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Abstract: The community is the basic unit of primary-level social governance, and the transformation of community governance practices in the urban-rural dual field to an integrated path is a key measure to promote the modernization of urban and rural primary-level social governance systems and governance capabilities. China's urban communities are characterized by rich basic resources but lack of endogenous power, and rural communities are generally in the initial stage of construction but have a solid cultural consensus. Based on the Functional Course Theory, this study analyzes the differences in the development of urban and rural community governance in China and reveals that the disconnection of institutional systems, lack of interaction between organizations, and disjointed governance models are the reasons for the large differences in the development paths of urban and rural community governance. Institutional interdependence, structural complementarity, and method of mutual learning are the footholds of the integrated development path of urban and rural community governance. In the context of urban-rural integration, it is necessary to coordinate urban and rural community governance and promote community governance innovation through urban-rural social interaction, gradually narrow the gap in community governance paths, and promote the integration of urban and rural social governance.
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1. Introduction

The coordinated development of urban and rural communities is a puzzle of social construction and an important measure to promote the modernization of Chinese-style social governance. Fundamentally speaking, it is a process of continuously narrowing the development gap between urban and rural areas until eliminating the opposition between urban and rural areas. Since the reform and opening up. From the perspective of the urban-rural dual structure of “center-periphery” in China, the rapid development of urbanization has led to profound changes in the proportion of urban-rural structures. The integration of social management is an important part of urban-rural integration. The city industrialization development model has led to a disproportionate reaction in the implementation of the overall urban and rural community policies in urban and rural communities. To eliminate the economic and social differences brought about by the urban-rural dual system, the Third Plenary Session of the 17th CPC Central Committee proposed to establish an integrated system to promote urban and rural economic and social development. Since then, the integrated development of urban and rural areas has become the main theme of China’s economic and social development. The development paths are gradually becoming more diversified, but due to the strong heterogeneity between urban and rural societies, community governance still presents completely different actual appearances in the two quadrants of urban and rural areas. In June 2017, the State Council issued the “Opinions on Strengthening and Improving Urban and Rural Community Governance”, which put forward new requirements for the modernization of community governance, emphasizing that the content of urban and rural integration has changed from the interaction of a single sector in the past to the diversified integration and development of various economic and social fields, and requires that urban and rural societies need to achieve overall planning and coordination of multiple contents. The report of the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China proposed to comprehensively promote rural revitalization and improve the urban and rural community governance system. It is proposed that urban-rural integration needs to fully consider the goal of mutual promotion of urban modernization and rural modernization, and smooth the flow of all elements of urban and rural social governance.

As social development enters a new stage of development, urban and rural communities are mentioned more frequently in policy documents, and urban-rural integration has gradually replaced one-sided studies of cities or villages as the field theme of community policy. The development of China's social governance has gone through a macroscopic phase from separate management of urban and rural areas to coordinated governance. The academic research on placing community governance in the urban-rural field is mainly carried out from the following three aspects: first, theoretical analysis and empirical research on the longitudinal process of urban-rural community development, discussing that urban-rural community governance in China follows the “community service-community construction-community governance.” The basic context of the development and evolution of community governance has experienced the development and evolution of the governance model of “administrative community-cooperative community-autonomous community”. The second is to classify the urban-rural integration model of the community and divide it into priority development Community, key development of urban communities, and urban-rural integration. It is concluded that the integration of urban and rural communities needs to be selected according to local conditions. The third is to focus on the effectiveness and proposals of a single community theme, such as the residents-centered study of autonomous atmosphere in the community influencing factors of digital construction, discussing the trend of multi-co-governance of community governance capabilities from the perspective of
organizational structure, and exploring the development path of community governance in China through studies such as promoting community cultural development while cultivating consensus.

