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Abstract: Community governance is the foundation of social governance and a guarantee for modernizing the national governance system and capacity. Residents’ satisfaction with community governance is an important factor in measuring community governance level. Based on similar related literature and practical research analysis, 18 influencing factors of community governance residents’ satisfaction were extracted from four dimensions. Through the principal component analysis of social science statistical software, 16 key influencing factors were finally selected, and six regression models were analyzed and compared. Further, they clarified the influence of various dimensions on residents’ satisfaction with community governance. Further analysis and research on the model show that community governance service, community education and community interpersonal communication are significantly positively correlated with residents’ satisfaction with community governance. Although participation in community governance as a single influencing factor has no significant effect in this study, it can also positively and significantly affect residents’ satisfaction with community governance under the joint action of community education and community interpersonal communication. Therefore, from the aspects of improving the service level of community governance, enhancing the participation of community governance in multiple ways, giving full attention to the role of community education and shaping the new model of community communication, a more realistic evaluation system of community governance residents’ satisfaction is designed.
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1. Introduction

In the recent Chinese governance system, community governance lays a fundamental position [1]. Community governance is the joint management of community public affairs by the government, community organizations and community citizens [2]. It has become the key point of social governance, the link between government governance and residents’ autonomy, which is a fundamental condition to truly promote the modernization of governance in China [3]. The report of the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China pointed out that it is necessary to “strengthen the construction of the community governance system and promote the shift of the focus of
social governance to the grassroots level”. In 2020, General Secretary Xi Jinping pointed out during his inspection at the Jilin Changchun Community Cadre College: “Only by strengthening social governance can we promote the modernization of the national governance system and governance capacity”. In April 2021, the Communist Party of China Central Committee and the State Council had released a plan for modernizing the system and capacity for primary-level governance, which shows that we should establish a sound institutional mechanism for grassroots governance, promote healthy interaction between government governance, social regulation and residents’ autonomy, and then improve the level of socialization, rule of law, legalization and professionalization of grassroots governance [3].

The level of community governance is directly related to the happiness index of residents and affects social harmony and stability and the effectiveness of social governance to a certain extent. In recent years, China’s urban and rural community governance and service level have improved significantly, however, there is still a certain gap in the people’s expectations. Community governance must establish the recognition of common goals through negotiation and cooperation and rely on the acceptance and approval of community residents to jointly manage the common affairs of the community, to achieve a high-level and modern community governance system, build a civilized, harmonious and beautiful socialist community with Chinese characteristics. Against this background, this paper first conducts an inductive analysis of the factors affecting residents’ community governance satisfaction. Secondly, by using principal component analysis and regression analysis, the key factors affecting residents’ satisfaction with community governance are explored from the perspectives of community governance services, resident participation, community education, and community interpersonal communication. At last, according to the research results, this paper provides decision-making and reference for improving community governance capacity from the perspective of practical effects.

This research has positive theoretical and practical significance. Firstly, from the perspective of theoretical significance, this study expands on the theories related to community governance. In view of the community governance, exploring the content and methods of community governance and focusing on the satisfaction of residents in the community can reflect the people-oriented value concept, which is helpful to clarify the role and function of residents in community governance, thus, improves the efficiency of community governance. Secondly, this study enriches the theoretical system of social governance and national governance. Starting from the research theme of “How to improve residents’ satisfaction in community governance”, this paper sorted out the current state of community governance and discussed the problem of low residents’ satisfaction, providing an experience for improving the level of community governance and improving residents’ lives. From the perspective of practical significance, the current community governance is in a new stage from single governance to multiple co-governance, which emphasizes the joint governance of the government and the public and pays more attention to the subjective feelings of residents, so as to better improve the work of the community. First of all, this paper focuses on the analysis of residents’ satisfaction with community governance in City N and the analysis of existing problems, which can provide a reference for other regions to conduct experimental exploration. Then, it is beneficial to the optimization of resource allocation by the government. By digging out the reasons why current residents are not satisfied with community governance, we can find the shortcomings and weaknesses of government resource allocation and put forward targeted optimization paths, which will encourage the government to further transform its functions and optimize resource allocation.

This study draws lessons from the research results of enterprise satisfaction to study and evaluate residents’ satisfaction with community governance. In the relative satisfaction relationship, residents are the objects of community governance services and
the beneficiaries of community public services. In this paper, the level of satisfaction is how community residents are satisfied with community governance public services.

