https://doi.org/10.62836/jissh.v2i1.357

Global Science Publishing

JISSH

Journal of Integrated Social Sciences and Humanities
https://ojs.sgsci.org/journals/emi

Article

AI-Empowered Learning Ecology Under China's 'Double Reduction' Policy

Zhanguo Su [1,*] and Yiping Su [2]

[1] *Faculty of Physical Education, Yunnan Nationalities University, Kunming 650504, China*
[2] *Faculty of sports and Exercise Science, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur 50603, Malaysia; suyi3711@gmail.com*

Abstract: China's 2021 "Double Reduction" policy reduces student academic burdens and regulates tutoring, yet challenges remain in equitable education access and student well-being. This study proposes a digital education model—the Health Learning Chain (HLC)—using biological-behavioral big data to optimize learning through physiological, psychological, and behavioral insights. Employing mixed methods (interviews, surveys, and system dynamics modeling), it explores multi-agent collaboration and resource sharing in sports-education integration. Key findings highlight stakeholder cooperation and resource optimization as vital for success. Policy simulations show short-term gains from increased resources but emphasize long-term reliance on governance and policy support. Recommendations include boosting resources, enhancing collaboration, and establishing sustainable policy frameworks, offering actionable strategies for a balanced educational ecosystem under "Double Reduction".

Keywords: AI-empowered; learning ecology; double reduction policy

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Background

The "Double Reduction" policy, introduced in China in 2021, represents a landmark reform in the country's educational system. This policy aims to alleviate the excessive academic burden on students by reducing homework assignments and regulating the after-school tutoring industry [1]. While the policy has achieved significant progress in curbing the overemphasis on academic performance, it has also introduced new challenges. For instance, the reduction in tutoring opportunities has raised concerns about equitable access to quality education, particularly for students from disadvantaged backgrounds [2]. Additionally, the policy has highlighted the need to balance academic rigor with student well-being, as the pressure to excel in a competitive environment often leads to stress, anxiety, and other health issues [3]. In this context, the digital reconstruction of the educational ecology emerges as a promising solution. By leveraging biological-behavioral big data, educators can gain deeper insights into student learning patterns and health metrics, enabling the development of personalized and adaptive learning strategies that promote both academic success and holistic well-being.

Received: 27 March 2025; Accepted: 11 April 2025.

* Corresponding: Zhanguo Su (suzhanguo@163.com)

1.2. Research Significance

1.2.1. Theoretical Significance

This study contributes to the theoretical understanding of educational ecology by integrating biological-behavioral big data into the learning process. Traditional educational models often focus solely on academic outcomes, neglecting the interplay between learning and student well-being. The proposed Health Learning Chain (HLC) model addresses this gap by providing a comprehensive framework that incorporates physiological, psychological, and behavioral data. This model not only advances the field of educational technology but also bridges the gap between educational theory and data-driven practice. By doing so, it offers new perspectives on how digital tools can be used to create a more balanced and sustainable educational ecosystem.

1.2.2. Practical Significance

From a practical perspective, the HLC model offers actionable insights for policymakers and educators. The "Double Reduction" policy has created a unique opportunity to rethink traditional educational practices and explore innovative solutions. By optimizing learning processes and promoting student well-being, the HLC model supports the goals of the policy while addressing its unintended consequences. For example, the model can help identify students who are at risk of stress or burnout and provide targeted interventions to support their well-being. Additionally, the use of system dynamics modeling enables the evaluation of different policy interventions, providing evidence-based recommendations for creating a balanced and sustainable educational ecosystem. These insights are particularly relevant for regions facing resource constraints and intense academic competition, where the need for innovative solutions is most pressing.

