Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2958-4396 | Vol. 3, No. 1, 2023

The Model, Dilemma and Outlet of Resilience Governance of Grassroots Community from the Perspective of Risk Society

Tifeng Liu

School of Public Administration, Hohai University, China

Abstract: During the period of social governance transformation, China and even the world have entered a high-risk stage. In such a risk community, the community, as the basic unit of social organism, is a key link and important support for stabilizing social order and improving social governance in the face of sudden major risk events. From the perspective of community resilience, it not only undertakes the interdisciplinary mission of Community Governance, but also broadens the resilient governance pattern of combining hardness and flexibility in the community. However, the current community risk prevention and control in China also exposes the shortcomings and problems in the resilience governance of grassroots communities in terms of process resilience, structural resilience, psychological resilience, and technological resilience. In view of this, in the new risk society of the post pandemic era, it is necessary to enhance the diversification of community resilience governance entities, strengthen emergency management mechanisms, cultivate citizens' awareness and ability to respond to risks, accelerate the construction of smart communities, and gradually achieve normal and good governance of communities in high-risk societies.

Keywords: Risk Society; Grassroots Communities; Resilience; Govern.

1. Introduction

We are in an era of global risks, and global risk governance has become an important topic. Risk has never been a temporary existence, but is always present, everywhere, and to varying degrees hinders or even threatens the survival and development of humanity. In the process of modernization, risks are constantly intertwined with humanity under the influence of complex factors such as technology, institutions, power, and culture, occasionally causing humanity to fall into uncertain fear of risks. Entering the 21st century, the intensity of social risks has been increasing. From the outbreak of SARS in 2003, to the subsequent oil shortages, power panics, the Indian Ocean tsunami, avian influenza, the novel coronavirus pandemic, and so on, humanity has been plunged into a high-risk crisis of globalization. The risk has always been unable to dissipate and is constantly threatening human life and health. Especially in disrupting the construction and development of a community with a shared future for mankind in today's world, there have been dilemmas such as low efficiency in global social risk governance, fragmented governance forms, and malfunctioning governance systems, leading to many countries entering an uncontrollable and disorderly state of risk governance. Therefore, in the face of this dilemma, countries need to strengthen their prediction of global risks and enhance their collaborative risk governance capabilities.

The report of the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China pointed out: "Strengthen the construction of the Community Governance system, and promote the focus of social governance to move down to the grass-roots level." [1] As the focus of social governance continues to sink to the grass-roots community, the risk society with high uncertainty and complexity has brought great challenges to Community Governance. Grassroots communities, as the key field for the modernization of the national governance system and governance capacity, and the "micro cell" of "China's governance", are not only the "last mile" for the Chinese government to connect and serve the residents, but also the window for the convergence of contradictions in social governance and reform and development. Therefore, in the face of the challenge of modernity in a risk society, how can communities better cope with the complex and diverse risks of governance, continuously improve the community governance system, and enhance the effectiveness of community governance? This is not only an important proposition for the modernization of grassroots community governance capabilities in the new era, but also a major test of the national governance system and governance capabilities.

2. Stimulation of Risk Society on Community Resilient Governance

German sociologist Beck first used the concept of "risk society" in his book "Risk Society" in 1986 to describe the postindustrial society and further theorize it. Beck believed that in the industrial era, with the continuous deepening of social modernization and globalization, Risk can be defined as responding in a systematic manner to the dangers and anxieties caused by modernization itself. Unlike traditional dangers, risk is a threat to modernization and a consequence of questionable globalization. [2] (07) Beck believes that the risks of modernization have characteristics such as anthropogenic, institutional, global, imperceptible, as well as greater diffusion and harm. [3] (18, 21, 21, 29) These characteristics invisibly make humans more at a loss when facing modernization risks. In the face of the complexity and high uncertainty of social risks, the community, as the window for each region to undertake and respond to risks, must actively respond to the national risk governance policy, support the collaborative participation of multiple subjects in the emergency assessment and management of community risks, especially strengthen the system endogenous power of community risk response and transformation, reduce the

