Research on Optimizing the Role of Social Organizations in Building, Governing, and Sharing Together

Xin Ma, Tan Sri Dato' Wira, Mohd Shukri Ab Yajid, Ali Khatibi, Jacquline Tham
The Communist Party of China Harbin Municipal Party School, Management and Science University, Shah Alam, Malaysia

Abstract: Social organizations are playing an increasingly important role in China's community governance, especially in realizing the purpose of constructing with people, governing for people and enjoying the benefits from social governance, but social organizations still confront many practical problems, such as imperfect participation mechanism, weak ability of resource acquisition and service, and insufficient independence and governance capacity in organization. This paper attempts to optimize the above problems by enhancing legal system and policy guarantee, improving the ability of resource acquisition and service, and improving the independence and governance capacity in organization. Based on improving the legal system and current situation of social organizations in community governance, this paper analyzes the key ways to optimize the role of social organizations in community governance and puts forward related policy suggestions, so as to improve the efficiency of social organizations in community governance, and provide theoretical basis and reference for realizing more efficient, democratic and harmonious community governance model.

Keywords: Social Organizations; Community Governance; Joint Construction; Co-Governance; Shared Benefits; Role Optimization

1. Introduction

Community community governance is an important part of social management. With the continuous improvement of social system, the traditional government governance mode of social system is gradually transformed into diversified governance mode. Social organizations are the connection between the government and residents. They play an important role in social governance innovation, community cohesion and social problems. However, the participation of social organizations in community governance still faces many problems, such as imperfect participation mechanism, insufficient resources and lack of governance independence. These problems seriously hinder the functional role of building, governing and sharing social governance. The exploration of ways to optimize the role of social organizations not only improves the ability of social organizations to participate in community governance, but also has important significance for achieving modernization of social governance. This paper analyzes the current problems of social organizations in China's community governance and puts forward the optimization strategies, so as to provide reference for the continuous development of social organizations.

2. The Importance of Social Organizations in Community Governance

2.1 Contributions of Social Organizations to Community Governance

Social organizations are important in community governance. They innovate and promote the development of community governance.

Social organizations mobilize residents to manage public affairs. It can make residents with a strong sense of identity and promote the community cohesion.

Social organizations not only provide tangible services, but also connect and coordinate the relationship between the government and residents. They promote the residents and the government to participate in the community construction and community management. In addition, social organizations help residents solve problems in community governance by providing specialized services and organizing social activities on a daily basis to improve the level and efficiency of community public services.

With the emergence of diversified social governance demands, the participation of social organizations has become increasingly important. Social organizations are an important complement to community governance. They can make up for the deficiencies of government functions and resources. The efficiency of community governance has been improved greatly through the synergy of social organizations, enhancing the democracy and transparency of community governance.

2.2 The Role of Social Organizations in Promoting Social Capital Accumulation

As social organizations promote the accumulation of social capital. Social capital is the total sum of trust, mutual assistance, and participation of residents to engage in public affairs, which is an important part of community development . Community residents participate in community activities and volunteer activities organized by social organizations, which enhance the consciousness of cooperation and mutual assistance. Finally, the accumulation of social capital is improved. The formation and development of social networks allow community residents to find more ways of social assistance in the face of difficulties. The guiding and facilitating role of social organizations allow residents to transcend their own interests and focus more on the overall interests and realization of public interests. With the participation of social organizations, community cohesion and trust are enhanced. It provides a strong impetus for the community cohesion and development . Finally, social organizations promote social harmony and co-governance by promoting communication and exchange.