2. Core Concepts and Literature Review

2.1. Influencing Factors of Resident Satisfaction with Community Governance

In the study of resident satisfaction, foreign scholars Ladwig and McCallum defined it as “the psychosocial response of residents to community services” [4]. After it, researchers, such as Heller, Rasmussen, Cook and Wolosin, have enriched the concept of resident satisfaction in terms of interpersonal interactions, value systems and life needs. Bard John divided resident satisfaction into general areas and specific areas [5]. Satisfaction in the general domain includes how people experience and feel about the community they live in, while satisfaction in the specific domain includes alienation between people as well as warmth and belonging, how people feel about community administration, and the quality of the environment, individual responsibility, etc. At present, the research on people’s satisfaction in China is still in its infancy. There is no clear definition of people’s satisfaction and the analyses of various aspects are not perfect enough. However, in terms of practical application, our government attaches great importance to the work of public satisfaction [6].

In the research on residents’ satisfaction with community governance, foreign scholars like Rojek believed that community service quality is an important aspect of detecting residents’ satisfaction with the community [7]. This service includes education, medical treatment and safety. Meanwhile, Christenson argued that the quality of life of residents in the Chinese community is the main entry point for community satisfaction research [8]. Chinese scholar Jihong put forward that community governance capacity should include community service provision, resident participation, cultural leadership, safety and conflict regulation and community informatization capacity [9]. Community governance capability includes community service supply, resident participation, community cultural leadership, community security and conflict adjustment, and community informatization capability [10]. Therefore, this study combines the actual development of urban and rural communities in China and analyzes resident satisfaction from four aspects: community governance service, community resident participation, community education and community interpersonal communication.

2.1.1. Community Governance Service

Community governance service capability mainly includes the leadership of grassroots party organizations, the public service capabilities of government and community departments, the service capacity of social organizations, and the self-organization capacity of residents [9]. Shiqiang fully affirmed the leading role of the party organization in community autonomy, which can effectively promote the voluntary participation of community residents in community governance [11]. Puqu thought that the structural and functional relationship between community party organizations and neighborhood committees constitutes the basis for their positive interaction, creating conditions for good governance in Chinese urban communities [12]. Feng’s views provided new ideas for pluralistic governance and pointed out that under the environment of government purchase policy, the cooperation between social organizations, governments and communities has brought new opportunities for the transformation of community governance. Wei et al. believed that following the threedimensional logic of “overall guidance of Party organizations and government—co-governance of social organizations and community organizations—the establishment of resident community” can promote the benign interaction of multiple subjects. It can not only enrich the innovative practices of grassroots social governance but also create a good community atmosphere in which people of all ethnic groups live, study, work, and enjoy
life together in the new era, and lay a solid ideological foundation for the community of the Chinese nation at the community level [13].

2.1.2. Community Resident Participation

The factors of residents’ participation in community governance include residents’ willingness and participation degree. The essence of community construction lies in interaction, and residents’ participation is at the core of community governance. Jijun believed that the current key work improves residents’ participation willingness, guides self-governance, and cultivates community volunteer service spirit [14]. Jing put forward the views on improving the participation of residents in community governance and believed that increasing the participation of residents can effectively improve the level of community governance and enhance the harmony of the community [15]. The countermeasures included strengthening education to improve residents’ ability to handle affairs and improving the degree and effectiveness of resident participation [15].

2.1.3. Community Education

The functions of community education include improving the safety awareness of community residents and the organizational degree of the community, mobilizing multiple subjects to participate in community governance, and promoting the formation of a healthy community culture [16]. Dongquan also believed that grassroots party organizations and community education, as the main body and mode of governance, respectively, play important roles in changing the concept of new citizens, improving the quality of residents, building social networks, and strengthening residents' sense of community identity and belonging [17].

2.1.4. Community Interpersonal Communication

Yanfei’s research results showed that strengthening community culture and cultivating good interpersonal relationships can help carry out community management work, improve community governance service capabilities, and enhance residents’ sense of identity with the community, thereby improving residents’ satisfaction with community governance [18]. Xiaoyu thought that positive emotions, such as community emotional interaction and community belonging, could help realize the effective connection between “people” and community, create a community of co-governance, and promote the participation of diverse subjects in community governance [19].

