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Abstract: Reforms in social governance are promoted by changes in social environments. Social governance models cannot be constant, and the rise of every innovative governance model is inseparable from an ever-changing society. The theoretical connotation of the collaborative innovation model in regional social governance is mainly reflected in its agents, actions, and processes. The fundamental requirements of the collaborative innovation model in regional social governance are de-administration and market-based. The key elements of the collaborative regional social governance model include: delegating power from central authorities, transferring selected social governance affairs, enhancing the development of governance capabilities in social governance agents, diversifying these agents by giving full play to the agency to strengthen the concept of collaborative governance for social governance agents, strengthening the establishment of the governance system, and ensuring the normal progress of the governance processes. The collaborative innovation model in regional social governance should be built in three aspects: a system of institutional norms, an evaluation indicator system, and law-based collaborative governance.
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Theoretical Implication of the Collaborative Innovation Model in Regional Social Governance

With the development of the science and technology industry, human society, in general, has entered the era of frequent and rapid information exchanges through vast and electronic communication networks. The rapid dissemination of information, the accelerated development of democratic processes around the world, and the awakening of citizens’ self-consciousness have brought rapid structural changes to the original social governance model. The new public management movement aims to reform the social governance model and to bring changes to the society. Although the new public management movement has not fundamentally changed the traditional content and model of social management, and the concept of “treating citizens as customers” seems outdated, it has proposed specific requirements for “streamlining administration and delegating power,” which indicate the direction and goal of collaborative social governance (Yao & Ye, 2020).

“Collaborative” refers to a harmonious state between each component or molecular unit within a system, and shows how a balanced open system can go from a disorderly state to an orderly state or from an orderly state to a more orderly state with the help of its internal non-linearity when the change in the external environment has reached a certain peak. Based on different perspectives, we believe that collaborative governance refers to the process in which diverse social agents take actions to address their common public affairs, realize social governance goals, and unleash the advantage of collaborative governance through mutual assistance, cooperation, and integration. First, the governing agents are diverse; besides the government, they include social organizations and citizens. Second, governance is a continuous process. The world is constantly changing, and reforms in social governance are promoted by changes in social environments. Social governance models cannot be constant, and the rise of every innovative governance model is inseparable from an ever-changing society. The fundamental requirement of the worldview of dialectical materialism is that everything must be based on reality and practice. Agents of social governance must focus on the realities of the society, learn from the experience of history, analyze previous governance models based on specific current conditions, and propose innovative ideas about adaptations to social governance models. Third, governance boundaries are the scope and scale of governance that are formed based on the key capabilities of governing agents and their interactions with other governing agents in society. Fourth, behaviors of governance are proactive. Fundamentally, social governance is the collection of many positive actions. Collaborative governance emphasizes shifting the focus of social management from government to social units. Collaboration among multiple governing agents is conducive to unleashing flexibility, diversity, and agency to address social issues and respond to emergencies. Relevance (sociality) makes every governing agent in society realize that the result of social governance is closely related to everyone and every organization in the entire society. When the society shares the achievements in its governance, the governance behaviors of the agents can be positive and proactive,
instead of oppressive and passive. Finally, analyzing the governance functions and the diversity of agents in collaborative governance makes up for some of the downsides in traditional social governance models. For example, in the traditional governance model, the government “takes over” social issues. As social issues become more complicated and the division of labor becomes clearer, the government would find it difficult to make its governance covering all aspects of society and achieve corresponding good results. In a model where a diverse group of agents participate in social governance, their collective power can make up for some of the insufficiencies in governance solely by the government. Collaborative governance can satisfy public interest, and interests of individuals within social organizations to reach the goals of social governance.

**Basic Requirements of the Collaborative Innovation Model in Regional Social Governance**

“Collaborative governance” originated from “Synergetics,” established by German physicist Hermann Haken. “Synergetics” states that when a system is in a chaotic state, to some extent, a synergistic effect exists among the large number of sub-systems that constitute the main system, and qualitative change will happen at the critical point and will transform the system from a chaotic state to a new stable state (Sun, 1989, p. 41). Essentially, collaborative governance is a model of governance in which multiple agencies participate. Based on the current social conditions in China, the diverse needs of society have made collaborative governance inevitable. In the traditional social governance process, public services were usually provided mainly by local governments. When government service is not able to satisfy the ever-increasing service demand of citizens, diverse power in social governance becomes especially crucial. Thus, innovative collaborative governance came into being. To truly meet the requirements of promoting the modernization of state governing capacities and governing systems put forth by the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC), it is necessary to create a balance between the state and the society in social governance to achieve coordinated development and collaborative governance of both the nation and the society.

