

## **The Preliminary and Reflection of Neighbourhood Governance Study in Taiwan**

**Yan-Yi Chang**

Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration  
Chung Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, R.O.C.

**Hong-Cheng Liu**

Associate Professor, Department of Public Policy and Management  
I-Shou University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, R.O.C.

**Chih-Pei Hu**

Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration  
Chung Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, R.O.C.

### **Abstract**

*In recent years, neighbourhood governance has been focused more than local governance and regional governance in Western countries. The concept of neighbourhood governance is also re-examined in 2000. It is not only gives an update of democratic values and meanings, but also talks the urban policy, social policy and local governance. At the same time, as the New Public Management changes the idea from government to governance, the boundary between state and the public also has been gradually changed. Among them, the degree of social stability is inadequate if not rooted in neighbourhood governance. Furthermore, according to the definition of the EU, "neighbourhood" is regarded as the cornerstone to achieve social integration and social stability. EU also emphasized the implementation of neighbourhood governance and community participation. Therefore, neighbourhood governance can be viewed as community participation and empowerment. Based on the previous discussion, what is the neighbourhood governance? We try to examine the literature about the governance. Why the neighbourhood governance issues barely explored by Taiwan scholars? Besides, Taiwan's political, policy and social environment increasingly faced the phenomenon of aging, low birth rate, and foreign spouses issues. In terms of policy discussion and development, the development trend of foreign countries seems to provide a reference of development path to Taiwan.*

**Keywords:** Community, Democratic Governance, Local Governance, Neighbourhood Governance, Urban Policy

### **1. Introduction: The Rise of Neighbourhood governance**

As the concepts of local governance and regional governance is gaining attention, "neighbourhood governance" which is even more foundational than local governance and democratic neighbourhood, is once again being revisited around the year of 2000. This not only grants newer values and connotations to democracy but has also become the core theme of urban policies, social policies and local governance for many governments. With the evolution "from government to governance", the boundary between country and individuals is gradually changing, many European countries have placed neighbourhood governance in the agenda of important policies.

According to the definition of the European Union, "neighbourhood" are perceived as the foundation stone to achieve social harmony and social stability. Also with the U.S., even though there are different levels of engagement, all solutions associated with the neighbourhood have provided community engagement as well as the possibilities for enablement and empowerment. The concept of neighbourhood governance emphasizes that if professionals and community members can be placed together within the decision-making body, harmony can be fostered and discrimination can be reduced. To put it simply, the key points of neighbourhood governance arise with the research approaches of governance, public and urban policies during the process of urbanization and social harmony, and are utilized for the coordination of resources and enablement of citizens through the establishment and upkeep of the governance network.

However, the topic on neighbourhood governance is rarely expounded by the academic circle in Taiwan. In addition, Taiwan's politics, policies and the intensifying topics on aging, decreasing birth rate, foreign spouses and Mainland spouses, as well as the possibilities of social discrimination from uneven distribution of wealth faced by the social environment in Taiwan, which seemingly can refer to the overseas development of academic and actual trends on the aspects of policy discussion and policy development, to look at its own development paths and areas of learning. In other words, the scope implicating local governance is relatively wider. It concurrently involves the relationship with public/private sectors and nonprofit sector, as well as the relationship with the central and local governments, which are mostly initiated from the public sector. Community governance is identical to local governance, relatively initiated from the public sector and nonprofit sector, and a governance model mainly based on residents in the community. In addition, the participation of residents in the community governance model is generally at the tail end part. The comparative difference is that "neighbourhood governance" involves urban policies in the early stage and the relationship with local residents. The community is involved as the main body with neighbourhood governance, spreading to the public sector, private sector and nonprofit sector.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Basic concept of Neighbourhood Governance**

Donald F. Kettl (2000) looked at governance from aspects of buckled globalization, decentralization and potential impacts on the role of the government, especially concerning influences which governance imposes on role adjustment and ability of the traditional government. Finally; with the induction of "innovative governance", serving as structural differentiator for traditional echeloned administration governance (Wälti and Kübler, 2003; Tsai, 2006).<sup>1</sup>

This study considers that "neighbourhood governance" is not (merely) "community governance" or "local governance", therefore the similarities and differences as well as relationship between "neighbourhood" and "community" are first explained. A community is probably a space where residents with relative similarities in nature (similar race, education, finances, income and social status) stay together, and a community has relatively common values, trust and harmony. Local governance which is different from neighbourhood governance generally refers to: "Determination and execution relating to national policies and local affairs where the decision-making body involved is not simply limited to the interactive relationship between both the central government and local government, but further covers public and private organizations and voluntary groups outside of the central and local government to connect and interact to form a complex form of collaborative networking." In other words, the scope of local governance involves a wider scope and simultaneously involves relationship with the public and private sectors and nonprofit sector, as well as relationship with the central and local governments which are mostly initiated by the public sector.

