



To cite this document: Poorahmad, A., Piri, E., Mohammadi, Y., Parsa, SH., & Heydari, S. (2018). Good Urban Governance in Urban Neighborhoods (Case Study: Marivan City). *Urban Economics and Management*, 6(4(24)), 497-514.

www.iueam.ir

Indexed in: ISC, EconLit, Econbiz, SID, EZB, GateWay-Bayern, RICeST, Magiran, Civilica, Google Scholar, Noormags, Ensani  
ISSN: 2345-2870

## Good Urban Governance in Urban Neighborhoods (Case: Marivan City)

### Ahmad Poorahmad

Professor, Department of Human Geography, Faculty of Geography, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

### Esmail Piri\*

Master in Urban Planning, Faculty of Social Sciences, Allameh Tabatabaie University, Tehran, Iran

### Yadegar Mohammadi

Master in Social Welfare Planning, Faculty of Social Sciences, Allameh Tabatabaie University, Tehran, Iran

### Shahram Parsa

PhD in Geography and Urban Planning, Faculty of Geography, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

### Saman Heydari

PhD in Geography and Urban Planning, Faculty of Geographical Sciences, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 2017/10/17

Accepted: 2018/06/09

**Abstract:** Good urban governance is one of the concepts that it takes into consideration the general welfare of citizens and its policies and programs are within the framework of specific indicators. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate good urban governance indicators in the central neighborhoods of Marivan city, (1, 2, 4, 14). The data and information of this research were collected in two ways, library and survey, that in the survey method, the questionnaire tool was used that validity and reliability were confirmed by experts in this field. The total sample size was estimated at 380 people using the Cochran formula, the sampling method is non-random and questionnaires were distributed randomly among citizens. SPSS and Excel software were used to analyze the data, and given the normality of the data, ANOVA test was used. Using Tukey's test, the differences between each neighborhood were investigated. The results indicated that in the neighborhoods studied, good urban governance indexes are not in desirable condition. The first and 14<sup>th</sup> neighborhoods do not have a significant difference in terms of accountability, consistency orientation and justice, and in other indices, these two neighborhoods have significant differences with each other. This significant difference is not high due to the difference in the average of the indices studied in both neighborhoods, and it can be said that the status of urban governance indicators in these two neighborhoods, like the two and four neighborhoods, is not in a desirable situation, and all of them are on almost the same level.

**Keywords:** Good Urban Governance, Urban Management, Neighborhood, Marivan

**JEL Classification:** N35, R11, H11, R11

---

\* Corresponding author: asmailpirii@yahoo.com

### 1- Introduction

In the past, urban management had no complex and multidimensional dimensions, so city administration and management was easier compared to now. With the increasing population of urbanization, the new socioeconomic, physical, and environmental challenges of cities have complicated their management. In other words, the increase in urban population caused a huge change in the city that management was not feasible in the traditional way and insisting on continuing the process of traditional management did not cover the interests of all stakeholders and not creating spatial justice. The initial idea of urban management efficiency was seen in components such as serving more capital, industrialization, more labor, and, in general, quantitative increase. However, global experiences, especially those of the World Bank, have shown that these approaches have failed to improve the living environment, and that the environmental, social and economic barriers and, more generally, the spatial barriers of these approaches are more evident. Ultimately, this development process has come to the fore and theories of sustainable development, a humanistic city and good urban governance. It is hoped that the new approaches, especially good urban governance, will be the most effective, least costly and most sustainable way of managing complex systems (Torabi, 2004). The multiplicity of actors and forces influencing urban life at different local, national and regional scales and the necessity of their convergence and alignment in a framework based on regional democracy and spatial justice can be considered as the most important argument for the necessity of establishing a model of urban governance and replacing it with urban governance. A

model that will allow diversification and divergence through the engagement and cooperation of all functional forces and all levels of geography and the replacement of convergence will provide a framework for sustainable and human-centered development of the metropolitan area and an efficient spatial organization in this framework (Kazimyan, 2007).

