PUBLIC CRISIS MANAGEMENT

ChienHsing Lee
National Cheng Kung University, Tainan City, Taiwan.

Abstract: Public crisis management has always been a hot topic studied by Chinese scholars. The connotation, subject, model of public crisis management, and the construction of public crisis management systems and mechanisms are the aspects that scholars have studied more. There are currently two views on the connotation of public crisis management. One view is that crisis management is the management of emergencies, and the other view is that crisis management is the management of the entire process of public crises. In terms of the subject of crisis management, there are three different views; in terms of research on the model of public crisis management, different scholars manage public crises from the perspective of e-government, knowledge management, and collaborative governance; Finally, in terms of the construction of public crisis management systems and mechanisms, current research by Chinese scholars mainly focuses on various aspects of public crisis management.
Keywords: Public crisis; Crisis management; Public crisis management; Crisis management model

1 THE CONNOTATION OF PUBLIC CRISIS MANAGEMENT

From the "SARS" in 2003 to the "Sanlu Milk Powder" in 2008, the "Wenchuan Earthquake" and the "Changsheng Vaccine" in 2018 and other incidents, This shows that public crises exist in various fields of our daily lives such as public health, food safety, and the natural environment. At present, more and more scholars are focusing on the field of public crisis management. This article briefly reviews the literature related to public crisis management in order to grasp the research focus, dynamics and future development trends in the field of public crisis management.

Chinese scholars have two different views on the definition of the connotation of public crisis management. The first view is that the management of emergencies is public crisis management. For example, Du Bagui et al. believe that the so-called public crisis management or government crisis management is how people deal with sudden public events[1]. Tang Jun believes that public crisis management is the measures taken by the government to benefit citizens and the environment after a crisis occurs[2]. Wei Jianing believes that public crisis management is to manage crises so that organizations and individuals can survive the crisis and minimize the damage caused by the crisis[3]. The second view is that public crisis management is a whole-process management, forming a cycle of "prevention-preparation-response-repair". For example, Zhang Chengfu pointed out that public crisis management is a dynamic process. The government responds to potential or existing crises. , taking a series of control activities at different stages of crisis development in order to effectively prevent, handle and eliminate crises[4]. Zhou Yayue believes that public crisis management is when the state formulates and implements a series of management measures and response strategies in a planned and organized manner in order to avoid or mitigate the harm caused by the crisis[5]. Gong Weibin believes that public crisis management is an activity in which public management agencies establish a crisis response mechanism and take a series of necessary measures to prevent and resolve crises, restore social order, and ensure people's normal production and life[6]. Sun Duoyong and others also believe that the so-called public crisis management is the management of all aspects of the crisis before, during and after the crisis[7].

This article agrees with the second view on the connotation of public crisis management. It believes that public crisis management should be a whole-process management, involving multiple aspects of management, including the prevention, response and recovery of public crises.

2 THE MAIN BODY OF PUBLIC CRISIS MANAGEMENT

Who should be the main body of public crisis management? Which organizations should be the main body of public crisis management? This is a key issue in the research on public crisis management in China. Different scholars have put forward different views on who or which organizations should be the main body of public crisis management. In summary, there are three main types: the first is with the government as the main body, and the second is that the government is the main body. The second type is the joint participation of multiple subjects led by the government, and the third type is the collaborative participation of multiple subjects.

2.1 Taking the Government as the Main Body

In the past management process of public crises, the government has become the natural subject of public crisis management. Since the government plays a leading role in all national affairs, the main body of public crisis management is the government. For example, Wang Hui and others believe that public crisis management is a series of crisis relief activities carried out by the government in the face of public crisis events[8]. Xu Li also pointed out that public crisis management can also be called government crisis management, which is the government's management of public crisis events. That is, the management activities carried out by the government in the process of the occurrence and development of public crises in order to reduce or eliminate the harm caused by the crisis to society and the people[9]. Ma Jianzhen believes that public crisis management is a process in which the government, under the guidance of crisis awareness or crisis concepts, collects and analyzes information on possible or already occurring crises[10].

2.2 Led by the Government, Multiple Subjects Jointly Participate

This view holds that in the process of public crisis management, in addition to the government, other social forces must also actively participate, but the government is at the core. Luo Jianping believes that China 's public crisis management should establish a new pattern led by government departments and widely participated by social forces[11]. Xia Meiwu believes that the subject of public crisis management is a complex structure, including government systems, enterprises, citizens and various non-governmental organizations, among which the government is in a dominant position[12].