Similarly, community governance is different from neighbourhood governance, for example on the scope the concept for community governance; Lin (2007) differentiates it into two aspects, communitarianism and governance. He considers the rise of communitarianism to be related to the left wing and right wing factions. The right wing advocates liberalism and considers the spirit of communitarianism as the most ideal path for engagement in citizen governance, while the left wing considers communitarianism to be a type of voluntary activity. Both ideologies mentioned above constitute the foundation of community governance. In other words, community governance emphasizes considerably on the participation of community residents in the community decision-making of diversified negotiations and integration of community interests. While the scope of Neighbourhood governance includes community governance and covers part of local governance. In comparison, "neighbourhood" may have several communities in close proximity geographically and space, but different communities have their respective cultural differences and racial composition. Due to the differences in culture and social diversity, they may not be able to similarly respond and accept the interference and services of the government or policies, as well as reap the benefits.

---

<sup>1</sup>If balancing sense over theory, based on individual doctrine of assumption; humans are selfish and have tendency to self-centered maximal utilization purpose. Hence, it is clear that all theoretic thrust would be conducted from an individualized inference angle. On the contrary, governance theoretic is in itself not determined for basic assumption or hypothesis; regardless of whether the methodology employed is based on individual doctrine or general doctrine, it is virtually impossible to learn the basic core value of the assumption or hypothesis, as well as the question of inference.

For example, the form of neighbourhood governance that Allen and Cars (2001) was most concerned about regarding the possibility of transformation with communitarianism being standardized. In the U.S. and Europe, minority racial groups are under-represented in the course of neighbourhood governance and there is the phenomenon of marginalization.

However, in earlier studies relating to neighbourhood governance, the focus has been relatively more on the domain of urban policy. For example, there is a high level of policy diffusion effect between the U.S and U.K, which explores the networking and collaborative governance system, to generate “New Urban Governance”. Traditional theories pointed out that urban governance is subjected to the dominance of developers and corporations because the control of capital will cause deviation in economic growth and urban development. From the perspective of institutional theory, governmental and non-governmental participants theoretically can engage in resources and policy negotiation, however, we cannot consider that “negotiation” will naturally emerge, and in fact it rarely emerges. It is difficult for us to track the operations behind the power of capital, and it is also difficult to determine if lower levels of benefits are manifested and designs are needed to maintain the governance system and structure (Stone, 1989). Earlier analyses on urban governance and systems have relatively neglected citizen engagement and effect, therefore Stone (2009) has recommended for studies on the order of urban governance to come from the perspective of diversified parties.

In recent times, there has been the issue of studies relating to urban development correcting traditional viewpoints. For example, Lucio et. al. (2013) has discussed a variety of neighbourhood topics from the perspective of land use and housing policy. The author has observed that the inability of society to adopt a diversified culture will result in unequal distribution and conflict. Globalization has resulted in migration and population movement, and the local governments and officials have the responsibility and obligation to manage such diversity.

## ***2. Diversity of Neighbourhood Governance***

However, how does a city manage diversity? Or to drive which meaningful “diversity”? How to foster diversity that is stable and socially harmonious? In general, there are many ways to implement neighbourhood diversity, the author made a comparison of the development strategies among 10 certain cities in the Southwest region of the U.S. and discovered that the hardware diversity approach (such as mixed housing) is more effective than the social aspects of language planning and diversity in engagement. Secondly, the local government is responsible for fostering the interaction of diversified groups, genuine acceptance and appreciation of diversity, besides solving issues.

First of all, Lang and Roessl (2011) carried out comparative studies on neighboring neighbourhood areas in Austria and Germany. The study subject is Gurtis, a village on the westernmost area of Austria and its cooperative “village store”. The population of this village is around 300 people and 150 households. The comparison is Luthe, a neighboring city in Germany. This is a medium city with 6,000 people in population and the study is carried out based on its “local community association”.

This study considers that “neighbourhood” should be above communities and villages, but not at the township level yet, especially where the topic of this discussion is not just about local governments but also the networking relationship of the locals. This is because only with mass recognition can neighbourhood organizations use the principles of collaboration to provide services to designated communities.

Secondly, neighbourhood governance mechanism and organization has been receiving attention because it is able to provide local public service, and has the potential to improve service quality, reinforce social harmony, empower citizen political capabilities, and concurrently have the accountability to be able to resolve its own issues. Hence, the members are local residents who are able to mobilize the mixed resources of contribution and voluntary work of residents, as well as government subsidies and market income.

In addition, relevant viewpoints, for example Durose and Lowndes (2010) consider that the rise of the current neighbourhood governance originates from the four factors of citizens, society, politics and economy. Through the creativity and vision of entrepreneurship, new engagement forums are established. Forums are ways for society to communicate and interact, and mediation is carried out by institutional entrepreneurs to generate public discussions. This is very effective for neighbourhood regeneration and competency establishment. Currently, it has very high agenda priority across the scope of Europe, leading to the concepts of neighbourhood empowerment and enablement, neighbourhood partnership and neighbourhood management.

