Spontaneous or Constructed? Neighborhood Governance Reforms in Los Angeles and Shanghai

Growing urbanization has intensified the challenges of urban management in both developed and developing countries. Significant attention has been given to building participatory governance at the grassroots level of urban management (Box 1998; Fung and Wright 2003). Many city governments around the world have initiated urban governance reform programs. Yet people often question whether government can initiate genuine empowerment because state orchestration will always be instrumental to state interests. Thus, it is of theoretical and practical significance to explore whether it is possible for state sponsorship to encourage democratic participation in urban governance. There is also no reason to believe that efforts to experiment with participatory governance will have the same consequences in all nations. Attention should be given to understanding how the formal political and legal contexts shape their trajectories, in particular the political institutions, administrative structures, and government policies in which these participatory innovations and reforms are embedded. To broaden and deepen our understanding of participatory governance theory and practice, there is a need for more comparative analyses of community governance reforms across countries (Bogason and Musso 2006).

To contribute to the understanding of community governance reforms, we selected two cases in two different countries—Los Angeles in the United States and Shanghai in China—for a comparative analysis. Since June 1999, Los Angeles has created a citywide neighborhood council system. The neighborhood councils are designed to build partnerships with local government to address local needs and requests, to promote public participation in city governance and decision making, and to serve in an advisory role on issues of concern to the neighborhood (City of Los Angeles 1999, Article I). The past 30 years have seen tremendous changes occurring in China—economically, socially, and politically. Yet China is facing the overall challenge of modernizing its political and administrative structures to match its modern society and reformed economy. The city of Shanghai, as the largest metropolitan area in China, began to restructure its resident committees to meet the growing demand for community services in the late 1990s.

The examples of Los Angeles and Shanghai were chosen for four reasons. First, both are major metropolitan areas in their countries. With a population of 3.7 million, the city of Los Angeles spans an area of 469 square miles, sprawling from the suburban San Fernando Valley in the northeast, to the wealthiest coastal communities that stretch from Venice to Palos Verdes, to the working-class industrial port community of San Pedro near the Los Angeles County border. Shanghai is the largest city in China and one of the largest urban areas in the world, with more than 20 million people in its extended metropolitan area. Shanghai is the largest city in China and one of the largest urban areas in the world, with more than 20 million people in its extended metropolitan area. Located on China’s central eastern coast at the mouth of the Yangtze River, the city is administered as a municipality with province-level status.
Second, the two cities are diversified. Such diversity has imposed a great challenge on the two cities’ urban administration. In the past, Los Angeles has experienced tremendous racial and cultural diversification as a result of the region’s status as an immigration hub, as well as middle-class flight that has left the region’s poorer and more racially diverse communities concentrated in the urban core. Although residents in Shanghai are not racially as heterogeneous as in Los Angeles, as many as 4 million people in the city are migrant workers from China’s impoverished regions. They join around 16 million local residents.

Third, both are typical of neighborhood governance reforms in their countries. Los Angeles’ citizen self-governance movement has reflected a nationwide trend over the past three or four decades in the United States (Berry, Portney, and Thomson 1993). Restructuring resident committees in Shanghai also has been a typical model of government involvement in community development in China (Li 2006).

Fourth, although the two community governance reforms are government sponsored, they differ in terms of implementation, function, and consequences. The Los Angeles neighborhood council system exhibits an overall feature of empowering local residents to participate in the process of policy making, while resident committee reform in Shanghai has been observed as an effort of local government to strengthen grassroots administrative functions (Xu 2008). A comparative analysis will shed light on how institutional structures facilitate or constrain the initiation, implementation, and consequences of community governance reforms across countries.

