

Original Paper

Community Administrativeisation and Governance Measures - A Case Study of Community S in Chengdu City

Yuling Deng

School of Marine Law and Humanities, Dalian Ocean University, Dalian, Liaoning, China

Received: June 20, 2024

Accepted: July 7, 2024

Online Published: July 12, 2024

doi:10.22158/sssr.v5n3p43

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sssr.v5n3p43>

Abstract

Since the reform of the "unit system", the problems exposed in the operation of community neighbourhood committees have led to endless debate in the academic community about the need for "administrativeisation". The theoretical basis for the "de-administration" of community neighbourhood committees comes from the relevant provisions of the Constitution and the law, while the theoretical basis for "administrativeisation" comes from the real problems that exist in practice, which is the gap between what should be the case and what is the case for community neighbourhood committees. Based on a sample analysis of Community S in Chengdu City, this paper synthesises the actual situation of community neighbourhood committees across the country, and puts forward some thoughts on the governance of community neighbourhood committees.

Keywords

community governance; administrative; neighbourhood councils

1. Introduction

As grass-roots mass self-governing organisations, residents' committees, on the one hand, have been given the expectation of improving residents' self-governing capacity, and on the other hand, they are also regarded as an important force for diversified social governance. Article 2 of the Organic Law of the People's Republic of China on Urban Residents' Committees (hereinafter referred to as the Urban Residents' Committees Law) clearly stipulates that "Residents' Committees are grassroots mass self-governing organisations for residents' self-management, self-education and self-service." Although it is clearly defined in the law, in practice, neighbourhood committees still undertake heavy administrative tasks. The community constructed in community building is a unit of national governance rather than a community of territorial and social life (Yang, 2007). Community neighbourhood committee of the administrative trend is becoming more and more serious, and the

neighbourhood committee of the "administrative" led to its own self-governing attributes weakened, and the legislation of the legal status of the concept of deviation. All along, the academic community on the "de-administratisation" of the issue of discussion, the conclusion of most of the government no longer delegate administrative affairs or neighborhood committees refused to carry out, to promote the rational allocation of government responsibilities and powers (Sun, 2016), change the concept of thinking, no longer "community" as a functional substitute, to focus on the maintenance of the "community". as a substitute for function, and to focus on maintaining Grassroots social order (Chen, 2018). However, there are still scholars who suggest that the "de-administration" of the neighbourhood committee is a "chivalrous windmill" misled by the wrong theory (Liu & Liu, 2017). The administrativeisation of the neighbourhood committee is the result of the neighbourhood committee's active choice and practice in the field of action (Hou & Wen, 2022).

During the COVID-19, the community council in the grassroots epidemic prevention and control played a pivotal role, from which it is not difficult to see the advantages of community council "administrative", a certain degree of "administrative" is conducive to community governance. How does the administrativeisation of community neighbourhood committees affect community governance, and can the administrativeisation of community neighbourhood committees (hereinafter referred to as communities) assist in completing the role of self-improvement. This paper will analyse the tendency and performance of the administrativeisation of community governance on the basis of the administrativeisation of the S community, and on this basis, analyse the path of administrativeisation of community governance and put forward corresponding suggestions.

2. Case Presentation: Tendencies and Manifestations of the Administrativeisation of Community Governance

S community jurisdiction of 20 streets and alleys, 111 courtyards, more than 5,000 households, household population of more than 14,000 people, more than 17,000 permanent residents, there are 50 resident groups, resident representatives 61 people, a total of 720 members of the community party members, the party committee under the grid of the party branch of 12.

2.1 Community Governance Tasks Administrative

Since the reform of the "unit system", the community has long assumed the tasks assigned by the government, the community is more similar to the street office "sent organs". In the eyes of the residents, the community is the nearest "government", "all looking for the community" "community can do anything" slogan is common throughout the country. The release of the Notice of the Ministry of Civil Affairs and the Central Organisation Department on Further Work on Community Burden Reduction (Minfa [2015] No. 136) has not effectively alleviated the complexity of community affairs. The community will be more like a link between the public and the government, with residents feeding back the various problems they encounter to the community every day, which in turn feeds back to the grassroots government as a way to solve problems.