However, neighbourhood governance is subjected to the limitations of its own capabilities as to whether it can be implemented or demonstrates effectiveness. Moreover, Brunger (2011) pointed out the importance of public neighbourhood forums. Northern Ireland planned the “Community Partnership Program” and engaged in discussion and dialogue with diversified participants at public forums, establishing a networking form of policing service, thereby spreading knowledge as well as reinforcing accountability and legitimacy. Parker and Murray (2012) also emphasized the importance of public engagement toward area planning within neighbourhood governance. The pull factors attracting participation by the public must be considered to be able to enhance the capabilities and conditions of neighbourhood governance. As for the government, there should be no concerns in responding to challenges, but rather focus on the ways to continue moving forward and advocating for democracy.

Similarly, the European Union published a study report in 2001 that was titled “Neighbourhood governance: The Capabilities of Social Integration”. This report was based on such a premise: The resources currently being allocated to deprived groups by governments of each respective country and its methods and processes have no effect. Requirements of the public are unable to be responded. As neighbourhood governance faces structural changes, service systems and local governments are also affected, the governments of each respective country should think profoundly of social programs, policies and new ways of response to oppose social discrimination. Secondly, the efficacy of social harmony programs not only provides the question of “what”, how to provide and who to provide are just as equally important. Therefore, it is necessary to establish communication, decision-making and execution forums based on the nature of the participants and development or reform of governance mechanism and structure (European Union, 2001).

Take for example the U.K., the analysis by Durose and Rees (2012) on the policy changes of the U.K New Labor Party government, pointed out that the Labor government in its early years proposed several policy agenda goals and plans, such as improving services and community enablement which have the structure of normative significance and viewpoint, becoming the pivot of policy administration at that time, and is also associated with evidence-based decision-making. However in 2006, after internal debates and official estimates on the most suitable scale for reflection, governance, service delivery and policy planning, neighbourhood governance may have been assessed as not being suitable. Therefore, many flagship centers and funding gradually disappeared. However, related activities and work still continue, such as agreements with local strategic partners and local governments. Simply said, the agenda of neighbourhood governance was not as effective as expected, and is easily overlapped with other plans, such as the 2007 neighbourhood employment fund.

### ***2.3. The Issues of Neighbourhood Governance***

The report written by Lyons that was released by the British government in 2007 emphasized that a local area agreement (LAA) is the preferential intergovernmental system for negotiations and policy administration. In order to assist the local government to shape its regional role, neighbourhood governance should be removed from its agenda (Lyons, 2007). Therefore, after 2007, neighbourhoods have gradually evolved upwards to the scale of economic governance for cities, regions or sub-nations, to establish cross-regional partnership at the local government level. This also represented that “local governments are back once again”, and the governance scale of the “removal of subsidiarity”, because of the repeated emphasis on the importance of the neighbourhood previously, and the significant reduction of such emphasis subsequently.

Following that, Beebejaum and Grimshaw (2010) studied the policy significance of the U.K. neighbourhood governance flagship plan, “New Deal for Communities (NDC)”, from the engagement experience of different races and groups. They pointed out that neighbourhood regeneration and community governance provides diversified groups with the opportunity to participate and decide, but racial and gender topics are rarely discussed. Therefore, they assessed the NDC plan as well as the participation and experience of women (including minority races).

However, they also have doubts regarding the actual participation and significance of the public toward the neighbourhood regeneration and NDC plan. It is hoped that neighbourhood regeneration will provide local knowledge and residents with the opportunity to participate and decide, but the problem is the expectations and opinions of these residents often clashing with professionalism. Furthermore, who is the so-called “representation” really representing? And how the appropriateness of its representation is confirmed. When faced with the agenda directed by the central government, deprived and remote rural communities lack influencing power in actual fact, and face the pressures of everyday life.

It is even more unlikely that deprived regions can “participate” (Blakeley and Evans, 2008). To put it bluntly, the government has planned what it thought was an inclusive system but was in actual fact still closed, such as the bureaucratic system and bureaucracy that further marginalize citizens. At the same time, Pill and Bailey (2012) also assessed the neighbourhood governance experience of Westminster cities in the U.K., and brought up issues on neighbourhood governance and related policies. The neighbourhood governance of Westminster cities mainly originates from civic and economic causes, and is driven by the nonprofit sector. However, it also requires funding support from the central and local governments. In the discussion, even though community enablement is asserted, the actual result is denial. The public has no controlling power over goals and resources, and this new governance mechanism is easily deconstructed.

In another comparison study carried out by Davies and Pill (2012), the individual case study subjects were based on Baltimore in the U.S. and Bristol in the U.K. They consider that it was necessary to rethink the hierarchy of neighbourhood governance. Both authors reckon that networking governance can be the way to mediate public services, calls for democracy and social control. However, after making convergence studies on both cities, it is reckoned that a type of trend should be reflected on once again. That is to withdraw from neighbourhood governance back to a higher point in hierarchy. Amidst the economic distress, a neighbourhood which is difficult to be enabled will be discarded by policies, such as due to economic distress, Bristol withdrew from neighbourhood governance to privatization and self-management. At the same time, a trend of neighbourhood governance hollowing out in the middle and calls for privatization emerged in Baltimore City in the U.S. In addition, new liberalism and ideals of *laissez-faire* have also distanced away from the tolerance and engagement values advocated by networking governance.

