

УДК 334.025

DOI 10.58649/1694-8033-2024-1(117)-292-299

Ma Lunzjun

Түндүк Батыш педагогикалык университети, Социалдык өнүктүрүү жана мамлекеттик башкаруу институту, Ланьчжоу, Ганьсу провинциясы, КЭР

Ma Lunzjun

Северо-Западный педагогический университет, Институт социального развития и государственного управления, старший преподаватель, г. Ланьчжоу, провинция Ганьсу, КНР

Longjun M.

Northwest Normal University, School of Social Development and Public Administration, Lecture of Public Administration, Lanzhou in China. E-mail: 412103064@qq.com.

**БИРГЕЛЕШКЕН КАТЫШУУ: КЫТАЙДЫН АЙЫЛ ЖЕРЛЕРИН БАШКАРУУДА
КООМДУК УЮМДАРДЫН КАТЫШУУСУНУН ОПТИМАЛДУУ МОДЕЛИ**

**СОВМЕСТНОЕ УЧАСТИЕ: ОПТИМАЛЬНАЯ МОДЕЛЬ УЧАСТИЯ
ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫХ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЙ В УПРАВЛЕНИИ
СЕЛЬСКИМИ РАЙОНАМИ КИТАЯ**

**COLLABORATIVE PARTICIPATION: THE IDEAL TYPE OF NGOS PARTICIPATION
IN CHINESE RURAL GOVERNANCE**

协同式参与：中国社会组织参与乡村治理的理想类型

Кыскача мүнөздөмө: Кытайда айыл жергесинде социалдык башкаруунун жаңы системасын түзүү үчүн биринчи кезекте айылдык коомдук уюмдардын социалдык башкаруу процессине биргелешип катышуусун камсыз кылуу зарыл. Айылдык коомдук уюмдардын биргелешкен катышуусунун тэрт мүнөздүү белгиси бар: 1) уюмдун иш-аракети баалуулуктардын социалдаштырылган критерийлерин жетекчиликке алуусу керек, 2) иш башкаруу процессинде макулдашылган максаттарга ылайык келиши керек, 3) ишке ашырууда башкаруунун демократиялык структурасына ээ болушу керек; уюмдун ыйгарым укуктарын, 4) биргелешкен кызматташуу процессинде өз ара пайда көрүүгө тийиш. Катышуучу моделдин артыкчылыктары, биринчиден, ал айылдык коомдук уюмдарды башкаруунун натыйжалуулугун максималдуу жогорулатууга мүмкүндүк берет; экинчиден, мамлекеттик бийликтин элге кызмат кылуу функциясын андан ары жакшыртууга жардам берет; үчүнчүдөн, карапайым эл арасындагы демократиянын деңгээлин жогорулатууга мүмкүндүк берет. Катышуучу моделдин артыкчылыктары, биринчиден, ал айылдык коомдук уюмдарды башкаруунун натыйжалуулугун максималдуу жогорулатууга мүмкүндүк берет; экинчиден, мамлекеттик бийликтин элге кызмат кылуу функциясын андан ары жакшыртууга жардам берет; үчүнчүдөн, карапайым эл арасындагы демократиянын деңгээлин жогорулатууга мүмкүндүк берет.

Аннотация: Для того, что создать новую социальную систему управления в сельских районах в Китае, в первую очередь необходимо обеспечить осуществление совместных участия сельским общественным организациям в процессе социального управления. Совместные участия сельских общественных организаций имеют четыре характерные черты: 1) деятельность организации должна ориентироваться на социализированные критерии ценности, 2) деятельность должна соответствовать с согласованными целями в процессе управления, 3) должна иметь демократичную структуру управления в осуществлении полномочии организации, 4) должна видеть взаимную выгодность в процессе совместном сотрудничестве. Преимущества модели совместного участия заключается в том, что, во-первых, оно позволяет максимально повысить эффективность управления сельских общественных организаций; во-вторых, в дальнейшем способствует улучшить функцию правительства в обслуживании народа; в-третьих, позволяет улучшить уровень демократии среди простых народ.

