

# The Construction of Co-construction and Co-governance Path for Resolving Grassroots Contradictions and Disputes

**Xi Huang**

*Haojing College of Shaanxi University of Science and Technology, Xianyang, 712000, China*

**Abstract:** *Grassroots contradictions and disputes, as an inevitable product of social transformation, directly affect social stability and people's sense of gain. Grassroots contradictions and disputes are an inevitable product in the process of social transformation, involving various fields such as economy, society, culture and politics. The effective resolution of these contradictions is crucial to maintaining social stability, promoting social harmony and improving people's well-being. In the context of modern governance, the traditional single governance model can no longer meet the complex and diverse needs of grassroots contradiction resolution. Therefore, exploring the path of co-construction and co-governance for resolving grassroots contradictions and disputes has become an important issue in current social governance. This paper first analyzes the current situation and characteristics of grassroots contradictions and disputes, then explores the necessity and feasibility of co-construction and co-governance in resolving grassroots contradictions, and finally puts forward specific paths for constructing the co-construction and co-governance mechanism, aiming to provide theoretical reference and practical guidance for improving the level of grassroots social governance.*

**Keywords:** *Grassroots Contradictions and Disputes; Co-Construction and Co-Governance; Path Construction; Social Governance*

## 1. Introduction

With the continuous advancement of China's social transformation and urbanization, grassroots society is undergoing profound changes. The interests of different groups are constantly adjusted and reconstructed, and grassroots contradictions and disputes show a trend of diversification, complication and frequent occurrence<sup>[1]</sup>. These contradictions involve fields such as land expropriation and demolition, house property disputes, neighborhood conflicts, labor disputes, and civil disputes, which not only affect the normal life of residents, but also pose a potential threat to social stability. In the past, the resolution of grassroots contradictions and disputes mainly relied on government-led governance models, such as administrative mediation, judicial litigation, etc. Although these methods have played a certain role, there are problems such as insufficient participation of social forces, low efficiency of dispute resolution, and difficulty in fundamentally resolving contradictions. In this context, the concept of co-construction and co-governance has been gradually put forward and valued. Co-construction and co-governance emphasize the participation of multiple subjects, including the government, enterprises, social organizations, and residents, in the process of social governance, so as to form a joint force to solve social problems.

This study explores the path of co-construction and co-governance for resolving grassroots contradictions and disputes, which helps to enrich and develop the theory of social governance. It can provide a new theoretical perspective for understanding the nature and resolution of grassroots contradictions, and expand the connotation and extension of the theory of co-construction and co-governance. At the same time, it can also provide a theoretical basis for the formulation of relevant policies and systems. The research on the construction of co-construction and co-governance path for resolving grassroots contradictions and disputes is of great practical significance for improving the efficiency of grassroots contradiction resolution, maintaining social stability, and promoting social harmony. It can help to mobilize the enthusiasm and initiative of multiple subjects, form a joint force for resolving contradictions, and fundamentally reduce the occurrence of grassroots contradictions and disputes. In addition, it can also improve the level of grassroots social governance and enhance the sense of gain, happiness and security of residents.

## **2. Current Situation and Characteristics of Grassroots Contradictions and Disputes**

In recent years, with the acceleration of social transformation, the number of grassroots contradictions and disputes in China has shown an overall upward trend. According to relevant statistics, the number of civil disputes accepted by grassroots judicial organs and mediation organizations has increased year by year, involving a wide range of fields<sup>[2]</sup>. Among them, disputes related to economic interests are the main types, such as land expropriation and demolition disputes, labor disputes, and property disputes. In addition, neighborhood disputes, family disputes, and disputes involving public services are also increasing. From the perspective of the subject of contradictions, grassroots contradictions and disputes involve multiple subjects, including individuals, enterprises, social organizations, and government departments. The contradictions between individuals and enterprises are mainly reflected in labor disputes, product quality disputes, etc.; the contradictions between individuals and government departments are mainly concentrated in administrative management, public services and other aspects; the contradictions between individuals are mainly neighborhood disputes, family disputes, etc.