The above literature have demonstrated that on one hand, there is more and more emphasis on the expansion of representation in all politics, reflection on the diversified possibilities within society and responding to issues of unequal wealth distribution and social discrimination. On the other hand, it has pointed out that neighbourhood governance and policy administration are actually inadequate to solving the issues after their implementation. Therefore, the neighbourhood may be lacking in embedded values, rules and behavioral models, as well as contextual factors such as trust and social capital which results in specific governance mechanism and capabilities being affected. Simply said, neighbourhood governance plays an important and critical role.

#### **2.4. Relevant Studies in Taiwan**

It was very few studies of “neighbourhood governance” in Taiwan. The most similar studies are mostly “community governance.” For example, the related studies of community governance such as Lin et al. (2012), Chang (2011), Wang et al. (2011), Hwang et al. (2010), Lin (2010), Chiang and Chang (2009), and Kuo et al. (2007). The aforementioned, many scholars are sociologists.

As for that relating to “neighbourhood”, take for example the Taishan District in New Taipei City used as an example by Tung (2011). Studies were carried out on children residing under different neighbourhood environment characteristics in satellite cities and towns to see if there were any difference in freedom of movement within the neighbourhood, and the factors affecting the freedom of movement of the children under different neighbourhood environment characteristics were also studied. Regardless whether it was in the central area or peripheral development area, parents will positively influence the level of independent mobility of children from home to school in different areas with its “sense of closeness and identity with the neighbourhood environment” and “sense of identity with the independent mobility of children”. First of all, Chang (2011) entered two deprived neighbourhood from an action perspective, to carry out analysis and speculation on the issues faced during the actualization process of the anti-social elimination movement, and demonstrates the service placement errors or deprived congregations possibly generated by the policy issues of the government; as well as enable one single deprived neighbourhood movement issue that was originally “invisible”, to be elevated to the level of policy dialogue with the public sector.

Secondly, Chen and Hu (2006) are primarily trying to understand the impact that the neighbourhood community environment has on health, and exploring the factors that influence the supporting environment of the community. The power distribution structure and status influence community resources, resulting in the physical environment, social resources and hazard and risk levels of each community to be different. This study suggested that the community building should be detached from an individual level of health services or acts and be transformed into an intervention model. Start thinking about the intervening directions of environment space, social structure and social trends at the community level, and create even more support for a healthy environment.

The related articles are including Chu and Lin (2007), and Liou (2011). The aforementioned domestic literature, in urban and community development-oriented, most of them are "neighbourhood" concept and statements. In actual fact, Chu and Liao (2010) have previously pointed out from a neighbourhood governance perspective that faced with the trend of a risky society and aging society, risk detection and prevention may become the niche for the neighbourhood head to carry out repositioning. As Hualien is located at the mountain back, employment opportunities are less than that in the northern part or western region. Many youths have left their hometown at a young age to seek out a living in the western region. This is especially obvious in the central, south and aboriginal tribal regions within Hualien, and this has resulted in the issues of single elderly residents, single parent families and grand parenting in Hualien.

In addition, there is also urban-rural divide in Hualien, outstanding examples of community building in Hualien such as Biyun Community and Minsheng Neighbourhood, which have won national awards, Ruisui Township organizing the drum tournament, and Fuyuan Village organizing the school district newsletter. They have all contributed immense efforts in creating and achieving excellence in community consciousness, but there are also many who fared badly. For example some villages in the southern township region of Hualien County, the community development associations will promote multitude of challenges resulting in difficulties to find the right candidate. Simply said, there is also urban-rural divide within the same farming industry boundary of Hualien. In this unwelcoming deprived and remote world, the village and neighbourhood heads can still create and watch over a warm and caring common entity where public power fails to address.

On the aspect of public administration scholars, studies that are relatively associated with neighbourhood governance, for example Lue (2004, 2012) pointed out that as compared to community development associations and nonprofit organizations out there where all respective types of social groups have entered the "filled with vitality" neighbourhood, villages and neighbourhood seemingly still have no specific transformation. In the impression of the general public, except for the few occasions of major natural disasters where the village and neighbourhood heads assist with disaster rescue, or making accusations in front of the media of not receiving attention from higher authorities, their image is seemingly obscured and even negative. The author reckons that such situations will continue to follow which will not only affect the functions of the villages and neighbourhood to be developed, but even possibly forming difficulties in smooth interaction between local self-governing groups and the public. In addition, Chiou (2007) explored the source of the Not-in-My-Backyard (NIMBY) Syndrome of the public in Taiwan, and the theory and implementation of community governance, and discussed the origins of community governance, which are of equal importance. Also, there are many relevant governance concepts which involve a wide expanse of types.

Finally, governance can be researched from the abstract angles of holistic perspectives (Chen, 2006), democratic governance (Farrelly, 2009; Chen, 2012), e-governance (Chu, and Li, 2009, Hu et al, 2013), network governance (Tsai, 2006), and cross-boundary governance (Lue, 2012). However, neighbourhood governance of public administration field are rarely discussed, for example like the Lowndes and Sullivan (2008), Musso, Weare, Oztas, and Loges (2006), and Chu and Liao (2010).

