies. All survey questions were on a 5-point scale, with higher scores indicating more realistic requirements, and the correlation between survey data is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Indicator relevance of the questionnaire

name	symbol	The mean $\pm$ standard deviation	coefficient of variation(CV)
Local education governance strategies	LG	3.471 $\pm$ 0.783	42.549%
Educational governance content	EG	3.727 $\pm$ 0.813	41.821%
Code of conduct system	CS	3.378 $\pm$ 0.899	46.614%
Cultural constraints and laws	CL	3.026 $\pm$ 1.023	43.802%
Collaboration among departments	CD	3.405 $\pm$ 0.788	43.146%
Community policy promotion	CP	3.071 $\pm$ 1.386	45.137%
Community and public awareness	CA	3.304 $\pm$ 0.890	46.933%
Public supervision of governance policies	PG	3.319 $\pm$ 1.232	47.114%

According to the survey and analysis in Table 1, there is no significant difference in the proportion of variability in the data of each index, and the proportion is greater than 40%, indicating that the content of eigenvalues in the data is relatively high.

### 3.2 Differences in indicators between education governance policies, communities, and justice

The relevance of the indicators between the education governance policy, the community and the judiciary, and the integration of the index content are the focus of the later analysis, and it is also the premise of departmental collaboration, so it is necessary to deeply analyze the correlation between the quality policy, the community and the judiciary, and the specific results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Indicator linkages between governance policies, communities and justice

		Local education governance strategies	Educational governance content	Code of conduct system	Public supervision of governance policies
Cultural	correlation	-0.377**	0.078	0.466**	-0.120*

		Local education governance strategies	Educational governance content	Code of conduct system	Public supervision of governance policies
constraints and laws	coefficient p-value	0.000	0.120	0.000	0.016
Community policy promotion	correlation coefficient p-value	0.057	-0.237**	0.277**	0.144**
Community and public awareness	correlation coefficient p-value	0.123*	-0.140**	0.197**	0.047
Collaboration among departments	correlation coefficient p-value	-0.077	0.164**	0.202**	-0.058
		0.125	0.001	0.000	0.251

\* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01

From the analysis results in Table 2, it can be seen that there are significant differences in the indicators of local education governance policy, education governance environment, cross-cultural system, departmental collaboration and public supervision. Among the above indicators, the local education governance policy had the largest difference (-0.377), followed by the behavior management system (0.277), and the smallest indicator was the supervision awareness of the public and the community (0.144). From the content analysis results of the above indicators, it can be seen that local education policies, community supervision and judicial departments all affect the governance of local communicative behavior. Among them, the influence of local governments is larger, 0.057, followed by the judiciary and communities, which are -0.140 and 0.202. In the process of judicial management, there are problems in the behavioral norms and systems of cross-cultural communication, which shows that all responsible parties and responsibility points have been clarified in local education governance. Based on the government, supplemented by the judicial department, and end-ended by community and public awareness, multi-content impact analysis is conducted. Among them, the main aspect of influence is cross-cultural communication and communicative behavior, and the influence point is the restraint of communicative behavior. Therefore, in the process of implementing local education policies, it is necessary to clarify the main responsibilities of the government, promote the cooperation between departments, give full play to the protective role of judicial institutions, complete the multi-index analysis of cultural communication behavior, and build a multi-content and multi-angle governance plan.