3. Research Design

3.1. Research Tools

Based on the community governance performance questionnaire launched by Hong [20] and combining the actual situation of the research object and the perspective of the research team, this study compiles four scales from four dimensions: community governance services, community resident participation, the impact of community education on community governance, and community interpersonal communication. Specifically, these scales are, respectively, the impact of community governance services on residents’ satisfaction with community governance, the impact of residents’ participation in community governance on residents’ satisfaction with community governance, the impact of community education on residents’ satisfaction with community governance, and the impact of community interpersonal communication on residents’ satisfaction with community governance. The questionnaire consists of residents’ basic information and questions about social governance satisfaction. In addition to the subjective and multiple-choice questions, the Likert five-level scale is used for social governance satisfaction (Appendix A). Participation in social governance is mainly examined through multiple-choice questions, requiring respondents to select the relevant activities they have participated in and score them according to the number of
activities they selected (a five-point system). The subjective questions examine the satisfaction of community governance. The study uses python’s snownlp package for sentiment analysis, and the scoring results are also divided into five-level scales: the value range between (0.8, 1) represents 5, (0.6, 0.8) represents 4, (0.4, 0.6) represents 3, (0.2, 0.4) represents 2, and (0, 2) represents 1. This study’s data analysis and statistical tools are mainly SPSS23.0 and PYTHON.

3.2. Sample Selection

Residents aged 18 and above in more than 20 communities in District B of N City are selected as the research objects, and the survey period is from November 2020 to March 2021. Questionnaires are compiled on an application software called “Wenjuanxing” and distributed to residents through adult schools, community colleges, streets and neighborhood committees. A total of 1056 questionnaires were received. After removing the missing and invalid questionnaires, 1044 were valid, with an effective rate of 98.7%. The basic information of the respondents is as follows (Table 1):

| Category                        | Number of People | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| **Gender**                      |                  |                |
| male                            | 342              | 32.8           |
| female                          | 702              | 67.2           |
| **Age**                         |                  |                |
| 0–17                            | 0                | 0              |
| 18–45                           | 527              | 50.5           |
| 46–59                           | 314              | 30.1           |
| 60–74                           | 193              | 18.5           |
| >75                             | 10               | 1.0            |
| **Years of Residence**          |                  |                |
| ≤1                              | 83               | 8.0            |
| (1, 5]                          | 318              | 30.4           |
| >5                              | 643              | 61.6           |
| **Political Status**            |                  |                |
| Party member of CPC             | 371              | 35.5           |
| League member                   | 75               | 7.2            |
| The Masses                      | 538              | 51.5           |
| Democratic parties              | 39               | 3.7            |
| Non                             | 21               | 2.0            |
| **Education**                   |                  |                |
| Junior high school and below    | 297              | 28.4           |
| Senior high school (secondary vocational school) | 235 | 22.5 |
| Junior college                  | 239              | 22.9           |
| Undergraduate                   | 261              | 25.0           |
| Graduate and above              | 12               | 1.1            |
| **Occupation**                  |                  |                |
| Heads of state organs, party and mass organizations, enterprises and institutions | 123 | 11.8 |
| Professional technicians        | 194              | 18.6           |
| Office staff and related personnel | 243 | 23.3 |
| Business and service personnel  | 241              | 23.1           |
| Production personnel of agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, fishery and water conservancy | 71 | 6.8 |
| Soldier                         | 4                | 0.4            |
| Other                           | 168              | 16.1           |
| **Monthly Income**              |                  |                |
| 3000 and below                  | 199              | 19.1           |
| 3000–5000                       | 421              | 40.3           |
| 5000–8000                       | 274              | 26.2           |
| 8000–15,000                     | 124              | 11.9           |
3.3. Research Approach

SPSS 23.0 is used in this study to conduct a statistical analysis on the collected questionnaire data. Firstly, we optimized the research tools and improved the original questionnaire by issuing test questionnaires. The Likert-style questions were changed to subjective questions, and individual engagement questions were changed to multiple-choice questions. Excluding individual invalid and highly interfering questions (Q15, Q16), the overall Cronbach α coefficient is 0.958, indicating that the corresponding variables of each factor have strong internal consistency and the scale has good reliability.

Secondly, SPSS was used to convert all factors into standardized values, and principal component analysis was used to analyze each first-level dimension and determine all factors of each dimension.

Thirdly, we scored each first-level dimension, analyzed the research results, and evaluated the impact of various factors of social governance on the satisfaction of residents in community governance to give corresponding suggestions.

4. Research Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Resident satisfaction with community governance is mainly influenced by community governance services, resident participation, community education and community interpersonal communication (as shown in Table 2).