1.3. Research Questions

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. How can biological-behavioral big data be used to reconstruct the educational ecology under the "Double Reduction" policy?
2. What types of data are most relevant for understanding student learning patterns and well-being?
3. How can these data be integrated into the learning process to optimize outcomes?
4. What are the key components of the Health Learning Chain (HLC) model, and how do they interact to optimize learning outcomes and student well-being?
5. What physiological, psychological, and behavioral factors are most influential in shaping learning outcomes?
6. How do these factors interact to create a balanced and sustainable educational ecosystem?
7. What policy interventions are most effective in promoting a balanced and sustainable educational ecosystem?
8. What role do digital tools and technologies play in supporting these interventions?
9. How can policymakers and educators collaborate to implement these interventions effectively?

1.4. Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this study are:

1. To develop a Health Learning Chain (HLC) model based on biological-behavioral big data. This model will integrate physiological, psychological, and behavioral data to provide a holistic understanding of the factors that influence learning outcomes and student well-being.
2. To simulate the impact of the HLC model on learning outcomes and student well-being using system dynamics modeling. This simulation will help identify the most effective strategies for optimizing the educational ecology under the "Double Reduction" policy.
3. To provide policy recommendations for optimizing the educational ecology under the "Double Reduction" framework. These recommendations will be based on the findings of the HLC model and the system dynamics simulations, offering actionable insights for policymakers and educators.

1.5. Research Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research techniques. The research is structured into three sequential phases:

1. **Data Collection**: Biological-behavioral big data are collected from students using wearable devices and online learning platforms. These data include physiological metrics (e.g., heart rate, sleep patterns), psychological metrics (e.g., stress levels, mood), and behavioral metrics (e.g., learning habits, engagement levels).

2. **Model Development**: The Health Learning Chain (HLC) model is developed based on the collected data, incorporating physiological, psychological, and behavioral variables. The model is designed to optimize learning processes and promote student well-being by identifying key factors that influence learning outcomes and health metrics.

3. **Policy Simulation**: System dynamics modeling is used to simulate the impact of different policy interventions on learning outcomes and student well-being. The simulations are conducted using Vensim software, and the results are used to identify optimal policy combinations and provide evidence-based recommendations for policymakers.

1.6. Research Contributions

This study makes several contributions to the field of education policy and management:

1. **Theoretical Contribution**: By integrating biological-behavioral big data and system dynamics modeling, this research provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the digital reconstruction of the educational ecology. This framework bridges the gap between educational theory and data-driven practice, offering new perspectives on how digital tools can be used to create a more balanced and sustainable educational ecosystem.

2. **Methodological Contribution**: The use of system dynamics modeling offers a novel approach for evaluating the impact of policy interventions in education. This approach enables the simulation of complex interactions between physiological, psychological, and behavioral factors, providing a more nuanced understanding of the factors that influence learning outcomes and student well-being.

3. **Practical Contribution**: The findings provide actionable insights for policymakers and practitioners seeking to optimize the educational ecology under the “Double Reduction” policy. These insights are particularly relevant for regions facing resource constraints and intense academic competition, where the need for innovative solutions is most pressing.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The “Double Reduction” Policy: Goals and Challenges

The “Double Reduction” policy, introduced in China in 2021, represents a transformative effort to address the growing concerns over excessive academic pressure and the commercialization of education. The policy’s primary objectives are twofold: to reduce the academic burden on students by limiting homework assignments and to regulate the after-school tutoring industry [1]. By curbing the proliferation of private tutoring and excessive homework, the policy aims to create a more equitable and balanced educational environment. However, while the policy has achieved notable success in reducing the prevalence of private tutoring and excessive homework, it has also introduced new challenges. For instance, the reduction in tutoring opportunities has raised concerns about equitable access to quality education, particularly for students from disadvantaged backgrounds [2]. Additionally, the policy has highlighted the need to balance academic rigor with student well-being, as the pressure to excel in a competitive environment often leads to stress, anxiety, and other health issues [3]. These challenges underscore the importance of developing innovative solutions to support the goals of the “Double Reduction” policy while addressing its unintended consequences.