### 3.3 The guiding role of education governance policies in communities and judicial institutions

Therefore, it is necessary to analyze the implementation effect of education governance, analyze and study from the community and judicial institutions, verify the effectiveness of the results, and provide corresponding support for the adjustment and optimization of policies in the later stage, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Relationship between education governance policies and communities and the judiciary

item	Governance status	Governance structure
------	-------------------	----------------------

	government	judicature	community	government	judicature	community
Local education governance strategies	0.616	1.428	-0.154	0.809	1.040	-0.583
Code of conduct system	3.000	4.241	4.666	4.789	4.241	3.000
Community policy promotion	-0.586	-1.303	-0.244	0.118	-0.723	0.008
Public supervision of governance policies	1.000	3.577	2.096	2.096	3.577	1.000
Cultural constraints and laws	2.367	4.266	3.173	3.173	4.266	3.006
Collaboration among departments	1.613	-1.115	0.955	0.617	-0.710	-0.285
Community and public awareness	2.730	2.331	4.138	2.401	2.331	3.000
Educational governance content	0.623	2.278	-1.250	0.468	1.619	-0.445

Note: Governance framework build = 0.808

From the analysis in Table 3, it can be seen that in the process of analyzing the existing governance status and governance structure, it will be found that the existing governance status is relatively good, both of which are greater than 0.6. However, there is a low value of governance structure, with a minimum value of 0.008, which indicates that education governance policy should focus on the optimization of governance structure, especially the collaboration between departments, and make effective use of existing governance resources. Through the analysis of the government, the judiciary and the community, it is found that there is a small deviation in the governance coefficient of the judicial sector, mainly because the laws and regulations of the judicial sector lack pertinence, the existing system cannot provide effective guarantees, and the difference is greater than 0.04. In terms of community governance, it is found that there are great changes in the current situation and governance structure of the community, and the deviation is greater than 1.235, indicating that the community does not recognize its own responsibilities in the education governance policy, and does not play a role in policy interpretation for the public. As a result, there are great problems in the status quo and structure of the community. At the same time, there is a large difference in the governance structure of the government, which is greater than 0.824, indicating that the existing government policies cannot meet the governance needs of cross-cultural and communicative behaviors, and its policies only solve short-term governance problems, but do not restrain and guide communicative behaviors. Moreover, the government has not clarified its own structure and conditions, and its values are 2.367, 1.613, 2.730 and 3.000, so there are structural deficiencies in the governance of local education policies, and they should clarify their responsibilities and play their guiding role. At the same time, there is no deviation in the judicial structure, mainly at the level of lack of specificity.

### 3.4 The main optimization aspects of cross-cultural communication behavior governance

For the governance of cross-cultural transaction behavior, the government laws and regulations, community and social cognition are verified, the scope and characteristics of the influence are identified, the overall optimization value is determined, the main influencing factors are found, and the specific results are provided for the later adjustment and enrichment of governance policies, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Optimization level of cultural communicative behavior governance

	government	Laws and regulations	community	Social cognition
Local education governance strategies	0.023	-0.116	-0.624	0.772
Educational governance content	0.745	0.400	-0.387	-0.367
Cultural constraints and laws	-0.307	0.905	0.266	-0.128
Code of conduct system	-0.403	0.450	-0.532	-0.594
Collaboration among departments	-0.017	0.476	0.035	0.000
Community policy promotion	-0.428	0.084	-0.123	-0.001
Community and public awareness	-0.270	-0.037	-0.198	0.002
Public supervision of governance policies	0.228	0.029	-0.289	-0.001

The results in Table 4 show that the role of the government on cross-cultural communication behavior is negative, which is -0.307, -0.403, -0.017, -0.428 and -0.270, respectively, and the characteristic values are 5, indicating that the government plays a major role in influencing it. 0.476 and 0.084 indicated that it played a significant normative role, and the roles of community and social cognition were all negative, with three variations of -0.123, -0.198, -0.289 and -0.367, -0.128 and -0.594, indicating that the existing social cognition of community was insufficient and could not realize the effective governance of cultural and educational behaviors. Therefore, local governments should give full play to the awareness of the community and the public, improve their governance analysis of education policies, and realize the constraints on cultural communication behaviors. In addition, it is necessary to provide policy reminders in terms of education policy and educational content. In addition, local governments and judicial institutions should strengthen their own construction, optimize the responsibilities of departments, promote cooperation between departments, complete the integration of education policies and supervision, optimize existing laws and regulations, and improve education policies according to the actual situation to improve their educational effectiveness.