Grassroots contradictions and disputes are no longer limited to traditional civil disputes, but involve more fields such as economy, politics, culture and society. For example, with the development of the Internet, network disputes, such as network fraud, network infringement, etc., have gradually increased<sup>[3]</sup>. The causes of grassroots contradictions and disputes are becoming more and more complex, involving multiple factors such as interests, systems, culture and psychology. A contradiction may be caused by the interaction of multiple factors, which increases the difficulty of resolution. Some grassroots contradictions and disputes break out suddenly, without obvious signs in advance, which makes it difficult to prevent and control<sup>[4]</sup>. For example, group incidents caused by land expropriation and demolition often break out suddenly, which has a greater impact on social stability. Grassroots contradictions and disputes are often interrelated and influence each other. A small contradiction may trigger a series of chain reactions, leading to more serious social problems. For example, a labor dispute may evolve into a group incident if it is not handled properly, affecting social stability<sup>[5]</sup>.

## **3. Necessity and Feasibility of Co-construction and Co-governance in Resolving Grassroots Contradictions**

Adapting to the complexity and diversity of grassroots contradictions: As mentioned above, grassroots contradictions and disputes are becoming more and more complex and diverse, involving multiple fields and subjects. The traditional single governance model is difficult to deal with these contradictions effectively. Co-construction and co-governance can integrate the resources and strengths of multiple subjects, give full play to their respective advantages, and form a joint force to deal with complex contradictions. Improving the efficiency of contradiction resolution: The participation of multiple subjects in co-construction and co-governance can make the resolution of contradictions more targeted and efficient. For example, social organizations have a better understanding of the needs and interests of specific groups, and can play a unique role in resolving contradictions involving these groups. Residents' participation can make the resolution of contradictions more in line with the actual situation of the grassroots, and improve the acceptance and implementation of the resolution results<sup>[6]</sup>.

Promoting the democratization of social governance: Co-construction and co-governance emphasize the participation of multiple subjects, which is an important manifestation of the democratization of social governance. It can ensure that the interests and demands of all parties are fully expressed and considered, and promote the formulation and implementation of more fair and reasonable policies and measures for resolving contradictions. Enhancing social cohesion: The process of co-construction and co-governance is a process of communication, negotiation and cooperation between multiple subjects. It can enhance mutual understanding, trust and cooperation between different groups, and improve social cohesion and centripetal force, thus reducing the occurrence of contradictions from the source.

The Chinese government has always attached great importance to social governance and has issued a series of policies and documents to promote the reform and innovation of social governance. For example, the "Guiding Opinions on Strengthening and Improving Urban and Rural Community Governance" clearly puts forward the need to adhere to the principle of co-construction, co-governance and sharing, and promote the participation of multiple subjects in community governance. These policies provide a strong policy support for the implementation of co-construction and co-governance in resolving grassroots contradictions. In recent years, China's social organizations have developed

rapidly, and their number and scale have continued to expand, involving various fields such as education, medical care, social welfare, and public services. These social organizations have professional knowledge and skills, and can provide effective services and support for resolving grassroots contradictions. At the same time, they also have strong organizational and mobilization capabilities, which can organize residents to participate in the resolution of contradictions. With the improvement of residents' cultural quality and democratic awareness, their awareness of participating in social governance is gradually increasing. They are more willing to express their demands and opinions, and participate in the resolution of grassroots contradictions that are related to their own interests. This provides a mass foundation for the implementation of co-construction and co-governance. The development of information technology, such as the Internet, big data, and artificial intelligence, provides new technical support for the implementation of co-construction and co-governance. It can improve the efficiency of information communication and sharing between multiple subjects, promote the transparency and fairness of the resolution process, and provide convenience for residents' participation.

#### **4. Current Problems in the Resolution of Grassroots Contradictions and Disputes**

##### ***4.1 Insufficient Participation of Multiple Subjects***

Although the number of social organizations has increased, their role in resolving grassroots contradictions is not fully played. Some social organizations have insufficient professional capabilities and lack of funds and resources, which makes it difficult for them to carry out effective work. In addition, some government departments have insufficient trust in social organizations, and there is a lack of effective cooperation mechanisms between them, which restricts the participation of social organizations. Affected by factors such as traditional concepts and lack of channels for participation, the enthusiasm of residents to participate in the resolution of grassroots contradictions is not high. Some residents believe that resolving contradictions is the responsibility of the government, and they are not willing to take the initiative to participate. Even if they participate, their participation is often formal and cannot play a substantial role. Enterprises are important subjects in society, but their participation in resolving grassroots contradictions is relatively limited. Some enterprises only pay attention to their own economic interests and ignore their social responsibilities, and are not willing to participate in the resolution of contradictions. In addition, there is a lack of incentive mechanisms to encourage enterprises to participate in grassroots contradiction resolution.