2.3 Comparative Analysis of Domestic and International Social Organizations in Community Governance

The role of social organizations in community governance has become increasingly prominent, particularly in promoting a social governance model characterized by joint construction, co-governance, and shared benefits. The participation methods and practical experiences of social organizations both domestically and internationally provide valuable insights for China's social governance. According to Zhang Qian (2023), social organizations can deliver effective services to residents, foster social participation, and enhance governance efficiency in advancing community governance based on joint construction, co-governance, and shared benefits [1]. Chu Dongwei (2021), through research on Jiangsu Province's social organizations participating in rural public cultural services, indicates that their involvement extends beyond cultural activities to actively advancing rural social services and cultural development [2]. Wang Jian and Yang Qianqian (2021) analyzed the successful model of social organization cultivation in Tianjin's Heping District, emphasizing that policy support and accumulated social capital have enhanced the dynamism of social organizations in community governance [3]. Liu Yuerou (2021) observed that social organizations in Lixia District, Jinan City, established deep connections with residents through precise service positioning, effectively boosting community governance participation and residents' sense of belonging [4]. Internationally, Santos (2025) examined how Spain's far-right political parties infiltrate civil politics through “elite” social organizations, revealing the dual role of such entities within complex socio-political structures [5]. Meanwhile, Liu and Zou (2025) studied Brazilian civil society organizations within the BRICS framework, highlighting their functions and roles in international cooperation. Domestic and international social organizations exhibit distinct practices in community governance[6]. Domestic organizations typically rely on government support, leveraging policy and funding guarantees to integrate resources and enhance service capabilities. In contrast, international organizations demonstrate greater independence and participation, particularly within civil society, where they operate with heightened autonomy and flexibility. These differences offer diverse perspectives for positioning the role and development pathways of China's social organizations in future community governance.

3. Challenges Faced by Social Organizations in China's Community Governance

3.1 Inadequate Participation Mechanisms

There are great challenges for social organizations because of the imperfect participation mechanism in Chinese community governance. Although the number of social organizations and their fields of participation have increased in recent years, their level of participation and influence in community

governance is still low. There is no effective communication and coordination mechanism between the government and social organizations. The participation of social organizations depends on temporary projects or development of certain policies. There are no stable and long-term participation mechanisms. In many areas, the cooperation between social organizations and the government is just in initial stages. The division of responsibilities and tasks are not clear, and the interests are also unclear. The participation of social organizations in community governance is only seen as a supplementary role, and the government puts social organizations in the passive position in decision-making[7]. The division of responsibilities and tasks are not clear, and the interests are also unclear. The role of social organizations in community governance is often regarded as supplementary and the active role of social organizations in governance cannot be played. There is also a lack of operation laws and regulations. Because of the lagging development of policies and laws, the legal system to play the active role of social organizations in governance is not yet in place. The participation mechanism is imperfect and the role of social organizations cannot be played to the fullest, which affects the effectiveness of community governance.

3.2 Insufficient Resource Acquisition and Service Capacity

Insufficient resource acquisition and service capacity appear to tend to suggest what may represent another substantially significant challenge faced by social organizations within this broader analytical framework of community governance. A substantial number of social organizations, particularly grassroots ones, seem to largely lack what might be characterized as stable funding sources and consistent resource guarantees, with financial constraints appearing to become what appears to constitute a bottleneck to their ongoing development. What seems to emerge from the instability of government subsidies and social donations is that the service capacity of social organizations tends to be substantially limited. Furthermore, a substantial number of organizations appear to possess personnel with relatively low qualifications and seemingly lack specialized service skills, what appears to result in somewhat limited practical influence in community governance[8]. When providing services, social organizations tend to predominantly rely on volunteers or temporary staff, seemingly lacking long-term, high-quality personnel, what tends to compromise the quality and efficiency of their services. What appears particularly significant about these findings is that, in addition, what seems to represent a critical aspect here is that a substantial proportion of organizations appear to offer relatively narrow service portfolios, seemingly struggling to adequately meet the increasingly diverse needs of community residents. What the data seems to suggest, for instance, is that amid an aging society, demand for elderly services appears to substantially surge in numerous communities, yet organizations tend to largely lack sufficient specialized services or resources to effectively address what appears to be this persistent challenge. What appears to follow from this analysis is that factors such as funding shortages, high staff turnover, and inadequate professional services tend to place substantial pressure on organizations to deliver high-quality, comprehensive community services. What this tends to indicate, therefore, is an ultimate undermining of what seems to be the overall effectiveness of community governance and resident satisfaction, what appears to warrant further interpretive consideration[9].

3.3 Insufficient Autonomy and Governance Independence of Social Organizations

The independence of autonomy and governance independence are quite lacking in social organizations in China, which has become an important constraint in the process of community governance. The activities of social organizations appear to be highly controlled by the government in many situations. That is, the government controls the allocation of social organization’s resources, the tasks to be performed by social organizations, as well as the decision-making process of social organizations, which reduces the independence of social organizations. The activities of social organizations must comply with the goals set by the government. There is little room for social organizations to make autonomous choices and make decisions. Thus, social organizations cannot play their innovative and flexible role in the community governance[10]. More interestingly, some local governments manage social organizations in a highly centralized way,

reducing the independence of social organizations in practice, and even causing the emergence of a government-centered "administrative" model. Under this model, social organizations are required to operate according to the instructions from the government and lose their basic functions of participating in public affairs and representing the interests of residents. In addition, the autonomy of social organizations is also limited in the narrow range of their social functions and governance models. They cannot make flexible adjustments to the service and operation methods according to the changes in community functions[11]. Suppressing the governance independence and innovative capacity reduces the effective role of social organizations in the co-construction, co-governance and sharing benefits process of social governance.