From the perspective of overall planning at the city and county levels, integrated governance of urban and rural communities has become inevitable. Although the integration of urban and rural social governance has reached a relatively consistent development concept and target system, and many advanced communities governance schemes and models have been discovered from the process of urban-rural integration in China, in practice, there are large differences between urban and rural communities’ governance and conflicts and problems at the primary-level level in urban and rural communities continue to emerge and become more complex. This paper intends to use the Functional Course Theory to analyze the reasons for the differences in the development of urban and rural communities' governance and conflicts and problems at the primary-level level in urban and rural communities has become inevitable. Although the integration of urban and rural social governance has reached a relatively consistent development concept and target system, and many advanced communities governance schemes and models have been discovered from the process of urban-rural integration in China, in practice, the differences between the urban and rural community governance systems have been discovered from the process of urban-rural integration. This paper cuts into the premise of the entire public policy and can determine the functions of the policy system, theme, and organizational structure of social management integration in urban-rural integration during the entire policy cycle.

To answer the relevant questions about the integration of the development path of community governance in the context of urban-rural integration, this study adopts the analytical framework of “institution, organization, and method” (Figure 1). and integrates the various stages of the policy function process model into the differential development of community governance in the context of urban-rural integration. This paper cuts into the premise elements and specific key points of the difference in the development of urban and rural community governance and analyzes the specific key points of the difference in the development of urban and rural community governance.

2. Research Framework

After the 1970s, policy science, as an interdisciplinary and applied research field, became a new direction for the development of public management, and promoted the trend of policy research from theory-oriented to application-oriented. Harold D. Lasswell, the founder of policy science, regards public policy as a political act or political action, and his functional course theory, which analyzes the whole process of public policy, is widely used in policy research by academic circles. The Functional Course Theory emphasizes that the operation of the public policy system is composed of a series of functional activities, it needs to complete the seven functions and stages of intelligence, suggestion, regulation, exercise, use, evaluation, and termination. Functions need to be brought into play during the process and the operation of the function requires the function to feed back the process. The Functional Course Theory analyzes the dynamic process of the entire public policy and can determine the functions of the policy system, theme, and organizational structure of social management integration in urban-rural integration during the entire policy cycle.

To answer the relevant questions about the integration of the development path of community governance in the context of urban-rural integration, this study adopts the analytical framework of “institution, organization, and method” (Figure 1). and integrates the various stages of the policy function process model into the differential development of community governance in the context of urban-rural integration. This paper cuts into the premise elements and specific key points of the difference in the development of urban and rural community governance and analyzes the specific key points of the difference in the development of urban and rural community governance.

(1) In line with the stage of intelligence, suggestion, and suspension, establish a wind vane for system construction

In the initial stage of the formulation of urban and rural primary-level governance policies, the party and the state put the two development systems of urban and rural systems in the macro-integrated community governance policy formulated by the macro-integrated planning. The difference in the practice of community building between urban and rural areas is becoming more and more prominent, and the development characteristics of the two will inevitably lead to divergence in the implementation of the same policy. Under such completely different development situations of urban and rural communities, the stages of policy information, suggestion, and suspension are the main reasons for setting the developmental difference melody in the two institutional systems.

First, considerations at the intelligence stage make urban and rural policy starting points different. The construction of rural community governance is inevitably confronted with the development of policies that lag behind urban communities at the beginning. Every year since 2013, the No. 1 central document has mentioned the improvement and development of the rural governance system. Today, when the country makes up for the homework of the policy system related to
rural community governance, it certainly pays attention to the weak foundation of rural economic development. However, when urban society has relatively abundant resources such as funds and talents, the community primary-level is more concerned about how to run various affairs in an orderly and stable manner, and how to innovate governance while maintaining order. The institutional system is biased toward how to mobilize high-quality community resources and promote fair and effective governance and services.

Second, it is suggested that the separation of phases will make the urban and rural policies separate forces. From a functional point of view, under the condition of correctly guiding the consensus culture of rural acquaintances, placing it in the framework of the system to form an organic integration of autonomy and the rule of law is an important measure to maximize the benefits of the modern governance system. The urban community attempts to improve the effectiveness of governance through the improvement and implementation of the system, cultivate the spiritual and cultural consensus of the community, and enhance the sense of participation and belonging of the residents. Based on the unstable community consensus, the only way to significantly improve the efficiency of community governance is by improving the system, and inspiring residents to participate in vitality, they can solve complex problems at the primary-level level of the community. However, in the face of the problem of unbalanced supply and demand of urban community governance and services, it does not seem to be as effective as it used to be.