Abstract: To establish a new rural social governance system in China, one of the basic requirements is to realize the collaborative participation of rural NGOs. Collaborative participation has four typical characteristics: socialized value orientation, consensus governance goal, open power structure and reciprocal cooperation process. In terms of its advantages, it is mainly manifested in three aspects: first, it can maximize the governance efficiency of rural NGOs; Second, it can further promote the construction of a service-oriented government at the grassroots level. Third, it can better improve community-level democracy.

[摘要] 中国要建立新型的乡村社会治理体制，一个基本要求就是实现乡村社会组织的协同式参与。协同式参与有四个典型特征，一是社会化的价值导向，二是共识性的治理目标，三是开放性的权力结构，四是互惠性的协作过程。就协同式参与的优势而言，主要表现在三个方面：一是能最大程度发挥乡村社会组织的治理效能；二是能更深入推进基层服务型政府建设；三是能更好提升基层民主水平。

Негизги сөздөр: Айылдык башкаруу, айылдык коомдук уюмдар, биргелешкен катышуу.

Ключевые слова: Управление в сельских районах, сельские общественные организации, совместное участие.

Keywords: Rural governance; Rural NGOs; Collaborative participation Introduction

[关键词] 乡村治理；乡村社会组织；协同式参与

With the rapid development of national modernization, especially the strong promotion of urbanization and marketization, drastic changes have taken place in Chinese rural society, and the traditional rural social governance system and mechanism have gradually failed. Faced with this problem, Chinese leadership has explicitly called for improving the social governance system and building a community of social governance (People's Daily 2019). So, the participation of rural

NGOs, as an important form of social public participation, plays an important role in this new system.

‘A community of social governance’ means joint efforts, common governance and shared benefits by diverse entities. From the perspective of rural NGOs, ‘a community of social governance’ means attaching importance to the ‘democratic consultation’, ‘collaborative participation’ and ‘equal participation’ of rural NGOs in rural social governance. This paper uses the concept of ‘collaborative participation’ to describe the ideal state and type of participation of rural NGOs in China. Then, as an important part of the modernization of Rural social governance in China, what is the connotation of ‘collaborative participation’ of rural NGOs? What are the basic features of ‘collaborative participation’ of rural NGOs? What are the advantages of ‘collaborative participation’ that make it one of the focal points of rural social governance innovation? These basic questions will be discussed in this paper.

The connotation of collaborative participation

‘Collaborative participation’, it refers to the rural NGOs can embody the characteristics of non - government, non - profit and sociality in the process of participation in rural social governance, can cooperate with the government to solve rural public problems, to exchange and share their own governance resources, to jointly discover and response to rural social contradictions and public needs.

The concept of collaborative participation, from an academic pedigree point of view, is similar to the following concepts or models to some extent. They are the ‘cooperative model’ in the four-models theory (Gidron et al. 1992), the ‘complementary model’ in the three-models theory (Young 2000), and the ‘co-production model’ in the continuous atlas models (Coston 1998), the ‘cooperative model’ in the ‘4C’ models (Najam 2000), the ‘integrative autonomy model’ (Kuhnle 1992), and the ‘holism model’ (Kramer 1993), ‘autonomy-cooperation’ model (Yang Xiaohong 2017), and ‘instrumental reciprocity model’ (Qiao Dongping 2015).

Collaborative participation, from the perspective of the relationship between NGOs and the government, abandons the unilateral dependence of rural NGOs on the government, emphasizes the subjectivity and independence of rural NGOs, and stresses the equality, consensus and mutual trust between rural NGOs and the government. In collaborative participation, rural NGOs and the government jointly shoulder governance responsibilities, share governance resources, face the uncertainties and external risks of governance environment and share governance achievements.

Collaborative participation means a new cooperative partnership between the government and rural NGOs. This new type of partnership is based on the recognition and commitment of both parties to the governance goals or cooperation goals, which point to the public goals and public interests. It can be formal, reflected in the text, or informal, and exists in mutual understanding, trust and tacit understanding. In a word, such partnership requires both parties to connect with each other in terms of technology, procedure and knowledge, as well as mutual recognition and consensus in terms of culture, system and value, so as to form a cooperative pattern of sharing interests and risks.