### ***3. The Rooted Foundation of Neighbourhood Governance***

Currently, the discussion of neighbourhood governance is generally associated with governance capacity and policy development. Relevant discussion and analysis are as follows:

#### ***3.1. Governance Capacity***

Boyle (1997) discovered that neighbourhood associations have been neglected in the past and marginalized from political participation. However, participation in neighbourhood organizations has significance and influence toward cultivating sense of belonging in the community group, as well as establishing capability and governance legitimacy. The so-called legitimacy includes representation, response and trust in the political capability of the government and citizens, which include the political efficacy felt by citizens and spill-over effects of participation, in helping the community feeling of citizens as a whole.

Purdue (2001) pointed out that social capital is the trust relationship between the community and leadership which helped to enhance partnership efficacy along the neighbourhood regeneration process, as well as reinforce interaction amongst partners within the neighbourhood governance to generate an energetic source of social capital.

According to Gonzalez and Harvey (2005), the factor analysis of governance capability includes: 1. Origin and overture; the critical events or activities stimulating collaborative governance, thus resulting in an atmosphere with strategy being designed and interaction being built by critical individuals or organizations. 2. Governance process: Enable activities and discussions to thrive, provides more or less resources for the parties in action. 3. Governance culture: Formal or informal rules, embed values in the local culture.

Similarly emphasizing on social capital and trust, Fallov (2010) observed that the building of community capacity has important significance toward neighbourhood regeneration, and is related to social capital. Neighbourhood regeneration scope includes employment, mass mobilization, and citizen engagement and prevents citizens from being marginalized outside of the resources and power process. However, these are embedded in the local networking and process topics. In order to elevate employability and active citizen spirit, pull factors and mechanism should be designed to encourage proactive participation of residents and neighbourhood and community affairs, reinforce social capital and enablement. Henceforth, a trust and mutually beneficial local networking can be established to enable residents to feel respected and establish a sense of efficacy, thereby enhancing employability and the capacity for self-management and accountability.

### ***3.2. Policy Development for Neighbourhood Governance and Regeneration***

Even though the governance, democracy and regeneration policies of the neighbourhood are not new policy agendas, it started in the 1960s, emerging among the policy domain of urban development and regeneration. Take the U.K. for example, the “Urban White Paper” published in 1977 (Imrie and Raco, 2003), to the 1980s period of the Conservative Party, gradually forming a locality concept used to execute residential and urban policy plans. However, the contemporary topic concerning social harmony and democracy participation primarily started only in the 1990s.

Recent neighbourhood governance originated from the development of collaborative governance theory, from the John Major government in the U.K. (1990-1997) starting to cultivate alliances, enabling voluntary and community departments and companies to collectively participate. After 1997, the New Labor Party government significantly pushed forward this agenda, inviting active individuals or representatives of the community and voluntary departments to join in many collaborative governance mechanisms. Around the year of 2000, it swiftly expanded and rose abruptly, becoming an important policy agenda, hoping to encourage the participation of all citizens, allowing the local governments to transfer authority to the neighbourhood and communities, as well as for the communities to carry out control over local decision-making

From the perspective of the U.K. and Denmark pushing forward its neighbourhood regeneration strategy, the policy goal of neighbourhood regeneration is based on individual capability and community capacity, and this is not only similar to the old community development from the past, it further emphasizes on social harmony and responds to existing underlying discrimination in society. The reasons for social discrimination, lack of resources, work and education opportunities lead to a locality effect.

In the U.K., in the initial period after the New Labor Party government came into power, all types of policy plans demonstrating the foundation based on “neighbourhoods” were swiftly developed, becoming the core of the New Labor Party government in its early days, and the pursuit of ways in interdepartmental policy coordination and efforts, including reform of services, social harmony, and responding to democracy deficit; interdepartmental policies include local governments, healthcare, education and economic development.

The important policies during this period include for example, the “Single updated budget”, which is targeted at neighbourhood level of planning solutions, budget allocation, and many focus points on governance and updated policy proposals which triggered many social policy agendas. This was subsequently transformed to become the “National Neighbourhood Regeneration Strategy”, hoping to implement individualized and localized social justice from the modern reform of the government, to enable citizen capacity, neighbourhood capacity and governance capacity to mutually integrate and able to further transform local, regional and central governance capacity. Among which, the flagship plan is “New Deal for Communities (NDC)” (Beebeejaum and Grimshaw, 2011). Take for example the new Labor Party’s article in 2000–“The New Promise of Neighbourhood Regeneration” mentioning the hope that communities have the following key social elements, including the establishing of a set of new rules by the community that is accepted mutually by residents; provide space and facilities to facilitate the interaction of residents; the public is able to be consulted and participate regarding how the neighbourhood operates; able to track down an issue immediately and prevent crime”.