The concept of management is a decision-making factor, management involves planning, organizing, monitoring and controlling, and all of these factors have interactive relationship (Latifi, 2008). The general purpose of the urban management system is a broad organization consisting of all relevant formal and informal elements that are effective on various social, economic and physical aspects of urban life, with the aim of managing and controlling the immaterial and sustainable development of the city. In this sense, urban management is a kind of open and highly complex human and social systems faced with many diverse elements and relationships. The data of this system are the demands of the government and its citizens and the development of quantitative and qualitative urban life; therefore, urban management includes all urban system, such as physical and functional space (policy-making, planning and implementation) and multilevel (Kazemian, 1997). Urban management is an attempt to coordinate and integrate publicly in order to cope with the major problems that citizens face and for a sustainable and fair, city (Van Dijk & Meine peiter, 2006). One of the most important tasks of urban management is the development and evaluation based on functional and performance indicators periodically and annually (Kerley, 1994). According to the United Nations, good

urban governance has the characteristics of sustainability, equality, effectiveness, transparency and accountability, security, social participation and citizenship. Urban governance is the most appropriate option for urban management to cope with urban poverty and promote sustainable economies in cities (Virtudes, 2016). Governance is a change in the role of local government in providing services, as well as changing local organizations from public administration to political leadership in civil society.

Neighborhoods 1, 2, 4, and 14 were selected for this research. The criteria for choosing these neighborhoods are the indicators in the detailed plan of Marivan city, which can be used to indicate the number of construction classes, the quality of building structures, the life of the building, the strength of the structure, the area of the arena, and Layers of construction masses, street networks and access to neighborhoods, per capita use in neighborhoods, neighborhood facilities and household income, and education (Marivan detailed plan, 1390). In this regard, regarding the city of Marivan, insufficient attention is paid to the issue of urban management, as well as the relationship between urban managers and residents of Marivan city is not desirable; therefore, there is a need for change from urban governance to urban governance. Meanwhile, there is a lack of balanced distribution of facilities and services at the city level, consequently, citizens' inadequate access to facilities and services in the city of Marivan. Hence, the study of urban governance as an effective link between urban management and residents of Marivan city in order to improve their quality of life seems necessary.

In this regard, the main question of this study is how good is the level of good

governance in the neighborhoods of Marivan?

## **2-Literature Review**

### ***a) Foreign Researches***

Popovich (2008) has used three main governance indicators, namely, participation, accountability and transparency in Ukraine. The results indicate that, in view of the Millennium Development Goals in reducing poverty, good governance is effective in reducing rural poverty in Ukraine, and benefiting from good governance indicators is much more appropriate than the current state of poverty reduction.

de Oliveira et al., (2013) did a research titled "green economy and urban governance". The results indicated that if we cannot recognize the relationship between our cities and our local environment with the world, in the long run, the lives of our cities will face problems that will make it hard for the inhabitants of today's cities.

Healey (2015) did a research entitled "Theory of Good City Planning and Governing." In this study, City-related theories, governance, planning interventions, and changing ideas about good city, factors for creating good governance, and governing theories in improving management as well as quality of place were regarded. It has been shown that good urban governance indicators are effective on urban governance.

Virtue des (2016) has devoted a research entitled "Good Governance Principles for Space-Based Planning on a Local Scale." In this research, in addition to addressing the research background, it is to examine the role played by the local government and the weaknesses and strengths.

Gjerde & Sylva (2017) did a research titled "Governance and Recovery: Compare Coping with Recent Disasters in Sri Lanka and New Zealand." In this study, the recovery of the post-earthquake situation in New Zealand 2010 and 2011 has highlighted a great deal of devastation. This research refers to the government structure that guides these two retrievals. The result showed that the effects of natural disasters could potentially complicate life and recovery. The consistency of trends and results in relation to cultural norms and the vital issue of housing are the main issues in these two cases.

#### **b) Iranian Researches**

Kazimian (2004), did his doctoral dissertation titled "Explaining the Relationship between Governance Structure and Urban Power with the Space Organization." The result of the research indicated that achieving a diverse, convergent, efficient and sustainable spatial organization in Tehran's metropolitan area is conditional on establishment of horizontal governing structure, multiplicity, coherent and multiplicity, and this is conditional on the institutions and the relations of balanced power and citizen-orientation.