Characteristics of collaborative participation

The collaborative participation of rural NGOs has four outstanding characteristics, namely socialized value orientation, consensus governance goal, open power structure and reciprocal cooperation process.

Socialized value orientation

The collaborative participation of rural NGOs emphasizes the value orientation of socialization rather than administration, that is, in the participation of rural NGOs in rural governance, they adhere to the social standard rather than the governmental standard, insist on the priority of responsibility over power, and emphasize the values of equality, trust, responsibility, openness, transparency, democracy and rule of law. As for the collaborative participation of rural NGOs, this paper holds that among many value elements, the three values of equality, trust and responsibility are particularly critical.

First, equal guide. The relationship between the government and rural NGOs is complicated, which includes both administrative relationship and cooperative partnership. Collaborative participation emphasizes that rural NGOs, as one of the governance subjects, have strong independence and autonomy. In the process of participating in rural social governance, they have relatively equal governance status and qualifications with the government, and share governance responsibilities and power. Without relatively equal subject status, it is impossible to achieve candid communication and fair and reciprocal cooperation between subjects. Without equal power, rural NGOs cannot form a powerful restriction on the government's transgression. Without equal responsibility, rural NGOs and governments cannot form mutually responsible ethical relations and universal standards of moral behavior.

Second, trust oriented. Trust is a stable belief of the agent's goodwill, ability and reliability to other agents. In the collaborative participation, the mutual trust between the government and rural NGOs is emphasized. Mutual trust means that in the process of participating in rural governance, both rural NGOs and the government have an open mind and transparent information. They can communicate and speak freely with each other and openly exchange views on public issues they face. On the one hand, the government does not have to worry about rural NGOs intentionally destroying social stability or endangering social order, nor does it have to worry about rural NGOs challenging their own political authority. On the other hand, rural NGOs will not be harassed and persecuted by the power system because of the authenticity of their speech, nor do they need to worry about being deprived of the qualification or rights of governing subjects because of their frankness and frankness.

Third, responsibility oriented. Collaborative participation emphasizes responsibility, which means that the subject of action in rural social governance undertakes certain obligations or responsibilities and bears corresponding consequences. In rural social governance, rural NGOs and the government assume common but differentiated responsibilities. The so-called common responsibility is that both rural NGOs and the government should actively respond to the public problems and needs of the rural society, and take active measures to fairly and efficiently realize the needs and interests of the public. When they fail to effectively assume their responsibilities, they should be investigated and punished accordingly (Zhang Chengfu 2000). The so-called differentiated responsibilities emphasize that the government and rural NGOs assume different responsibilities based on different division of labor, and emphasize the concretization and refinement of responsibilities -- meaning that responsibilities are determined according to the position and role of actors in the division of labor system. In rural governance, to determine whether rural NGOs and the government should take certain responsibilities, and how much responsibility they should take, it can be decided according to the consensus reached by rural NGOs and the government as well as their respective positions and roles (Kim Dongri 2018).

Consensual governance goal

Collaborative participation emphasizes the consensual governance goal and regards it as an important basis for the cooperation between rural NGOs and the government. In collaborative participation, both rural NGOs and the government realize that public interest is the highest value pursuit of rural governance, and the realization of public interest is closely related to both sides. Neither party can unilaterally assume the responsibility by itself, and collaborative cooperation is the best way to promote the realization of common interests.

In collaborative participation, consensual governance objectives do not appear automatically, but are obtained through full democratic consultation and rational discussion based on equal and independent governance subject status. Therefore, the consensus governance goals established in the collaborative participation get rid of the one-way linear form in which the government decides and controls the rural governance goals from top to bottom. Instead, they are negotiated from a more diversified and complex value system and are influenced by multiple value factors. This consensual governance goal is neither a simple summation of the governance goals of the government and rural NGOs, nor merely the intersection of their governance goals, but the integration and sublimation of their governance goals through equal consultation and rational discussion.