##### ***4.2 Imperfect Mechanism for Resolving Contradictions***

At present, there are multiple mechanisms for resolving grassroots contradictions, such as people's mediation, administrative mediation, judicial mediation, arbitration, litigation, etc. However, there is a lack of effective connection and coordination between these mechanisms, resulting in problems such as repeated handling, mutual prevarication, and difficulty in transferring cases. This not only increases the cost of resolving contradictions, but also affects the efficiency and effect of resolution. The procedures and standards for resolving grassroots contradictions are not perfect, which leads to arbitrariness and uncertainty in the resolution process. For example, in people's mediation, the qualifications and skills of mediators are uneven, and the mediation results are not legally binding, which affects the credibility of mediation. In administrative mediation, there may be problems such as abuse of power and unfair mediation due to the influence of administrative factors. There is a lack of effective supervision and evaluation mechanisms for the resolution of grassroots contradictions, which makes it difficult to ensure the quality and effect of resolution. For example, there is no clear standard for evaluating the performance of mediators and relevant departments, and there is a lack of effective supervision over the implementation of resolution results, which leads to the phenomenon that some resolution results are not implemented.

##### ***4.3 Insufficient Guarantee for Resolving Contradictions***

The funding for resolving grassroots contradictions is mainly dependent on government financial allocation, but the amount of funding is often insufficient, which restricts the development of work such as the construction of mediation organizations, the training of mediators, and the publicity of legal knowledge. Some grassroots mediation organizations are in a difficult situation due to lack of funds, and cannot carry out their work normally. Shortage of professional talents: The resolution of grassroots

contradictions requires professional talents with legal knowledge, psychological counseling skills, and communication and coordination capabilities. However, at present, there is a serious shortage of such professional talents at the grassroots level. Most grassroots mediators are part-time or volunteers, with low professional quality and insufficient professional skills, which affects the effect of contradiction resolution. The infrastructure for resolving grassroots contradictions is relatively backward, such as the lack of fixed office space, necessary office equipment and communication tools for mediation organizations, which affects the normal conduct of work. In addition, the information construction of grassroots contradiction resolution is also relatively lagging behind, and it is difficult to realize the sharing and utilization of information resources.

## **5. Paths for Constructing the Co-construction and Co-governance Mechanism for Resolving Grassroots Contradictions**

### ***5.1 Clarifying the Responsibilities and Roles of Multiple Subjects***

The government should play a leading role in the co-construction and co-governance of grassroots contradiction resolution. It should formulate relevant policies and regulations, provide policy support and funding guarantee, and coordinate the relationship between multiple subjects. At the same time, the government should strengthen supervision and management of the resolution process to ensure the fairness and impartiality of resolution. In addition, the government should transform its functions, reduce administrative intervention, and give full play to the role of social organizations and residents. Social organizations should play a professional role in resolving grassroots contradictions. They can carry out professional services such as legal consultation, psychological counseling, and conflict mediation according to their own advantages and characteristics. For example, legal aid organizations can provide legal aid to vulnerable groups; psychological counseling organizations can help parties to adjust their emotions and resolve psychological conflicts. In addition, social organizations can also organize residents to participate in the resolution of contradictions and reflect their demands and opinions.

Residents are the direct participants and beneficiaries of grassroots contradiction resolution, and should play a main role. They should enhance their awareness of participation and responsibility, take the initiative to participate in the resolution of contradictions that are related to their own interests, and express their demands and opinions in a rational and legal way. At the same time, residents should abide by the rules and regulations of the community, respect the opinions of others, and maintain the harmony and stability of the community. Enterprises should assume social responsibilities and play an active role in resolving grassroots contradictions. They can participate in the resolution of contradictions through donations, providing venues and resources, etc. For example, enterprises can provide funding support for community mediation organizations; provide training opportunities for mediators; and help resolve labor disputes and neighborhood disputes involving enterprises. In addition, enterprises can also strengthen communication and cooperation with the government, social organizations and residents to jointly promote the resolution of grassroots contradictions.