vulnerability of Community Governance, and enhance the concept of community resilient governance. It can be seen that the world has entered a high-risk society at present, and various "black swan" events may occur at any time. In response to this form, a wave of governance has been set off around the city to build resilient communities. Beijing is the first city to incorporate the task of building resilient cities into its overall urban planning and included in the "14th Five Year Plan". It is required to build 50 resilient communities during this period. The new round of overall planning for Shanghai in 2035 also proposes the development positioning of "resilient cities", and regards the construction of resilient communities as an important reform path to enhance the social governance system and governance capacity. [4] Currently, the entry of risks into the social field is a process, and during the outbreak period of risks, communities need to minimize the direct impact of risks to the greatest extent possible through emergency management systems; During the risk mitigation period, by linking the operational network of the community, the vitality of the community is restored, and the main cooperation barriers are eliminated to achieve the resolution and absorption of risks; In the normal period of risk, it is still necessary to reshape community vitality and stimulate the endogenous motivation of members through resource sinking, transform extreme ideas of eliminating risks, and jointly build a long-term governance system that coexists with risks. In short, risk management at different stages cannot be separated from the concept of resilient governance. Therefore, the existence of social risks has two sides. Holding a positive and optimistic attitude towards risks and adhering to the concept of resilient construction and governance can help achieve the goal of long-term community governance. Based on this, the academic community has also begun to study the catalytic effect of risk society on community resilience governance, and "resilience governance" has become a hot topic in the field of sustainable development research in various countries around the world in recent years.

3. The Transformation of the Paradigm of Grass-Roots Community Governance

The earliest study of "community" was by German scholar Ferdinand Tennis in the late 19th century. He believed that community was like a lasting and truly shared community between people, and the community itself should be understood as a vibrant organism. [5] Up to now, communities have developed into the basic units of the national social structure, which are closely related to the lives and interests of residents, and are also the most important areas for national governance. Foreign scholars believe that Community Governance is usually concentrated in the multi-level compound community of residents' production and life. Helen Sullivan, a scholar studying local governance at the University of Birmingham, UK, believes that Community Governance has three core themes, namely, "community leadership, promoting the supply and management of public services, and cultivating social capital". [6] This also indicates that the purpose of community governance is to strengthen effective cooperation between grassroots governments and residents. The process of community governance is to share community public services and achieve efficient interaction between residents and the government. The result of community governance is to truly achieve the effective operation of community capital and safeguard the fundamental interests of residents. In short, community governance is the most fundamental and crucial part of the national governance system. Currently, the paradigm of grassroots community governance has also begun to shift under the influence of social risks.

3.1. Over Rigid Community Risk Governance

In the face of risks, the grassroots are the weakest link. As the last mile of social governance and the "forefront gateway" for emergency response, communities urgently need to hold onto the last line of defense when risks arise, ensuring the production and life safety of grassroots community people. Currently, the population in grassroots communities is characterized by high density, high mobility, and strong unfamiliarity. Risks in various fields are transmitted and constantly evolving, leading to significant challenges in community risk governance work. According to relevant data, 80% of sudden risk events occur in grassroots communities, making risk management more difficult. In the past, traditional risk management emphasized a "one size fits all" approach to rigid management, using a mandatory and controlled approach based on institutionalized implementation to manage risks. [7] When managing communities, it is mainly manifested in risk control through administrative intervention and force enforcement, with a focus on the prevention and resolution of individual risk events, and a lack of attention to the fragility of grassroots risk governance. Over time, excessive rigidity and insufficient resilience have become common issues in community governance in China. Common food safety, infectious diseases, ecological environment, or major public emergencies in the community inevitably lead to the development of risks, or blindly follow the control of higher-level governments while ignoring the psychological panic and concerns of community grassroots personnel, which is likely to expand the risk and even bring other secondary risks and disasters. This rigid model of temporarily suppressing risks through mandatory means mainly relies on the risk management agenda of authoritative departments, and various actions and decisions are based on written regulations and formal procedures. Although this model has a certain degree of execution power, it faces problems such as weak initiative, weak ability to integrate external forces, significant internal fragmentation, and a lack of freedom and innovation among individuals in a rigid governance system when facing highly uncertain and complex governance environments and tasks. [8]