Table 2. Influencing Factors of Each Dimension (n = 1044).

| Influencing Factor Dimension | Influence Factor                                                                 | Average Value | Standard Deviation |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Community Governance Services| Q3 Ask the neighborhood committee if there is a problem                          | 3.86          | 0.972              |
|                              | Q4 Strong property management serviceability and good service attitude             | 3.81          | 0.977              |
|                              | Q5 Community party organizations are enthusiastic about serving residents          | 4.06          | 0.932              |
| Resident Participation       | Q1 Often participate in community activities                                     | 3.14          | 0.852              |
|                              | Q2 What activities have you participated in                                       | 1.82          | 1.134              |
|                              | Q12 Willing to participate in community governance                                | 4.11          | 0.894              |
|                              | Q13 Willing to participate in community affairs and problem-solving               | 4.08          | 0.905              |
| The Role of Community Education| Q9 Community education promotes neighborhood relations                              | 4             | 0.948              |
|                              | Q10 Community education promotes community culture construction                   | 4.1           | 0.914              |
|                              | Q11 Community education improves the ability of community governance participation| 4.13          | 0.91               |
| Community Interpersonal Communication | Q8 Good neighborhood communication                                        | 3.93          | 0.968              |
|                              | Q14 Neighbors help each other well                                                | 3.802         | 1.112              |
| Resident Satisfaction of Community Governance | Q6 Public security and order                                                    | 4.07          | 0.95               |
|                              | Q7 Sanitary environment and landscape greening                                   | 3.7           | 1.075              |
|                              | Q17 Community affairs disclosure and publicity                                   | 2.02          | 0.963              |
|                              | Q18 Overall satisfaction                                                          | 3.01          | 0.234              |
4.2. Variable Analysis

4.2.1. Dependent Variable: Resident Satisfaction with Community Governance

Resident satisfaction with social governance services is measured through four items (dependent variable S in Table 3): Questions 6, 7, 17 and 18. Among them, Question 18 is a subjective question, which is scored using the SnowNL package of Python, and the score after processing is 1–5 points. The answers to the remaining questions are assigned 1–5 points from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Principal component analysis is used to extract two common factors with eigenvalues greater than 1: “residents’ satisfaction with community environmental governance” and “residents’ satisfaction with transaction processing and publicity” (KMO = 0.648, \( p < 0.001 \)). Among them, the variance contribution rate of “residents’ satisfaction with community environmental governance” is 43.306%, and the variance contribution rate of “residents’ satisfaction with transaction processing and publicity” is 25.754%. The cumulative variance contribution rate of the two is 70.060%.

Table 3. Variable Description of Each Dimension (n = 1044).

| Variable Description of Each Dimension (n = 1044). |
|---------------------------------------------------|
| **Dependent Variable**                            |
| **Component Matrix**                              |
| **Principal Component 1 (Residents’ satisfaction with community environmental governance)** |
| Item | Component | Item | Component |
| Q6   | 0.921     | Q17  | −0.154    |
| Q7   | 0.922     | Q18  | 0.101     |
| **Eigenvalue = 1.732, Percentage Variance = 43.306%** |
| **Y1 = 0.70012 \times Q6 + 0.70017 \times Q7 − 0.1169 \times Q17 + 0.07698 \times Q18** |
| **Principal Component 2 (Residents’ satisfaction with transaction handling and publicity of community affairs)** |
| Item | Component | Item | Component |
| Q6   | 0.064     | Q17  | 0.712     |
| Q7   | −0.027    | Q18  | 0.748     |
| **Eigenvalue = 1.070, Percentage Variance = 25.754%** |
| **Y2 = 0.06142 \times Q6 − 0.026Q7 + 0.68802 \times Q17 + 0.72262 \times Q18** |

| Independent Variable                              |
| **Community Governance Services (G)**            |
| **Principal Component 1 (Community governance services)** |
| Item | Component | Item | Component |
| Q3   | 0.909     | Q4   | 0.902     |
| Q5   | 0.902     |      |           |
| **Eigenvalue = 2.454, Percentage Variance = 81.814%** |
| **X1 = 0.58046 \times Q3 + 0.57604 \times Q4 + 0.57604 \times Q5** |

| **Resident participation in community governance (P)** |
| **Principal Component 1 (Willingness to participate in community governance)** |
| Item | Component | Item | Component |
| Q1   | 0.461     | Q12  | 0.912     |
| Q2   | 0.448     | Q13  | 0.907     |
| **Eigenvalue = 2.067, Percentage Variance = 51.663%** |
| **X1 = 0.32055 \times Q1 + 0.31172 \times Q2 + 0.63436 \times Q12 + 0.63060 \times Q13** |

| **Principal Component 2 (Community governance participation)** |
| Item | Component | Item | Component |
| Q1   | 0.697     | Q12  | −0.344    |
| Q2   | 0.708     | Q13  | −0.358    |
| **Eigenvalue = 1.233, Percentage Variance = 30.820%** |
\[ X_2 = 0.79213 \times Q_1 + 0.79841 \times Q_2 - 0.55651 \times Q_1^2 - 0.56791 \times Q_1^3 \]