To achieve regional collaborative development, de-administration for social organizations is indispensable. The overall status-quo of social governance in China is that although the government supports non-government forces to participate in the process of social governance to provide better public services, measures to streamline administration and delegate relevant power if necessary have not been effectively taken so that de-administration has not yet been fully achieved in social governance. For example, urban residents committees, each as a local self-governing organization in its community, should fully reflect the general will of community residents, but based on our investigations and analyses, sub-district nowadays tend to delegate administrative tasks to urban residents committees, thus gradually administratizing them. This deviates from the purpose of de-administration. In addition, some local governments use a project-based system to purchase public services from society. To obtain funding from government projects, many social organizations have
changed their relationship with the government and become subordinates. When these organizations participate in social governance, they tend to express the will of the government and it is difficult for them to self-govern, self-serve, and self-innovate in social affairs. It is worth noting that many local governments have not yet fully understood the diversity of agents in social governance. Based on our investigations, the pursuit of short-term immediate effects is an important driving factor. Regional collaborative governance includes not only intra-regional coordination, but also intra-regional cooperation between the government and other governing agencies. To truly achieve collaborative social governance and motivate self-governing organizations and citizens to participate in social governance, de-administration for self-governing organizations is essential. First, citizens’ participation in social governance needs to be increased. When the government is formulating and adjusting social governance policies, it should consult and fully consider people’s opinion. Active participation of citizens will allow their will to be better expressed to policymakers and public policies to be more open, more reasonable, and more practical, reflecting the collective will of the broadest masses and safeguarding the immediate interest of the vast majority. Second, it is also necessary to cultivate the ability of social organizations to participate in social governance. Improving and cultivating the ability of social organization to participate in social governance is an important step. Various policies and funding should be used to support and guide social organizations in their participation in social governance and unleash their functions. In the collaborative governance model, the role of the government should be to formulate guidelines and policies for the development of social governance, and specific social affairs should be handed over to specialized, and socialized social organizations, which are agents in the self-governance of society. Their self-governance and self-monitoring also enrich the connotation of the rule of law in modern society.

**The Collaborative Innovation Model in Regional Social Governance**

**Delegation of Power and Transfer of Selected Social Governance Affairs**

“A wise leader should put his people in positions that can unleash their strengths instead of exposing their weaknesses. Then, everything can be achieved, and all meritorious services will be performed.”① Allowing social organizations to be in positions where their strengths can be best utilized will greatly reduce the possibility of making mistakes and improve the accuracy and scientificity of decision-making. A government is not omnipotent, nor is it the caretaker of citizens, so it cannot and should not take over all public affairs. With the development of society, the government has begun to abandon the rule of utilizing the power obtained from the traditional hierarchy to maintain its regulation of social order. Instead, the government has started sharing public power with social agents and delegating to social agents the tasks that it is not good at or on which it may not be

---

① See Guanzi: Comments on the Situation.
able to make accurate decisions so that it can focus on affairs where it must exercise public power. To establish a collaborative governance model, the legitimacy for social governing agents to exercise power needs to be recognized, so the state needs to make an institutional arrangement that empowers agents in society to participate in and take responsibility for social governance. The task of the government is not to compete with society for the ownership of public power, but to provide a good institutional environment for it. The government should unite different parties for social governance through its guidance, be a good leader in this process and establish a reasonable and open governance system.

**Enhancing Governance Capacity of Social Governing Agents and Diversifying Them**

To use something, one must first strengthen it. Enhancing the capacity of social governing agents will help them share the responsibility of social governance with the government and promote society to develop on a good and healthy path. The rationalization of authority in Max Weber's description of traditional hierarchy is outdated. In modern society, establishing the authority of government depends on the people. Government is not the product of God or nature; it is the product of the people (Samuel, 2008). Government is produced by the people. Its legitimacy no longer comes from the “mandate of heaven” or “the divine.” Instead, it comes from the approval and voluntary obedience of the people. People nowadays are different from those in the past, as they have their own different demands, and the model of collaboration satisfies the need of the public to participate in social governance. In addition, the participation in social governance by a wide range of social agents is not only a means in the social governance model, but also more importantly a manifestation of democracy. The participation of diverse social agents can effectively restrain the emergence of corruption in the government, and it can significantly improve the degree of democratization and political transparency. Overall, a service-oriented government and local social forces reinforce each other, as social forces require the government to provide a good governance environment. The government thus transforms from being regulation-oriented to being service-oriented. On the other hand, a service-oriented government can promote rapid development of social forces and use its establishment and innovation to ensure healthy development of each agent in social governance.