In the following sections, we first describe the urban political and administrative structures in the two cities by highlighting their common features of hybrid governance and differences in degrees of “spontaneous versus constructed orders.” The structural difference guides us in illustrating how the formation of the neighborhood council system in Los Angeles can be understood as “high spontaneous and low constructed,” and that of resident committees in Shanghai as “low spontaneous and high constructed.” We move on to investigate whether neighborhood councils and resident committees meet the criteria for representative legitimacy. Then we assess the functioning of the two neighborhood reform movements. The paper concludes with some implications for comparative studies on community governance reform.

Hybrid Urban Governance Structures in Los Angeles and Shanghai

We define urban governance as institutions and processes in which collective decisions are made—policy formulation—and public goods and services are delivered—policy implementation in the urban setting. We highlight the structural aspect of urban governance because it refers to features of a system that is stable over time and that forms the framework within which policy activities and processes occur and through which the objectives of the policies are achieved. In the literature and practice of citizen participation, governance structures are considered important because they generate patterns of action and determine which activities and results are possible (Box and Musso 2004).

Urban governance structures in both Los Angeles and Shanghai resemble some features in Kettl’s (2002) description of “hybrid governance,” a combination of vertical, hierarchical authority and accountability and horizontal alliances and partnerships. On the one hand, in a traditional hierarchical, authority-based administrative structure, top officials operate through a chain of command from the state to the local to the grassroots level, giving orders and expecting them to be followed by those at lower levels. On the other hand, governments at all levels increasingly rely on a horizontal network of partners in policy implementation, whether those partners are civic organizations, nonprofits, or even citizens. The vertical and horizontal aspects of governance fit nicely with Hayek’s (1978) differentiation of constructed versus spontaneous orders in social institutions. A vertical type of governance is a constructed order that is deliberately designed to achieve specific, defined policy purposes, while a horizontal type of governance emphasizes a spontaneous order that is self-organizing and voluntary.

Yet the two cities’ governance structures differ in the degree of vertical versus horizontal lines. Los Angeles has much shorter vertical and broader horizontal lines than Shanghai. The difference illustrates the fundamental distinctions between liberal and socialist societies: Liberal societies depend primarily on spontaneous order, whereas the structures of socialist societies take constructed and designated order as their model. Liberal societies are fundamentally decentralized. By contrast, socialist societies are centralized and monolithic. Their governments attempt to control all aspects of life. Despite reforms to the centrally planned economy in China, there is centralized rule of one political party, which controls all political and administrative activities. Anything the party does is to be approved, and anything that threatens its central role is condemned and suppressed. Socialist societies clearly try to organize themselves according to the principles of constructed order (Hayek 1978).

Fragmentation in Los Angeles versus Hierarchy in Shanghai

Created by progressive reforms to its 1925 charter, the governance structure of Los Angeles includes a relatively weak mayor and a city council composed of 15 members, each representing a constituent district of 250,000 residents. Within their own districts, the city council members have considerable policy control. City administration is highly fragmented among 32 departments, and administrative oversight is shared among the city council and more than 240 city commission members, “part-time citizen officials” appointed by the mayor to oversee particular departments.

If the urban governance structure in Los Angeles can be characterized as fragmented, Shanghai’s urban governance would be considered a heavily top-down, authoritarian, and hierarchical structure. Under the jurisdiction of the Shanghai municipal government, there are 18 geographic districts, each with its own district government. The average district has a population of about 1 million. Each district is divided into multiple subdistricts, and each subdistrict, in turn, is further divided into numerous resident committees.

Shanghai’s administrative structure has also been described as a “two-tier government, third-level administration and fourth-level network.” “Two-tier government” refers to municipal and district governments that have independent administrative, financial, and law enforcement powers. “Third-level administration” denotes subdistrict offices. Resident committees form the “fourth-level” network
in a hierarchy in which the higher level oversees the operation of the lower level. A resident committee consists of a network of neighborhood cells. Residents living in the same building or block constitute a neighborhood cell. The cell leader is appointed by the resident committee and acts as a liaison between the residents and the resident committee. Because of the hierarchical nature of this governing arrangement, the structure is characterized by higher levels of stability and rigidity than in comparable cities in the West (Whyte and Parish 1984). Moreover, a “dual bureaucracy” system adds another layer of complexity, as the Communist Party organizations play an important role in the direct management of the state bureaucracy. In a twofold organization, both the party and the government keep corresponding structures.