Taghavi & Tajdar (2009) in a study entitled "An Introduction to on Good Urban Governance in an Analytic Approach" concluded that at present, introducing a good urban governance approach as the most effective, least costly and sustainable management practices. The purpose of the present paper is to investigate and analyze the concepts and principles related to good urban governance and examine a sample of domestic experiences associated with this approach emphasizes that despite the urbanization of some of the problems of

urban management in Iran, the proper explanation, institutionalization and strategic look at the issue of good urban governance helps sustainable urban management speed and it is hoped more cities will be formed.

Tavakoli Nia & Shams Pooya (2017) did a research aimed at explaining the status of local governance in terms of good governance and its relevance to the component of participation. The results of the research showed that the level of local governance components in Darakeh neighborhood is lower than the average level. There is also a significant and direct relationship between the participation and the governance of the local community and its components. Therefore, with the reduction of participation, the privilege of the local community decreases and, on the other hand, the level of participation decreases as well.

Sajadi et al., (2017) DID a research to investigate the role of a competent government in improving the quality of urban environment from residents' point of view and studying the urban environment of Baghe-Ferdows neighborhood. Data collection was done by filling out a questionnaire and face-to-face interview with 374 residents and analyzing the data using SPSS software. Research findings indicate that in the participation index, the willingness to participate in environmental decision-making at the neighborhood level, response index, the authorities' attention to improve the environment of your neighborhood, the effectiveness and efficiency, the impact of the municipality applied programs in reducing the pollution of your place of life, transparency, the amount of information you have about implementing environmental plans and programs in the neighborhood, the

liability index, the level of responsibility of urban managers for the protection of the urban environment, the degree of legal compliance of authorities with local pollutants, justice and equality index, and the level of access to green open spaces and environmental spaces in the neighborhood perpetrators had more loading factors.

Movahed et al., (2014) did a survey of good urban governance carried out in the Tehran 19<sup>th</sup> district neighborhoods. The results of the study showed that, based on the TOPSIS model and statistical tests, only 24% of the neighborhoods had a good governance status. In addition, the findings indicated that according to the T-TEST test, a good urban government variable is lower than the average level of mean, and this shows that in sample neighborhoods, the level of governance is not good enough.

Hikmatnia et al., (2015) studied and analyzed good urban governance in the city of Ilam. In this research, three accountability, responsibility, and regulatory indicators were used. Data were analyzed using SPSS software and one-sample t-test. The valuation of the variables has been done using the Likert scale. The results based on t-test showed that the level of all good governance indicators in Ilam is lower than the average level of Likert scale. Therefore, it can be said that the fourteen districts of Ilam are at an unsatisfactory level regarding these components.

### 3-Theoretical Background

Today, change from state to governance is more than a change in institutional structure. These changes include changes in the style, expression and discourse of the state. There is no longer a presumption

that the government has a monopoly of governance and there is no certainty about the responsibilities of the government and other sectors. The role of the government is not as a provider of public goods, rather the role of a facilitator, which enables local communities to manage their own affairs. Similarly, it is assumed that the legitimacy of the ruling is more than the result of the electoral prerogative of the traditional government, with the direct participation of citizens and stakeholders in the management of activities (Woods, 1995). Therefore, new ideas in the field of urban management suggest that issues such as participatory approach, metropolitan governance and urban strategic management are opposed to focused and top-down approaches for managing partnerships and flexible (Hendriks, 2013). These new urban management approaches use participation and transparency as the main components of their goals, which is a flexible organization of interactions and social activities, the private sector, and urban management (Mc Cann, 2016). As the nature of events in the cities become more complex, their management approach should be changes (Lewis and Mioch, 2005). Good urban governance became a mental retreat in 1994 and a few years later became coercion. In the late 1980s, after a decade of structural economic adjustment policies in many African countries, the World Bank concluded that governance is a key issue in the development strategy of countries whose performance is weak. In other words, the World Bank, in the 1989 studies, found that governance - the way the country's management and administration, or the relationship between citizens and governors - is the central issue of development. Subsequently, at the Second World Conference on