### 3.5 Summary of Results

Through feature cluster analysis, this paper summarizes and analyzes the local education policy, social supervision, and the improvement of the judicial department, verifies the research hypothesis of this paper, and the restraining effect of cross-cultural communication behavior, so as to provide support for the implementation and adjustment of the strategy in the later stage, and the specific summary results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5 The results of this paper are valid

hypothesis	content	outcome
Hypothesis 1	Whether the guidance of local governments to the judiciary and the community can play a role as a legal guarantee, regulate community supervision behavior, and promote inter-departmental coordination;	establish
Hypothesis 2	whether the improvement of laws and regulations affects the implementation of the public's rights and interests in supervision, as well as the in-depth interpretation of the content of education policies, and has a positive impact on the cognition of social governance and the standardization of cross-cultural communication behaviors;	establish
Hypothesis	The public and the community can monitor the implementation of	establish

3	educational policies and make recommendations on the governance of cultural communicative behaviour.	
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

From the analysis results in Table 5, it can be seen that local governments have an impact on both the judiciary and the community, and local governments should clarify their responsibilities and guide the judiciary to improve laws and regulations. At the same time, it promotes the integration of the government, the judiciary and the community, which plays a leading role. The main body of education policy implementation is the government, and the direction of the judicial department to improve the law should be targeted suggestions, provide supplements to governance policies and systems, protect the legitimate rights and interests of the community and the public, and improve the effect of policy governance. In addition, the community and the public should play and exercise their right to supervise, improve the governance effect of the policy, and provide suggestive opinions for the adjustment and enrichment of the policy. There is an interactive relationship between the judiciary and the community, and the law guarantees the exercise of the community's duties, and the community provides the judicial department with perfect opinions and targeted suggestions, and jointly conducts judicial supervision with the local government, so as to improve the effectiveness of the judicial department's performance of duties. On the whole, local governments are the leading, laws and regulations are intermediate media, and communities and the public mainly play a feedback role, so rational constraints and coupling should be carried out in the governance framework to create a good governance atmosphere and conditions.

#### 4. Discussion

##### 4.1. Local governments are to strengthen restraint and guidance on the conduct and governance of communities and judicial departments

In the process of analyzing the education governance policy, the value of the government's governance content and governance direction is negative, indicating that the actual change needs of the government in the governance process are solidified and cannot effectively meet the actual governance requirements. Communication between the government and the judiciary and the community is also negative, indicating a lack of effective government guidance. At the same time, in the process of carrying out governance, its optimized structure and potential are great (Ivonchuk, 2022). This proves that local governments should strengthen the governance of communities and the judicial sector, and restrain their governance behaviors to ensure the effective implementation of cultural exchanges. In the process of strengthening the construction of community justice departments, local governments should play a role in guiding and restraining them, so they should strengthen their own responsibilities and clarify the purpose and methods of governance. Local governments should listen to the opinions of the public and feedback from the community, understand the rationality and effectiveness of the implementation of education governance policies, and adjust the implementation strategies in a timely manner to enrich the governance content (Zakroczymski, 2022). At the same time, local governments should contact the judicial departments and communities to achieve synergy between departments, and effectively restrain and guide the governance behavior of various departments. Cross-cultural communication belongs to the governance of social and educational resources, the public is the main participant, the government is the advocate of governance, and the community is the searcher of relevant information, so the above aspects should strengthen coordination to achieve overall constraints and optimization, and the legal department should adjust the content of the community and the government in a timely manner, and enrich the corresponding content to meet the actual governance needs. In the process of implementing education policies, it is necessary to stratify the content of

cross-cultural behaviors, carry out educational governance according to the needs of the community public and the government at different levels, complete the goals of educational governance, and optimize the existing governance structure. Match the content of education with the method of education. The government and judicial departments meet the actual needs of local governance, create a good governance environment, and form a multi-angle cultural communication behavior governance system.