2.3 Collaborative Participation of Multiple Subjects

This view holds that in the process of public crisis management, the government and all relevant subjects in society have the responsibility to manage public crises, and these subjects are required to jointly manage public crises in the process. For example, Wang Hongwei believes that in a pluralistic co-governance network, the government, enterprises, NGOs, volunteers, and citizens are all stakeholders in crisis management. It is a public crisis response model characterized by coordination, network-centered, and involving multiple subjects[13]. For example, Sha Yongzhong and others believe that public crisis management should carry out collaborative governance, that is, with the support of information technology, social elements such as governments, non-governmental organizations, enterprises, and individual citizens participate in the collaborative process[14]. Zhang Xiaoming believes that the main subjects of public crisis management include government departments, non-governmental departments, private sectors such as enterprises, and even individual citizens[15].

The above three views are different interpretations by Chinese scholars on who should be the subject of public crisis management. The first view is that the government is the only subject of public crisis management; the second view is that there can be many subjects of public crisis management, including the government. , non-governmental organizations, media, citizens, etc., but among these subjects, the government is in a dominant position, and other subjects must obey the government; the third view is somewhat similar to the second view, but not the same , this view holds that the main bodies of public crisis management include governments, non-governmental organizations, media 50 entities, citizens, etc., but there is no distinction between these subjects, their status is equal, and the subjects jointly participate in the management process of public crises.

3 PUBLIC CRISIS MANAGEMENT MODEL

In the process of research on public crisis management, Chinese scholars have been looking for a public crisis management model suitable for China. Scholars mainly explore the model of public crisis management from three perspectives, including exploring the model of public crisis management in China from the perspective of e-government, knowledge management, and collaborative governance.

3.1 The E-Government Perspective

With the advancement of science and technology, the rapid development of the Internet and new media, public crisis management must also adapt to modern development conditions. Therefore, e-government has gradually become an important means for the government to manage public crises. Li Zhiping believes that from the perspective of e-government, the public crisis management model should include three links. The first is in terms of early warning and monitoring systems, which should analyze and evaluate various environmental factors that may lead to crises, and evaluate these Identify and classify the monitored information, and formulate corresponding crisis response plans for possible crises; secondly, in terms of crisis process tracking, the collected crisis information must be analyzed using technical means, and the information must be electronically The government affairs platform is transmitted to the central database of the government crisis management system to provide a basis for crisis handling; thirdly, in terms of crisis decision-making and command, a crisis decision-making organization must be established and relevant databases must be established[16]. Guo Jingtao proposed

the construction of a public crisis early warning and monitoring system, a public crisis status tracking system, a public crisis decision support system, a public crisis command and dispatch system, and a public crisis impact assessment and claims settlement system in the e-government environment, and pointed out that its operating environment must Comply with the requirements of e-government concept[17]. Fang Lei and Zhang Wenqing believe that in the context of e-government, the government's crisis management system should include a security early warning subsystem, a crisis status tracking subsystem, a crisis emergency response subsystem, a crisis impact assessment and a claims subsystem to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the crisis. Management[18].

3.2 Knowledge Management Perspective

Different scholars have proposed models for constructing public crisis management from the perspective of knowledge management. Li Zhihong and others believe that knowledge management can help improve the efficiency of government crisis management. Through knowledge sharing and the use of collective wisdom, the government's adaptability and innovation capabilities can be improved, and a "three-layer" management model for sudden public crises has been formed, which includes the management process level, the management system level and the management organization level[19]. Based on the perspective of knowledge management, Shang Shixiong and others proposed a system model for public crisis management, including four major departments: monitoring and early warning system, prevention and emergency preparedness system, crisis emergency response system, and crisis evaluation and claims settlement system[20].