Human Settlements, in 1996, the United Nations adopted its motto “Global Action for Good City Governance” and emphasized that cities in the world would have to move towards the establishment of urban governance (Barakpour, 2006). The concept of governance since the 1980s, it has entered the texts of sociological sociology and local administration, indicating the old subject or content about the relationship between power and society (Tavakoli & Momeni, 2016), and since the introduction of the term “good governance”, there have been many definitions and perceptions (Hataminejad et al., 2015). Good governance is the proper relationship between governors and citizens, aimed at maximizing public welfare, paying attention to the material and spiritual enjoyment of human beings and their material and spiritual satisfaction, meeting the needs, and supporting the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens (Ismailzadeh et al. 2015).

The importance of balancing the needs of today's and future generations through sustainable development has brought about a change in the approach in urban management and urban services delivery. This change of approach has led to the introduction of concepts such as good urban governance, which has been proposed as the most efficient and effective way of managing modern cities. This approach to urban governance is based on sustainable and democratic development, to influence all actors in urban management as well as to meet all the needs of citizens. Theoretical model is a good rule and especially good urban governance in an attempt to formulate best practices in urban management and management. In fact, good urban governance is the impact of all urban actors on the management of

the city, to meet public services, the general needs of citizens, and to balance the needs of the current and future generations (Shakeri, 2014). Proper governance is necessary to achieve sustainable development in the territory of each land (Sharifzade et al., 2017). This new approach to manage human societies in developing countries can be very promising and may lead to dramatic changes in the discussion of factors such as organizational-institutional corruption, education and communication with people, the empowerment of strategic policies through participation in these areas. (Alizadeh et al., 2015). In the development literature, there is a close relationship between good governance and sustainable development, which is so important at the various national and local levels. (Frank et al., 2013). Achieving a city with high quality of life where the facilities and needs of citizens are provided depends on the realization of a good urban governance model that provides consensus, legitimacy and effectiveness of decisions, and the participation of citizens in city decision making and administration. Hence, good governance is a model for the optimal use of resources and authority in order to achieve the goals of sustainable development; an development that ensures the realization of justice, order, security and health of the individual and society, and optimal protection from the sources of biological resources, along with prosperity, the growth and prosperity of the talents and capabilities of the community and the environmental capabilities. Hence, good governance is a prerequisite for sustainable development (Mohammadpour Zarandi & Tabatabaei Mozdabadi, 2017). Good urban governance should not only be in line with the sustainability index in the city, but also

must lead to fair and transparent decision-making processes (Jose & Others, 2013). The government plays a good role in promoting good governance. A government that claims to have a good government will win more confidence from the stakeholders and create an appropriate business and organizational culture (Sukmadilaga et al., 2015). According to Faludi, the distinction between content theories and theories cannot be summed up only in theoretical discussions, but it reflects two types of completely different issues faced by planners and urban managers. One kind of thing is land management, neighborhoods, and traffic flows that make up planning content. The other type is the issues that are related to the planners, their organization and method of work. In his opinion, these issues are more fundamental and, at the same time, more general than issues that are considered as issues of planning content. As long as these issues are not resolved in some way, even the purest content theory will not be fruitful. He says that while both theories are necessary for effective planning, planners should see the practical theory as the cover or content of the content theory, and not vice versa. Thus, the distinction between procedure and content, although largely in the field of planning theories, is also valuable in terms of practical issues in terms of helping to differentiate issues and challenges, prioritize and identify appropriate solutions.

**Content Theory:** Issues and problems such as informal settlements, unofficial city development, inappropriate urban services, and lack of health can be categorized as thematic and content issues of the city. In addition, most of the issues

and problems that are categorized by municipalities are included in this category.

**Practice Theories:** This relates to issues to city planning and administration, although they are intangible and hidden, are more important and more fundamental than urban content issues because they create or exacerbate content issues. Among these challenges are the weak institutional capacity of cities, the dislocation of the city's various departments, the lack of incentives and initiatives to create essential changes in the city, resist the transformation and inappropriate relations between the government and local and urban administrations. Any major changes in the city and the reduction of its thematic issues are subject to major reforms in urban planning and management systems and approaches (Barakpour, 2002).