This consensus governance goal can truly and deeply reflect the actual public needs and opinions, and ensure the correct direction of rural social governance to the greatest extent. At the same time, such consensus governance goal can provide a basic basis for dividing responsibilities between the government and rural NGOs, and promote mutual trust between the government and rural NGOs, provide basic motivation for coordinated actions and mutual support, and provide effective evaluation criteria and standards for rural NGOs to participate in rural governance.

Open power structures

Collaborative participation breaks through the closed administration-led power structure, changes the passive obedience of rural NGOs to the government in traditional participation, and establishes a relatively equal governing subject status with the government to share the public power in rural governance.

In the open power structure, rural NGOs are no longer just marginal participants, no longer have limited behavior options, and no longer only obey the unilateral arrangements made by the government for rural governance. On the contrary, rural NGOs, as a form of organized or collectivized participation of the public, have obtained relatively sufficient power support from the public. They not only have a strong right of discourse and expression, but also have the right to act independently. Rural NGOs have become the new authoritative subjects in rural governance. The sharing of public power by rural NGOs will not destroy the integrity and stability of public power, nor weaken the efficiency of government power, but promote the publicity and stability of public power to a greater extent, and enhance the legitimacy of government power.

In the open power structure, rural NGOs is not only a marginal organization to fill gaps, but also an important subject force to improve the efficiency of rural social governance. In this power structure, rural NGOs can enter into the key links of setting public policy issues and even decision-making, and can truly reflect the public needs and opinions of rural society, and influence decision-making to a great extent. Moreover, they can inquire and hold responsible for policy consequences. That is to say, in the open power structure, At the same time, rural NGOs will supervise and balance government power.

Reciprocal collaborative process

In collaborative participation, both rural NGOs and the government have no profit-making demands. They both focus on public interests and are committed to solving rural social problems and meeting public needs. In the process of collaboration, rural NGOs and the government do not have the relationship of oppression or substitution, there is no confrontational conflict, they will not deceive each other, maliciously hide negative information, hide negative consequences, etc., and they will not use their advantageous resources to put their partners at a disadvantage. On the contrary, in this process, rural NGOs and the government can trust and understand each other, increase the interaction and sharing of resources, and promote the growth and progress of each other. When misunderstandings or delays occur in the collaboration process, rural NGOs and the government can carry out prudent communication or negotiation, consciously accept reasonable criticism from the other side and solicit constructive opinions.

The advantages of collaborative participation

It is beneficial to maximize the governance efficiency of rural NGOs

Generally speaking, passive and dependent participation cannot stimulate the enthusiasm and vitality of the participants. But _voluntary collaboration can create value that cannot be created by individuals, no matter how rich or savvy they are' (Putnam 2001). This is as true of cooperation between individuals as it is of cooperation between organizations. In collaborative participation, rural society organizations have emerged on the equality of social governance body, can full play to their initiative, enthusiasm and creativity and other management advantage, can effectively promote rural integration of social resources, improve the effectiveness and efficiency of rural social governance, can provide the public services that the government cannot do well and enterprises are unwilling to do, so as to comprehensively improve the level of rural public services.

It will help further promote the construction of rural service-oriented government

First, in collaborative participation, rural NGOs undertake part of the responsibility of public governance from the government. The government has changed from assuming unlimited responsibility to assuming limited responsibility. With the transfer of government functions to rural NGOs, government agencies can also be streamlined, and the internal operating mechanism, system, procedures and methods of the government will be effectively improved and promoted.

Second, in collaborative participation, rural NGOs can effectively mobilize other social resources through multiple channels and bear the responsibility for part of public service expenditure, while the streamlining of government institutions can also help the government relieve the financial pressure brought by its own operation. While alleviating the financial pressure, the government's financial resources can be used more effectively in public services.

Third, collaborative participation can limit government power and prevent government corruption or abuse of power. The collaborative participation of rural NGOs means that public power is shared by the government and rural NGOs. The power enjoyed by rural NGOs can effectively supervise and restrict the power of the government, prevent the government from crossing the boundary, and realize _restricting power with power'.

Finally, collaborative participation can enhance the credibility and legitimacy of the government. Equal and open participation can enhance the public's understanding and trust in the government, and improve the speed and accuracy of the government's response to public demand, which will enhance the credibility and legitimacy of the government.