3.3 Collaborative Governance Perspective

Zhang Lirong et al. discussed the construction of a public crisis management model in the context of synergy and proposed the concept of "public crisis collaborative governance". They believed that the multiple subjects of public crisis management should consciously use modern means such as information technology to The chaotic elements in the public crisis management system are unified to form a state with a stable structure and mutual coordination, so as to prevent and resolve crises, and propose a path to build a public crisis collaborative governance model. The first is to improve the collaborative governance Relevant laws and regulations, the second point is to optimize the rights and responsibilities system of collaborative governance; the third point is to strengthen the resource guarantee of collaborative governance; the fourth point is to build an information platform for collaborative governance; the fifth point is to cultivate social capital for collaborative governance[21]. From the perspective of integration and collaboration, Tong Linjie believes that government public crisis management should enhance the government's public crisis awareness, update governance concepts, improve crisis information management mechanisms, build a governance network with the participation of multiple subjects, integrate and utilize media resources, and improve the organizational structure of public crisis governance. , Improve the legal construction of government crisis management[22].
The construction of the above three public crisis management models is defined from different perspectives. The first one is constructed from the perspective of e-government, which combines public crisis management with the current rapid development of informatization and networking in China. , using data to conduct relevant analysis and predictions to manage public crisis practices; the second is to construct a public crisis management model from the perspective of knowledge management, which can effectively improve the government's public crisis management s efficiency. Through knowledge sharing and the use of collective wisdom, the government can better manage crises; the third is to explore and build a public crisis management model from the perspective of collaborative governance. Collaborative governance by multiple subjects can help improve the level of crisis management..

4 CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC CRISIS MANAGEMENT MECHANISM

Regarding the construction of public crisis management mechanisms, scholars have proposed different contents and countermeasures. Looking at these countermeasures, they can be divided into four interconnected links, including the prevention and pre-control link of crisis management, crisis handling link, crisis aftermath link and crisis recovery link.

4.1 Crisis Prevention and Control

In the process of crisis prevention and pre-control, the first view is that we should start from enhancing crisis awareness. For example, Wang Lefu and others believe that most government departments should have crisis management awareness. If government departments do not have this crisis awareness, then they will not actively discover or collect crisis-related information[23]. Kang Wei proposed that the main strategies for public crisis prevention and control should include cultivating society's crisis awareness, establishing an effective social mobilization and rescue mechanism, and also paying attention to the cultivation of personal psychological quality

and social environment[24]. Pan Pan believes that in terms of crisis prevention, a publicity and education mechanism should be established to establish crisis awareness. Knowledge[25]. The second perspective is to explore the various stages of establishing a crisis early warning mechanism. Zhang Xiaoming proposed that the public crisis early warning mechanism mainly consists of six subsystems: early warning information collection subsystem, early warning information analysis and evaluation subsystem, crisis prediction subsystem, crisis early warning indicator subsystem, crisis alarm subsystem, and crisis early control countermeasure subsystem[26]. Huang Shunkang believes that the key to establishing crisis early warning is to establish an efficient information system including a comprehensive crisis early warning information system, meteorological, earthquake, marine disaster early warning systems and economic crisis early warning systems[27]. Feng Xiying believes that the early warning system should include two parts, the first is the warning part when a crisis comes, and the second is the early warning drill part. The public can judge the strength of the crisis through different colors. Secondly, the government should attach great importance to field exercises of public crisis management and conduct regular exercises for different crisis types in order to improve the ability and level of responding to different crises[28]. The third point of view is to study from the perspective of establishing legal mechanisms and setting up specialized organizational agencies. For example, Tan Weiguo believes that it is necessary to improve the government's preventive mechanism for effectively responding to public crises from several aspects such as establishing specialized organizational agencies and building a legal system[29]. Li Xin believes that building an efficient information early warning system includes improving the information communication mechanism, improving the information command system, strengthening the crisis early warning legal system, and building a reasonable early warning management organization[30].

4.2 Crisis Management

In the crisis management process, Ma Pinzhong proposed the emergency command linkage process and emergency linkage command system. Chen Nan proposed to establish a complete legal system and norms for information disclosure during public crises, establish an independent crisis information release agency, and pay attention to the gradient issue of government information release during public crises[31]. Cai Zhiqiang proposed to mobilize social organizations and the public through social mobilization to cooperate with the government to deal with the crisis[32]. Li Junfang and others believe that mobilizing and arranging various social organizations, economic organizations, the public and public opinion to actively participate in emergency response to public crises, realizing resource integration and collaborative decision-making, and seizing the best opportunity to minimize the disaster caused by the crisis[33]. Wang Ge believes that in order to deal with the crisis, we must first analyze the relevant factors involved in handling the crisis, and make different response measures according to the characteristics of different factors[34].