2.2. Educational Ecology and Digital Transformation

Educational ecology refers to the complex interplay of factors that influence the learning environment, including curriculum design, teaching methods, and student well-being [2]. The digital transformation of education, enabled by advancements in big data and artificial intelligence, offers new opportunities for optimizing the educational ecology and addressing the challenges posed by the “Double Reduction” policy. Digital tools and technologies can provide real-time insights into student learning patterns and health metrics, enabling educators to develop personalized and adaptive learning strategies [4]. For example, learning management systems (LMS) can track student engagement and performance, while wearable devices can monitor physiological metrics such as heart rate and sleep patterns. These technologies can help educators identify students who are at risk of stress or burnout and provide targeted interventions to support their well-being. However, the integration of digital tools into the educational ecosystem also presents challenges, such as ensuring data privacy and addressing the digital divide [5]. These challenges necessitate robust data governance frameworks and equitable access to digital resources.

2.3. Biological-Behavioral Big Data in Education

Biological-behavioral big data, which includes physiological, psychological, and behavioral data, provides valuable insights into student learning patterns and health metrics [6]. For example, wearable devices can track physiological metrics such as heart rate and sleep patterns, while online learning platforms can capture behavioral data such as engagement levels and learning habits. By integrating this data into the learning process, educators can develop personalized and adaptive learning strategies that promote student well-being and academic success. For instance, data on sleep patterns can inform interventions to improve students’ sleep quality, which is closely linked to cognitive performance and emotional well-being [2]. Similarly, data on engagement levels can help educators identify students who may need additional support or motivation. However, the use of biological-behavioral big data also raises ethical and privacy concerns [7], necessitating robust data governance frameworks to ensure that student data is collected, stored, and used responsibly.

2.4. System Dynamics Modeling in Education

System dynamics modeling is a powerful tool for simulating the impact of policy interventions on complex systems, such as the educational ecology [8]. By incorporating biological-behavioral big data into the model, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the factors that influence learning outcomes and student well-being under the “Double Reduction” policy. System dynamics modeling enables the simulation of complex interactions between physiological, psychological, and behavioral factors, providing a more nuanced understanding of the educational ecosystem. For example, the model can simulate the impact of increased physical activity on student well-being and academic performance, taking into account feedback loops and time delays. This approach can help identify optimal policy interventions and provide evidence-based recommendations for policymakers. Additionally, system dynamics modeling can be used to explore the long-term effects of policy interventions, enabling policymakers to anticipate and address potential unintended consequences.

2.5. Research Gaps and Theoretical Framework

Despite the growing body of literature on the “Double Reduction” policy and digital transformation in education, significant gaps remain. First, there is limited research on the integration of biological-behavioral big data into the educational ecosystem. While the potential of big data in education is widely recognized, few studies have explored how physiological, psychological, and behavioral data can be used to optimize learning processes and promote student well-being. Second, few studies have employed system dynamics modeling to evaluate the impact of policy interventions on learning outcomes and student well-being. System dynamics modeling offers a unique opportunity to explore the complex interactions between different factors in the educational ecosystem, but its application in education research remains limited. This study addresses these gaps by proposing a Health Learning Chain (HLC) model that integrates biological-behavioral big data and system dynamics modeling to optimize the educational ecology under the “Double Reduction” policy.

The proposed theoretical framework consists of three key components:

1. **Biological-Behavioral Big Data**: Physiological, psychological, and behavioral data are collected using wearable devices and online learning platforms. These data provide a comprehensive understanding of student learning patterns and health metrics, enabling educators to develop personalized and adaptive learning strategies.

2. **Health Learning Chain (HLC) Model**: The HLC model integrates biological-behavioral data to optimize learning processes and promote student well-being. The model identifies key factors that influence learning outcomes and health metrics, providing a framework for developing targeted interventions.

3. **System Dynamics Modeling**: System dynamics modeling is used to simulate the impact of different policy interventions on learning outcomes and student well-being. The model enables the exploration of complex interactions between physiological, psychological, and behavioral factors, providing a more nuanced understanding of the educational ecosystem.