It will help improve democracy in rural areas

First, collaborative participation can enhance the democratic consciousness of rural people. On the one hand, NGOs are voluntary groups in nature. ‘Such voluntary groups are free democratic schools from which all members can learn the theory of group life and cultivate the social capital of participation and cooperation at a higher level and on a larger scale’ (Tocqueville 1988). On the other hand, the cooperative participation of rural NGOs can liberate farmers from the closed circle of blood and kinship, enable them to face the public more equally and freely, inspire and guide rural people to care about the public interests and the interests of others, and gradually acquire the consciousness of public service and modern democratic concept.

Second, collaborative participation can promote the depth of democratic participation. ‘Real democracy should be a democracy in which all citizens directly and fully participate in the decision-making of public affairs, from the setting of policy agenda to the implementation of policies, citizens should participate’ (Zhao Xiaofeng and Liu Tao). Traditionally, the participation of rural NGOs was limited to the level of policy implementation, but could not be deeply involved in public decision-making. However, in collaborative participation, rural NGOs no longer passively accept various alternative plans provided by political elites like consumers in the market, but directly participate in the public decision-making process. Such deep participation is closer to the essence of democracy.

Conclusion

To establish a new type of rural social governance system in China, one of the basic requirements is to realize the collaborative participation of rural NGOs. Collaborative participation emphasizes that rural NGOs, as relatively equal governance subjects, cooperate with the government, exchange and share their own governance resources to solve rural social problems, and jointly realize the discovery and response to rural social contradictions and public needs. Collaborative participation has profound implications of value and institutional structure, and its typical characteristics are as follows: first, the value orientation of socialization, including equality, trust and responsibility; Second, consensual governance goal; Third, the open power structure; The fourth is the reciprocal cooperation process. In terms of the advantages of collaborative participation, it is mainly manifested in three aspects: first, it can maximize the governance efficiency of rural NGOs; Second, it can further promote the construction of a service-oriented government at the grassroots level. Third, it can better improve community-level democracy. From the connotation, typical characteristics and advantages of the cooperative participation of rural NGOs, it is reasonable and necessary to take it as an important focus of the modernization of China's rural social governance.

References:

1. Chen Weilei. 2014. ‘Operation Mechanism, Strategy and Logic of government and non-profit Organization Projects -- A Sociological Analysis of government Purchase of Social Work Service Projects’ [J]. *Journal of Public Administration* (3): 93-105.
2. Dennis R Young. 2000. ‘Alternative Models of Government-Nonprofit Sector Relations: Theoretical and International Perspectives’ [J]. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29(1):149-172.
3. Gidron B. et al. 1992. ‘Government and the Third Sector: Emerging Relationships in Welfare state’ [M]. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
4. Huang xiaochun, Zhang Dongsu. 2015. ‘Chinese NGOs at the Crossroads: Policy Choice and Development Path’ [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai People Publishing House.

5. Jennifer M. Coston.1998. ‘A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships’ [J]. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*27(3):358-382.
6. Jing Y, Savas. 2009. ‘Managing Collaborative Service Delivery: Comparing China and the United States’[J]. *Journal of Public Administration Review* 69 (s1) :101-107.
7. Kim Dongri et al. 2018. ‘Accountability Research: Taking Chinese Local Government as the Center’ [M]. Tianjin: Tianjin People's Publishing House.
8. Kramer.R.M. et al. 1993. ‘Privatization in four European Countries : Comparative Studies in Government-third Sector Relationships’ [J]. New York: M.F.Sharpe.
9. Najam A.2000. ‘The Four-C of Third Sector-Government Relations: Cooperation, Confrontation, Complementarity, and Cooptation’ [J]. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*10(4):375-396.
10. Qiao Dongping et al. 2015. ‘Cooperation between Government and NGOs: Models, Mechanisms and Strategies’ [M]. Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House.
11. Yang Xiaohong.2017. ‘NGOs Participation in Social Governance model and its Motivation Analysis’ [J]. *Administrative Science Forum* (04):41-46.