Third, the suspension phase delinks urban and rural policies step by step. Focusing on the needs of residents, adopting construction opinions from multiple groups, and analyzing the current difficulties and advantages of primary-level community governance from the perspective of China’s urban and rural development status and future trends are the main basis for policymakers to deal with urban and rural community governance issues. To maintain the continuity of the policy system, the rural community institutional system has a high frequency of updates and a large range of content replacements due to the initial construction stage, rural governance has undergone a transformation from forced innovation to self-consciousness. The urban social management system the system is comprehensive and perfect, and maintaining policy stability has always been the main purpose of improving the effectiveness of the system and deepening system reform. The completely different development goals of the two make community governance go in different policy directions in urban and rural areas.

(2) Exercising regulations and driving functions, and adjusting the organizational structure contingency

The structure is the carrier of function. The organizational structure of urban and rural communities is generally adjusted according to the direct deployment and arrangement of the party and the state, and local governments make adjustments under the guidance of their superiors. As far as the urban and rural primary-level structures are concerned, the community structure is two sets of organizational rules. The rationality of the organizational structure directly determines the level of function, the structural adjustment changes are affected by the regulations in the process and the performance of the driving function.

First, define functions and define organizational structure, rights, and responsibilities. The community structure refers to the various elements within the community and the relatively stable composition formed among them. The division of community responsibilities and changes in the organizational structure is more directed by the higher-level government, and then relevant supporting normative documents are issued according to local needs to regulate the adjustment of the organizational structure of urban and rural communities. Urban and rural communities are born in different backgrounds, and now they have formed two sets of structural systems and different advantages and difficulties in the development of urban and rural communities reflect the structural issues of community development.

Second, the driving function determines the norms of urban and rural communities. Driving stages and functions emphasize what community governance should look like. In the management of community affairs, the primary-level of the community are obliged to be supervised by the superior government units and resident groups that empower them. This makes the primary-level standardization of governance affairs. Under the highly standardized community management system, the direct or indirect participation of multiple subjects also plays a supervisory role in the setting and adjustment of primary-level organizational structures. Different types of participants in urban or rural communities have different statuses and discourse power in community affairs, and the structure of urban and rural communities also shows great differences due to the different requirements of norms.

(3) Strengthen the functions of driving, evaluation, and application, and complement each other’s advantages in urban and rural governance

Goverance refers to the issues of “who will manage”, “how to manage” and “what to manage” in community affairs. Considering the integration of urban and rural development, “Opinions on Strengthening and Improving Urban and Rural Community Governance” proposes to standardize the participation of urban and rural community subjects, Instructive measures and management methods, such as optimizing the working mechanism and improving the governance model, guide the direction of urban and rural community governance work methods, and the effective functioning of primary-level management methods can improve institutional efficiency and stabilize organizational structures.

First, the driving function architecture governance model. The optimal configuration of the organization needs to be excavated during the driving process, and the driving function depends on the organizational structure to effectively play. Urban and rural communities promote the improvement of primary-level management organizations and community self-government, which is the process of building urban and rural community self-governance systems and governance models. In the driving stage of community governance development under the urban-rural integration, the different basic characteristics of the community under the urban-rural dual system will directly affect the integration and changes of the two governance models.

Second, evaluate the overall governance effectiveness of functions. The evaluation function is an important link between the implementation of the policy and the adjustment of the application function and the standardization of community governance and construction work can be strengthened by improving the internal and external evaluation mechanism. The effectiveness of governance at the primary-level level plays an evaluation function in the
management process of urban and rural communities through the way of public information.

Third, use functions to highlight differences in governance. The application and implementation of laws and rules are affected by urban and rural areas and local differences. The state’s decentralization and empowerment promote the continuous transformation of the primary-level based on local particularities and the community governance methods generally show a trend of diversification and innovation. Under the development of community governance, the functions of its institutional process and the adjustment of organizational structure are embodied in different community governance methods in the practice process. The publicity and complexity of community affairs prevent community affairs from relying solely on the government, and the intervention of multiple forces in the community and the innovation of management methods and measures are all challenges in breaking through urban and rural primary-level governance.