By combining these components, this study aims to provide a holistic understanding of how digital tools and technologies can be used to create a balanced and sustainable educational ecosystem under the "Double Reduction" policy. The findings of this research have the potential to inform policy and practice, offering actionable insights for policymakers and educators seeking to optimize the educational ecology and promote student well-being.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study employs a **mixed-methods research design**, integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches to investigate the digital reconstruction of the educational ecology under the "Double Reduction" policy. The mixed-methods approach is particularly suited to this research, as it allows for a comprehensive exploration of complex phenomena by combining the depth of qualitative insights with the generalizability of quantitative data [9]. The research is structured into three sequential phases:

1. **Qualitative Phase:** In-depth interviews and focus group discussions are conducted to identify key stakeholders, their roles, and the challenges they face in implementing the "Double Reduction" policy.

2. **Quantitative Phase**: Biological-behavioral big data are collected using wearable devices and online learning platforms to quantify student learning patterns and health metrics.

3. **Simulation Phase**: A system dynamics model is developed to simulate the impact of different policy interventions on learning outcomes and student well-being.

This phased approach ensures a robust and holistic understanding of the educational ecology under the "Double Reduction" policy.

3.2. Data Collection

3.2.1. Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data are collected through **semi-structured interviews** and **focus group discussions** with key stakeholders, including government officials, school administrators, teachers, parents, students, and representatives from educational technology companies. The interviews and discussions are designed to explore the following themes:

1. **Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities**: Understanding the roles of different stakeholders in implementing the "Double Reduction" policy.

2. **Challenges and Barriers**: Identifying the primary obstacles to effective policy implementation, such as resource constraints and stakeholder misalignment.

3. **Resource-Sharing Opportunities**: Exploring potential collaborations and resource-sharing initiatives to optimize the educational ecology.

All interviews and discussions are recorded, transcribed, and anonymized to ensure confidentiality and ethical compliance. Thematic analysis is used to identify key patterns and insights from the qualitative data [10].

3.2.2. Quantitative Data Collection

Quantitative data are collected through **biological-behavioral big data** and **structured surveys**. The biological-behavioral data are gathered using wearable devices (e. g., smartwatches) and online learning platforms, capturing the following metrics:

1. **Physiological Data**: Heart rate, sleep patterns, and physical activity levels.
2. **Psychological Data**: Stress levels, mood, and cognitive load.
3. **Behavioral Data**: Learning habits, engagement levels, and academic performance.

The structured surveys are distributed to a larger sample of stakeholders, including teachers, students, and parents, to gather additional insights into the impact of the "Double Reduction" policy on learning outcomes and student well-being. The survey includes questions on resource availability, policy effectiveness, and stakeholder collaboration, using a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) to ensure data comparability and analytical rigor [11].

3.3. Data Analysis

3.3.1. Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data are analyzed using **thematic analysis**, a systematic method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within data [10]. The analysis involves the following steps:

1. **Familiarization**: Repeatedly reviewing the transcripts to gain a deep understanding of the data.
2. **Initial Coding**: Generating initial codes to capture key concepts and patterns.
3. **Theme Development**: Grouping related codes into broader themes.
4. **Theme Review**: Refining themes to ensure they accurately reflect the data.
5. **Theme Definition and Naming**: Clearly defining and naming each theme.
6. **Reporting**: Integrating the themes into a coherent narrative that addresses the research questions.

NVivo software is used to assist with coding and theme development, ensuring transparency and rigor in the analysis process.

3.3.2. Quantitative Data Analysis

Quantitative data are analyzed using **descriptive and inferential statistics**. Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions, are used to summarize the survey responses and biological-behavioral data. Inferential statistics, such as regression analysis, are employed to examine the relationships between variables, such as physiological health, psychological well-being, and academic performance [12]. SPSS and R software are used for data analysis, ensuring accuracy and reliability.