#### **4.2 The judiciary provides the community and the public with a sense of protection**

The judicial department is to provide safeguards for the implementation of education governance policies, and to enhance the power of community and the public to supervise policies, and encourage the public to participate in the governance of education in their own regions. At the same time, the judicial departments should adopt targeted temporary regulations for cultural communication behavior and cultural governance content, and create a good governance environment. Through the in-depth analysis of cultural communication behaviors, we can find the combination point of local education governance policies, improve temporary laws and regulations, urge communities to interpret policies, and enhance the public's awareness of participation (Jorda et al., 2022). The improvement of laws and regulations can prompt the community and the public to clarify their responsibilities, improve the level of supervision of the public on education governance, and lay a good environment for education governance. The legitimate rights and interests of the public and the community are guaranteed, which can provide effective suggestions and tips for local governments, promote local governments to clarify their own responsibilities, and promote the rational development of education governance policies. Therefore, the judicial sector is the guarantee for the local government of the community and the public to participate in education governance, and it is also the main influencing factor of education governance. In the process of improving laws and regulations, local governments should play a leading role in restraining the judicial sector, enhancing the responsibilities of the judicial sector, and promoting the effective implementation of policies. On the whole, the judicial department is the protection body for the rights and interests of the community and the public in governance supervision, and has the ability to promote the rationalization of governance policies for the restraint of communicative behavior. At the same time, the judiciary should clarify its responsibilities, understand the public's demand for law, and optimize the existing legal structure and local governance environment (Zlaten, 2023).

#### **4.3 The community and the judicial department jointly supervise the educational policy of communicative behavior**

The community and the judiciary are the implementing agencies of local education governance and the implementers of local governments to understand the effect of governance, so they form interactive feedback with the government to promote the rational development of education policies. At the same time, the community bears the responsibility of educating the public about the content of education, and the judicial and legal institutions bear the responsibility of protecting the public's right to know, and the two can work together to promote the society. The public's enthusiasm for participation in governance can improve the level of social supervision of governance policies, and the community and judicial institutions can understand the implementation effect of governance policies through the public, and improve the legal process and rules and regulations according to the results, and give feedback to the local government on the implementation of policies. Under the constraints of the judicial department, local governments fulfill their responsibilities to promote the effective implementation of community governance in education, enhance the participation of the public, and ensure that

governance policies match actual governance needs. In addition, in the process of cross-cultural behavior constraints, the judiciary should ensure exchanges between different cultures, avoid contradictions and violations of governance, and improve the effectiveness of education governance in the region. Under the dual role of the judiciary and the community, local governments should timely and comprehensively grasp the implementation effects of governance policies, and realize multi-angle governance based on existing governance resources. On the whole, the community and the judiciary can help the government clarify its responsibilities, improve the effective governance of communicative behavior, create a good governance environment, and promote the development of the local governance environment.

## **5. Conclusion**

The difference in education governance policies was the largest, which was -0.377. The effect of the government on cross-cultural communication behavior was negative, which were -0.307, -0.403, -0.017, -0.428 and -0.270, respectively, and the characteristic values were 5, indicating that the government had a guiding role in the community and the judiciary and could promote the collaboration between the administrative departments. The value of the behavior management system is 0.277, and the value of laws and regulations is positive, and the value of the role is 0.4000, 0.905, 0.450, 0.476 and 0.084, respectively, indicating that the judiciary plays an intermediate role in the process of social governance, which can ensure the smooth progress of social governance and promote the implementation of the administrative system, and the supervision awareness of the public and the community has a value of 0.144. The roles of community and social cognition were all negative, and the change values were -0.123, -0.198, -0.289 and -0.367, -0.128 and -0.594, indicating that the community and the public had a suggestive effect on the government, helping it clarify its social responsibilities and adjust governance policies. On the whole, the construction of a three-dimensional governance system between local governments, judicial institutions and communities can improve governance policies and systems and improve the level of local governance. There are also some limitations in this study, mainly in the process of collecting cross-cultural behavior data, and the scope of cross-cultural behavior data collection will be expanded in the future, so as to enrich the data indicators and improve the accuracy of the research results.