3. Research and Analysis

Due to the differences in natural conditions, social economy, regional scenes, and other factors, it will take a long time to achieve the complete convergence of urban and rural community governance models, but the integrated development of urban and rural areas requires that the general trend of the two convergent developments will not change. With the in-depth exploration of theoretical research and practice, the development of urban-rural integration gradually tends to be systematized and specific. The analysis of the functional process of the whole policy cycle finds that the country as a whole pays attention to the issue of urban-rural social coordination, and urban-rural communities with a dual system Governance lack specific content in the actual sector intertwined development. Based on this, the research studies the possibility and feasibility of the integration of dual paths of urban and rural community development, compares the practical forms of the institutional system, organizational structure, and operation mode, and analyzes the deep-seated reasons why urban and rural governance have taken completely different community paths.

(1) Institutional Basis: Differences in Information and Suggestions on the Premises of Urban and Rural Community Governance

“Opinions on Strengthening and Improving Urban and Rural Community Governance”, “The 14th Five-Year Plan” New Urbanization Implementation Plan, “National New Urbanization Plan (2021-2035)” and other relevant documents have been issued one after another to outline the development direction for urban and rural community governance. The communication between urban and rural areas is one-way rather than two-way convection. While economic development is the priority, the negative impact of the dual structure should be resolved as much as possible. The construction of the rule of law in urban communities is relatively high, and the construction of the rule of law in rural communities is still in its infancy. How to balance the prerequisite elements of urban and rural social management to achieve integrated governance at the institutional level is the key to the overall planning and mutual learning of primary-level community governance systems.

In the actual process of urban and rural community governance, the strengths of the complementary mechanisms of the dual constraints of formal and informal systems are different. The institutional construction of urban community governance is certainly well-developed, and Multiple subjects such as social organizations and voluntary organizations are gradually being valued in community affairs in the renewal of the system. Under the framework of institutional norms, all affairs of community governance are in order, and the highly unified institutional system drives urban community governance to a standardized, fixed, and rigid path of modern community governance, which delineates governance subjects and means, the scope of authority. It is to provide institutional space for the implementation of community services and community culture cultivation. Urban communities have a complete system to implement their planning goals, abundant resources, and abundant talents. In urban community governance policies and path planning, they are more focused on cultivating cultural consensus and stimulating development momentum, to innovate the channels for residents to participate in community governance and cultivate consensus on the spiritual level of the community. Therefore, in addition to the abundant supply of infrastructure and resources, the current urban community institutional system is rigid and single, lacks the continuous innovation motivation of community governance, and makes it difficult to fully exert the effectiveness of community governance. These are the key issues that urban communities urgently need to seek breakthroughs.

Compared with cities, rural community governance has traditional characteristics that state power has not touched the depths since ancient times. The formation of policy documents related to rural community construction is mainly extracted from urban and rural social governance system norms and rural construction policies. The highly standardized institutional standards of urban communities are difficult to integrate into rural communities due to the strong local autonomy in rural areas, making it difficult for urban and rural community institutional systems to achieve a balanced state of “seeking common ground while preserving differences” under the integrated management of urban and rural societies. In recent years, the relevant institutions and systems of rural communities have been continuously improved and developed. In addition to implementing relevant national policies, the rural primary-level need to maintain village rules and conventions, and cultural customs that have been reached by relying on the rural social network. However, the actual operation of the system is not suitable. Problems such as local distribution and strong local autonomy make it difficult to change residents’ ideas, making it difficult to effectively implement rural community governance policies. This makes the relevant rural community systems out of touch with community governance practices. In addition, because of the characteristics of the social network of acquaintances in rural areas, the opinions of community residents are highly coordinated, and rural community governance tends to form opposite extreme orientations: on the one hand, there is a community consensus with a high sense of identity, and some institutional policies can be logically implemented. On the other hand, if the policy concept is contrary to the local consensus will, more conflicts of interest will arise, and it is difficult to control the governance situation of harmonious coexistence among various types of rural organizations, hindering the community governance process.