**Giving Full Play to the Agency and Enhancing the Understanding of Social Governing Agents for Collaborative Governance**

The governance conception of governing agents needs to be cultivated in two ways. First, collaborative governance needs to be recognized by those in power. Based on the social features in China, social governance with Chinese characteristics is a process under the CPC leadership and guided by the government and diverse social governing agents actively participate in the governance of social and public affairs and jointly promote the harmonious and orderly development of society. Different from Western countries which mostly feature a multi-party system, the CPC leadership is the defining feature of Chinese socialism. As the holder of public power, the government is not
only the administrative agency that formulates and implements policies, but more importantly, the connection between the Party and the people. For thousands of years, ancient rulers governed individuals by issuing orders, but in our ever increasingly complex society, the relationships between behavioral agents have become increasingly dependent, and social governance is usually more complicated than social management. Decisionmakers should fully realize that the aim of promoting the establishment of a collaborative governance framework is not to undermine the positions of those in power within social governance, but to expand the range of governing agents and make them join hands with the government to govern the society together, giving full play to the huge strength of the socialist system. Therefore, those in power should recognize the legitimacy of other governing agents and seek common grounds while reserving differences during governance decision-making processes, respecting the opinions of every social governing agent, and considering their input in the development of various social governance policies formulated by the government. We should adhere to the goals of establishing a community of social governance and seeking common development, and continuously move forward towards collaborative governance. Second, collaborative governance requires the recognition not only of those in power, but also of other social governing agents. Social organizations, citizens, and enterprises should improve their understanding of collaborative governance, be aware of their roles as social agents, and reach a consensus on the goals, interests, and needs of social governance. Agents of social governance need to safeguard national interests and at the same time follow and observe the rules. In addition, as each governing agent may act on its own interest, it is necessary to restrain such an inclination. Governing agents negotiate and may surrender part of their self-interest to maximize joint interests.

**Strengthening the Establishment of the Governance System and Ensuring the Normal Progress of the Governance Process**

The role of the system is that it can clarify the rules under which social governance operates, and the rights and responsibilities of each governing agent. By clarifying the rights and obligations of individuals, the system can regulate individual behavior. It is the result of applying conventions to social governance and the fundamental guarantee of social governance. As we move forward in time, different social demands will arise, and meeting these demands always challenges the regulating ability of the existing system. With the awakening of citizenship and continuous advancement of urbanization, if individual or collective demands of people or social organizations cannot be satisfied in time, people may join the political life through unionizing individuals or collectives. This type of political participation manifests itself as the advancement of democratization in countries that have developed an appropriate governance model and an advanced system. Conversely, in societies that lack reasonable rules and have backward systems, riots will usually break out. This also shows that if the existing system cannot meet the needs of individuals for their participation in politics and of its own for expansion, then social governance cannot be effectively improved in social governance. Within the framework of the collaborative governance system, all agents of social governance must strictly
follow the pre-determined rules of collaboration. Every citizen and social organization must adjust their requirements and demands according to the regulations of the system and pursue them in a reasonable way through legal channels.

Institutionalizing the collaborative governance model can not only effectively improve the transparency in the governance process, reduce the rate and possibility of making mistakes, but also clarify the goals and processes of governance and reduce the time costs of collaborative consultations. At the same time, it can make clear the responsibilities of agents so that they will not be able to push their luck or pass the buck. In addition, during the institutionalization process, the specific conditions in China need to be considered and, on this basis, useful experience of other countries can be drawn on to establish a social governance system that suits the conditions of China. During the establishment of the implementation pathways of the innovative collaboration model of social governance, the difference in politics, economy, and culture between different countries should be fully considered. Merely talking about the good practice of other countries is nothing more than rhetoric, since the same advanced system may not work well in every country. The design of social governance systems is not changeless, and adjustments based on national conditions and local features are needed. The importance of localization to the establishment of a system is self-evident. Ignoring the role of localization will not only fail to achieve the initial goals but also cause incalculable damage. As a developing country, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, China has always adhered to the path of socialism with Chinese characteristics based on its national conditions to develop a socialist system suitable for China.

**Establishing the Collaborative Innovation Model in Regional Social Governance**

**The System of Institutional Norms for Collaborative Governance**

The modernization of social governance is the overall requirement for the governance system and capacity. To modernize the social governance system and capacity is to “institutionalize, scientify, standardize, program, and refine the social governance system, and ensure that the governing agents adopt a way of thinking and methods under the rule of law and the legal systems to govern the society, thereby transforming advantages of socialism with Chinese characteristics in all aspects into increased effectiveness of social governance” (Xu, 2014; Wang & Xue, 2015).