The structural difference also reflects a difference with respect to the meaning of “community” in the American and Chinese contexts, which, in turn, has a significant impact on their experiments with neighborhood governance reforms. Americans think of community as multiple identities—communities where they live, work, and play. They could be members of religious, ethnic, advocacy, political, labor union, charitable, and even sports “communities” (Savas 2008). Yet the meaning of community in China is strictly defined in geographic and administrative terms. The Ministry of Civil Affairs in China, a central government agency, officially defines a community in an urban area as either a subdistrict or a resident committee. A neighborhood or community in the Chinese context is considered to be an administrative unit nested within a hierarchical urban governance system.

**The Formation of Los Angeles’ Neighborhood Council System and Reforms to Shanghai’s Resident Committees: Spontaneous versus Constructed**

We position the Los Angeles neighborhood council system and Shanghai’s resident committees differently in a two-level framework of spontaneous order and constructed order, in which each order ranges from low to high. Both systems are a combination of spontaneous and constructed orders. The neighborhood council system in Los Angeles is “high spontaneous and low constructed,” and resident committees in Shanghai are “high constructed and low spontaneous.” When creating Los Angeles’ neighborhood council system, local residents act spontaneously, but within a constructed framework provided in the city charter, ordinance, and neighborhood council plan. Neighborhood council systems in other U.S. cities are even more spontaneous than Los Angeles, and no government requirements are imposed on them (Berry, Portney, and Thomson 1993). In reforming Shanghai’s resident committees, local communities follow a framework designed by the local government and lack spontaneity.

**A Combination of Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches in Los Angeles**

The neighborhood council system is a result of a push–pull process between community activists and city officials. The metropolitan governance structure in Los Angeles was designed to serve the homogeneous population and business interests of the early twentieth century. It cannot meet the challenges posed by postmodern Los Angeles (Box and Musso 2004). City Hall is perceived by many residents as distant from local communities and inefficient in the delivery of services. Fewer than 30 percent of the city’s residents rated it as “very good” or “excellent.” More immediate threats came from secession movements in three city areas—the San Fernando Valley, Hollywood, and the Los Angeles Harbor area (San Pedro and Wilmington). These residents demanded increased local control over land-use decision making, more equal revenue allocation, and more responsive service delivery, and so they sought to separate from the city of Los Angeles.

The neighborhood council system was established in 1999 when Los Angeles voters adopted a new charter for the city. It was expected to unite the city by promoting local participation in municipal government and by making government more responsive to local needs. The citywide system involves relatively autonomous but potentially interdependent councils in which neighborhoods identify their own boundaries, establish their own missions and bylaws, adopt their own systems for financial accountability, and elect their own officers.

**A Top-Down Approach in Shanghai**

The neighborhood council movement in Los Angeles can be understood as an attempt to address the growing tension between increased urban diversity and the homogenizing legacy of Progressive Era institutions (Cooper and Musso 1999). The reforming resident committees in Shanghai are best described as an example of adapting urban administrative structure to the challenges emanating from the significant social and economic transformations that have occurred in China. They exemplify the prominent role of the “administrative state” in the policy process (Cooper and Lui 1990; Painter 2005). An administrative state tends to dominate the public policy process from initiation through adoption to implementation.