(2) Structural differences: the double cycle of regulation and driving in the organizational structure
There are dualities in the community structure and process. The relevant policies and driving functions of the community are constantly cyclically reconciled in the interactive operation of the two in the structural process. There is certainly a dual difference between urban and rural areas in the community organizational structure. Today, the overall community organization system is relatively mature it is an important support point for the party to govern at the primary-level level. Through the improvement of the organizational structure elements of the party committee and the neighborhood committee, community residents and non-community members participate in community construction in various ways, including residents. In the actual participation of community affairs, various community subjects also increase their participation after understanding relevant policies, effectively improving community affairs. Social organizations and voluntary organizations play an irreplaceable role in the functioning of work in community governance policies and, their passive or active expression is all indirectly involved in the construction of community governance.

There are policy and resource advantages for development at the primary-level level of urban society. Compared with the past, the community governance platform is more systematic and sounder, the governance methods are more diversified, and the governance efficiency has been significantly improved. But now there is a gap between supply and demand in community governance and services and the phenomenon of mismatching rights and responsibilities also frequently occurs. Organizational problems such as lack of clear authority within the primary-level community and between higher-level government units or departments make it difficult for primary-level communities to effectively solve new affairs and problems. Since China’s urbanization has entered a period of steady and quality improvement, the characteristics of a half-acquainted society and an unfamiliar society have gradually emerged in all aspects of community management. Different from the “common problems” encountered in traditional urban community governance, the current urban community is facing new governance problems emerging from the process of urbanization construction transformation. For urban communities that are in the stage of governance modernization and in-depth construction, how to stimulate the endogenous power of participation in community self-government, improve the sustainable and long-term development mechanism of “self-hematopoiesis” in community construction, and improve the effectiveness of community governance are the core issues of community governance during the current urbanization transformation period.

In contrast, the modernization of rural community governance in China is still in the exploratory stage. Rural communities are located in a relatively broad area, as a social entity, they are group communities and regional communities with certain characteristics and are simpler than urban ones. However, the local characteristics of rural construction are obvious and the overall resource base is relatively backward, it is still in the corresponding “platform construction stage” in the process of urban community governance and construction. Although rural community affairs have a clear division of labor, the complicated primary-level affairs in the rural communities centered around the development of local industries make the departments and personnel closely related. The organizational structure of rural communities is flat and the comprehensive governance of the village community, the governance of the village by the township, and the mass discussion are the norms of the multi-governance attributes among rural communities. The report of the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China proposed to build a livable, suitable, and beautiful village, and to develop community governance in the context of rural revitalization. In the community organization structure, the party and the state promote institutional normative work to break through difficult and unsolvable governance problems inside and outside rural organizations. Realizing the integration of governance is a continuous work of rural community governance in my country. In the process of integrating rural community governance resources and improving the community organization system, cultivating and guiding social organizations and self-organizations to participate in community affairs in an orderly manner is the practice of promoting rural primary-level social governance require.

(3) Governance methods: the connotation comparison between normative implementation and consensus building

The urban social network is intertwined and complex, and there is a strong correlation between various affairs in the community closed loop. To improve management efficiency and better coordinate the work of multiple parties, urban community governance adopts certain mandatory policy tools. As a result, urban communities place more attention on the implementation of governance to regulate the exercise of primary-level powers by rules and regulations. Since the self-directed community affairs in the current grass-roots organizational structure have not yet been fully delegated, the city’s systematic management system is more likely to adopt a single top-down approach in grass-roots communities, and it is more manifested in the implementation of policies with a color of command. This makes it difficult for most urban local communities to form a stable and distinctive community culture in a complex residential structure, which has no positive impact on the cultivation of community building. So, urban community governance is more similar to rural communities, and the embedded governance and service supplier of the government often does not match the needs of the masses starting from the residents.

With the advent of the data age, government departments use information technology to combine isolated administrative sectors, providing technical support for the integrated management of primary-level community operation systems. With the construction of information platforms and the integration of information technology, primary-level communities have used the overall advantages of digital governance to break through the intractable diseases caused by fragmented management in the past, and urban communities have achieved data integration through the use of information technology, which has improved the quality of the community governance. However, with the popularization of digitalization and the use of new community governance issues, and the overall development of urban and rural communities in China, the level of governance affairs faced by community primary-level in the complex information environment is gradually increasing. Problems with ineffective governance, such as urban communities that give priority to digital construction models, lagging in digital concepts, and insufficient technical personnel at the primary-level level, are especially reflected in rural communities.