**Laws and regulations in social governance.**

In a society based on the rule of law, its legal system is deemed as the ideal guarantee “common good” and guidance to all members of the society for their duties. One of the more important roles of the rule of law is that if a set of basic rules and regulations is pre-established and its application is both consistent and predictable. People may expect less controversies and disputes (Li, 2019, pp. 133—154). The rule of law is an important means of modernizing regional social governance, and efforts should be made to enhance the awareness and capability of the rule of law for residents in urban
and rural communities. The Third Plenary Session of the 18th CPC Central Committee proposed, “Adhering to governing by the rule of law, strengthening protections under the rule of law, and using the way of thinking and methods of the rule of law to resolve social conflicts.” The rule of law is the fundamental guarantee of order in modern society, and it can improve the effectiveness and legitimacy of social governance. The level of the rule of law in social governance is the key variable that determines its level of modernization (Tang, 2014). Without the rule of law, it will be difficult to carry out social governance and achieve corresponding goals (Chen, Chen & Chen, 2020). In order to promote regional economic development in China, collaborative institutional norms should include: (i) the system of rules and regulations. One important aspect in the establishment of a social institutional system for modern governance is to formulate corresponding local social governance regulations based on city characteristics. Currently, only a few cities in China have formulated corresponding local regulations on social governance, and most of them are in the form of rules, policies, and other normative documents, characterized by lack of stability and standardized local social governance legislation. Therefore, local regulations and government rules that clarify rights and responsibilities and are easy to implement should be formulated to provide a legal basis for overcoming challenges in social governance. (ii) the implementation system for the rule of law. “Laws cannot implement themselves.” The gap between the generality of law and its specific application needs to be bridged by judicial decision-making. The effective implementation of various systems is the key to realizing the rule of law, and it will be difficult to achieve without an effective implementation system. Therefore, some scholars believe that the legal decision-making mechanism should be improved and implemented, and openness of processes, standardization of discretion, and normalization of behaviors should be promoted. The mechanism of the rule of law for resolving social conflicts and public crises should be strengthened and improved to make the rule of law a long-term and institutionalized means for this purpose (Yin, 2014; Wang & Xue, 2015; Chen, 2018). (iii) the supervision system for the rule of law. Without supervision, the rule of law cannot be really achieved, so the supervision system plays an important part in developing the rule of law. In the process of establishing a supervision system for the rule of law, the key points and difficulties in supervision should be identified, and the system should be established by stages and categories. In this regard, some scholars believe that supervision should be strengthened against issues including abuse of power, taking bribes, bending the law, playing favorites, and committing irregularities to establish and improve a three-dimensional and all-day supervision network for the rule of law (Yu, 2020; Chen, 2018). (iv) the protection system for the rule of law. The process of modernizing social governance is the process of comprehensively promoting the rule of law, so a unified public network of legal service should be established. Modern information technology should be utilized, to promote the intellectualization of collaborative social governance.

① See Mencius: Li Lou (Part A).
Policies and regulations for social governance.

Policies and regulations for social governance are important as they provide important guidance for directions, protections and actions for social governance. In this regard, the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone and the city of Nanjing have successively formulated corresponding systematic regulations on social governance. In 2018 and 2019, Sichuan and Chongqing signed the “1+12” Cooperative Agreement and the “2+16” Special Plan respectively to promote their joint participation in national strategies, including the Yangtze River Economic Belt and the New Land and Marine Routes for Western Regions. In 2019, they jointly promoted nine key tasks, such as the construction of open channels and platforms, joint prevention and controls for ecological environment, interconnections of infrastructure, and industrial cooperation, and co-prosperity. They also made progress in promoting market integration, collaboration, and sharing of public services, such as establishing the “Sichuan-Chongqing Patent Administration and Law Enforcement Collaboration” platform, a collaboration and interconnection mechanism for food production, and a mutual assistance mechanism for supervising special food production and operations. In addition, they collaboratively maintain the order of fair competition in the market.

Self-governing norm of social governance.

The self-governing agents are the creators and observers of self-governing norms. Accelerating the establishment of a democratic, open, and inclusive system of self-governing norms, building a community of social governance in which people can all assume and fulfill their own responsibilities and improving the level of socialization for social governance are important parts of modernizing community-level social governance. In terms of the establishment of self-governance in regional social governance, the premise of establishing a social self-governing normative system is a comprehensive implementation of the rule of law and at the same time it is necessary to improve the mechanisms of community-level self-governance (including institutional mechanisms, operational, and protection mechanisms), the mechanisms of self-governance in enterprises and institutions (including the role of unions, protecting the rights and interests of staff, and resolving internal disputes), and the establishment of a self-governing normative system in cyber virtual space (the subject, content and object of the regulating activity) (Yu, 2020).