In other words, the key point in neighbourhood regeneration is on rebuilding communities to let residents be able to interact on their way of governance in their place of residence. As for the characteristics of NDC, it is a continuance of the previous regeneration plan, for example a single new budget and urban challenges, emphasis on management of neighbourhood partnership and participation of local (Lawless, 2004). NDC was a 10-year plan starting from 1999 targeted on 88 of England's most deprived and poorest areas with the most severe social issues to carry out improvements. A radical long term approach to track the issues in the poorest areas (DETR, 1998, para. 3.1). A total of 39 partners participated and through a holistic approach, policy intervention was carried out in 5 domains of urbanization, including environment and residences, unemployment, healthcare, education and crime.

NDC emphasized that the public is the critical partner. The participation of the public will be required from the role of the community, participation of discussion to the decision making on priorities and plans at all respective policy stages. The local government is only a member of the local council, other council members are formed by public, private, community and voluntary departments, to become an organization of representation. These neighbourhood regeneration policy agendas are primarily administered by the "Community cum Local Government Departments". Despite the central government gradually losing traction after 2010, the local governments have persisted, establishing structure and system, as well as expanding it to security and policing.

#### ***4. Preliminary Discussion and Analysis***

##### ***4.1. Enabling Democratization and Reform of Taiwan's Bureaucratic System***

Neighbourhood governance and related policy agendas can improve on past elitist-led government management through participation of social and public affairs within and surrounding the villages and neighbourhoods, thereby being able to build social capital, expand horizontal networking relationship, and then incorporate the borderline groups and individuals from the political communications into the community group. Individuals can also reinforce their sense of political efficacy through their participation in public affairs. In other words, neighbourhood governance and management have the most connotations of democracy and participation in discussion among public administration recently. Through physical observation of the environment and the requirements of affiliated parties, the neighbourhood has become the governance model of a diversified center.

##### ***4.2. Reinforcement of Interaction with the Public and Social Departments***

The current theory of governance is to perceive the government or public sector as a diversified center, and normalize the participation of non-governmental organizations in public affairs. This study reckons that from a perspective of collated and integrated values and requirements, neighbourhood governance integrates the expectations and requirements of local affiliated parties, to incorporate democratic participation and significance of citizen contact. Therefore, the government can build interaction and decision-making rules through participation in the mobilization and management of social resources, to collectively respond to the issues of social discrimination and unequal wealth distribution.

##### ***4.3. Integration, Negotiation and Management of Policy Execution Networking***

At present, structural changes are taking place in society and this generates impact and influence toward social harmony. In a high risk and aging society, risk detection and prevention may become the positioning niche for neighbourhood governance. Governments will normally allocate resources to disadvantaged areas through formal structures and processes. During the course of policy execution, the opinions of local residents should be assessed and incorporated into the decision-making and strategy level and efficacy of neighbourhood governance. What is the degree of power sharing? And be able to connect with the results of international academic researches, to enable local academics and practical development to be able to fit in and get closer with the pulse of international development.

##### ***4.4. Reinforcement of Public Governance Quality***

The current governance theory is already gradually detaching from the discussion and concept of pure theory, and gradually heading toward practicality and actualization. Governance is based on affiliated parties at its core, assessing how they perceive and diagnose the situation on neighbourhood governance, acknowledging the required action to be taken from a certain point and let the collaborative relationship become more transparent, accountable and have even more engagement and collaborative work.

Overall speaking, the summarized references of neighbourhood governance may include the goals of neighbourhood regeneration plans and the administrative operations of neighbourhood involving action takers, collaborative relationships, capability nurturing, networking relationship, and the handling of conflicts, elimination of transformation roadblocks, system arrangements and cultivation of democracy in the neighbourhoods. Most important of all, during the course of forming the neighbourhood governance, ensure that public services continue to improve and emphasize on collaboration between citizens and the government. Concurrently, neighbourhood governance should care about good engaging cultivation and the relationship of political figures in performing neighbourhood governance.

### **5. Conclusion: Growing Importance of the Neighbourhood**

With regards to whether the neighbourhood of the governance mechanism being discussed should be based on the concept of neighbourhoods, neighbourhood or village, or can be used as a starting point for the research on relevant topics on the public administration domain, but what is even more meaningful is that the topic and connotation of democratic neighbourhood governance. The important goal lies with how social discrimination can be reduced, and not emphasizing on what services to provide, and this provides an engagement process to collectively solve the issues for relatively faraway and poor neighbourhoods. The significance of this engagement process lies in improving from the elitist-led government management of the past, bridging social capital and transcending traditional networking relationship. Through the expansion of the horizontal network and improvement of mass action information to generate new interrelationship, the political communications with borderline groups will be incorporated and information sharing will be carried out, as well as bridging networking and people relationship. Therefore, the important significance of neighbourhood governance lies requiring the government to respond to the needs of people, place emphasis on the appropriateness of the administrative process, emphasize on the connotations of public interests, distribute social resources appropriately and fairly, prevent abuse of power by the public sector, and prevent any fraud from happening.