In recent years, the city of Chengdu to promote the transformation of old compounds, issued by the Chengdu Municipal Housing and Urban-Rural Development Bureau, the Chengdu Municipal Finance Bureau on further strengthening the views of the old compounds renovation project construction organisation and management (Chengdu Housing and Construction Development [2022] No. 82), mentioned that, the owners of the old compounds, owners' committees or residents' self-governance organisations in accordance with the prescribed degree of entrustment, the street office or the township people's government to take the lead in promoting the transformation of the relevant work, is the main body of the transformation work of the old courtyard, the industry committee or residents' self-governing organisation should participate in the whole process of transformation. The General Office of the Chengdu Municipal People's Government on the further development of the implementation of the work to promote the independent addition of lifts to existing homes (Chengbanfa [2021] No. 2) also proposed that the community neighbourhood committees are responsible for the collection of public opinion, the platform to build, the mediation of dissenting views, verification and copy the work of the street office, while the street office is responsible for supervising the community neighbourhood committees to work, the implementation of the work of the government subsidies issued and so on. I visited the S community found that the old courtyard renovation and additional lifts, are by the residents of the entire building within their own consultations, all agreed to sign the results will be reported to the community, if individual residents do not agree with the transformation, you can find the community grid organization mediation and consultation, if you can not mediate the negotiation properly, the new lift and renovation of things can only be temporarily put aside, once the residents do not agree, things can easily be put on hold! However, every year, the government will issue targets to the relevant units to promote the project, the targets are directly related to the year-end assessment, the community must actively negotiate to complete the task. It is not difficult to see that the neighbourhood committee as an autonomous organisation, the work led by the grassroots government, but finally implemented to the community level, according to the Constitution, the community and the grass-roots government does not have a direct link, but in practice, often several communities under a street office, the community is busy dealing with the street office of the work, including but not limited to the low income people, people with disabilities, the elderly people each month subsidies, the key population preferential work, and housing security work. Key populations and housing security, and when it comes to "creating culture", "creating health" and so on, but also to cope with the inspection of various units. The community, as the voice of the people, but on the side of the Government in its behaviour, is neither close to the people nor a source of support for them. Another boundary has been created with the masses, making it difficult to feel the attributes of self-governance.

2.2 Administrativeisation of Community Governance Personnel

The community is only a grass-roots mass self-governance organisation. The community is not an administrative body of the government, nor is it an institution. Community workers, who are representatives of the residents, the head and members of the neighbourhood committee are elected by

the residents by vote. They are not civil servants and have an administrative rank. The Fourth Plenary Session of the 19th CPC Central Committee proposed sound social governance and the implementation of grid-based management and services, which led to the emergence of the profession of gridman. Grid members are those who are engaged in service management and undertake frontline work in the grid, and are generally selected from existing community workers and grassroots support staff of relevant departments (Qian, 2023). Grid workers rely on information technology means and matter disposal standards for urban and rural governance and public service matters, work duties mainly include basic information collection, social sentiment collection, security hidden danger investigation, conflict investigation and resolution, various matters to assist in the management of services, policies and regulations propaganda. Community workers focus on the provision of administrative empirical services, their working method is based on administrative, empirical characteristics, and satisfaction-oriented; their work duties mainly include organising community service activities, improving services for special people, carrying out mass social mutual assistance activities, and assisting the government to do a good job in providing residents with minimum subsistence protection, etc. Within the scope of the S community, each street is handled by a different grid worker to deal with the residents' Various types of problems, fixed posts and responsibilities, the responsibility is implemented to the individual grid clerk, to ensure that each grid clerk's phone is open to facilitate communication with the residents at any time, and his or her salary is uniformly paid by the street office.

In practice, most of the personnel in the community are directly appointed by the street office or open recruitment, and in recent years, there is no shortage of recruitment information for community staff seen on the recruitment platform. I have observed the residents of the S community voting election activities, resident representatives of the election of personnel is limited to a fixed number of grid staff, there have been residents asked whether they can also participate in the selection of the grid staff said that the residents are retired, don't come to fight with their own bowl of "cold rice", to such words to dispel the residents' ideas, from a certain point of view, reduce the enthusiasm of the residents to participate in the election, the residents of the election of the enthusiasm of the residents, the residents of the election of the residents. Residents' enthusiasm for participation, the election of residents only makes the work of the gridman in the procedural rationalisation, the loss of the process itself should bring procedural justice.