Building the Evaluation Indicator System of Collaborative Governance

Enhancing the public safety evaluation indicator system.

Maintaining public safety, social stability, and the long-term stability and peace of a socialist country with a people’s democratic dictatorship is the common goal of the state and the people. Public safety was an important part of science and technology development during the 2006–2010 period. Its content is comprehensive, not only including the safety of water resources, ecological environment, and energy, resources but also covering the safety of national information systems, medical insurance, and the military. The public safety system in China mainly includes the national security system for the prevention and control of emergencies, the national public safety deployment and planning system, and the national disaster risk prediction and assessment system. As China has been attaching great importance
to establishing better public safety, governments at all levels have been increasing their investments in public safety. The work on public safety has achieved great progress, but some issues still exist in practice. Therefore, the public safety evaluation indicator system must be enhanced in order to utilize effective information in the evaluation of indicator projects to provide feedback that will allow timely discovery of public safety issues and offer data that is necessary to make effective corrections and improvements.

### Table 1: Enhancing the Public Safety Evaluation Indicator System

| Indicator System for Environment and Resources | Ecological Environment | Water Resources | Other Energy |
| Indicator System for National Disaster Prevention and Relief | National Disaster Risk Prediction and Assessment | National Disaster Prevention System | National Disaster Relief System |
| Indicator System for Public Safety Emergency | National Safety Protection for Emergency Prevention and Control |
| Other | National Information System | Medical Insurance, Food and Drug Safety | Military Security and Law and Order |

**Constructing the evaluation indicator system for the governance of virtual communities.**

Gene A. Youngblood proposed the word “virtual community” in 1983. In 1993, Howard Rheingold defined virtual community as social aggregations that emerge from the Net when enough people carry on those public discussions long enough, with sufficient human feelings, to form webs of personal relationships in cyberspace (Lee, 2021). We believe that based on this definition, a virtual community is a collection of social relations formed among people who are active on the Internet (digital communication network) to conduct a series of activities. Compared to the real society, the virtual community is asymmetric, anonymous, and formed online, which makes it relatively difficult to govern and poses some challenges to social governance. However, a virtual community is essentially an extension of the real world, so the establishment of the governance system for virtual communities can also be an extension of the real social governance system. Therefore, an evaluation indicator system for the governance of virtual communities also needs to be established based on the difficulties in virtual community governance.

The first issue in virtual community governance is cyber-violence, which stems from issues related to information asymmetry between the Internet and real society. One important criterion for the level of virtual community governance is the incidence and resolution of cyber-violence cases. There is great practical significance for using cyber-violence as an evaluation indicator for virtual community governance.

Big data has been widely collected and is being used to discover multiple patterns of personal behaviors, so the protection of online privacy and intellectual property should also be included in the evaluation system of virtual community governance. The right of information is described as the right to “control the flow of information about the right-holder” (Posner, 1977, p. 393). Privacy is a fundamental right, essential to autonomy and the protection of human dignity. It serves as
the foundation upon which many other human rights are built. The right to privacy in the virtual community is an extension of the right to privacy in real society. Based on the classification of rights in the civil law, the right to privacy on the Internet is a typical personal right. The right to privacy on the Internet refers to all kinds of private information and activity spaces enjoyed by citizens which must not be violated by others according to the law, which prohibits anyone from revealing the private information of other citizens or defaming them on the Internet (Li, 2010). Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to protect the privacy and intellectual property of Internet users and to include the protection of online privacy and intellectual property into the evaluation indicators of virtual community governance.

These three main indicators are critical for building an effective evaluation indicator system for virtual community governance, protecting the rights of the virtual community (to comply with socialist values), and monitoring indicators of cyber-violence and the protection of online information and personal privacy. These indicators can also reflect issues in virtual community governance that need to be addressed, and the implementation of these indicators is mainly supervised through regional collaborative governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Construction of an Evaluation Indicator System for Virtual Community Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Virtual Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyber-Violence Monitoring Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator for Protecting Online Information and Personal Privacy</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Innovations in the social mentality evaluation indicator system.**