3.2. Community Resilience Governance with a Combination of Rigidity and Softness

Later, the Chinese government delegated power and began to combine administrative orders from different regions to develop practical and feasible emergency policies for risk prevention and control, gradually effectively controlling risks. Research has found that the previously used rigid governance gradually injects a flexible force, and the two forces go hand in hand, forming a resilient governance pattern that combines rigidity and flexibility. Especially in communities, a resilient range with inclusivity, variability, and mutual assistance should be formed for dynamic self-adjustment and resilient governance. Encourage the community to actively participate in the risk management process, involving more entities and organizations, and jointly suppress the expansion and

regeneration of risks. Resilience comes from the Latin word 'resillo', which emphasizes the emergency and disaster prevention capabilities of a community. It is also translated as resilience, resilience, resilience, and so on. [9] It has successively appeared in the fields of physics, disaster science, ecology, and other disciplines. Later, the meaning of resilience was extended, not just simple rebound and recovery. Resilience has been introduced into fields such as urban planning and public management in social sciences, becoming an adaptive and resilient ability to respond to external environmental threats and destruction. [10] The concept of community resilience introduced from abroad has been translated into community resilience, resilience, and resilience in China. Afterwards, domestic scholars Wu Xiaolin and Xie Yiyun believed from the perspective of public health and safety that community resilience is the ability to strengthen the sustainability and vitality of communities by taking joint action, connecting internal and external resources, and effectively resisting disasters and risks. [11] From the perspective of modernization of governance systems, community resilience has characteristics such as sustainability, adaptability, redundancy, agility, and initiative. [12] In other words, community resilience not only emphasizes the adaptability and learning ability in the process of Community Governance, but also focuses on the multi force cooperation of the community in response to public health emergencies such as the COVID-19 epidemic, especially the ability of community residents to actively participate in governance. In short, resilience is of great significance for the response to the epidemic crisis and the improvement of the Community Governance system and capacity, and is the basis for supporting the sound operation of the social system.

4. The Dilemma of Resilient Governance in Grassroots Communities

The theory of community resilience, as an innovative governance concept, not only has interdisciplinary theoretical advantages, but also has become a hot topic in current domestic public management research. [13] Community resilience provides a new direction for optimizing the emergency governance mechanism of the community and improving its governance level, as it emphasizes the ability of the community to self-organize, adapt, and recover from external interference. However, the current community resilience governance system in China is not yet perfect, and the construction of resilient communities is still in its early stages. Domestic research on community resilience has not yet formed a mature theoretical framework. However, community resilience played a significant role during the epidemic prevention and control period, and party and government leaders have included the construction of resilient communities in the 14th Five Year Plan. It is pointed out that resilient communities are dynamic communities that are based on collective community action, can link internal and external resources, effectively address regional disasters and risks, and recover from harmful impacts to maintain sustainable development. [14] Community resilience is multi-dimensional. Based on China's national conditions and the investigation of community epidemic prevention and control, this study will attempt to build a governance framework for community resilience at the risk of COVID-19 from the four dimensions of process resilience, structural resilience, psychological resilience, and technical resilience, and explore the plight of community resilience in the development process, as well as the effective path of community resilience governance in the post epidemic era.