The development of rural society is not in a fiercely competitive market environment, and the construction and
development of rural communities is not a simple copy of the operating model of urban communities. Based on the social characteristics of acquaintances in rural life in China, “Just listen to the knock on the door and you will know what is coming.” It makes it easier for rural neighbors to build consensus and the broad interest demands of residents in rural communities can be relatively easily mobilized collectively. The actions of cadres in rural communities and the mobilization methods led by the team are different from those in urban communities. The practical premise of rural community construction is that the residents have a relatively consistent view of the interests of local affairs in the community, and when the state promulgates relevant community governance policies in rural areas, it is necessary to maintain the atmosphere of harmonious coexistence of rural communities. The two seem to co-exist, but the actual operation is often contradictory, which has a strong impact on cohesion for rural communities, only those parts that are recognized by the masses will be implemented in a more biased manner. This kind of governance can truly achieve stability in practice. Therefore, the phenomenon of alienation of local policy implementation is more likely to occur under this governance method. Although the countryside has entered the stage of governance modernization under rural revitalization, if the relevant policies of community governance are not implemented in the countryside, if no effective and stable targeted measures are taken for the governance method. Although the countryside has entered the stage of governance modernization under rural revitalization, it is necessary to maintain the atmosphere of harmonious coexistence of rural communities. The two seem to co-exist, but the actual operation is often contradictory, which has a strong impact on cohesion for rural communities, only those parts that are recognized by the masses will be implemented in a more biased manner. This kind of governance can truly achieve stability in practice. Therefore, the phenomenon of alienation of local policy implementation is more likely to occur under this governance method. Although the countryside has entered the stage of governance modernization under rural revitalization, if the relevant policies of community governance are not implemented in the countryside, if no effective and stable targeted measures are taken for the process, this kind of governance that relies on harmonious relations is difficult to achieve the expected policy goals in the actual governance process.

In summary, when faced with the actual situation and problems of different governance in urban and rural areas, there are large differences in the practical forms of community governance in terms of institutional systems, organizational structures, and operating methods, which brings the dual dilemma of system coordination and traction interaction to the community scene. The party and government have promoted the models of urban and rural community governance that have achieved good results in the national field and publicized and promoted the excellent models of communities through various methods such as setting up models, demonstration examples, and evaluating excellence, to solve the current community governance problems, provide a scientific, effective, standardized and standard way for the modernization of community governance, and seek new management models from it. It is not only to promote rural experience to rural experience, or to download the urban community governance model to another urban community. Then it can be sought new breakthroughs in the past binary boundaries to realize the modernization and development of community governance between urban and rural areas.

4. Conclusion

The policy guidelines for national economic development tend to guide urban and rural community governance to resonate at the same frequency, to achieve balanced development and establish a community of social governance. Rapid economic and social development pushes primary-level communities to face social problems and difficulties in community governance. The shortcomings of the common governance methods in the community, such as low efficiency, unsatisfactory interaction between participating subjects, and insufficient mobilization of community participation, lead to the lack of sustainable development. However, in different fields of urban and rural areas, it is difficult for community governance to achieve ideal results under the current institutional system, and it is also difficult to create an atmosphere and situation of effective coordination and harmonious interaction under special circumstances.

(1) The urban community governance path follows the integration trend of “model mutual learning - functional mutual embedding”

There are two paths for the construction of primary-level governance: one is to follow the national institutional arrangements, and the other is to learn from model experience. Urban and rural community governance faces different problems, but they all stem from the same structural dilemma. To achieve an integrated breakthrough in the governance path, the following points must be achieved in the community governance system: a. Coordinating the institutional system; b. Implementing normative measures; c. Innovating the working mechanism, to coordinate urban and rural community governance Goals, paths, and models, promote the modernization of national governance, and build a community of social governance. In the changing governance environment, efficient governance methods will also expose problems in the community management structure. Therefore, it is necessary to give full play to the functions of community organizations, integrate urban and rural governance resources, clarify community service targets, break the duality between urban and rural areas, promote the complementarity and isomorphism of community structures, help communities find the positioning of management and services, and stimulate the endogenous power of community governance.