4.3 Crisis Aftermath

In the aftermath of the crisis, Liu Juan and others mainly proposed from an economic perspective to establish a relevant aftermath fund supervision mechanism, improve the public crisis insurance system, and strengthen post-disaster audit work. At the same time, she also proposed to establish a post-disaster psychological assistance plan. etc[35]. From the perspective of post-disaster compensation, Zhou Haisheng believes that the content of crisis aftermath includes not only compensating the losses caused by the government's mistakes and illegal behaviors in the crisis management process, but also including compensating the losses caused by the government's faultless and legal behaviors in the crisis management. Compensation[36]. From the perspective of punishment, Wang Xuejun believes that the aftermath of a crisis should include punishment of those directly responsible for the crisis. The cause of the crisis should be identified, the nature and responsibility of the accident should be defined, and relevant personnel should be dealt with[37].

4.4 Crisis Recovery

In the crisis recovery process, You Zhibin proposed the basic principles of public crisis recovery, the main participants, the basic steps and strategies of recovery[38]. Zhang Yanyan believes that in terms of crisis recovery, citizen culture should be reshaped, crisis decision-making capabilities should be improved, and the legal mechanism for crisis recovery should be improved[39]. Wu Xingjun proposed that in the crisis recovery process, on the one hand, we should classify and summarize the problems existing in crisis management and propose corresponding improvement measures, so as to accumulate experience and improve the ability to respond to crises. On the other hand, the public crisis management system must be reformed in a timely manner to prevent the occurrence of crises[40].

5 SUMMARY AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

By studying relevant literature on public crisis management, we can find that first of all, scholars have different understandings of the specific connotation of public crisis management. One view is that public crisis management is the management of emergencies, while the other view is that public crisis management is the management of emergencies. Management is the management of the entire process of public crisis; secondly, there are three different views on the subject of public crisis management. The first view is that the government is the subject of public crisis management; the second view is that public crisis management is the main body. Management is managed by multiple subjects, but the government plays a leading role in it. The third view is that public crisis management involves multiple subjects, and the status of multiple subjects in public crisis management is equal. The second and third views that most scholars now agree with are the second and third views; thirdly, different scholars have proposed public crisis management models from different perspectives, namely from the perspective of e-government, The perspective of knowledge management predicts the construction of public crisis management models from the perspective of collaborative governance; finally, scholars pay more attention to the construction of public crisis management systems and mechanisms, including the prevention and pre-control links, crisis handling links, and crisis management of public crisis management. Study on the aftermath and crisis recovery links.

For the subjects of public crisis management, current research is mostly focused on the government, non-governmental organizations, new media, and citizens, and there is less research on other related organizations such as charitable organizations, women's federations, and youth federations; for In the field of public crisis management research, Chinese scholars have done less research on public crisis events in ethnic minority areas and rural areas than on public crisis management in cities. In terms of future research, the author believes that first of all, more relevant research on public crisis management in other social organizations, ethnic minority areas, and rural areas should be strengthened; secondly, China is now in an era of rapid development of information technology, and public crisis management and The use of big data is combined to conduct more targeted and applicable public crisis management through relevant analysis of public crisis event data.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

[1] Du Guigui, Zhang Tao. Correctly understand several relationships in public crisis management. Journal of Northeastern University (Social Science Edition), 2003, (5): 361-363.
[2] Tang Jun. Discussing the innovation of public crisis management from an international perspective. Theoretical Discussion, 2003, (5):82-84.
[3] Wei Jianing. Crisis and Crisis Management. Management World, 1994, (6): 53-59.
[4] Zhang Chengfu. Public Crisis Management: A Comprehensive Integration Model and China's Strategic Choices. Chinese Administration, 2003, (7): 6-11.
[5] Zhou Yayue. On accountability in public crisis management. Journal of Beihang University (Social Science Edition), 2010, 23(6):15-20.
[6] Gong Weibin. The connotation and characteristics of public crisis management. Journal of Southwest University of Political Science and Law, 2004, (3): 7-12.
[7] Sun Duoyong, Lu Yang. Theoretical Development and Practical Issues of Crisis Management. Jiangxi Social Sciences, 2004, (4): 138-143.
[8] Wang Hui, Hong Jin. Analysis of the relationship between public crisis management and credibility. Journal of Beijing Institute of Technology (Social Science Edition), 2008, (5): 93-96.
[9] Xu Li. The rational return of government functions in public crisis management. People's Forum, 2012,(36):26-27.
[10] Ma Jianzhen. A brief analysis of government crisis management. Yangtze River Forum, 2003, (5): 48-51.
[11] Luo Jianping, Xue Xiaoyong. Public crisis management from the perspective of governance theory. Business Times, 2011,(7):97-98.
[12] Xia Meiwu. Positioning and Reshaping of Government's Role in Public Crisis Management. Jianghuai Forum, 2012, (3): 76-80.
[13] Wang Hongwei. Changes in public crisis management models from the perspective of overall national security. Administrative Forum, 2018, 25(4):18-24.
[14] Sha Yongzhong, Xie Zhiyuan. On collaborative governance of public crises. Chinese Administration, 2010, (4): 73-77.
[15] Zhang Xiaoming. Looking at the design of public sector crisis management mechanism from the SARS incident. Journal of University of Science and Technology Beijing (Social Science Edition), 2003, (3): 19-23+35.