4.1. Process Resilience: Insufficient Adaptability and Flexibility of the Community

The adaptive cycle theory emphasizes the ability of community systems to recover, adapt, transform, and develop themselves. [15] The improvement of community adaptation, recovery and other abilities is not achieved overnight, but requires a process. Based on the adaptive cycle theory, the development of resilience ability undergoes an exploration phase, a preservation phase, a release phase, and a reorganization phase. The dynamic changes in resilience vary at different stages. [16] At present, in different stages of community governance, sometimes success may develop, and sometimes failure may occur at some stage. Only resilient communities can improve their adaptability and self-adaptability in this process. Therefore, process resilience is an important dimension of community resilience. It mainly includes two parts: on the one hand, there should be a set of procedures or institutional preparations to deal with risks or crises, which can provide early warning, response, recovery, and self-adaptation in the first time; On the other hand, there is a community governance system that is relatively flexible in terms of processes or procedures, which can ensure that the community has a flexible ability to respond to unexpected risks. For example, in the current outbreak period of major public health emergencies, the community, as the most sensitive first line of defense, has lost the ability to make decisions within the community when the local government is nearly paralyzed. It is unable to comprehensively investigate the community, and it is also difficult to effectively complete the upload and release. Instead, it forms a distorted state of formalism "form epidemic prevention", causing people to worry about and doubt the governance authority. This leads to insufficient adaptability of the community to emergency situations during the governance process, resulting in longer periods of exposure for residents to risk shocks.

4.2. Structural Resilience: Unbalanced Coordination and Governance Mechanism of Multiple Entities in Communities

Structural resilience is an important guarantee in community resilience governance. Structure mainly refers to the arrangement of relations between Community Governance subjects. [17] The importance of structural resilience lies in forming harmonious joint governance relationships with other entities based on government functions. The division of community structure in China is relatively complex, and the structure of different subjects emphasized here is an organizational structure. It refers to how government, organizations, markets, and community personnel collaborate to form effective governance structures, thereby enhancing the structural resilience of communities. For example, in the face of major public health emergencies, although some community volunteers, community owners and members, community personnel, etc. actively participate in community risk prevention and control organizations, they

reflect the structural resilience of the community in purchasing protective materials, residents' daily necessities, and other aspects. However, due to the rapid spread of the risk of the incident, the grassroots government in the community is no longer able to effectively communicate specific risk prevention and control work. Community workers are also under heavy pressure to continue working. They not only need to constantly supplement various materials, but also frequently communicate with community residents, provide psychological counseling, and sometimes suffer complaints and blame from residents. Some residents are unable to actively play a leading role due to their inability to understand the mandatory forms of prevention and control management. The entities that previously actively participated in risk emergency management have encountered various problems in the prevention and control process, and the multi entity coordination and governance mechanism constructed has also been imbalanced in practical operations.

4.3. Psychological Resilience: High Anxiety of Community Personnel

Psychological resilience, also known as psychological resilience, refers to the ability to effectively adapt to adversity, risk, frustration and other stress situations. [18] In the process of facing major risk events, grassroots community personnel generally go through six psychological stages: ignoring threats, anxiety and panic, rebelling with anger, gradually adapting, accepting the situation, and finally recuperating and recovering. Community personnel, including grassroots medical personnel, police officers from police stations, civil affairs officers, disabled full-time committee members, village/neighborhood committees, and other community workers, may face enormous psychological pressure due to public anxiety and heavy work pressure when facing risk emergency management. They may even experience secondary or substitute trauma due to seeing people sacrificed due to risk events, this urgently requires strengthening the psychological resilience construction of community personnel, in order to alleviate their anxiety, panic, and psychological pressure. In addition, in addition to individual community needs resilience, groups and society also need resilience. Good social recovery also provides individuals with stronger sense of security and good social support.