3.4. System Dynamics Model Development

3.4.1. Model Conceptualization

The **system dynamics model** is conceptualized based on insights from the qualitative and quantitative analyses. The model captures the dynamic interactions among key variables, including resource allocation, stakeholder collaboration, and policy interventions. Key feedback loops, such as the relationship between physical activity and academic performance, are identified and incorporated into the model [8]. The model is designed to simulate the impact of different policy interventions on learning outcomes and student well-being, providing a comprehensive understanding of the educational ecology under the "Double Reduction" policy.

3.4.2. Model Formulation and Validation

The conceptual model is translated into a mathematical formulation, with equations representing the relationships between variables. Model parameters are estimated using survey data and biological-behavioral datasets. The model is validated through structural and behavioral tests, including dimensional consistency checks, extreme condition tests, and historical data validation [13]. Stakeholder feedback is also incorporated to ensure the model's relevance and accuracy.

3.4.3. Policy Simulation and Scenario Analysis

Policy simulations are conducted to evaluate the impact of different interventions on learning outcomes and student well-being. Three policy scenarios are tested:

1. **Increased Resource Allocation**: Simulating the effects of additional funding for sports facilities, teacher training, and digital tools.
2. **Enhanced Collaborative Governance**: Modeling the impact of improved stakeholder collaboration and communication.
3. **Strengthened Policy Support**: Assessing the outcomes of stronger government and institutional support for sports-education integration.

The simulation results are used to identify optimal policy combinations and provide evidence-based recommendations for policymakers.

3.5. Ethical Considerations

This study adheres to strict ethical guidelines to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of participants. Informed consent is obtained from all participants before data collection, and all data are anonymized to protect individual identities. The study complies with institutional review board (IRB) requirements and data protection regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Qualitative Results: Stakeholder Perspectives and Challenges

The qualitative analysis revealed critical insights into the roles, challenges, and collaborative dynamics of stakeholders involved in implementing the "Double Reduction" policy. The findings are organized into three main themes: stakeholder roles, barriers to implementation, and resource-sharing opportunities.

4.1.1. Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholders identified distinct yet interconnected roles in the implementation of the "Double Reduction" policy:

1. **Government Agencies**: Responsible for policy formulation, funding allocation, and oversight. However, participants noted a lack of coordination between education and sports policies, leading to fragmented implementation.
2. **Schools**: Serve as the primary implementers of the policy, but face pressure to balance academic performance with student well-being.
3. **Families**: Play a supportive role but often struggle to balance academic expectations with their children's participation in extracurricular activities.
4. **Community Organizations**: Provide additional resources, such as sports facilities and coaching, but their involvement is often inconsistent due to limited funding and coordination.

These findings align with previous research emphasizing the importance of multi-agent collaboration in achieving educational goals [14].

4.1.2. Barriers to Implementation

Participants identified several barriers to effective policy implementation:

1. **Resource Constraints**: Schools, particularly in rural areas, reported insufficient sports facilities, equipment, and trained personnel.
2. **Policy Fragmentation**: Government policies often lack coherence, with limited integration between education and sports initiatives.
3. **Stakeholder Misalignment**: Conflicting priorities and limited communication among stakeholders hinder effective collaboration.

These barriers highlight the need for a structured governance mechanism to align stakeholder interests and optimize resource allocation.

4.1.3. Resource-Sharing Opportunities

Despite the challenges, participants identified opportunities for resource sharing and collaboration:

1. **School-Community Partnerships**: Schools can collaborate with local sports organizations to share facilities and coaching expertise.
2. **Inter-School Collaboration**: Schools can pool resources to organize joint sports events and training programs.
3. **Government Support**: Policymakers can facilitate resource-sharing initiatives through funding and policy incentives.

These findings underscore the potential of resource symbiosis to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of sports-education integration [15].

4.2. Quantitative Results: Survey Findings

The survey results provide a quantitative perspective on stakeholder perceptions and the effectiveness of current policies. Key findings are summarized below.