4. Strategies for Optimizing the Role of Social Organizations

4.1 Improving Legal Frameworks and Policy Support for Social Organizations

Within this broader analytical framework, what appears to tend to suggest a crucial dimension involves enhancing legal frameworks and policy support for social organizations, which seems to lend support to what may represent an elevated role for them in community governance. What tends to emerge as theoretically important is that effective participation by social organizations in community governance appears to warrant being grounded in what appears to constitute a robust legal framework and policy support. Given the complexity of these theoretical relationships, what seems especially noteworthy in this analytical context is that it appears prudent to suggest that efforts ought to be substantially accelerated to formulate and refine relevant laws and regulations governing social organizations, ostensibly defining their legal status in community governance and tending to ensure their equal participation and collaboration with government and other social forces[12]. Policies should ostensibly provide clearer pathways for participation, appear to define their responsibilities and authority in community governance, and predominantly ensure they are not subject to what may be characterized as excessive interference when delivering social services.

What also appears significant in this context is that financial support and tax incentives for social organizations ought to be strengthened to encourage multi-channel fundraising, thereby substantially enhancing their service capacity and overall sustainability. What seems to result from these considerations is that a robust oversight mechanism appears to also warrant establishment to generally ensure transparency and fairness in their activities, thereby bolstering their credibility in community governance. The government should tentatively introduce specific policies to lend support to social organizations in launching innovative projects and services, encouraging their collaborative efforts with multiple stakeholders including government, businesses, and residents. What this tends to indicate is that legal safeguards will not only appear to promote a more active role for social organizations in governance but also appear to enhance their autonomy and governance capabilities, fostering what seems to be a healthier and more efficient community governance system[13].

4.2 Enhancing Resource Access and Service Delivery Capabilities of Social Organizations

What appears to emerge from these considerations is that strengthening the resource access and service delivery capabilities of social organizations appears to tend to suggest what is substantially important for elevating their governance role, within this broader analytical framework. What the evidence appears to reveal is that, in order to ensure these organizations can ostensibly serve communities, their shortcomings in resource acquisition and service capacity appears to provide evidence that may support the need for addressing[14].

What appears to be indicated is that governments tend to suggest what appears to be a necessary establishment of diversified funding support mechanisms. What also appears significant in this context, beyond fiscal allocations, is that they tend to point toward what appears to be an active encouragement of social organizations to collaborate with enterprises, charitable institutions, residents, and a broad spectrum of other stakeholders to jointly raise funds. What appears to follow from this analysis, through measures such as establishing special funds and promoting tax incentives, is that stable financial support seems to lend support to what may represent the provision of resources to enable social organizations to undertake projects with

substantially greater social impact[15].

What appears to warrant further interpretive consideration is that social organizations appear to suggest what seems to be a prioritization of interaction and communication with community residents to understand what are presumed to be actual needs. What this tends to indicate is an ostensible avoidance of resource wastage and redundant efforts, while simultaneously improving service precision and effectiveness, given the complexity of these theoretical relationships. What seems to result from these considerations, therefore, is that governments tend to point toward what appears to be an encouragement of cross-departmental collaboration and cross-sectoral resource integration among social organizations, fostering cooperative networks to promote resource sharing and predominantly optimized allocation.

What seems especially noteworthy in this analytical context pertains to service capacity: organizations appear to suggest what seems to be a strengthening of staff training and professional development to enhance their ability to deliver what appear to be high-quality services. What this tends to indicate as an inclusion is the cultivation of social workers, volunteers, and other relevant personnel to provide what might be characterized as specialized talent support, thereby what appears to result in the improvement of the scientific rigor and professionalism of services. What the data seems to suggest is that social organizations should also appear to suggest what seems to be an exploration of technological applications, leveraging information tools to substantially boost service efficiency, ostensibly reduce human resource wastage, and potentially further enhance their service capabilities, from this particular interpretive perspective.