4.4. Technical Resilience: The Effectiveness of Community Risk Emergency Management is Relatively Low

With the continuous acceleration of social modernization, informatization, and intelligence, using technology to strengthen the intelligent management of communities and improve community governance functions is an important direction of current community governance. The community can empower community construction, improve the intelligent level of Community Governance, and thus enhance the technical resilience of the community as a whole through big data, the Internet, artificial intelligence, 5G network and other information technology. Technical resilience is also a key element in improving the community emergency governance system. [19] Currently, community risk emergency management can achieve goals such as risk monitoring and warning, efficient resource sharing, and rapid access to risk information through various technical means, thereby improving community risk emergency capabilities. Therefore, technological resilience is also an important element for community epidemic prevention and control. It can not only quickly warn of risks, but also maximize the prevention and control of the spread of epidemic risks. For the intelligent management of communities, China is currently in a stage of development. Nowadays, there are also many communities that use inappropriate technology in a certain part of the grid when facing risk events, which may lead to blind spots in grassroots community management. In the early stages of risk, many communities have a relatively refined grid distribution, with duty personnel in each street, building leaders on each floor, volunteers, grassroots party members, etc., striving to prevent and control risks to the maximum extent possible, and personnel at all levels are also dedicated to their work. However, there are still some blind spots in the grassroots grid, such as untimely delivery of materials for patients and inaccurate data collection. In summary, currently, there is a large space for community technological resilience governance, and the effectiveness of community risk emergency management is also relatively low.

5. The Way Out for Grass-Roots Community Governance

The development of anything has two sides. In the context of a risk community, complex and ever-changing risks do not necessarily mean the destruction of humanity, but may also lead to new vitality. The emergence of community resilience not only demonstrates people's confidence in innovative governance at the grassroots level, but also strengthens their determination to strive to improve community emergency management. Community, as the last mile of urban governance, is also an important gateway for epidemic prevention. Therefore, it is necessary to reflect on the current issue of community resilience governance and then tailor the medicine to the case. In order to enhance the innovative governance capacity of communities in the context of the normalization of the epidemic, and jointly build a community of shared destiny that is closely related and lives together.

5.1. Improve the Emergency Mechanism for Community Emergencies and Enhance the Flexibility of Governance

Community emergency, resilience is crucial. Resilience is an innovative governance ability for communities to adapt and recover from risks. At present, a complete emergency mechanism has not been formed in the process of community resilience governance, leading to insufficient self-adaptation ability of community personnel when dealing with risks. In other words, this emergency mechanism does not have the characteristics of procedural and full cycle management. In short, Community Governance requires not only a complete set of emergency mechanisms to respond to risks or crises, but also accurate early warning of risks, response to risks, and ultimately self-adjustment and recovery. We also need this mechanism to be flexible in the governance process. That is to form a flexible emergency management mechanism throughout the entire process. Summarizing the experience of community COVID-19 prevention and control, we can see that, first of all, the power of the community government should be decentralized, and community workers can quickly make emergency strategies when risks come; Secondly, the government must establish a system of emergency warning, decision-making, leadership, coordination, control, and other related systems, and regularly exercise them in daily life to

make the entire emergency mechanism open and transparent in the community, thereby ensuring flexible response in the event of sudden public events. Finally, in addition to community governments and members of community organizations, community residents should also be encouraged to actively participate in community risk emergency drills to improve their risk response ability and prevention and control awareness. Especially in the context of high global risks, although the prevention and control of the COVID-19 epidemic in China has achieved some results, we still cannot relax our vigilance. As an important gateway for internal non-proliferation and external input, communities must strengthen their process resilience, so as to better achieve community safety governance under the normalization of the epidemic.