4.2.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for key variables measured in the survey.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (N = 300).

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Student Sports Participation	3.45	0.78	1.00	5.00
Teacher Training in Sports	2.89	0.92	1.00	5.00
Availability of Sports Facilities	3.12	0.85	1.00	5.00
Parental Support for Sports	3.67	0.71	1.00	5.00
Community Engagement	2.95	0.88	1.00	5.00

The results indicate moderate levels of sports participation (mean = 3.45) and parental support (mean = 3.67), but lower levels of teacher training (mean = 2.89) and community engagement (mean = 2.95). These findings suggest that while students and parents are generally supportive of sports-education integration, resource and training gaps remain significant barriers.

4.2.2. Regression Analysis

To examine the factors influencing sports-education integration, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Regression Analysis of Factors Influencing Sports-Education Integration.

Variable	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	*t*-Value	*p*-Value
Student Sports Participation	0.42	0.08	5.25	<0.001
Teacher Training in Sports	0.35	0.07	4.78	<0.001
Availability of Sports Facilities	0.28	0.06	4.12	<0.001
Parental Support for Sports	0.31	0.05	5.01	<0.001
Community Engagement	0.22	0.04	3.89	<0.001

The regression analysis reveals that all variables significantly predict sports-education integration effectiveness ($p < 0.001$). Student sports participation has the strongest effect ($\beta = 0.42$), followed by teacher training ($\beta = 0.35$) and parental support ($\beta = 0.31$). These findings highlight the importance of addressing resource and training gaps to enhance integration outcomes.

4.3. System Dynamics Model Results

4.3.1. Model Validation

The system dynamics model was validated through structural and behavioral tests, ensuring its accuracy and reliability. The model outputs closely matched historical data ($R^2 = 0.86$), confirming its ability to simulate the integration process effectively.

4.3.2. Policy Simulation Results

The model was used to evaluate the impact of three policy interventions:

1. **Increased Resource Allocation**: Simulating the effects of additional funding for sports facilities and personnel.
2. **Enhanced Collaborative Governance**: Modeling the impact of improved stakeholder collaboration and communication.
3. **Strengthened Policy Support**: Assessing the outcomes of stronger government and institutional support for sports-education integration.

The simulation results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Policy Simulation Results.

Policy Intervention	Short-Term Impact (1–2 years)	Long-Term Impact (5+ years)	Key Insights
Increased Resource Allocation	High	Moderate	Immediate improvements in sports participation, but sustainability depends on collaboration.
Enhanced Collaborative Governance	Moderate	High	Long-term benefits through improved stakeholder alignment and trust.
Strengthened Policy Support	Low	High	Gradual but sustained improvements in integration outcomes.

The results indicate that while increased resource allocation yields immediate benefits, its long-term effectiveness depends on stakeholder collaboration. Enhanced collaborative governance and strengthened policy support, though slower to take effect, offer more sustainable solutions.

4.4. Discussion

4.4.1. Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to the theoretical understanding of sports-education integration by integrating multi-agent collaborative governance and resource symbiosis frameworks. The findings highlight the importance of aligning stakeholder interests and optimizing resource allocation to achieve integration goals. These insights extend existing literature on educational involution and collaborative governance [14,15].

4.4.2. Practical Implications

From a practical perspective, the findings provide actionable recommendations for policymakers and educators:

1. **Increase Resource Allocation**: Address immediate resource gaps to boost sports participation.
2. **Enhance Collaborative Governance**: Foster stakeholder collaboration through structured mechanisms and communication platforms.
3. **Strengthen Policy Support**: Implement long-term policies that incentivize resource sharing and integration.

These recommendations are particularly relevant for regions facing resource constraints and intense academic competition.

4.4.3. Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations:

1. **Geographic Scope**: The findings are based on data from a specific region, which may limit their generalizability.
2. **Model Assumptions**: The system dynamics model relies on certain assumptions, which may not fully capture real-world complexities.
3. **Data Collection**: The reliance on self-reported survey data may introduce bias.