Effect of community education on community governance (E)

\[ X = X_1 \]

KMO = 0.755, \( p < 0.001 \)

Cumulative Variance Contribution Rate = 88.852%

| Item   | Component | Item   | Component | Item   | Component |
|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|
| Q9     | 0.933     | Q10    | 0.958     | Q11    | 0.938     |

\[ X_1 = 0.57116 \times Q_9 + 0.58647 \times Q_{10} + 0.57430 \times Q_{11} \]

Principal Component 1 (The role of community education in community governance)

\[ \text{Eigenvalue} = 2.666, \text{Percentage Variance} = 88.852\% \]

Community Interpersonal Communication (C)

\[ X = X_1 \]

KMO = 0.612, \( p < 0.001 \)

Cumulative Variance Contribution Rate = 88.018%

| Item   | Component | Item   | Component |
|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|
| Q8     | 0.938     | Q14    | 0.938     |

\[ X_1 = 0.70711 \times Q_8 + 0.70711 \times Q_{14} \]

Principal Component 1 (Community interpersonal communication)

\[ \text{Eigenvalue} = 1.760, \text{Percentage Variance} = 88.018\% \]

Control Variables

| Variables               | Explain |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Gender                  | Male = 1; Female = 2 |
| Age                     | The age range from low to high is 1–5 |
| Years of Residence      | < 1 year is 1, 1–5 years is 2, and more than 5 years is 3 |
| Political Status        | 1 = “Party Member of CPC”; 2 = “League Member”; 3 = “The Masses”; 4 = “Democratic Parties”; 5 = “Non” |
| Educational Background  | 1 = “Junior high school and below”; 2 = “Senior high school (Secondary vocational)”; 3 = “Junior college”; 4 = “Undergraduate”; 5 = “Graduate and above” |
| Occupation              | 1 = “Person in charge of state organs, Party mass organizations, Enterprises and institutions”; 2 = “Professional technicians”; 3 = “Office staff and related personnel”; 4 = “Business and service personnel”; 5 = “Production personnel in agriculture, Forestry, Animal husbandry, Fishery and water conservancy”; 6 = “Soldier”; 7 = “Others” |
| Monthly Income          | 1 = “3000 and below”; 2 = “3000–5000”; 3 = “5000–8000”; 4 = “8000–15,000”; 5 = “15,000–30,000” |

4.2.2. Independent Variables

Independent variable I: Community governance service (independent variable G in Table 3). Mainly including Questions 3–5. The principal component analysis method extracts a common factor, “community governance service”, with an eigenvalue of 2.454 (KMO = 0.748, \( p < 0.001 \)), and its variance contribution rate is 81.814%.

Independent variable II: Resident participation in community governance (independent variable P in Table 3). Questions 1, 2, 12 and 13 are included. The principal component analysis is used to extract two common factors with eigenvalues greater than 1: “Willingness to participate in community governance” (Table 3, independent variable P, principal component 1) and “participation in community governance” (Table 3, independent variable P, principal component 2). The cumulative variance contribution rate of the two is 82.484%. According to the variance contribution rate, it is synthesized into “resident participation in community governance” (KMO = 0.630, \( p < 0.001 \)).

Independent variable III: Effect of community education on community governance (Table 3, independent variable E). Questions 9, 10 and 11 are involved. The principal component, “community education promotes community governance” (KMO = 0.755, \( p < 0.001 \)), is extracted by principal component analysis, and its variance contribution rate is 88.852%.

Independent variable IV: Community interpersonal communication (Table 3, independent variable C). Question 8 and Question 14 are designed to test this factor. One principal component, “community interpersonal communication”, is extracted by
principal component analysis (KMO = 0.612, \( p < 0.001 \)), and its variance contribution rate is 88.018%.