2.3 Lack of Autonomy in Community Governance

Residents, as part of the community, are the main body and core of the community, however, residents have low participation, weak organisation and a relatively weak sense of participation when it comes to community governance. Due to the ideological confinement, most people still pursue the habit of "less participation, less trouble", residents willing to participate in community governance, mostly enthusiastic retirees, the overall age of young people facing the "996" and the pressure of life of the car loan, their own life can not yet take into account, for the community governance of the lack of

self-governance, the residents of the community as a member of the community is the main and core. Young people, faced with the pressure of "996" and home and car loans, are unable to take care of their own lives, and are even more indifferent to community governance. During my visit to Community S, I found that the residents' group leaders or residents' committee members who came to respond to the problems were old and retired people who participated in the process on their own initiative.

Young faces are seldom seen, and the age and quality of participation in community governance varies, ultimately leading to an imbalance in community governance and differences in the level of self-governance. Communities are busy coping with various inspections and meetings of higher levels of government, and when there is a conflict between residents' self-governance issues and tasks assigned by the government, it is often difficult to balance them, with the vast majority choosing to put government tasks first and residents' issues second. Some studies have pointed out that the residents' affairs of neighbourhood committees only account for 20 per cent (Yang & Yu, 2012). Residents reflecting problems, faced with staff not in the office, telephone contact description is not clear, low efficiency, resulting in their own problems are not effective feedback, and in the end, but also a lot of energy, in the long run, the residents think that the small problems tolerate a little bit of the past, can not tolerate to go to the door of the government to make trouble, so in the face of community governance, the majority of residents do not look at the Neighbourhood Committees as a basic organisation for the realisation of democratic rights, they also lack the concept of self-management through the neighbourhood committee (He & Cai, 2005), preferring to spend more time on leisure and entertainment rather than participate in it, and lack a sense of identity with the neighbourhood committee.

Communities do not have their own independent financial resources, and they rely on the government for their salaries and subsidies. At the end of the year, the government sends people to visit each community to conduct surveys and have one-on-one conversations with each staff member, and the results of the conversations and the performance of the staff will directly affect the final year-end bonuses. During the epidemic, only occasional corporate donations allowed for some additional subsidies that communities received for working overtime day and night. Even because of the lack of special funds, the annual welfare work for veterans, but also corporate donations can only be issued, this "financial power on the centralised, decentralised" system, even as a self-governing organisation of the residents' committees, it is very difficult to dedicate themselves to community self-governance, but also because of the lack of independent funds, resulting in the community must be dependent on the government! It is also because of the lack of financial independence that the community must be dependent on the government.

3. Generative Logic of Community Administrativeisation

Community administrativeisation refers to the administrativeisation of community space, staffing, basic functions, organisational systems and operational mechanisms (Bu, 2011). The administrativeisation of

S communities is mainly reflected in two aspects. On the one hand, from the point of view of the community's external factors, financial allocations, material supplies, and the division of office space basically rely on government funding; on the other hand, from the point of view of the community's internal factors, the implementation of the community's own rules and regulations are all mainly focused on completing the tasks delegated by the higher-ups. In short, the administrativeisation of community organisations mainly stems from the strong external environmental factors such as the government, as well as their own organisational failures and the expected subordination tendency of community organisations (Ma, 2018). The strong government compresses the development space of the community itself, as well as the process of democratic development, the community itself is willing to ideologically inclined to the government.

The administrativeisation of the community is only a means of governing the grassroots, with the aim of achieving grassroots democracy and building a socialist democratic state. In the case of Xinguan pneumonia, for example, the community was responsible for, but not limited to, posting risk classification lists for different parts of the country, reporting codes for people returning home, installing door magnets for residents living in quarantine, and answering dozens, if not hundreds, of telephone inquiries about the epidemic every day; if there was a suspected case in an area with a large number of people moving about in the precincts, the community had to communicate with the "Time Accompaniment" on a daily basis. When a suspected case occurs in an area with a large number of mobile residents, it is necessary to communicate with the "time and space companion" every day, and in the event of a confirmed case, it is quite common for the working hours to be reversed. From this, we can see that the community, as a link between the residents and the Government, has contributed to the maintenance of stability at the grassroots level and cannot be ignored. Therefore, the community cannot be stripped off from the government governance unit, which will reduce work efficiency and give rise to a lack of responsibility.