Social mentality refers to people’s cognition of social phenomena based on their own values. Issues related to social mentality are worthy of great concern, but how to measure and evaluate changes in social mentality is a complex subject. Most current studies have analyzed and explained the concept of social mentality and its function and formation mechanisms (Ma, 2008). We believe that it is, and will continue to be, very difficult to quantify social mentality as an issue of social ideology. In the design of the specific indicator system, the reality of collaborative social governance in each region should be seriously considered, and the system should be built layer by layer, gradually increasing in depth by following the formation process of social mentality. The social mentality evaluation indicator system mainly includes three aspects, the core ideology of socialism, social norms, and citizens’ self-consciousness, which is also the formation process of social consciousness. First, the self-consciousness of citizens forms self-cognition. Then, the core values and the culture of a nation are formed. Finally, the national consciousness and culture are defined and translated into normative documents, such as laws and regulations, thereby having a binding effect on the society. This is also a relatively complete evaluation system. Therefore, the social
mentality evaluation indicator system mainly includes three layers, the core ideology of socialism, social norms, and citizens’ self-consciousness.

Table 3: Innovations in the Social Mentality Evaluation Indicator System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator for the Core Ideology of Socialism</th>
<th>Conception of Freedom</th>
<th>Conception of Equality</th>
<th>Conception of Justice</th>
<th>Conception of Rule of Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator for Social Norms</td>
<td>Legal Norms</td>
<td>Ethical Norms</td>
<td>Business Norms</td>
<td>Norms of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator for Citizens’ Self-Consciousness</td>
<td>Sense of Security</td>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>Sense of Justice</td>
<td>Sense of Happiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reconstructing the evaluation indicator system for cultural governance.**

The culture of a nation is the main embodiment of its spiritual cohesion and value orientations, and the cultural soft power is also an important part of the comprehensive national power of the country. The quality of culture is the touchstone for the quality of society, and the establishment of a cultural governance evaluation indicator system is an important part of building a regional collaborative governance system. Based on the actual situation of regional social governance in China, the cultural governance evaluation system can be constructed from three aspects, the core value system of society, the cultural quality of citizens, and the development of the cultural industry. The core values of society create the core structure of it. This is repeatedly emphasized in this study. Social values are at the absolute core and are the most important part of constructing social ideologies, because they reflect the spiritual core of a nation and a society. The framework of our governance institutions and the social governance systems are based on the core values of society. The core value system of society constitutes the spiritual connotations of the Chinese people. The cultural quality of citizens determines the overall cultural quality of society, so if we are to examine the national cultural quality, the individual cultural quality of every citizen needs to be examined. A great social culture can significantly promote and influence the cultivation of citizens’ cultural quality. The cultural industry is an important carrier for the culture to manifest itself as material power. It is part of the core competitiveness in every country’s development in modern society, and an important indicator of the cultural soft power. Therefore, the development of the cultural industry should also be included in the evaluation indicators of cultural governance.

Table 4: Reconstruction of the Evaluation Indicator System for Cultural Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator for Core Values of Society</th>
<th>Conception of Patriotism</th>
<th>Conception of Dedication</th>
<th>Conception of Integrity</th>
<th>Conception of Friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator for the Cultural Industry’s Development</td>
<td>Cultural Talents</td>
<td>Cultural Infrastructure</td>
<td>Cultural Protection</td>
<td>Cultural Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stable can it contribute to regional economic and cultural development. Social stability is also the basis for maintaining national political, economic, and cultural security. With the analysis of the development experience of various countries in the world, it is not difficult to notice that the more developed regions are often regions where societies are particularly stable. Conversely, places that have experienced constant warfare are often relatively less-developed in terms of social and economic growth. Therefore, the role of stability in ensuring the harmony and development of society is self-evident. The social stability evaluation indicator system should be improved to better monitor and quantify social and economic stability, political stability, leading social idea stability, and the stability of social life. After studying the social stability indicator system, we found that a few features need to be added to the system. First, it needs to be ensured that the social, economic, cultural, and political systems should be constructed following the rule of law, which means that the legal system should be mostly complete and effective. Second, it needs to be ensured that the social, economic, cultural, and political systems should be operating in a controllable manner and should not grow out of control. Finally, it needs to be ensured that the social, economic, cultural, and political institutions should be pragmatic and reasonable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Improving the Evaluation Indicator System of Social Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators for Economic Stability in Society</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of Economic Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability in People’s Living Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators for Political Stability in Society</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity in Value Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identical Political Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators for Stability of Social Ideas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators for Stability in the Order of Social Life</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Life Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Life Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reshaping the decision-making risk evaluation indicator system.**

As the social and economic reforms continue to deepen in China, various social issues have also emerged and may cause certain instability and risks in Chinese society. Therefore, in the process of promoting social and economic reforms, the decision-making risk assessment system needs to be constantly improved to cope with the ever-changing social environment and various social issues that may arise. It is necessary to continue to reshape the decision-making risk evaluation system. The evaluation of decision-making risks is mainly divided into two aspects: external risk and internal risk (Hao, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Reshaping the Decision-Making Risk Evaluation Indicator System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reshaping the Decision-Making Risk Evaluation Indicator System</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators for External Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics (Good Law and Governance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy (Balanced Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators for Internal Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality of Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of the Decisions (Evaluation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Rule of Law in Collaborative Governance

The rule of law in the collaborative innovation system in regional social governance.