4.3 Safeguarding the Independence and Governance Capabilities of Social Organizations

Both the independence and governance capacity of social organizations affect their initiative and innovation in community governance. To protect the independence and governance capacity of social organizations, administrative intervention should be reduced. That is, the government should protect social organizations by establishing policies and providing financial support, but should not intervene in their daily operations and decision-making. Delineations of responsibilities and authority should be set up to ensure that social organizations have adequate independence when participating in community governance. Social organizations should make decisions and design services for specific communities based on needs, which improves the flexibility of service provision. Government support should be demonstrated through macro-level policies and allocations of resources, which allows social organizations to operate independently. Both the independence and governance capacity of social organizations affect their initiative and innovation in community governance. To protect the independence and governance capacity of social organizations, administrative intervention should be reduced. That is, the government should protect social organizations by establishing policies and providing financial support, but should not intervene in their daily operations and decision-making[16]. Delineations of responsibilities and authority should be set up to ensure that social organizations have adequate independence when participating in community governance. Social organizations should make decisions and design services for specific communities based on needs, which improves the flexibility of service provision. Government support should be demonstrated through macro-level policies and allocations of resources, which allows social organizations to operate independently. Social organizations should establish scientifically governed organizations, clarify the responsibilities and division of labor between leaders and decision-making bodies, and improve the internal governance level. Social organizations should cultivate governance teams with professional capabilities, which improves their ability to deal with social issues and emergencies. By establishing solid organizations and governance systems, social organizations can better deal with various challenges in community governance, which improves governance level and service quality. When their independence and governance capacity are protected, social organizations can participate more effectively in the community governance system of joint construction, co-governance, and shared benefits, which improves the sustainable development level of the community.

References

[1] Zhang, Q. (2023). Building a co-construction,

co-governance, and shared community: A community social organization governance consortium. Journal of Changzhi University, 40(3), 45–52.

[2] Chu, D. W. (2021). Co-construction, co-governance, and sharing: A study on the high-quality development of social organizations participating in rural public cultural services in Jiangsu. Journal of Taiyuan Normal University (Social Science Edition), (3).

[3] Wang, J., & Yang, Q. Q. (2021). Stimulating the vitality of social organizations to build a co-constructed, co-governed, and shared social governance pattern: An analysis of the new model of social organization cultivation and development in Heping District, Tianjin. Qiuzhi, (3), 2.

[4] Liu, Y. R. (2021). Research on the participation of urban community social organizations in community governance: A case study of H community in Lixia District, Jinan City (Master's thesis). Nanning Normal University.

[5] Santos, G. F. (2025). Profile: Far-right strategies to co-opt progressive politics: Vox's top-down civil society organizations in Spain. Social Movement Studies, 24(5), 652–660.

[6] Liu, M., & Zou, S. (2025). A study on the role and positioning of Brazilian civil society organizations under the BRICS mechanism. Advances in Social Behavior Research, 16(5), 22–31.

[7] Gibson, W., Junco, R. N., & Lehn, V. D. (2025, October 10). Sensing life: The social organisation of the senses in interaction [Monograph]. Taylor & Francis.

[8] Dicastillo, L. O., Roteta, I. A., Baztán, A. E., & others. (2025). PromoACTIVA-SC: A tool aiming at identifying health promotion practice of civil society organizations. Healthcare, 13(17), 2097.

[9] Wang, Y., & Qiu, Y. (2025). How civil society organizations influence environmental governance in the Global South. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 75, 101556.

[10] Guan, N. (2025). Experience sharing on the development and maintenance of volunteer backbones in social organizations. Scientific and Social Research, 7(5), 83–89.

[11] Xiang, Y. (2022). The practical dilemmas and coping strategies of social organizations participating in social governance in the new era. Journal of the Party School of the CPC Jinan Municipal Committee, (1), 43–48.

[12] Ha, S. J. (2024). A practical study on how social work promotes community social organizations' participation in community governance (Master's thesis). Northwest Minzu University.

[13] Liu, S. S., & Yang, J. Y. (2023). Stimulating community autonomy vitality through social organizations. Frontline, (2), 80–83.

[14] Liu, H. X. (2022). The practical dilemmas and optimization paths of social organizations participating in urban community governance. Urban Information, (20), 40–42.

[15] Shao, Y. Q. (2022). Research on the dilemmas and countermeasures of social organizations' participation in rural cultural revitalization. Art and Technology, 35(8), 193–195.

[16] Yan, D. D. (2020). Research on government cultivation of community social organizations (Master's thesis). Hebei Normal University.