In the prereform era, although a mandated component of the urban political and administrative hierarchy, resident committees played a relatively marginal role in urban administration because of the “omnipotent” nature of the danwei- (work unit–) based society (Xu 2008). Under the socialist planned economy, most urban adults were assigned a job in a danwei (either a state-owned enterprise or other public organization) that secured their income, housing, health care, pension, as well as other welfare benefits. Danweis were also places where urban residents were subject to political and ideological control. The resident committee was supplementary to the danwei-based institution by being involved in political mobilization, social control, and community service provision. The resident committees were typically used by the party and the government to mobilize residents for major social and political events, such as the National Holiday celebration. It monitored family planning compliance, maintained household registry rolls, and implemented other government-sponsored programs. It was also responsible for taking care of the disabled, orphans, and childless old people who did not belong to any danwei.
However, since the introduction of the market economy, Chinese society has undergone a remarkable social and economic transformation that has led to the disintegration of the *danwei*. The “Iron Rice Bowl” (referring to lifelong employment) was broken, and many urban residents no longer enjoyed lifelong employment because of a large-scale restructuring and privatization of state-owned enterprises. A large number of employees were laid off and became social welfare recipients. The privatization of housing, which used to be distributed by the *danwei*, further weakened residents’ affiliation with their state employers. As a result of relaxed restrictions on population mobility, millions of migrant workers from rural areas flooded into major urban cities in pursuit of job opportunities. Under the new social and economic conditions, resident committees were suddenly required to assume more responsibilities in urban administration. With their declining traditional functions of political mobilization and social control, resident committees began to play a more important role in the provision of social services in their communities.

Against this background, the Ministry of Civil Affairs began a nationwide Urban Community Building program in the late 1980s. The program was aimed at meeting the growing demands of community-oriented social services left unfulfilled by the disintegrated *danwei* system. The goal for community services identified by the ministry was “to launch and organize cooperative social service activities among members of the community under the leadership of the government, so as to solve social problems in the community” (Li 1997).

The program trickled hierarchically down to the municipal, district, subdistrict and neighborhood levels. The Shanghai municipal government began to restructure its resident committees in the early 1990s. Efforts were made to have residents in the neighborhood elect representatives to form a new resident committee. The elected resident committee, as a major decision-making body in the community, holds regular meetings. The function of community service delivery was reorganized into a community service center staffed by professional social workers (Xu, Gao, and Yan 2005). The elected resident committees select competent staff into the community service center and oversee and evaluate their performance. They have the final say on major issues concerning their community.

**Heterogeneous Neighborhood Councils in Los Angeles**

The formation of neighborhood councils in Los Angeles is “high spontaneous” in the sense that it is “self-determining and self-governing.” The process is also “low constructed” because the charter leaves many details about the design to the discretion of neighborhood council organizers and provides little guidance. Although initiated by the city charter reform, the actual organization of neighborhood councils has occurred in a grassroots fashion with minimum technical assistance or resource support from the city government. The charter provision requires that they represent all stakeholders within a neighborhood and defines stakeholders as those who live, work, or own property in the neighborhood. Stakeholders define boundaries, determine stakeholder population, and address issues of concern to the community. The council must establish operational procedures and secure community support in order to qualify for certification. The Board of Neighborhood Commissioners certifies (and decertifies) councils. It is the policy board for the neighborhood council system. Within one year, a governing board must be elected and seated. Once a certified neighborhood council has elected a governing board, it can apply for $50,000 in annual funding that can be used for either operations or neighborhood projects. The Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, a city agency, assists councils in organizing, running meetings, and navigating city bureaucracy. This department also regulates councils and ensures that they follow all of the rules governing public bodies. Councils can also be decertified by the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners for reasons indicated in the charter and ordinance.

Neighborhood council elections have been relatively successful despite some problems concerning election disputes. Civic engagement in Los Angeles is historically weak. Given the council’s nature as an advisory body, election turnout is low but respectable. As of April 2008, there were 88 certified neighborhood councils, and all had elected boards. Three councils have been decertified. The whole system covers 3,485,085 residents in the city. The governing board structure varies from council to council—there is no standard form. Councils are free to decide new operational structures, including committee and subcommittee assignments. Some of them are divided into subcommittees with geographic representations. Some include stakeholders representing homeowners, renters, business, faith-based organizations, and other nonprofits. The size of neighborhood councils also varies dramatically, with an average population of 38,298. The top five neighborhood councils cover populations ranging from 103,364 to 73,966 and the bottom five ranging from 14,931 to 7,323 (Department of Neighborhood Empowerment 2007). Consequently, neighborhood council capacity varies considerably across the city.