## **References**

- Corradini, E., Nicolazzo, S., Nocera, A., Ursino, D., & Virgili, L. (2022). A two-tier Blockchain framework to increase protection and autonomy of smart objects in the IoT. *Computer Communications*, 181, pp. 338-356.
- de la Rosa, R. I. L., & Ibarias, N. S. L. (2023). Autonomy in Tibet: From Central Normativity to Local Praxis. *Mexico Y La Cuenca Del Pacifico*, 12(34), pp. 45-66.
- Do Vale, H. F. (2021). Four Decades of Territorial Distribution of Power in Spain: A Measurement of Subnational Autonomy (1974-2018). *Revista Espanola De Investigaciones Sociologicas*(173), pp. 3-25.
- Dovrat, D., & Bruckstein, A. M. (2021). AntAlate-A Multi-Agent Autonomy Framework. *Frontiers in Robotics and Ai*, 8.
- Ermini, B., & Salvati, L. (2021). Decentralization, administrative reforms and local government performance: The impact of inter-communality in a pre-crisis time. *International Journal of Ecological Economics & Statistics*, 42(3), pp. 68-91.
- Esteve, R., Bernardes, S. F., López-Martínez, A. E., Martín-Delgado, C. E., & Ramírez-Maestre, C. (2022). The Informal Social Support for Autonomy and Dependence in Pain Inventory Spanish version. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 30(5), pp. E1991-E2002.
- Frediani, D. A., Davel, E. P. B., & Ventura, A. C. (2022). THE AUTONOMY CHALLENGE WITHIN SOCIOENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS THE DIALOGIC MANAGEMENT. *Gestao E Desenvolvimento*, 19(1), pp. 179-204.