In general, for most policies and professional planning, if there is no democratic administration, naturally it is very easy to transplant or replicate the experience from overseas. However, the public may not have the desire, capability, and professional planning to engage in dialogue with a bureaucratic organization. Ultimately, the only participants are from the public sector. Therefore, policy planning departments should be conscious of the issue on participation capacity and desire, and be willing to establish mechanisms for people from all walks to be able to participate and engage in dialogue. Finally, in the course of the neighbourhood regeneration and capability building process, do not reduce the possibilities for dialogue due to the race, vocation or unemployed status or education level of the resident. In other words, in order to achieve public service goals, the enhancement and reinforcement of neighbourhood governance has become the necessary design foundation to strive for better governance. With regards to the public affairs aspect of local government, the neighbourhood and even participants should demonstrate a more diversified trend, for example: public sector, private sector, civic society, residents, and even cross-regional governance. Finally, regardless whether it is a public topic or from the perception of a participant, the concept must primarily be based on enhancing public services and implementing democratic administration. In addition, the discussion of this study is based on neighbourhood governance and is still a discussion at the theoretical level.

### **References**

- Allen, J. and G.Cars. (2001) Multiculturalism and Governing Neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*, 38(12): 2195-2209.
- Beebejaum, Yasminah and Lucy Grimshaw. (2011). Is the 'New Deal for Communities' a New Deal for Equality? Getting Women on Board in Neighbourhood governance. *Urban Studies*, 48(10): 1997-2011.
- Blakeley, G. and B.Evans. (2008). It's Like Maintaining a Hedge: Constraints on Citizen Engagement in Community Regeneration in East Manchester. *Public Policy and Administration*, 23: 100-113.
- Boyle, P.(1997). Participation in Neighbourhood Governance and Its Influence on Sense of Community, Capacity, and Legitimacy. University of Colorado at Denver.
- Brunger, Mark. (2011). Governance, Accountability and Neighbourhood Policing in Northern Ireland: Analysing the Role of Public Meetings. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 55(2-3): 105-20.

- Chang, Chin-Fen.(2011). The Action Issues on Entering Disadvantaged Neighbourhood to Implement Anti-Social Exclusion: Methods and Introspections. *Journal of Community Work and Community Studies*, 1(2): 125-168.(in Chinese)
- Chiang, Ta-Shu and Li-Ya Chang.(2009).An Empirical Study on Benchmarking Leadership and Local Governance of County Magistrates and City Mayors in Taiwan. *Taiwan Democracy Quarterly*,6(2): 61-125.(in Chinese)
- Chiou, Chang-Tay. (2007). NIMBY and Community Governance: The Predicament and Outlet of Taiwan's Environmental Protests. Taipei: Weber Publication International Ltd.
- Chen, Chih-We.(2006). Holistic Governance and Accountability. *Journal of Law and Politics*, 20: 143-164.(in Chinese)
- Chen, Don-Yun. (2012). Democratic Governance: An Institutional Reconciliation of Public Administration and Democracy. Taiwan: Wu-nan Culture Enterprise.(in Chinese)
- Chen, Shu-Mei and Susan C. Hu.(2006). Effects of Neighbourhood Environments on Health: A Literature Review. *Journal of Healthy Cities*, 4: 31-37. (in Chinese)
- Chu, Chen-Ming and Nan-Guey Liao.(2010)Hualien County Neighbourhood Governance for Practice and Inspiration. Paper was presented at the Roundtable of the Roles and Functions of the Grassroots Village Repositioning. (in Chinese)
- Chu, Cheng-Te and Chao-Yi Lin.(2007). Effect of Housing Complex on Neighbourhood Relationship and Environmental Consciousness: Example on Housing Complex of Taipei City. *Journal of Design Science*,10(1): 115-137.(in Chinese)
- Chu, Pin-Yu and Luo-Wei Li. (2009). Development and Challenges of E-Governance. *Forum on Training and Development*,107: 1-13.(in Chinese)
- Davies, J. S. and M. Pill. (2012). Hollowing Out Neighbourhood Governance? Rescaling Revitalization in Baltimore and Bristol. *Urban Studies*, 49 (10): 2199-2217.
- DETR. (1998) New Deal for Communities: Phase 1 proposals: Guidance for Pathfinder Applicants. London: DETR.
- Durose, C. and J. Rees.(2012). The Rise and Fall of Neighbourhood in the New Labour Era. *Policy & Politics*, 40(1), 39-55.
- Durose, C. and V. Lowndes. (2010). Neighbourhood governance: Contested Rationales within a Multi-Level Setting - A Study of Manchester. *Local Government Studies*, 36(3), 341-365.
- European Commission(2001). Neighbourhood governance- Capacity for Social Integration. DG Research.
- Fallov, M. A. (2010) Community Capacity Building as the Route to Inclusion in Neighbourhood Regeneration. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(4): 789-804.
- Farrelly, M. (2009). Citizen Participation and Neighbourhood governance: Analysing Democratic Practice. *Local Government Studies*, 35(4), 387-406.
- Gonzalez, S. and P. Healey. (2005). A Sociological Institutional Approach to the Study of Innovation in Governance Capacity. *Urban Studies*, 42(11): 2055-2069.
- Hu, Lung-Teng, Kuan-Chiu Tseng, Chih-Kai Chang, and Rong-Chih Huang.(2013). Influential Factors of Electronic Cross-Boundary Governance: An Exploratory Study with Multiple Cases. *Journal of Public Administration*, 45: 1-39. (in Chinese)
- Hwang, Yuan-Shie, Su-Jen Liu, Li-Hsin Chuang, and Xing-Ting Lin.(2010). The Relationship between Community Social Capital and Community Development. *Journal of Public Administration*, 32: 29-75.(in Chinese)
- Imrie, R. and M. Raco. (2003). *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, Community, and Urban Policy*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Kettl, Donald F. (2000). The Transformation of Governance: Globalization, Devolution, and the Role of Government. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6): 488-497.
- Kuo, Jui-kun, Chun-shen Wang, and Cheng-Neng Lai.(2007). Community Empowerment and Social Capital-- Perspective of Kaohsiung Residents' Cognition. *City Development*, 3: 110-134.(in Chinese)
- Lang, R. and Dietmar Roessler (2011). Contextualizing the Governance of Co-operatives: Evidence from Austria and Germany. *Voluntas*, 22: 706-730.
- Lawless, P. (2004). Locating and Explaining Area-Based Urban Initiatives: New Deal for Communities in England. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 22: 383-399.