### ***5.2 Improving the Mechanism for Resolving Contradictions***

The investigation of contradictions and disputes is the first line of defense in grassroots conflict management. Only by discovering potential conflicts in a timely and comprehensive manner can problems be resolved at an early stage. In the investigation process, we should give full play to the strength of grassroots organizations and the masses, and build an all-round, multi-level investigation network. We can learn about contradictions and disputes in residents' lives through daily inspections by community grid workers; we can also use information technology to establish an early warning system for contradictions and disputes, conducting real-time monitoring and analysis of various conflict risks. At the same time, special investigations should be carried out regularly, with increased efforts in key areas, key groups of people and key time periods to ensure no blind spots. For example, in areas prone to conflicts such as demolition and resettlement, and labor disputes, we should intervene in advance, proactively understand the demands of the masses, and resolve potential conflicts in a timely manner.

The resolution of contradictions and disputes requires a diversified mediation mechanism. People's mediation, administrative mediation, and judicial mediation each have their own advantages, and we should strengthen the connection and cooperation between them to form a joint force in mediation. We should encourage and support social organizations and professionals to participate in mediation work,

giving play to their advantages in professional knowledge and social resources. In the mediation process, we must adhere to the principles of mediation in accordance with the law and the integration of reason and sentiment. Mediation in accordance with the law ensures the legality and fairness of the mediation results, making the parties convinced; the integration of reason and sentiment focuses on considering the emotional needs and actual situation of the parties, making the mediation results more humanized and acceptable.

### **5.3 Strengthening the Guarantee for Resolving Contradictions**

We should increase funding investment in resolving grassroots contradictions, establish a multi-channel funding guarantee mechanism, and ensure the normal operation of contradiction resolution work. The government should increase financial allocation, and at the same time encourage social forces to donate and sponsor. We can establish a special fund for grassroots contradiction resolution to support the construction of mediation organizations, the training of mediators, and the publicity of legal knowledge. We should strengthen the cultivation of professional talents for resolving grassroots contradictions, improve their professional quality and skills. We can establish a training system for mediators, carry out regular training on legal knowledge, mediation skills, psychological counseling and other aspects, and improve their professional level. At the same time, we can introduce professional talents from outside, such as lawyers, psychologists, sociologists, etc., to provide professional support for grassroots contradiction resolution. We should strengthen the infrastructure construction for resolving grassroots contradictions, improve the working conditions of mediation organizations. We can build standardized mediation rooms, equip them with necessary office equipment and communication tools.

## **6. Conclusion**

Grassroots contradiction resolution is an important part of social governance, and constructing a co-construction and co-governance path is an effective way to deal with the complexity and diversification of grassroots contradictions. At present, grassroots contradiction resolution still faces problems such as a single subject, lack of coordination, and backward technology. By clarifying the roles of multiple subjects, establishing a collaborative mechanism, strengthening institutional guarantees, and promoting digital transformation, we can form a governance synergy and improve the efficiency and effect of grassroots contradiction resolution.

## **Acknowledgements**

The project of School-Level Research of HaoJing College of Shaanxi University of Science and Technology: Research on the Co-construction and Co-governance Mechanism for Resolving Grassroots Contradictions and Disputes, 2025XJ008.

## **References**

- [1] James Kennedy. *Finance and rural governance: centralization and local challenges*[J]. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 2013, 40(6)..
- [2] Chen Baifeng, Lü Jianjun. *Grid Management at Urban Grassroots and Its Institutional Logic*[J]. *Journal of Shandong University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 2018(04): 44-54.
- [3] Chen Hanfei, Gao Qicai. *An Empirical Study on the Positive Role of Village Rules and Regulations in Rural Governance*[J]. *Tsinghua Law Journal*, 2018, 12(1): 62-88.
- [4] Guo Zhiyuan. *Research on the Innovation of Mechanisms for Preventing and Resolving Grassroots Social Contradictions in China*[J]. *Journal of Anhui University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2014, 38(02): 119-129.
- [5] Hao Li. *An Analysis of the Mechanism for Citizens' Orderly Political Participation from the Perspective of Resolving Social Contradictions*[J]. *Chinese Public Administration*, 2015(10): 109-112.
- [6] Cheng Ping. *What Are the Key Points and Difficulties in Realizing Co-construction, Co-governance and Sharing*[J]. *People's Tribune*, 2017(32): 72-74.