- García, J. R. B. (2023). The Inter-Administrative Relationship of Coordination with Respect to Local Entities: The Legal Problem of the Tension Between Coordination and Autonomy. *Revista Digital De Derecho Administrativo*(29),pp. 317-330.
- Garcia, M. M. (2021). TERRORIST PRESSURE DURING TRANSITION AND NATIONALIST FORMATION OF BASQUE AUTONOMY. *Historia Actual Online*(55),pp. 23-36.
- Gavin, M., & Stacey, M. (2023). Enacting autonomy reform in schools: The re-shaping of roles and relationships under <i>Local Schools, Local Decisions</i>. *Journal of Educational Change*, 24(3),pp. 501-523.
- Gendzwill, A. (2021). Local autonomy and national-local turnout gap: Higher stakes, higher turnout? *Regional and Federal Studies*, 31(4),pp. 519-539.
- Goinheix, S., & Freigedo, M. (2021). SUB-NATIONAL LOCAL AUTONOMY INDEX IN URUGUAY. *Revista Iberoamericana De Estudios Municipales*(23),pp. 35-61.
- Haeblerlin, M., & Pasqualini, A. (2022). Pointing out the false autonomy of Brazilian municipalities: The "quality of the Federation" drawn by the Rule of Law and its impact on promoting the common good. *Revista De Investigacoes Constitucionais-Journal of Constitutional Research*, 9(3),pp. 515-542.
- Haines, K. (2021). Oaxaca and global forest governance: Indigenous autonomy, local institutions, and forest outcomes in Southern Mexico. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 28,pp. 25-46.
- Ivonchik, M. (2022). Does Local Autonomy Breed Leviathans? An Empirical Examination of All Cities in the United States. *Political Research Quarterly*, 75(4),pp. 1079-1095.
- Jorda, M., Vulliez, M., & Khatib, O. (2022). Local Autonomy-Based Haptic-Robot Interaction With Dual-Proxy Model. *Ieee Transactions on Robotics*, 38(5),pp. 2943-2961.
- Klyszcz, I. U. (2023). Gorno-Badakhshan and Karakalpakstan since 1991: understanding territorial autonomy in Central Asia. *Central Asian Survey*, 42(3),pp. 500-517.
- Kotisova, J., & Cisarová, L. W. (2023). "I Know Which Devil I Write for ": Two Types of Autonomy Among Czech Journalists Remaining in and Leaving the Prime Minister's Newspapers. *International Journal of Press-Politics*, 28(1),pp. 238-256.
- Ladner, A., & Keuffer, N. (2021). Creating an index of local autonomy - theoretical, conceptual, and empirical issues. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 31(2),pp. 209-234.
- Li, Y. Z., Wang, S. H., Liu, H., Yang, B., Yang, H. Y., Zeng, M. Y., & Wu, Z. Q. (2022). A backtracking differential evolution with multi-mutation strategies autonomy and collaboration. *Applied Intelligence*, 52(3),pp. 3418-3444.
- Lin, B. Q., & Zhou, Y. C. (2022). Understanding the institutional logic of urban environmental pollution in China: Evidence from fiscal autonomy. *Process Safety and Environmental Protection*, 164,pp. 57-66.
- Lo, S. (2021). Hong Kong in 2020 <i>National Security Law and Truncated Autonomy</i>. *Asian Survey*, 61(1),pp. 34-42.
- Malická, L. (2021). Financial Autonomy of Local Governments in the Slovak Republic: A Panel Data Investigation. *Ekonomicky Casopis*, 69(7),pp. 669-686.
- Matthews, K. (2022). Japanese Delegated Legislation: The Local Autonomy Law\*. *Australasian Parliamentary Review*, 37(1),pp. 149-166.
- Mukhtar-Landgren, D. (2021). Local Autonomy in Temporary Organizations: The Case of Smart City Pilots. *Administration & Society*, 53(10),pp. 1485-1511.
- Mullin, A. (2023). Children, Social Inclusion in Education, Autonomy and Hope. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 17(1),pp. 20-34.
- Nordholm, D., Arnqvist, A., & Nihlfors, E. (2022). Sense-making of autonomy and control: Comparing school leaders in public and independent schools in a Swedish case. *Journal of Educational Change*, 23(4),pp. 497-519.
- Ohta, R., Ryu, Y., Kataoka, D., & Sano, C. (2021). Effectiveness and Challenges in Local Self-Governance: Multifunctional Autonomy in Japan. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(2).
- Oprea, F., Onofrei, M., Paraschiv, G., & Cojocariu, L. (2022). Do Local Budgets Influence Regional Development? Empirical evidence from Romania. *Lex Localis-Journal of Local Self-Government*, 20(1),pp. 77-99.

Pal, A., & Radvan, M. (2022). Financial Autonomy of the Local Self-governments in the Countries of the Visegrad Group in the Context of the European Charter of Local Self-government. *Lex Localis-Journal of Local Self-Government*, 20(4),pp. 1143-1169.

Panara, C. (2022). Subsidiarity v. Autonomy in the EU. *European Public Law*, 28(2),pp. 269-296.

Park, S., & Kim, S. (2021). How Does Fiscal Autonomy Influence Fiscal Outcomes Depending on Corruption. *Lex Localis-Journal of Local Self-Government*, 19(1),pp. 91-109.

Zakroczymski, S. (2022). Is the European Charter of Local Self-Government an Effective Instrument for the Protection of Local Autonomy in Poland? *Central European Public Administration Review*, 20(2),pp. 169-189.

Zlatan, R. (2023). Autonomy in Local Digital News: An Exploration of Organizational and Moral Psychology Factors. *Journal of Media Ethics*, 38(4),pp. 267-284.