At the present stage, the administrativeisation of the community has, to a certain extent, enhanced the authority of the community in front of the residents. On the one hand, the residents are subject to the community's deployment under the idea of "government control over the people"; on the other hand, the sense of ownership propagated by the neighbourhood committees brings them closer to the committees and they take part in some self-management, self-service and self-education tasks, which facilitates the community's governance and the realisation of grass-roots democracy to a greater extent.

4. Discussion

4.1 Exploring the Path of Community Administrativeisation

4.1.1 Clarify the Relationship between the Government and the Community

China has long been a managerial government, the work report of the 17th National People's Congress pointed out that we should "change functions, rationalise relations, optimise structure, improve effectiveness" and build a service-oriented government (People's Daily Press, 2007). The work of the

government is packaged into the community, is the main manager of the community, in the community governance issues, can be said to be unquestionable. Community management and government management mode is consistent, the government's powers and responsibilities to a certain extent penetrate into the community, if the community from the government stripped, as if scraping the bones of the pain. The government should set out the list of powers and responsibilities, not all the tasks packaged to the community, can be appropriate to outsource some of the affairs of the community, the community to complete the community can get the due reward from it, and the separation of the government's financial resources, the formation of their own unique funds, economic independence in order to move towards a new chapter of community self-government. The community should be clear about its own position, as a self-governing organisation, it can negotiate with the government to solve difficult problems, jump out of the concept of a managerial government, and maintain a good relationship of cooperation with the government for mutual benefit.

4.1.2 Clarify the Legal Status of the Community

For a long time, the main responsibility of the community is unclear, and the legal position is ambiguous. The Organic Law of the Urban Residents' Committee of the People's Republic of China, adopted in December 2018, clearly stipulates the tasks of the residents' committee, and the relevant departments of the people's government of the municipal and municipal districts can give operational guidance to the subordinate committees of the residents' committee, so that the community takes into account both the "self-governance" and "administration". This gives communities the dual attributes of "self-governance" and "administration". Its legal provisions do not respond to the legal status of the community, and are one-sided in their application. The community is a class of administrative organisations, the class of administrative organisations is non-administrative organisations, but undertake certain social management functions, not for profit (Wu, 2001). The author believes that the community can be regarded as an administrative subject rather than an administrative organ. Administrative subject refers to the organisation that can exercise administrative power in its own name, and can independently assume the corresponding legal responsibility arising therefrom, and is not equivalent to the administrative organ, so that managers outside the administrative organ is not an administrative organ, but can become an administrative subject to give administrative law care (Zhang, 2000), the community, if it is included in the concept of administrative organisations, will depart from the concept of self-governing organisations as stipulated in the Constitution.

4.1.3 Explore the Model of Self-government under the Administrativeisation of the Community

China's population distribution is characterised by more east and less west, different population densities in different parts of the country, the situation of each community is more complex, a region in Beijing, the resident population reached 600,000 people, a community in Tibet, the resident population is only a thousand people. The situation varies from place to place, both in terms of population density and ethnic beliefs. The government and the community consult and communicate, the government uses the community to communicate effectively with the residents, and the community uses the government

and the information it has to adapt to the local situation and create local governance regulations for the situation in the district, making community governance more reasonable and more humane.

Different parts of the country have embarked on different paths to explore community autonomy models, represented by the Shenzhen Lantian model and Tongling model, which stimulate the advancement of the reverse-administration process in order to reach the goal of full autonomy; and the Nanjing and Baotou models, which reposition the street-community function in pursuit of limited autonomy, with the intention of seeking a balance between administration and autonomy (Wang, 2019). Chengdu City took the lead in establishing the Chengdu Municipal Committee of Urban and Rural Community Development and Governance (referred to as the Social Governance Committee) in September 2017, separating community governance from the civil affairs department and forming a separate Social Governance Committee, which is used to build a community governance system, make all kinds of social subjects participate in grass-roots governance more actively, and basically form a new type of grass-roots governance pattern of "one nucleus and three administrations, and common construction and common governance and sharing". A new type of grass-roots governance pattern has basically been formed, in which "one core, three administrations, and shared governance". A community governance division has been set up under the committee to guide and promote the participation of various types of subjects in the development and governance of urban and rural communities, eliminating the need for various organs to issue different tasks, which would then be assigned to each community by the street office, and directly and centrally dealing with the problems of community governance, thereby improving the efficiency of community governance.

