

Standardization of community public cultural services

Yiran Liu

College of Humanities and Foreign Languages, China Jiliang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310000

ABSTRACT

Community public cultural service is an important way to protect the basic cultural rights and interests of citizens. Community cultural construction can meet the needs of residents, enhance the sense of belonging of residents, create a warm atmosphere, and maintain social stability. The coverage rate and construction level of community cultural centers vary greatly in different regions of China. Standardization construction is of great significance for improving the level of community public cultural services. We hope to improve the demand level of community public cultural services, provide more high-quality services for citizens, and meet their cultural needs. The standardization of community public cultural services is an important guarantee for modern countries to safeguard citizens' fundamental cultural rights. It is an important basis for promoting national rejuvenation and development. This paper takes the field of community public cultural services as the research object, sorts out the current situation of standardization development, analyzes the mechanism of standardization in the field of community public cultural services, constructs the standard system of community public cultural services, and puts forward suggestions on the implementation path.

KEYWORDS

community; Public cultural services; Standardization.

1 Introduction

Public cultural services refer to the public cultural facilities, cultural products, cultural activities and other related services provided by the government with the participation of social forces for the main purpose of meeting the basic cultural needs of citizens. Community public cultural service, as the "foundation" of public cultural service, is an important grass-roots organization unit of public cultural service, an important way to realize the basic cultural rights and interests of the people, and plays an important role in improving the quality of citizens and promoting social harmony.

The so-called community public cultural services refer to the comprehensive use of political, administrative, market and socialization mechanisms by Chinese central and local government departments at all levels to meet the growing public cultural needs of community residents in the context of the construction of a socialist society with Chinese characteristics. On the one hand, to provide community residents with rich, diverse, high-quality and non-competitive, non-exclusive public cultural products or services; on the other hand, the use of laws and regulations, public policies, intelligent new technology and organizational management tools and means to ensure that the above public cultural products or services fair, just, rapid and effective supply.

Promoting the development of basic public services through standardization is an inevitable requirement of the new era. With the development of China's economy and society, the people's demand for public cultural services is increasing day by day, and standardization construction has become an important means to improve the level of community public cultural services. This paper aims to explore the standardization of community public cultural services and provide theoretical support and practical guidance for promoting the standardization of community public cultural services.

2 Current situation of standardization of community public cultural services

2.1 Development and release of relevant standards

In January 2015, Chinese authorities issued the Opinions on Accelerating the Construction of a Modern Public Cultural Service System, making comprehensive arrangements for accelerating the construction of a modern public cultural service system, promoting the standardization and equalization of basic public cultural services, and protecting the basic cultural rights and interests of the people. As an important part of the Opinions, the Guiding Standards for National Basic Public Cultural Services (2015-2020) is a key institutional design for building a modern public cultural service system. At present, China has issued a number of national standards, industry standards, local standards and group standards related to community public cultural services. For example, GB/T32151-2015 "Community public cultural service standards", GB/T20647.3-2006 "Community Service Guide Part 3: Culture, education, sports services", DB4420/T3-2020 "Administrative village (community) comprehensive cultural service center service standards" and so on. At present, eight national standards, three industry standards and more than 60 local standards have been introduced in the field of community public cultural services. From the perspective of standard types, there are mainly four categories: service standards,

construction standards, management standards and evaluation standards. Among them, service standards account for the majority, accounting for about 60%, followed by construction standards, management standards and evaluation standards are less. From the perspective of community public cultural service elements, the standards focus on venue facilities, personnel, cultural activities, information and other standards are few.

2.1.1 Local characteristics and standards have been adapted to local conditions

Since the promulgation of the "National Guiding Standards for Basic Public Cultural Services", all localities have responded positively, not only following the basic national framework and the strict norms of relevant departments, but also closely matching their actual conditions, including economic conditions, geographical distribution, population composition and cultural traditions, to refine and formulate local implementation standards. The aim is to develop a set of service guidelines that meet national guidelines, reflect local characteristics and meet local needs. For example, Zhejiang Province issued the "Management Standards for Grassroots Cultural Teams" for the management of grassroots cultural groups; Weihai City, according to its urban characteristics, formulated the "Weihai City Library construction Code", aiming at optimizing the reading space; And Chengdu city through the "Chengdu grassroots comprehensive cultural Service Center Service standards" to improve the comprehensive service level of community culture. These measures jointly demonstrate innovation and differentiated development in the construction of public cultural service systems in various regions, aiming to promote public cultural services closer to the people's livelihood and benefit the whole people.

2.1.2 Wide coverage and extended public cultural network

In recent years, public cultural services have actively sought cooperation with quality supervision departments to enrich the diversity and level of public cultural service standards and enhance the comprehensive influence of public cultural service standards. Establish a coordination mechanism for the construction of a public cultural service system led by cultural departments, promote the coordination of resources among departments, clarify tasks, perform their respective duties, build and share, and jointly promote the standardization of public cultural services, involving libraries, cultural stations, cultural centers, science and technology centers, museums, etc.