**A Paradox of High Voting Rate and Low Participation and Homogeneous Resident Committees in Shanghai**

In contrast, resident committees in Shanghai are “high constructed and low spontaneous.” In 2000, some 50 resident committees experimented with direct elections. About 20 percent of resident committees in the city were directly elected three years later. In 2006, the Shanghai municipal government decided that 40 percent of its resident committees should be directly elected. The city’s Bureau of Civil Affairs planned the whole process, and the subdistrict party committees and its neighborhood branches assumed responsibility for implementing the election. By the end of 2006, 18,712 members in 3,371 committees were elected, and 53 percent of them were direct elections.

A typical election went through four stages: community outreach, voter registration, solicitation of candidates and election. In almost all the communities, mobilizing residents to participate in the elections turned out to be very difficult. The whole process can be characterized as “participation by invitation.” Election staff employed a face-to-face invitation strategy. They visited families one after another to register voters and nominate candidates. Yet residents demonstrated a negative attitude toward serving on the resident committees and were unwilling to be the community decision makers. One survey demonstrates that only 17 percent of residents were willing to participate in community affairs (Wang and Feng 2004). It was existing resident committee staff and neighborhood cell leaders who selected the candidates. On election day, staff knocked on the doors one by one to invite residents to cast their ballots. Most
of votes were so-called proxy votes. That is, instead of showing up at the election, residents authorized either a family member or their neighborhood cell leaders to cast their ballots.

Several case studies of different neighborhoods illustrate a paradox of “high voting rate and yet low participation rate” in elections (Wu, Zhai, and Wang 2008). For example, in one neighborhood, there were 2,765 registered voters in total. As many as 2,401 ballots were tallied and produced a very high voting rate of 86.8 percent. Yet it was discovered that only 304 residents actually came to cast ballots, suggesting that each of them cast 7.9 ballots on average. Assuming that one voter represented one family with an average size of four people, the total ballots should be 1,216. What happened to other 1,185 ballots? These were proxy ballots cast by neighborhood cell leaders on behalf of other residents. In fact, each neighborhood cell leader cast 20 proxy ballots in addition to his or her own family ballots. If we only counted 1,216 as direct ballots, the overall voting rate would be down to 44 percent. The high voting rate was mainly attributable to the large number of proxy votes.

On the surface, the low level of volunteerism reflects the fact that modern urban residents in China are tired of any government-sponsored political event, even if it is intended for a good cause. But the root cause should be traced back to the legacy stemming from the old, rigid, socialist planning system. Four decades of state control imposed on every aspect of ordinary people’s lives basically eradicated any voluntary association, an important feature of civil society. When the state begins to withdraw from some domains of social life, no alternative social organizations are ready to fill the vacuum. Resident committee elections have to rely on the existing network of neighborhood cell leaders as the major outreach, mobilization, and organizational mechanism. Local residents are less inclined to participate in community collective decision making through self-governing and self-organized grassroots organizations. They lack the tradition of bottom-up advocacy.

In a hierarchical administrative structure, the boundaries and size of resident committees are predetermined by higher-level administration. A typical resident committee in Shanghai covers an area of 100,000 square meters, with a population of 2,000 households. The elected resident committees have all adopted a unified governing structure that includes one director and four to eight members. Under the elected resident committee, there are five subcommittees—planning, social security, public safety, property management, and audit. The organizational structure of subcommittees corresponds exactly to that of functional departments in higher-level governments. For example, the Social Security Subcommittee follows a hierarchical chain of the Municipal Labor and Social Security Bureau, the District Labor and Social Security Division, and the Subdistrict Social Security Section.