5. Conclusion

Community governance "administrative" and "de-administrative" academic controversy has never ceased, community governance can not be a single emphasis on "de-administrative", in the context of the experience of three years of new coronary pneumonia, the community plays an important role under the leadership of the government. Under the background of three years of new coronary pneumonia, the community plays an important role under the leadership of the government, appropriate "administrative" is more in line with the actual needs of the present, the government's deployment of the community is more reasonable and effective; the residents to cultivate a sense of ownership, active participation in democratic activities, the community and the residents of both sides of the run in order to create a higher level of public interest.

References

- Yang Min. (2007). Community as a unit of national governance - a case study of residents' community participation and community perception in the process of urban community building movement. *Sociological Research*, 2007(04), 137-164+245. <http://doi.org/10.19934/j.cnki.shxyj.2007.04.007>

- Sun Baiying. (2016). How is it possible to "de-administer" urban community neighbourhood committees? *Nanjing Social Science*, 345(07), 51-58. <http://doi.org/10.15937/j.cnki.issn1001-8263.2016.07.008>.
- Chen, P. (2018). Community de-administration: The main modes and their operation logic - based on national empirical observation and analysis. *Learning and Practice*, 2018(02), 89-97. <http://doi.org/10.19624/j.cnki.cn42-1005/c.2018.02.012>
- Liu Taigang, & Liu Kaijun. (2017). Neighbourhood committee "de-administration": the "knight in shining armour" under the misguidance of the wrong theory - the logic of the broad social organisation theory based on the demand spillover theory. *Journal of Beijing Normal University (Social Science Edition)*, 261(03), 118-125.
- Hou Liwen, & Wen Jun. (2022). Section for body, autonomy for use: the endogenous logic of active administrativeisation of neighbourhood committees - the case of Yijie Street in Southern Jiangsu Province. *Sociological Research*, 37(01), 136-155+229.
- Qian Danni. (2023). The Meaning and Path of Enhancing Media Literacy of Grid Workers. *Media*, 2023(04), 81-82.
- Yang Aiping, & Yu Yanhong. (2012). Selective Coping: An Organisational Analysis of the Action Logic of Community Resident Committees--The Case of L Community in G City. *Sociological Research*, 27(04), 105-126+243-244. <http://doi.org/10.19934/j.cnki.shxyj.2012.04.008>
- He Yanling, & Cai He. (2005). The "involution" of grassroots self-governance organisations in Chinese cities and its causes. *Journal of Sun Yat-sen University (Social Science Edition)*, 2005(05), 104-109+128.
- Bu Wanhong. (2011). An Institutional Economics Analysis of the Causes of Community Administrativeisation. *Socialist Studies*, 196(02), 102-106.
- Ma Quanzhong. (2018). Administrativeisation of Social Organisations: Representation, Generation Mechanism and Governance Path - An Empirical Analysis Based on the C Foundation. *Journal of CPC Tianjin Municipal Party School*, 20(04), 71-80. <http://doi.org/10.16029/j.cnki.1008-410x.2018.04.011>
- Report of the 17th National Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC), Holding High the Great Banner of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics and Striving for a New Victory in Building a Moderately Prosperous Society in All Aspects. Beijing. *People's Daily Press*. 2007.
- Wu Gang. (2001). The concept of administrative organisation. *China Administration*, 2001(07), 29-31.
- Zhang Shuyi. (2000). Research on Administrative Subjects. *Chinese Law*, 2000(02), 80-86. <http://doi.org/10.14111/j.cnki.zgfx.2000.02.008>
- Wang Y. (2019). Reform of community de-"administrativeisation" from the perspective of holistic governance. *Administrative Reform*, 2019(07), 54-60. <http://doi.org/10.14150/j.cnki.1674-7453.2019.07.008>