2.2 Comparison of foreign standards

Public service refers to the reform and innovation of the system, organization, system, system and mode of public service in order to adapt to the changes of social public demand and provide the public with more just, more comprehensive, better quality and more convenient public service. Foreign public service reform includes public service system reform, public service organization reform, public finance system reform, public service system innovation, public service mode innovation and so on.

The development history of public cultural service standardization in foreign countries shows that it started before China. The United States took a landmark step in this regard with the release of the Customer First: Standards for Serving the American People in 1997, which was the first national-level manual of government service standards in the United States and marked the formal specification of the quality of public services. In the same year, the British government also established nine basic principles to guide public services, further refining the guiding framework for public services. France followed suit, introducing public service quality standards in 2004 to improve the efficiency and satisfaction of public services. In the wave of market-oriented reform of public services, many countries actively explore and optimize the allocation of resources by introducing market competition mechanism. This reform not only promotes the rationalization of government finances, but also enhances the flexibility and efficiency of the provision of public services, ensuring that broader social needs are met. The market-oriented strategy encourages the private sector and non-profit organizations to participate in the supply of public services, which is complementary to the government departments and jointly promotes the innovation and upgrading of the public service system.

Regarding the governance of a certain type of public service, the latest research direction is the theory of cooperative governance. Representative achievements include: NeilBradford (2016), taking Toronto, Canada as an example, studied the localized discourse of cooperative governance of urban public policy; SofiaNikolaidou et al. (2016) study on cooperative governance in urban green space construction; DavidePonzini et al. (2014) believe that the cooperative governance model is the best supply model for public cultural services due to the inherent diversity of culture itself. Based on the cooperative governance model of Ansell and Gash (2008), they systematically analyze how to ensure cultural diversity in the cooperative governance of Italian cultural districts. In short, as a cutting-edge governance theory emerging in the post-new public management period, cooperative governance has attracted increasing attention from western scholars, and has been widely applied to a variety of public affairs governance issues such as environmental governance, policy making, performance evaluation, and inter-governmental relations.

In Western countries, the development of social organizations has a profound social foundation, and many public cultural affairs can be completed in the form of volunteers. This way of dealing with public affairs in the form of social self-help or self-organization is conducive to mobilizing social resources to the maximum extent, saving innovation costs, and public production can promote the standardization process of social and cultural services to a certain extent.

3 Problems and suggestions in the standardization of community public cultural services

3.1 Problems Exist

Although a series of standards have been formulated in the field of community public cultural services in recent years, and many countries have actively promoted the exploration of standardization practice, effectively improving the overall standardization level of community public cultural services in China, it is still necessary to face up to the fact that compared with the current rapid development of community cultural services and the increasingly diverse and high-quality cultural needs of the people, There is still a big gap in the standardization of community public cultural services. This indicates that there is still a large room for improvement in terms of the richness of service content, the accuracy of supply, the modernity of facilities, and the innovation of management and operation. It is urgent to narrow the gap between service supply and demand through deepening standardization work, so as to fully meet the spiritual and cultural pursuit of the people.

3.1.1 Uneven level of system construction

Despite the continuous efforts of governments at all levels to extend public cultural services downward, aiming to enhance the popularity and convenience of services, at the grass-roots level, a scientific and standardized community public cultural service standard system has not been fully established, resulting in the lack of clear guidance standards and technical support in actual operation. This lack has greatly affected grass-roots communities that undertake the responsibility of public cultural services. Without the guidance of a unified standard system, it is difficult for them to systematically improve service quality and efficiency. As a result, community public cultural services generally face the problem of uneven level, which not only restricts the prosperity and development of grass-roots culture, but also restricts the development of grass-roots culture. It is also difficult to effectively meet the growing needs of the people for diverse cultures.

3.1.2 Lack of strength in standardized evaluation

The state, industry and local governments have started to formulate a series of standards on public cultural services, covering many aspects such as service content and facility construction, but these standards mainly focus on the construction of hardware facilities and basic service specifications. On the other hand, the standardization of operation management precision, performance evaluation scientificity, and service guarantee mechanism soundness is relatively weak. As a key tool, standards play an important role in ensuring the quality of grassroots community cultural services and accelerating the improvement of service efficiency. However, the number, breadth and depth of existing standards are not enough to fully support the actual needs of the rapid development of community public cultural services, resulting in the lack of specific and executable guidance basis at the practical level, which affects the "focus" of effective standardization work. Therefore, it has become an urgent task to improve the standardization system covering more dimensions such as operation management, evaluation and assessment, and service guarantee, and support the high-quality development of community cultural services with a more comprehensive standard network.

3.2 Suggestions

3.2.1 Improving standardization policies

To construct a comprehensive standardized management system of public cultural services is the key to realize standardized governance, and standardized management documents constitute the framework and implementation of this system. At the policy level, clearly define the roles and responsibilities of governance subjects, strengthen the supervision of governance processes, establish and improve reward and punishment mechanisms, so as to encourage all participants to actively perform their duties and ensure the effective implementation of standardization work. In addition, improving the performance evaluation system is another important link to improve the quality of service, which requires in-depth research and setting scientific and reasonable evaluation indicators and constructing rigorous evaluation standards. It is particularly important to establish a set of open and transparent public evaluation and feedback mechanism, so that the voice of service users becomes the direct driving force for improving services and optimizing

standards, truly realizing the people-oriented, and promoting the continuous optimization and innovative development of public cultural services.