At present, the multi-participation pattern of urban communities in China has yet to be perfected. Market players should be actively guided to enter the field of community services, and the roles and responsibilities of the government, market, and society should be clarified. After the introduction of market forces in urban communities, it is necessary to establish a benefit-sharing mechanism and a consensus culture to enhance community self-governance and multi-level governance. At the same time, urban communities should optimize the efficiency of resource allocation in the operating mechanism by learning from the collective economic model of rural communities, highlighting urban and local characteristics, improving the level of public services and the matching between supply and demand, to stimulate the participation willingness and ability of household portals, and promote the development of residents and social organizations. At present, most urban communities across the country are facing governance problems such as tension between cadres and the masses, lack of consensus, and low participation. Due to the characteristics of a half-acquaintance society, governance under the leadership of party committees and neighborhood committees often has limited effects. Therefore, under a standardized and orderly governance system, it is necessary to bridge the structural “vacuum” between the residents and the leadership, cultivate and maintain a good consensus atmosphere, and learn from the advantages of the human relationship network in the rural acquaintance society. And then improve the participation channels and methods of multiple subjects such as self-organization and volunteer groups, and attract more residents to join urban community governance according to the characteristics of different masses. Activate passive
participation into active participation by innovating various forms of participation, and forming an invisible and effective participatory link in the governance process.

The rural society is facing the urgent task of strengthening and improving the mode of economic development and improving the level of the rural economy, but the lack of basic hardware has restricted the orderly operation of the governance system. Conversely, the chaos of the governance situation has also hindered the healthy development of the local economy. Rural social problems are mainly manifested in the insufficient supply of public services, weak primary-level organization functions, and lack of cadre team building. Only by realizing comprehensive economic and social development in the countryside can we lay the foundation for the coordinated promotion and improvement of rural governance. The government, the market, and the society present a different form of interactive practice in rural community governance than in cities. Drawing on the experience and motivation of urban development and governance, a sustainable new rural collective economic operation mode can be constructed in agricultural development and investment in rural enterprises. Within the rural community, economic and social management is closely integrated into the rural primary-level management, and the overall connection between the various sectors of the community is higher than that of the city. Rural communities rely on the essence of democratic management and use market forces to form a pattern of mutual promotion between the two, thereby improving the status quo of rural governance. Therefore, for the rural community economy as a whole, we should continue to improve the infrastructure and eliminate shortcomings and loopholes to gradually improve the level of economic development, reform the working mechanism, give full play to the advantages of the countryside to promote the improvement of all aspects of community governance.

(2) The lack of matching mode of urban and rural community governance is an important reason for the lack of sustainable power in community development

Both urban and rural communities are faced with the dilemma of how to form community consensus, establish a stable operating mechanism, cultivate community culture, and stimulate community governance capabilities. The lagging matching mode of urban and rural community governance is one of the important factors restricting the integrated development of urban and rural areas in China. To solve this problem, it is necessary to start from two levels of urban communities and rural communities, analyze the existing problems and reasons, and put forward corresponding countermeasures and suggestions according to their characteristics and needs.

The problems in urban communities mainly include the following aspects: First, the high population mobility makes it difficult for communities to form a stable social network and spiritual and cultural consensus. Second, the application of information technology is insufficient, resulting in a low degree of informatization of community affairs, and it is difficult for primary-level cadres to grasp the dynamics of community population structure and provide convenient and effective public services. The third is the low participation of residents, resulting in a lack of subjectivity and vitality in community governance. In response to these problems, urban communities should take the following measures: First, use information technology to build an overall governance network to achieve information sharing and collaboration with other communities, higher-level governments, and administrative units in other jurisdictions. The second is to optimize the "hardware" construction of facilities, environmental management, and safe communities, to enhance residents' sense of identity and belonging to the community. The third is to discover key figures, do a good job in demonstration work, lead residents to actively participate in community affairs, and create a good and harmonious community cultural atmosphere.