To better explain and discuss the rule of law in the collaborative innovation system in regional social governance, we need to divide the system into multiple dimensions based on the logic structure. The first dimension should contain the concept of collaborative social governance. However, it is worth noting that so far, academia has not yet agreed on a clear and unified definition of social collaborative governance. Typically, when discussing this issue, some scholars tend to refer to collaborative social governance as “direct social governance cooperation or collaboration between different urban agglomerations” (Liu & Niu, 2018). In addition, since the emergence of collaborative social governance was accompanied by a series of concepts, including regional economic integration and regional social governance, this concept has been referred to as “intra-regional collaborative governance” in other studies. The second dimension of the collaborative innovation system in regional social governance should contain the concept of social innovations. At the national level, the concept of a social innovation system can be traced back to the National Science and Technology Conference in 2006, where Hu Jintao emphasized “building regional innovation systems with their own characteristics and advantages.” The regional innovation systems he was referring to were actually social innovation systems, top-down extensions of the overall national innovation system at the regional social level.

In terms of the rule of law in the collaborative innovation system in social governance, we believe that the following issues should be addressed. First, in researching the rule of law in the collaborative social governance systems, scholars are currently focusing on the main methods and pathways for realization. In terms of methods, the rule of law is the foundation of modern national governance, and the inherent requirement of national governance is to implement the rule of law (Zhang, 2014). Therefore, building a framework for the rule of law in social governance, creating a good atmosphere for the rule of law, constantly improving the procedures for the rule of law, and raising the standards for the rule of law in social governance are indispensable for achieving the rule of law in the collaborative innovation system in regional social governance, and an important optimization factor. Efforts need to be made simultaneously on four different levels: legislation, law enforcement, justice, and law-abiding requirements to push forward level by level social governance by using the law as a tool and adhering to the rule of law in establishing the collaborative social governance systems. Second, in terms of the pathways to achieving the rule of law in the collaborative systems, the main view is that good law and good governance must go hand in hand. Like the old saying goes, “Laws cannot implement themselves.” However, in terms of specific recommendations for laws, some scholars believe that the study should not be limited to the scope of current statutes, but should also cover common law and other laws in life (Luo & Zhou, 2016), such as establishing and improving reward systems, blacklist systems, information disclosure systems, publicity systems, and
compliance assistance, and promoting public interest litigation (Jiang, 2019). In terms of application, scholars believe that governance agents can use administrative measures to achieve a negotiation-based and agreement-based regulatory model (Ji, 2017). For some social issues, means other than laws can be used in their resolution, but the use of these means must be constrained within the framework of the constitution and law (Zhao, 2019). In addition to the studies above, there are many refined areas in academic research on the rule of law in collaborative social governance, such as revitalizing and protecting the rights of private enterprises and the private economy (Yue, Li & Xiong, 2013), the linkage of community work (Jiang, 2019), and intra-regional innovation capacity building in knowledge, technology, and services as well as protecting intellectual property by law (Mu, 2012). In general, there are many research results on the rule of law in social governance, and scholars in China have mostly affirmed the importance and scientificity of the rule of law in promoting the innovation and modernization of social governance.

The rule of law in collaborative innovation capacity in regional social governance.

To better understand the rule of law in collaborative innovation capacity in regional social governance, it is necessary to deconstruct this concept and propose a simple definition. By analyzing and summarizing relevant prior studies, we found that there is a great deal of controversy about the definition of collaborative innovation capacity, but fundamentally, it is generally held that collaborative innovation capacity in regional social governance, especially in intra-regional urban agglomerations, refers to the close relationship between cities in space, economy, transportation, and communications, and this is the basis for forming social space networks with regional characteristics. The governance capability of a system is reflected in the aspects of enterprises, scientific research institutions, and universities in the network, the relationship network among them, and the flow of resources, such as talents, information, and funding (Chen, 2021). Some scholars believe that this concept includes at least the following core characteristics: innovation efficiency, availability of innovation factors and resources, sharing of innovation achievements, and sustainability of innovation capabilities (Xie, 2015). In terms of the rule of law and the collaborative innovation capacity in regional social governance, we believe that the rule of law in this context refers to a way of thinking and a way of governance, and the implementation of this concept throughout the whole process of the building collaborative innovation capacity in regional social governance.