4.2.3. Control Variables

In this study, gender, age, years of residence, political status, educational background, occupation and monthly income are taken as control variables to investigate their impact on residents’ satisfaction with community governance. All variables are numbered nominal variables, and the corresponding relationship between the specific attributes and values of variables can be referred to in Tables 2 and 3.

4.3. Regression Analysis Model of Influencing Factors of Residents’ Satisfaction in Community Governance

In this paper, resident satisfaction with community governance is used as a dependent variable, and community governance service, resident participation in community governance, the effect of community education on community governance, and community interpersonal communication are used as independent variables for regression analysis. The variance inflation factor VIF of each explanatory variable is less than 4.6, so there is no multicollinearity among the variables in the model, and its Durbin–Watson coefficient is 1.925, indicating that there is no autocorrelation in the residuals [21]. Model 1 mainly observes the impact of individual-level factors on residents’ satisfaction with community governance. Models 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 examine the impact of each variable on the satisfaction of residents with community governance. Model 6 includes all independent variables and control variables.

4.3.1. The Influence of Individual Factors on Resident Satisfaction with Community Governance

From Model 1, it can be seen that the years of residence and political status have a significant negative impact on residents’ satisfaction with community governance, while other individual-level factors have no significant impact on it. Further investigation and data analysis found that residents with longer living years mostly lived in old communities, and their living environment and governance concepts were relatively weak. As a result, the coefficient was \( -0.003 \). Party members have relatively high levels of satisfaction with community governance and found that grassroots party organizations have played a great role in it, while those without party affiliation and democratic parties are relatively low, and it is found that these people have a relatively high degree of education. The research of relevant scholars also indicates that residents with high educational backgrounds have higher requirements and expectations for community governance [22].

4.3.2. The Influence of Each Independent Variable on Residents’ Satisfaction with Community Governance

Model 2 adds community governance service factors based on Model 1. The results show that community governance services are significantly positively correlated with residents’ satisfaction with community governance (0.317 **), which can explain about 66% of the variation in satisfaction, indicating that the better the community governance service, the higher the residents’ satisfaction with the community governance.

Model 3 adds community governance participation factors based on Model 1. The results show that residents’ satisfaction with community governance is significantly positively correlated (0.366 **), but it can only explain 23.8% of the variation in satisfaction, so community governance participation is not statistically significant here.

Model 4 adds the role of community education based on Model 1. The results show that the integration of community education into community governance has a significant positive correlation (0.319 ***) with residents’ satisfaction with community governance,
and it can explain about 68% of the variation in satisfaction. Therefore, the integration of community education into community governance positively affects residents’ satisfaction with community governance’s greater significance.

Model 5 adds community interpersonal factors to Model 1. The results show that community interpersonal communication factors are significantly positively correlated with resident satisfaction with community governance (0.322 ***), and it can explain nearly 59% of the variation in satisfaction. Therefore, the more harmonious community interpersonal relationships are, the more conducive to improving resident satisfaction.

Model 6 is the full model. The data in Table 4 show that the factors of community governance service, resident participation in community governance, the effect of community education on community governance, and community interpersonal communication are all significantly positively correlated with resident satisfaction of community governance, and they can explain 75% of the variation in satisfaction. Among them, the coefficients of community governance service, community education and community interpersonal communication all exceed 0.1, indicating that these three factors have a greater impact on resident satisfaction in community governance, while community governance participation is relatively weak.

Table 4. Analysis of the Influence Factors of Various Dimensions on Resident Satisfaction with Community Governance.

|                          | Model 1     | Model 2    | Model 3    | Model 4    | Model 5    | Model 6    |
|--------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Years of Residence       | −0.003 *    | −0.004 *** | −0.003 *   | −0.004 *** | −0.003 **  | −0.004 *** |
| Gender                   | −0.037      | 0.030      | −0.058     | −0.042     | 0.012      | 0.003      |
| Age                      | −0.047      | 0.026      | −0.059 **  | 0.010      | 0.019      | 0.026 *    |
| Political Status         | −0.048 *    | −0.002     | 0.030      | 0.006      | −0.020     | 0.009      |
| Educational Background   | −0.012      | 0.004      | −0.019     | 0.013      | 0.009      | 0.011      |
| Occupation               | −0.009      | 0.006      | −0.001     | −0.001     | 0.004      | 0.005      |
| Monthly Income           | 0.029       | 0.004      | 0.069 ***  | 0.009      | 0.023      | 0.013      |
| Community Governance     |             |            |            |            |            |            |
| Services                 | 0.317 ***   |            |            |            |            | 0.133 ***  |
| Resident Participation    |             |            |            |            |            | 0.034 *    |
| The Role of Community    |             |            |            |            |            |            |
| Education                | 0.319 ***   |            |            |            |            | 0.124 ***  |
| Community Interpersonal  |             |            |            |            |            |            |
| Communication            | 0.322 ***   |            |            |            |            | 0.105 ***  |