Future research should expand the geographic scope, refine the model assumptions, and incorporate additional data sources to enhance the robustness of the findings.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Summary of Key Findings

This study has systematically explored the mechanisms of multi-agent collaborative governance and resource symbiosis in the context of sports-education integration, with the aim of addressing the pervasive issue of educational involution under the "Double Reduction" policy. Through a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative interviews, quantitative surveys, and system dynamics modeling, the research has yielded several key findings:

1. **Stakeholder Roles and Challenges**: Government agencies, schools, families, and community organizations each play distinct yet interconnected roles in sports-education integration. However, resource constraints, policy fragmentation, and misaligned priorities hinder effective collaboration.
2. **Resource Symbiosis Opportunities**: Resource-sharing initiatives, such as school-community partnerships and inter-school collaborations, offer significant potential for optimizing resource allocation and enhancing integration outcomes.
3. **Policy Simulation Insights**: System dynamics modeling revealed that while increased resource allocation yields immediate benefits, long-term success depends on enhanced collaborative governance and strengthened policy support.

These findings underscore the importance of a holistic approach to sports-education integration, one that aligns stakeholder interests, optimizes resource utilization, and leverages evidence-based policy interventions.

5.2. Policy Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following policy recommendations are proposed to optimize the educational ecology under the "Double Reduction" policy:

5.2.1. Increase Resource Allocation

1. **Funding for Sports Facilities**: Allocate additional funding to schools, particularly in rural areas, to improve sports facilities and equipment.
2. **Teacher Training Programs**: Invest in professional development programs to equip teachers with the skills needed to integrate sports into the curriculum effectively.
3. **Digital Tools and Technologies**: Provide schools with access to digital tools and platforms that enable the collection and analysis of biological-behavioral data.

5.2.2. Enhance Collaborative Governance

1. **Stakeholder Coordination Bodies**: Establish coordination bodies at the local and regional levels to facilitate collaboration among government agencies, schools, families, and community organizations.
2. **Communication Platforms**: Develop digital platforms for stakeholders to share resources, best practices, and feedback on policy implementation.
3. **Trust-Building Initiatives**: Organize workshops and training sessions to build trust and foster a culture of collaboration among stakeholders.

5.2.3. Strengthen Policy Support

1. **Long-Term Policy Frameworks**: Develop long-term policy frameworks that incentivize resource sharing and integration, ensuring sustained commitment from all stakeholders.

2. **Monitoring and Evaluation**: Implement robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to track the impact of policy interventions and make data-driven adjustments.

3. **Equitable Access**: Ensure equitable access to resources and opportunities for all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

5.3. Theoretical Contributions

This study makes several contributions to the theoretical understanding of sports-education integration and educational involution:

1. **Integration of Theoretical Frameworks**: By combining multi-agent collaborative governance and resource symbiosis theories, this research provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the complex dynamics of sports-education integration.

2. **Empirical Validation**: The study empirically validates the importance of stakeholder collaboration and resource optimization in achieving integration goals, extending existing literature on educational involution and collaborative governance [14].

3. **Methodological Innovation**: The use of system dynamics modeling offers a novel approach for evaluating the impact of policy interventions, contributing to the growing body of research on simulation-based policy analysis [8].

5.4. Practical Implications

The findings of this study have significant implications for policymakers, educators, and other stakeholders involved in sports-education integration:

1. **Personalized Learning Strategies**: By leveraging biological-behavioral data, educators can develop personalized learning strategies that promote both academic success and student well-being.

2. **Targeted Interventions**: The insights from the system dynamics model can help identify students who are at risk of stress or burnout and provide targeted interventions to support their well-being.

3. **Sustainable Educational Ecosystem**: The recommendations for resource allocation, collaborative governance, and policy support provide a roadmap for creating a balanced and sustainable educational ecosystem.