3.2.2 Promote digital management

We should make full use of modern scientific and technological means to promote the transformation of standardized management of public cultural services to technology and information, build an integrated public cultural service platform and digital management platform, and achieve intelligent and efficient management through technology empowerment.

Establish a comprehensive standardized governance database to ensure that standardized management documents at all levels can be updated, publicized and consulted online in a timely manner, so as to achieve centralized management and convenient sharing of information resources.

On this basis, actively explore the latest technologies such as big data, cloud computing, artificial intelligence and other new technologies, as well as intelligent terminal equipment into all areas of public cultural services and management processes, such as through intelligent analysis of public needs to customize personalized services, the use of Internet of Things technology to optimize facility management, with artificial intelligence to enhance service interaction experience. To improve service efficiency and quality, and enhance public participation and satisfaction.

3.2.3 Equalization of public services

As R. Wilson said, "Commercial activities are the foundation of our wealth, and the surplus money from such activities funds high culture, funds universities and foundations (and governments), and funds artists and their work." Thanks to the prosperity of commerce and rising incomes, people were able to buy paintings, donate to symphony orchestras, and commission artists to design buildings and sculptures." However, on the other hand, we should also see that the market economy tends to ignore the cultural needs of vulnerable groups who lack the ability to pay money.

Under the market mechanism, material and spiritual products follow monetary votes rather than the basic material, spiritual and cultural needs of society. A rich man may drink the milk that a poor man needs to maintain his health; The price paid by a rich man on a ticket to a fancy entertainment venue could be the cost of a poor child's school fees for a year. This suggests that efficient market mechanisms can produce great inequality. This is not a problem with the role of supply and demand.

As Samuelson put it, "The market mechanism does exactly what people want it to do - it puts things into the hands of those who bid the highest, those who have the most monetary votes." Defenders and critics of the price mechanism recognize that an efficient market system can produce great inequality." However, according to the principle of fairness, every citizen (including members of different social classes) has the fair right to access to service opportunities, service content, quality and service process when obtaining cultural resources and enjoying cultural services. However, charges, especially excessive charges, are generated for low-income and vulnerable social groups.

In the provision of public cultural products and services to the public, especially the vulnerable groups, the market mechanism has "failure" or limitations, which needs to be remedied through the equalization mechanism aimed at "enabling the masses to enjoy free or preferential basic public cultural services". In other words, under the conditions of a market economy, it is necessary to provide "free or preferential" public cultural services to all citizens, including vulnerable social groups, which cannot be provided by the market mechanism.

4 Closing remarks

The process of issuing public cultural service standards in different communities shows significant regional differences. This diversity undoubtedly poses a complex challenge to the realization of unified and efficient service standardization across the country, highlighting the imbalance and urgency faced by Chinese community cultural centers in the standardization process.

As the public's cultural demand continues to rise, government departments, as the leading force in community cultural construction, urgently need to put more emphasis on improving the service standardization and quality of community cultural centers, and narrow the development gap between regions through policy guidance and resource allocation. At the same time, as the direct beneficiaries of services, the public should enhance their own cultural awareness and sense of participation, take the initiative to understand and advocate their own cultural rights and interests, and jointly participate in and promote the construction and development of community cultural centers, making them an important platform to meet the needs of diverse cultures and promote social and cultural harmony. This is not only a positive response to the current challenges, but also the only way to build a strong socialist culture.

References

- [1] Xu M. Y., Guo X., Ren Y., Gong C. C., & Zhou A. P. (2023). Thoughts on the standardization of community public cultural services. *China Standardization*, 20, 93-97.
- [2] Wang X. S. (2016, December 30). Exploring and promoting the standardization of basic public cultural services. *China Culture Daily*, p. 006.
- [3] Qiao G. L., He S. B., & Yang X. D. (2014, September 3). Strengthen resource integration to promote standardization of grassroots public cultural services. *China Culture Daily*, p. 001.
- [4] Yan S. Q., Kang J. S., & Lu H. H. (2011). Research and thinking on promoting public service standardization. *China Standardization*, (7), 113-118.
- [5] Wang M., Li X. Y., Tian Y., & Chen Y. (2024). Balanced adaptation and coordinated development: Policy tools for local government cultural service standardization. *National Library Journal*, 33(1), 88-106.
- [6] Ruan K. (2014, May). Thinking on promoting standardization of public cultural services in Zhejiang. *Zhejiang Today*, 56-57.
- [7] Hu Y. L. (2019). Cooperative governance of community public cultural services: Logic, conflict, and motivation [Doctoral dissertation, Tianjin University].
- [8] Chen L. X. (2011). Promoting the equalization of basic public cultural services. *Zhejiang Social Sciences*, 12, 4-7.