Note: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001; Model 1: R² = 0.026, ΔR² = 0.020, F = 3.993, sig < 0.001; Model 2: R² = 0.664, ΔR² = 0.661, F = 255.174, sig < 0.001; Model 3: R² = 0.243, ΔR² = 0.238, F = 41.626, sig < 0.001; Model 4: R² = 0.683, ΔR² = 0.681, F = 279.257, sig < 0.001; Model 5: R² = 0.588, ΔR² = 0.585, F = 184.562, sig < 0.001; Model 6: R² = 0.753, ΔR² = 0.751, F = 286.255, sig < 0.001.

5. Conclusions and Countermeasures

5.1. Conclusions

This paper studies residents’ satisfaction with community governance from four dimensions: community governance service, community resident participation, community education and community interpersonal communication. Firstly, through the literature review and in-depth interviews with community staff and residents, teachers in adult schools and community colleges, 18 influencing factors are extracted. Secondly, SPSS is used to conduct a principal component analysis of the questionnaire, which obtained the four dimensions mentioned above and 16 influencing factors. Finally,
regression analysis analyzes the relationship between explanatory and dependent variables. The main conclusions are as follows.

Firstly, community governance service, community education, and community interpersonal communication significantly correlate with residents’ satisfaction with community governance. During the individual interviews, some residents mentioned that “the community now has easy access to medical services, sports venues and educational venues, so they are very satisfied”. High-level community governance services can help improve residents’ satisfaction with community governance. Community education plays a greater role in improving residents’ literacy and participation in community governance and publicizing community governance, thereby promoting resident satisfaction. Harmonious and mutual helping community interpersonal communication can improve residents’ happiness, affect the implementation of specific policies and measures of community governance, and positively affect residents’ satisfaction with community governance.

Secondly, as an independent influencing factor, community governance participation has no significant effect in this study; however, it does not mean that community governance participation is meaningless to resident satisfaction. Under the joint influence of variables, such as community education and community interpersonal communication, community governance participation can significantly affect residents’ satisfaction with community governance. The empirical research of Gao Hong et al. showed that community governance participation has the most significant positive impact on community governance performance among all the influencing factors.

5.2. Countermesures

Based on the above conclusions, the following countermeasures are proposed:

First and foremost, improve the level of community governance services. On the one hand, establish a sound, scientific and reasonable organizational structure for community governance, including community party organization, community development coordination committee, and a resident’s supervision committee. The community party branch should play the role of “axis”, and vertically promote the “community party committee-community party branch-building party group” structure by coordinating the implementation and strengthening of the internal integration capacity of the party organization. Horizontally, the cooperative governance mechanism needs to be improved to mobilize party organizations, community organizations and profit-making organizations to jointly participate in grassroots governance services [23]. On the other hand, they should give full attention to the role of community interpersonal communication and use the grid governance system to promote the implementation of community governance [24]. According to the logic of “one core, one grid, multi-governance and co-operative scenario”, primary, secondary and tertiary grids are divided to further enhance the effectiveness of grassroots governance by taking the grid as the coverage area and the community residents as the central point. Finally, explore integrating party construction work and community governance to improve community governance services so as to further improve the system of grassroots mass self-governance led by grassroots party organizations. For issues of concern to the community and major community affairs, the party organization should take the lead in holding listening and evaluation sessions.

Secondly, mobilize the enthusiasm of residents to participate in community governance. First, establish a mechanism and channel for community party and league members to participate in community governance and service, actively gather the backbone of the community, and make them exert their functions. By setting up party groups and building leaders in a piecemeal manner, “horizontally to the edge and vertically to the bottom” [25], the tentacles of party-residence organizations are further extended to allow party members and group members to play a role in community governance [26]. Secondly, make full use of the advantages of social organizations and
establish an effective path to improve the level of community governance [27]. As a vehicle for residents to participate in community activities, community social organizations promote neighborhood deconfliction and the creation of new customs based on the promotion of collaboration in knowledge and skills among the organization’s members [28]. At the same time, it is necessary to give full access to the positive role of community education in establishing and maintaining social organizations to improve community governance ability and personal literacy of community residents. On the one hand, the integration of various educational resources in the community promotes the organic integration of all levels and types of education; on the other hand, it enhances the sense of participation in residents’ subjects, fosters learning organizations and groups, and builds public learning spaces, so as to give better access to the role of community education work in promoting the process of community governance.