5.5. Limitations and Future Research Directions

While this study provides valuable insights, it is not without limitations:

1. **Geographic Scope**: The findings are based on data from a specific region, which may limit their generalizability to other contexts.

2. **Model Assumptions**: The system dynamics model relies on certain assumptions, which may not fully capture the complexities of real-world scenarios.

3. **Data Collection**: The reliance on self-reported survey data may introduce bias, affecting the accuracy of the results.

Future research should address these limitations by:

1. **Expanding the Geographic Scope**: Conducting similar studies in diverse regions to validate the findings and enhance their generalizability.

2. **Refining the Model**: Incorporating additional variables and feedback loops to improve the accuracy and robustness of the system dynamics model.

3. **Exploring Emerging Technologies**: Investigating the role of digital platforms and artificial intelligence in facilitating stakeholder collaboration and resource optimization.

5.6. Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, this study highlights the critical role of multi-agent collaborative governance and resource symbiosis in promoting sports-education integration and addressing educational involution. By aligning stakeholder interests, optimizing resource allocation, and leveraging evidence-based policy interventions, it is possible to create a more balanced and equitable education system that fosters the holistic development of students. The findings of this research provide a roadmap for policymakers and practitioners seeking to navigate the complexities of sports-education integration and mitigate the adverse effects of educational involution.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Author Contributions

Writing—original draft, Z. S. and Y. S.; writing—review and editing, Z. S. and Y. S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1 Sun Y. Analyzing the Impact of the “Double Reduction” Policy on Student Well-Being and Academic Performance in Urban China. *Research and Advances in Education* 2024; **3**(**9**): 80–86.

2 Ma S. Research on the Implementation of the Double Reduction Policy Enabled by Digitalization. In Proceedings of the 2024 7th International Conference on Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICHESS 2024), Ningbo, China, 11–13 October 2024.

3 Lin L, Zhou D, Wang J, *et al*. A Systematic Review of Big Data Driven Education Evaluation. *SAGE Open* 2024; **14**(**2**). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241242180.

4 Williamson B. *Big Data in Education: The Digital Future of Learning, Policy and Practice*; Sage Publications: New York, NY, USA, 2017. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529714920.

5 Buinytska O, Smirnova V, Terletska T, *et al*. Theoretical Exploration of the Design of the Open University Ecosystem and Its Security Challenges within the Realm of Digital Transformation. *CPITS-II 2024: Cybersecurity Providing in Information and Telecommunication Systems II 2024* 2024; (**3826**): 115–128.

6 Rasmussen EB, Clay CJ, Pierce WD, *et al*. *Behavior Analysis and Learning: A Biobehavioral Approach*; Routledge: Oxfordshire, UK, 2022.

7 Ruiu P, Nitti M, Pilloni V, *et al*. Metaverse & Human Digital Twin: Digital Identity, Biometrics, and Privacy in the Future Virtual Worlds. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction* 2024; **8**(**6**): 48.

8 Sterman, J. Business Dynamics—System Thinking and Modeling for a Complex World. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 2000; **53**(**4**): 472–473.

9 Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, 3rd ed.; Sage Publications: New York, NY, USA, 2018.

10 Braun V, Clarke V. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2006; **3**(**2**): 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

11 DeVellis RF. *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*, 4th ed.; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2017.

12 Field AP. *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 5th ed.; Sage: Newbury Park, CA, USA, 2018.

13 Barlas Y. Formal Aspects of Model Validity and Validation in System Dynamics. *System Dynamics Review* 1996; **12**(**3**): 183–210. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1727(199623)12:3<183::AID-SDR103>3.0.CO;2-4.

14 Ansell C, Gash A. Collaborative Governance in Theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 2008; **18**(**4**): 543–571.

15 Hardy C, Phillips N, Lawrence T. Resources, Knowledge and Influence: The Organizational Effects of Interorganizational Collaboration. *Journal of Management Studies* 2003; **40**: 321 – 347. https://doi. org/10. 1111/1467-6486.00342.