[16] Li Zhiping. Research on public crisis management model based on e-government perspective. Association for Science and Technology Forum (second half of the month), 2012, (9): 141-142.

[17] Guo Jingtao. Research on the construction of public crisis management system in ethnic minority areas under the e-government environment. Inner Mongolia Social Sciences (Chinese Edition), 2012, 33(5):101-105.

[18] Fang Lei, Zhang Wenqing. Research on the framework of government crisis management system in e-government environment. Chinese Soft Science, 2004, (4): 45-49.

[19] Li Zhihong, Wang Haiyan. Research on sudden public crisis management model from the perspective of knowledge. Technology Management Research, 2009, 29(10):51-53.

[20] Shang Shixiong, Wang Xuan. Research on government environmental crisis management system based on knowledge management theory. Business Research, 2006,(8):107-110.

[21] Zhang Lirong, Leng Xiangming. Discussion on innovation of public crisis management model in the context of synergy. Chinese Administration, 2007, (10): 100-104.

[22] Tong Linjie. Integration -an innovative approach to government network public crisis management from a collaborative perspective. Journal of Tianshui Institute of Administration, 2016, 17(4):67-70.

[23] Wang Lefu, Ma Jun, Guo Zhenglin. Public sector crisis management system: taking the SARS incident as an example. Chinese Administration, 2003, (7): 23-27.

[24] Kang Wei. Research on public crisis prevention and control management. Academic Communication, 2008, (9): 48-50.

[25] Pan Pan. Analysis of public crisis early warning mechanism based on system theory. Social Scientists, 2010,(8):101-103.

[26] Zhang Xiaoming. Design of public crisis early warning mechanism and construction of indicator system. Chinese Administration, 2006, (7): 14-19.

[27] Huang Shunkang. Research on public crisis early warning mechanism. Journal of Southwest University (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition), 2006, (6): 115-119.

[28] Feng Xiying. Challenges and responses to current public crisis management in China. Fujian Forum (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition), 2012, (1): 159-163.

[29] Tan Weiguo is sharp. The construction of a public crisis prevention mechanism—Taking the government's effective response to the Wenchuan earthquake as the research subject. Hubei Social Sciences, 2009, (7): 25-27.

[30] Li Xin. A brief discussion on the construction of public crisis early warning system. Ningxia Social Sciences, 2011, (6): 36-39.

[31] Ma Pinzhong. Research and development trends of emergency command linkage technology at home and abroad. High Technology and Industrialization, 2004, (11): 48-50.

[32] Cai Zhiqiang. Social participation: an interpretation of the crisis governance paradigm. Journal of the Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, 2006, (6): 108-112.

[33] Li Junfang, Dong Yuan. Research on optimization of public crisis management mechanism during social transformation period. Journal of Lanzhou University (Social Science Edition), 2012, 40(6):115-120.

[34] Wang Ge. Construction of an integrated framework for public crisis management operating mechanisms. Theory and Modernization, 2010, (5): 113-116.

[35] Liu Juan, Liu Tao. Research on the construction of public crisis aftermath management mechanism. Journal of Hebei Northern University (Social Science Edition), 2010, 26(2):55-58.

[36] Zhou Haisheng. Issues of state compensation in the aftermath of public crisis recovery. Journal of Xihua University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2009, 28(3):108-112.

[37] Wang Xuejun. Early warning, response and reconstruction: the construction of contemporary Chinese government crisis management system. Theoretical Exploration, 2004, (4): 81-82.

[38] You Zhibin. Research on recovery management of public safety crises. China Public Security (Academic Edition), 2008, (1): 79-84.

[39] Zhang Yanyan. Research on public crisis recovery management. Business Culture (Academic Edition), 2009, (7): 116-117.

[40] Wu Xingjun. Basic characteristics and mechanism construction of public crisis management. East China Economic Management, 2004, (3): 53-55.