Representative Participation
In Western societies, residents with higher education and family income levels are more likely to participate in community affairs, while lower levels of participation are observed among lower-income minorities in neighborhood councils in the United States (Berry, Portney, and Thomson 1993). Despite their nature of spontaneous versus constructed, both the neighborhood councils in Los Angeles and the resident committees in Shanghai exhibit such an elite bias.

Participation in Neighborhood Councils
The elected neighborhood councils do not adequately incorporate the cultural diversity of Los Angeles. The average size of a neighborhood council board is about 21 board members. Elected board members in neighborhood councils are generally better educated, wealthier, white, and older than the average person in their community. A total of 67 percent of neighborhood council board members have a college degree, compared to 34 percent of all residents in Los Angeles. Board members also are more likely to have household incomes that exceed $100,000, to be white, and to be older than 45 (Musso et al. 2006). The profile of elected board members is criticized as having representative biases and endangering the political legitimacy of the councils (Musso et al. 2007). These representative biases raise questions regarding the boards’ ability to speak and act on behalf of diverse constituencies and suggest that council decision making may not adequately represent the views of community stakeholders.

Participation in Resident Committees
The central and local governments, led by Chinese Communist Party committees, worry that resident participation in community programs with political purposes could empower local communities and challenge their authority (Shi 1997). In urban China, community participation is confined to community collective decision making and community service provision. Serving on the elected resident committee is the primary mechanism for participating in community collective decision making. Residents can also participate in the service programs sponsored by the resident committee.

A complete demographic profile of elected resident committee members in Shanghai is not available. Different studies suggest that, compared with the once-appointed resident committees that were dominated by “aunties and grannies,” there are more male, educated, and younger elected committee members. In a survey of 10 randomly selected resident committees in Shanghai, elected committee members are predominantly female. A majority of them are in the age ranges of 41–50 years and 51–60 years. In all, 53 percent of them have high school diplomas and 7 percent hold undergraduate degrees (Lu and Li 2008). Another study shows that 70 percent are party members (Chen forthcoming). The increased male participation in grassroots governance, a higher level of education for elected members, as well as a strong presence of party members are considered desirable aspects in the eyes of higher-level government because this helps to improve the social status of community workers.

Although the participants in collective community decision making are more like community elites, residents who are older with lower levels of education and lower incomes are found to show greater involvement in community-sponsored programs. Those residents are facing more difficulties and need more services than the average resident. They are usually the beneficiaries of community service programs (Thomas 1986), and their participation can be interpreted as their dependence on the community for a job, elder care, health care, as well as other welfare programs (Xu 2007). Whether and how the elected resident committees are willing to champion the interests of the vulnerable population in their communities remains a question.
What Are Neighborhood Councils and Resident Committees Doing?

In order to examine how neighborhood councils and resident committees function in their urban governance structures, we analyze the activities they are pursuing and the time they spend on different types of activities. The results suggest that the neighborhood councils in Los Angeles primarily are “working horizontally,” by functioning as a channel for residents to participate in the process of policy formulation (Musso et al. 2006). The resident committees in Shanghai are “working vertically” and remain a vehicle for policy implementation for the government’s social control as well as for urban administration (Benewick, Tong, and Howell 2004).

**Neighborhood Councils in Los Angeles: Working Horizontally in Policy Formulation**

An analysis of the content of neighborhood council board meeting agendas divided their activities into non-issues versus issues (Musso et al. 2006). The boards devoted two-thirds of their energies to non-issue activities, and issue-oriented items account for one-third of all agenda items. Among the non-issue items, given neighborhood councils’ nature of self-maintenance, it comes as no surprise that 52 percent of them were devoted to managing internal operations, which include attention to procedures and bylaws changes, managing committees, and appointing officers. The second most common area of non-issue activity is government relations (26 percent), followed by community relations and events (17 percent). Relationships with city council office staffs and city department administrators develop a council’s capacity to oversee service delivery, while community relations and involvement in events develop networks within the community.