5.2. Building a Community Risk Governance Community and Achieving Multi Entity Linkage

Contemporary China has entered a high-risk society due to its huge transformation, and the construction of the human destiny is crucial. Resilience has become a powerful weapon in dealing with risk wars. The current resilience governance should be based on the premise of multi entity linkage, achieving communication and collaboration among various entities. Firstly, structural resilience should be based on the premise of integrated governance by political parties, and then form a joint force with other diversified entities to participate in governance. [20] Specifically, under the leadership of grassroots party organizations in the community, other entities are encouraged to actively participate in risk emergency management and enhance their defense awareness against sudden public health events. Community neighborhood committees should flexibly respond to problems that arise in risk management and control, and promptly propose solutions; Community enterprises also need to respond to government policies, actively cooperate with community risk emergency management, and actively offer suggestions and suggestions; Community organizations should widely organize and mobilize the masses for prevention and control, and strictly prevent the spread of risks; Community volunteers should enhance their self-organization ability and enhance their resilience. In this major public emergency, many volunteers from different professions played an important role, including those who purchased protective materials, transported materials, as well as psychological counselors, doctors, social workers, etc. Therefore, in building a community with a shared future for mankind, communities need a coordinated governance of multiple entities, forming a structured mechanism with clear division of labor, flexible response, and collaborative cooperation, and creating a normalized community risk management team to achieve the diversification of community risk governance entities.

5.3. Enhancing the Psychological Resilience of Community Populations and Adapting to the Normalized Development of the Epidemic

Psychological resilience refers to the ability to quickly rebound from a post traumatic state to a pre traumatic state. Community governance cannot be achieved without the support of the general public in the community. Therefore, improving the psychological resilience of community members can not only alleviate the anxiety of community members facing major risks, but also enable community members to better adapt to the social life of the epidemic normalization. Specifically, from the perspective of community members themselves, they should communicate more with family and friends, expand their social support network, and enhance their resilience in the risk of the epidemic. In addition, the prerequisite for having a good mindset is to have a healthy body first. Community residents should strengthen their physical exercise to better cope with the normalized community life under the epidemic. From the perspective of Community Governance, the community should establish and improve the social security system, because only within an economic security system can community residents improve their economic life quality. The community should also strengthen the construction of community service support systems, such as meeting the emergency material needs of community populations, so that community members can truly feel the warmth of the community and better build resilient communities.

5.4. Strengthen Community Emergency Technology Capabilities and Accelerate the Construction of Intelligent Communities.

With the continuous acceleration of social informatization and intelligence, technologies such as big data, blockchain, and artificial intelligence empower the construction of smart communities. This epidemic prevention and control also utilize methods such as facial recognition, intelligent analysis cameras, and mobile phone scanning to carry out epidemic prevention and control. However, overall, the level of community emergency management using new technologies is not high. This also indicates that the governance of community technological resilience should not only build a community intelligent service platform, but also enhance the ability of community members to learn new technologies, thereby enhancing the community's risk emergency response ability. Firstly, community grassroots organizations should actively learn modern information technology, especially emergency management techniques in the community. At the same time, it is necessary to hire professional talents with high-tech level from other places to provide emergency technology training for community organizations and members, especially in data operation and analysis capabilities, and actively test their own emergency technology in practice. Secondly, through emerging technologies such as the Internet of Things, big data and artificial intelligence, we should build an intelligent community risk identification and early warning platform, comprehensively perceive the community risk source points and conduct intelligent analysis, realize dynamic monitoring and real-time early warning of the community's safe operation status, so as to enhance the community's ability to respond to risks. Finally, data fusion and intelligent application of emergency resources should be promoted. Utilize big data to improve the efficiency of emergency material scheduling, and simulate crisis response based on the types, stocks, and characteristics of resources within and outside the community, combined with crisis scenarios, to construct the optimal resource combination and allocation plan, and improve resource utilization efficiency. Thus, making smart communities the "nose of the ox" that holds the community's risk prevention and control.