- Lin, Ji-Lang.(2007). Towards the Sustainable Development of the Local Community Governance Model: An Example of the Daan Community in Jhushan Township. *Forum on Training and Development*, 74: 32-44.(in Chinese)
- Lin, Xin-Ting, Li-Hsin Chuang, Su-Jen Liu, and Yuan-Shie Hwang.(2012). Making the Community Work: The Correlation between Social Capital and Community Participation. *Taiwanese Journal of Social Welfare*, 10(2): 161 – 210.(in Chinese)
- Lin, Wan-I.(2010). To Establish a Family-centred and Community-basd Social Welfare Service Delivery System. *Community Development Journal*, 129: 20-51.(in Chinese)
- Liou, Horng-hwang.(2011) The Study of Sense of Community and Neighbourhood Caring or Interaction among People in Taiwan. *Human Ecology: Vision and Insight*, 5: 1-41.(in Chinese)
- Lowndes, V. and H. Sullivan. (2008). How low can you go? Rationales and challenges for neighbourhood governance. *Public Administration*, 86(1), 53-75.
- Lucio, J. D. , J. C. Auer, and E. W. Johnston. (2013). Neighbourhood Diversity: Framework for Municipalities. *State and Local Government*, 45(1), 48-56.
- Lue, Yue-Chang.(2004). Reorientation of the Roles and Functions of the Village Under the Local Governance Perspective. Paper was presented at the workshop of the Shape the Future Image of the Grass-roots Organization of Local Government(in Chinese)
- Lue, Yue-Chang.(2012). The Implementation of Cross-Regional Governance: Challenges and Prospect. *Journal of Civil Service*,4(1): 85-106.(in Chinese)
- Lyons, (2007). *Place-Shaping: a Shared Ambition for the Future of Local Government*, Lyons Inquiry into Local Government. London: The Stationery Office.
- Musso, J. A, C. Weare, N. Oztas, W. E. Loges.(2006). Neighbourhood Governance Reform and Networks of Community Power in Los Angeles. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1): 79~89.
- Parker, G. and C. Murray (2012). Beyond Tokenism? Community-led Planning and Rational Choices: Findings from Participants in Local Agenda-setting at the Neighbourhood Scale in England. *Town Planning Review*, 83(1): 1-28.
- Pill, M. and N. Bailey(2012). Community Empowerment or a Strategy of Containment? Evaluating Neighbourhood governance in the City of Westminster. *Local Government Studies*, 38(6): 731-751.
- Purdue,D.(2001). Neighbourhood Governance: Leadership, Trust and Social Capital. *Urban Studies*, 38(12),2211~2224.
- Stone, C.N. (1989). *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Stone, C.N. (2009). Who is governed? Local Citizens and the Political Order of Cities in J.S. Davies and D.L. Imbroscio (eds) *Theories of Urban Politics*, 2nd ed, London: Sage, pp. 257-273.
- Tsai, Yun-Tung.(2006). Democratic Administration and Network Governance. *Taiwanese Political Science Review*,10(1): 163-209.(in Chinese)
- Tung, Chuan-Ming.(2011). The Effects of Neighbourhood Environment Characteristics on Children's Freedom of Movement in Taiwanese Satellite Town. *Architecture and Planning*, 12(3): 6-34.(in Chinese)
- Wang, Shu-Twu, Shan-Ru Chao and Hui-Li Hsu.(2011). A Study on the Interactive Relationship between Local Governments and Community Organizations in Post-Disaster Reconstruction--The Reconstruction Project for Typhoon Morakot Disaster Area as Example. *Journal of Community Work and Community Studies*,1(2): 59-94.(in Chinese)
- Wälti, Sonja, and Daniel Kübler. (2003). 'New Governance' and Association Pluralism: The Case of Drug Policy in Swiss Cities. *Policy Studies Journal*,31(4): 499-525.

\*This research was supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST Project No. 104-2410-H-216-002) in Taiwan. Besides, Chang is also the correspond author, and his e-mail is cyy@chu.edu.tw.