The reasons to promote the rule of law in collaborative innovation capacity in regional social governance.

The main reasons are as follows. The first reason lies in the need of intra-regional economic integration since the reform and opening up. From the development of the social governance concept in China, we know that the rapid social and economic development since the reform and opening up has accomplished great benefits, but has also given rise to many social governance issues, such as market blockade, market protection, insufficient market competition, and imperfect market factors, which have affected collaborative development of regional economy (Li, 2009). Based
on the collaborative social and economic development needed to further advance the reform and opening up, the resolution of various intra-regional issues will also need to be achieved through intra-regional collaboration. The law as a means, and the rule of law as a goal of social governance, are indispensable parts of the process of the rule of law in collaborative innovation in social governance. The second reason is the social governance demand for collaboration, participation, and common interests (Liu, 2013). The mobility of economic resources and factors of production, like talents, will inevitably lead to complex and diverse social governance issues. Therefore, orderly intra-regional collaboration on social governance issues can effectively avoid wasting administrative resources at the intra-regional level, thus helping to ensure that intra-regional local governments can resolve public service and welfare issues in a unified way (Liu, 2013). In solving major livelihood issues in social governance, adherence to the rule of law can also allow the government to truly identify its role—to be service-oriented. The third reason is the need for fair development in intra-regional societies. Under the premise of administrative division, the social governance agents (especially administrative agencies) of intra-regional public service affairs may tend to pass the buck or conduct repeated law enforcement activities (Xu & Li, 2016), while the lack of public services at the margins may lead to unfair allocations of social resources. Therefore, social governance with intra-regional collaboration can maximize fair distribution of administrative and social resources (Ma, 2013). The rule of law, as the common belief of social governance agents, and the law, as the common authority, serve as the yardstick, which will help reach a consensus on social governance within the framework of the law.

Specific content of the rule of law in collaborative innovation capacity.

After analyzing the emerging and existing problems of collaborative innovation capacity in social governance, we realized that the best way to improve collaborative innovation capacity in social governance systems and to solve these issues is to implement the concept of the rule of law and make good use of the means for the rule of law. Therefore, research on the rule of law in collaborative innovation capacity in social governance systems has become the top priority. We believe that the rule of law in collaborative innovation capacity in social governance systems should mainly include the following aspects. First, intra-regional social governance agents should firmly establish the rule of law thinking. Social governance agents must have the capacity for collaborative innovations in social governance, and the most important agents in a region are the administrative agents which exercise public power. Therefore, intra-regional local governments at all levels should firmly establish the rule of law thinking and the awareness that “the task is to promote the rule of law and to promote the rule of law is the task,” and they should always act and govern according to the law. The law can be an important linkage for intra-regional local governments, and the belief in the rule of law can unite the power of them. Under this premise, collaborative innovation capacity of in social governance systems will surely improve in a steady and consistent manner. Second, in addition to the agents of public power, the establishment of non-governmental and social organizations must be enhanced to cultivate effective social agents for collaborative governance. The rule of law thinking is not a simple response to acting in accordance with the law; it also includes cultivating the rule of law thinking in
social agents. The best way to achieve this is to let all types of social agents participate in the process of collaborative governance. To enable social organizations to abide by the law, their rule of law thinking needs to be established. This is not only sharing responsibility with the government, but also improving the capability of collaborative governance. The ability of social governance agents to take positive collaborative actions, depends on the knowledge that the rule of law will inevitably play a strong and positive role in promoting the rule of law in collaborative innovation capacity in social governance systems. The third is to normalize the education of community residents on the concept of the rule of law. The rule of law allows people to organize their lives in a safe and predictable way. As community residents are important objects of social governance, it is extremely important to cultivate the rule of law thinking of them, to help them understand the importance, fairness, and rationality of the rule of law. They need to understand that only through the rule of law can their interests be truly protected. Fourth, in terms of the development of judicial agencies, intra-regional judicial agencies should actively explore collaborative models, strive to break down various barriers between regions, enhance cooperation and exchange, and allow judicial agencies to firmly establish their images as defenders of the rule of law, which will play an important role in enhancing regional collaborative governance capabilities.

The rule of law is a way to resolve social conflicts in a rational and peaceful manner, and it is the best social governance model currently developed by any human society. The best practices and methods of implementing the rule of law in social governance innovation and coordination capabilities should focus on the cultivation of the rule of law thinking of the cooperating subjects in the region, and this thinking should be cultivated and supported throughout the process of social governance.
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