6. Summary

With the continuous occurrence of global risk crises, social risk governance has become the theme of the times. Especially in the face of the threat of the COVID-19 pandemic, which has both human and natural factors, it is necessary to form a community of shared future around the world to resist the risks of the epidemic together and truly achieve group immunity. Based on current experience in risk emergency management, community-based prevention and control work is very convenient, efficient, and comprehensive. The governance of community resilience is an important concept for grassroots communities to improve community emergency mechanisms, strengthen the linkage of diverse community entities, closely connect with community residents, and accelerate the construction of intelligent communities. It is also a key governance path for all humanity to jointly resist social risks. Therefore, it is necessary to actively build resilient communities, enhance their ability to respond to risks and resist disasters, and build a solid wall of prevention and control for a risk society. At present, the construction of community resilience in China is still in its infancy, and the theoretical framework and resilience assessment system for community resilience governance are not perfect enough. Therefore, in the post pandemic era, China needs to continue to strengthen community resilience construction and make enhancing community resilience an integral part of social construction. In order to better respond to the normalization risks of society, enhance the safety and confidence of human production and life. Ultimately, continuously improving the sustainable development capacity of society.

References

[1] Selected Important Documents Since the 19th National Congress (Part 1), Central Literature Publishing House, 2019, p. 35.

[2] Ulrich Beck. risk society: A New Road to Modernity [M]. Translated by Zhang Wenjie, et al. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2018.

[3] Ulrich Beck. Risk Society [M]. Nanjing: Yilin Publishing House, 2004.

[4] Wang Qian Resilient Community Governance logic and risk deconstruction strategy from the perspective of field theory [J]. Quest, 2022 (06): 122-130.

[5] Ferdinand Tennes. Community and Society. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1999.

[6] Sullivan H. Modernisation, Democratisation and Community Governance .Local Government Studies. 2001, 27 , 1-24.

[7] Gai Hongwei, Niu Chaowen From "Rigidity" to "Resilience" - The Paradigm Evolution and Institutional Response of Community Risk Governance [J] Qinghai Social Sciences, 2021 (06): 119-127.

[8] Wang Lu, Xiao Wentao Rigid Regulation, Elastic Management, and Resilient Governance: The Logical Turn and Enlightenment of Urban Risk Prevention and Control [J] Fujian Forum (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition), 2021 (5): 167-175.

[9] Timmerman,“ Vulnerability, Resilience and the Collapse of Society: A Review of Models and Possible Climatic Applications.” in Environmental Monograph, Toronto: Institute For Environmental Studies, Canada,1981.

[10] Bozza A, Asporone D,Manfredi G.Developing an integrated framework to quantify resilience of urban systems against disasters.Natural Hazards:Journal of the International Society for the Prevention and Mitigation of Natural Hazards, 2015, 3,1729-1748.

[11] Wu, X.L; Xie,Y.Y. Resilient communities based on urban public security. Tianjin Social Sciences,2018,3,87-92.

[12] FOLKE C, CARPENTER S R,et al. Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience Adaptability and Transformability. Ecology and Society,2010,15 (4) , 20.

[13] Deng,S. Social Resilience Construction and Social Work Orientation in Epidemic Crisis. Social Work, 2020 (4) ,64.

[14] Zhang,Y. A study on the development of a well-off society in China. Sociological Research, 2020 (6), 3.

[15] Walker B, Holling C S,Carpenter S R,et al. Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Socialecological Systems.Ecology & Society,2004,9(2) , 3438-3447.

[16] Holling C S, Gunderson L H. Resilience and Adaptive Cycles. Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems. Island Press, 2001.

[17] Hu,T.X; Yang,R.W. Research progress of urban internal spatial structure in the west, paper of the annual conference of Asian geographers, Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong press,1998.

[18] ONNOR K M, DAVIDSON J R . Development of a new resilience scale: the connor-davidson resilience scale (cd-risc). Depression and Anxiety, 2003, 18(02), 76-82.

[19] Xiao, W.T; Wang, L. Resilient cities: strategic choice for the safe development of modern cities. Southeast Academic Journal, 2019, (2), 89-99.

[20] Tang,W.Y. Political Party Integration and Governance: An Interpretation of Grassroots Governance Model in Contemporary China. Zhejiang Social Sciences,2020, (3),68.