Thirdly, give full access to the function of community education. The first step is to explore participation channels to establish and improve the system and mechanism of community education participation in community governance. The community education co-management model of “party-building-led, government-led and multi-party participation” should be adhered to [29]. A three-tier network of “district-level community colleges-street branches-community teaching points” was supposed to be further established in order to better expand the coverage of community teaching points in the community. The second step is to optimize and expand the contents and forms of community education. In terms of educational content, civic education, education on the rule of law, science education and other learning content that is popular with community residents, can be added. Meanwhile, a scientific evaluation system should be formulated to promote the modernization of community governance and the effectiveness of residents’ participation in community education evaluation. Finally, give access to the leading role of community education. It is necessary to give full access to the resource advantages of community education, provide systematic and characteristic services, guide community residents to pay attention to the key and difficult issues of community governance, mobilize multiple subjects to participate in community governance, to pool their wisdom and strength, improve the level of community governance, and enhance resident satisfaction.

Fourthly, shape a new model of community interaction using the internet as a platform. Given the current weak interpersonal communication among community residents, creating a brand new form of interpersonal communication in small and micro diverse communities in the internet era is significant to form harmonious, friendly and mutually helpful community interpersonal relationships [30]. Then, define neighborhood relations as the basis. In view of the fact that many communities—especially old communities—are “unmanaged”, “unmanageable” and “unpaid”, the current situation is to adopt a “voluntary service + organizational linkage + good neighbor activities” operational mechanism, actively play the role of party members as pioneers, and encourage community residents to participate in the management of daily affairs. This is to achieve the goal of “self-governance to mobilize the masses participating in community affairs, the rule of law to resolve conflicts” in order to smooth the service of “the last meter” for the community masses.

This study also has the following limitations. Firstly, the sample was selected from a more restricted range. Due to the epidemic, the author was unable to reach the communities in other areas to conduct the survey. Therefore, the data collected in this paper has spatial and temporal limitations. Secondly, this paper did not adequately discuss objective environmental differences in communities. As resident satisfaction with community governance may be influenced by the facilities and environmental conditions of the community, future research could collect new data from a large sample of people across the country and test the correlation and causality between the factors that have been generalized by controlling for environmental variables. This could be achieved from...
a quantitative research perspective, with a view to constructing a more generalized model of resident satisfaction with community governance.
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**Appendix A**

**Part I: Basic Information**

Which community do you live in?

A. Lily Community  B. Dagang Community  C. Cuckoo Community  D. Lotus Community  E. Gaotang Community  F. Begonia Community  G. Hongmei Community  H. Lingxiao Community  I. Rose Community  J. Milan Community  K. Sunny Community  L. Tong Wan Community  M. Sunny Community  N. Snow lotus Community  O. Silver Community  P. Winter jasmine Community  Q. Magnolia Community  R. Zhilan Community  T. Bauhinia Community  U. Others………..

For how many years you have lived in this community?

_____ Years

What's your gender?

A. Male  B. Female

What's your age?

A. 0–14  B. +14–45  C. 46–59  D. 60–74  E. 75 and above

Political status?

A. Party member  B. Democratic  C. The masses  D. League members  E. Non-party democrats

Educational background?

A. Junior and below  B. High School  C. College  D. Undergraduate  E. Ms and above

What's your job?

A. Technical job  B. Business, Services  C. Soldier  D. Production personnel  E. Others

Monthly income

A. less than 3000  B. 3 k–5 k  C. 8 k–15 k  D. 15 k–30 k  E. +30.000

**Part II: community governance satisfaction problem**

How often do you participate in community activities?

A. Regularly participate  B. Occasionally participate  C. Neutral  D. seldom participate  E. Never participated

What types of community activities have you participated in before?

A. Lectures on health knowledge  B. Folk customs, festivals and other activities  C. Community school classes  D. Volunteer services  E. Others

Do you understand the work of the neighborhood Committee?

A. Strongly Agree  B. Agree  C. Neutral  D. Disagree  E. Strongly disagree

Do you report problems to the community?
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