Land use and planning (including transportation) together constitute the single most important issue for councils, at 49 percent of all issue-related activities. Project-specific activities, such as requests for zoning changes, account for nearly half of the land-use agenda items. Assistance (including funding) to local programs made up 13 percent of issue-oriented items, followed by beautification at 11 percent of items, the fourth-largest category. Some 12 percent of council agenda items addressed public safety concerns. Agenda items on the environment were 7 percent of all issue items, while the economy accounted for 5 percent of issue items.

**Resident Committees in Shanghai: Working Vertically in Policy Implementation**

The major aim of reforming resident committees is to transfer social welfare responsibilities and service provision from the local government to the local community. To this end, the government subsidy accounts for as much as around 70 percent of the resident committee’s total budget. Because of this financial dependence, resident committees are asked to undertake many administrative functions at the grassroots level, including community health, public safety, family planning, conflict resolution, population census, social security, and so on. Some resident committees are even responsible for implementing as many as 148 programs on behalf of municipal, district, and subdistrict governments (Yang 2007).

To many observers, resident committees represent an extension of administrative functions to the grassroots level (Zhu 1999). Yet some argue that even such a state-led community governance reform could potentially empower the community with autonomy (Liu 2008). One deliberative institution established by the resident committees in Shanghai is the “three-meeting” mechanism of coordination, public hearing, and evaluation. Residents can bring their disputes to the coordination meeting for mediation. They also can voice their concerns on policies and projects that affect their neighborhood at the public hearings, often with participation by officials from district and subdistrict governments. The evaluation meeting provides them with opportunities to assess the performance of resident committees and the quality of services delivered by subdistrict offices (Liu 2008).

**Conclusion**

We start with the idea that city governments around the world vary in the way they are organized and in their approaches to community governance reforms. Our comparative study suggests that the neighborhood council system in Los Angeles can be best described as “high spontaneous and low constructed,” while the resident committees in Shanghai are “high constructed and low spontaneous.” We attribute the different patterns to the political and administrative structures in which these reforms are embedded.

The neighborhood council system in Los Angeles is designed to include neighborhood residents in policy formulation and service delivery. However, the institutional support for council involvement with the city government has evolved in an ad hoc and halting manner. There is a lack of structured arenas for councils’ interaction with the city council, the mayor’s office, boards and commissions, and city departments. Because of their self-organizing nature, neighborhood councils are burdened by an extraordinary share of efforts at self-maintenance and external relations activities. The city should play a more “constructing” role in providing greater assistance to councils, while developing more structured arenas for engagement around policy formulation and service delivery. The charter, ordinance, and plan actually provide for a Congress of Neighborhood Councils that would serve this purpose, but it has never been implemented as intended. It has been only an information-sharing
and training event run by the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment.

In the case of resident committees in Shanghai, their dual role of serving as an agent of government in policy implementation and also as self-organized community organizations makes it difficult to engage local residents in community collective decision making. The process of reinforcing grassroots government functions and the process of developing civic capacity (Li 2008) are logically contradictory. Resident committees simply cannot ignore the government’s agenda and represent all residents’ interests. A less hierarchical, flatter administrative relationship between local governments and resident committees is therefore needed to create more incentives for community participation—in other words, to make it “more spontaneous and less constructed.”

The concepts of spontaneous and constructed orders are useful because they cement the structural relations that lie behind the efficacy of government-initiated neighborhood governance reforms. They capture the variations of government involvement in promoting citizen participation in urban governance. The effectiveness of government-initiated civic engagement programs, we argue, depends on a balanced combination of “constructed order”—state involvement—and “spontaneous order”—community self-organization. How this balanced combination is achieved, of course, depends on both the historically determined character of the state apparatus and the nature of the social structure in which it is embedded, as a comparison of neighborhood council systems in Los Angeles with resident committees in Shanghai illustrates.
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