The problems of rural communities mainly include the following aspects: First, the economic and social foundation is weak, which leads to the lack of funds, talents, technology, and other support for community construction. The second is that locality is strong, which makes it difficult for community work to connect with the management system of the local government at a higher level, and it is also difficult to adapt to the development direction of national governance. The third is that the policy goals are too high, which makes it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of community governance, and it is also difficult to stimulate the endogenous motivation contained in the rural cultural consensus. In response to these problems, rural communities should take the following measures: First, give full play to the advantages of the rural political system, improve the organizational structure of primary-level communities, and promote democratic consultation and decision-making in rural affairs. The second is to moderately lower the policy goals, give the villages a certain amount of contingency space, and abandon the evaluation of governance effectiveness with a single report card, but ensure the in-depth implementation and implementation of rural policies step by step. The third is to promote the construction of rural cultural spiritual guidance, give full play to the advantages of rural cultural consensus, and stimulate the cohesion and creativity of rural communities. In the absence of community consensus and stable governance operation, the matching mode of urban and rural community governance lags, resulting in the lack of sustainable development of urban and rural communities, and the cultural development of urban communities is difficult to cultivate under the institutional arrangement mechanism. Coordinating the internal and external governance of the community can be used to achieve governance breakthroughs in the field, and the construction of community residents as the demand guides the decision-making thinking of the community to shift to community affairs. Rational and irrational decision-making complement each other’s advantages and use each other's advantages to play a role in the characteristics and status of the community and release the governance source power of multiple subjects in the community under the dual field of urban and rural areas.

(3) The integration of urban and rural community governance paths needs to be stimulated by the mutual traction of institutions

From community service, and community construction to community governance, urban and rural communities have undergone three stages of evolution, and the institutional system has also continued to innovate, bringing new ideas to community governance. However, there are differences in the dual field between urban and rural areas, which makes the traditional community governance model not applicable to both, and it is difficult to establish a consistent urban-rural community governance system between the two. In this case, in the face of the common problems of community governance, it is necessary to adjust the thinking and
functions of community governance according to changes in the governance environment. In the context of urban-rural integrated development, the realization of the complementarity and integration of urban and rural community governance functions can open up a broader space for community governance and provide dynamic support for the construction of an urban-rural community governance community.

Under the background of highly standardized institutions, urban communities are facing complex and changeable new challenges and diversified residents’ needs. To fulfill its past functions, urban communities try to find new sources of power in software. However, due to the constraints of traditional governance models and inertial thinking, urban communities have difficulty adapting to changes in primary-level work, and empirical decision-making is ineffective when dealing with complex and new problems. Therefore, urban community governance needs to adhere to the principle of the rule of law, and timely update laws, regulations, and policy measures related to community construction. At the same time, cultivating community cultural consensus is a long-term and meticulous process, which cannot be easily changed due to institutional changes. In institutional changes, residents’ needs should always be oriented, and effective responses should be given. It is also necessary to clarify the responsibilities and authority of primary-level cadres in urban and rural communities and optimize the organizational structure of primary-level communities.

Rural development and governance are a mutually reinforcing whole. In the process of rural revitalization, both development and governance must take into account the close relationship between farmers. In rural community governance, due to the deep contacts and familiarity between primary-level cadres and villagers, it is easy to form a consensus on rural decision-making matters and mobilization, but it is also difficult to deal with extreme situations in the implementation process. To this end, rural communities should learn from the methods of urban precision governance, adapt to the development opportunities of governance modernization, and improve the systematicity and effectiveness of the primary-level community governance decision-making system. In practice, due to the low technical level of the cadre team and the inertial thinking of the primary-level and the masses in handling local affairs, the transformation of the decision-making model of rural primary-level community governance has been hindered. Therefore, it is necessary to make up for the shortcomings of rural system construction by publicizing and popularizing the construction of the rule of law to guide the standardized decision-making and implementation of community affairs and strengthen the legalization training of cadres. At the same time, according to the actual situation, integrate into the urban community governance model, encourage rural primary-level communities to innovate governance methods, and optimize the whole process of rural primary-level governance policies. In addition, when implementing relevant urban community governance measures in rural communities, we should refer to urban communities for granting certain local self-government rights, empowering the primary-level, strengthening the status and role of multiple subjects in rural community governance matters, to create more governance space for primary-level communities.
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