#### 4- Research Method

In this research, data were collected in a documentary and survey form. In the documentary mode, the indicators were extracted and these indicators were arranged in the form of a questionnaire and finally, a questionnaire of 20 items based on five-point Likert scale was distributed among the sample population. The statistical population of the present study consists of residents of neighborhoods 1, 2, 4, 14 from the district1 of Marivan city. In total, according to the detailed plan of Marivan in 2011, there are 3,017 people (detailed plan of Marivan, 2011). Using the Cochran formula, the total volume of samples was estimated at 380 people. Sample was selected using simple and easy sampling method. The questionnaires were distributed among them by neighborhood and proportional to the population of neighborhoods; neighborhood 1 with population of 3213,

neighborhood 2 with population of 4483, neighborhood 4 with population of 9227, neighborhood 14 with a population of 13194. Finally, in the neighborhood one 41 questionnaires, the neighborhood 2, 57 questionnaires, neighborhood 4, 116 questionnaires and neighborhood 14, 166 questionnaires were distributed. Finally, a neighborhood 41 questionnaire; neighborhood 57; a quadrant of four; 116 questionnaires; a quarter of the 166 questionnaires) were distributed.

The criterion for the selection of neighborhoods 1, 2, 4 and 14 for this research is the indicators in the detailed plan of Marivan city, including indicators of the number of building floors, the quality of construction, the age of the building, the strength of the construction structure, the area of the arena and the land of the masses, passages and access to neighborhoods, per capita use in neighborhoods, neighborhood facilities and equipment, average household income and education (Detailed Plan of Marivan, 2011).

Neighborhoods are located in the central core of Marivan. Neighborhoods 4 and 14 have a well-planned, physically new structure and their inhabitants have a better socioeconomic base. In contrast, neighborhoods 1 and 2 have unplanned textures and structurally exhausted and

their inhabitants have lower socioeconomic status. Therefore, the neighborhoods were selected in this research.

In this research, the content validity index has been used to measure the validity of the questionnaire. Therefore, in order to calculate this index, expert opinions on the content of the test are used. Accordingly, the questions of good urban governance index were evaluated by fifteen experts. Before distributing the questionnaire, its validity and reliability were measured in different ways. The minimum amount of content validity ratio (CVR) should be 49% according to the number of specialists, which according to the content validity ratio formula is 55% for the present questionnaire, which suggests that from the experts' point of view the content of the questionnaire can help us achieve our goal. Table 1 summarizes the results of this test. Moreover, in order to measure the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach Alpha has been used. The mean of the calculated alpha is 72% for the sum of the indicators of good urban governance index, which indicates the high reliability of the questionnaire items and the internal correlation of the questions to measure the variables. The results of this test are shown in Table 3.

**Table1. CVR for good urban governance index**

| Variable | Citizenship Participation | Effectiveness and Efficiency | Accountability | Responsibility | Transparency | Legitimacy | Agreed orientation | Equity | Strategic Insight | Decentralization | Mean |
|----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------|------------------|------|
| CVR      | 0.51                      | 0.62                         | 0.55           | 0.49           | 0.59         | 0.64       | 0.57               | 0.50   | 0.53              | 0.55             | 0.55 |

**Table2. Alpha value for good urban governance index**

| Variable | Citizenship Participation | Effectiveness and Efficiency | Accountability | Responsibility | Transparency | Legitimacy | Agreed orientation | Equity | Strategic Insight | Decentralization | Mean |
|----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------|------------------|------|
| Alpha    | 0.67                      | 0.72                         | 0.78           | 0.69           | 0.71         | 0.70       | 0.72               | 0.76   | 0.77              | 0.71             | 0.72 |

In Table 2, the indicators are briefly reviewed. In this research, Delphi method has been used to identify good urban governance indicators. In this method, first, components and indices were extracted from internal and external sources, and the experts got their views and their views were received. In the next step, after applying the amendments, to

confirm finally, determining the weight and significance of each of the dimensions and indicators, the views of the group were again retrieved in the form of a questionnaire. Finally, the components and related items were formulated for assessing good urban governance in Marivan city.

**Table3. Principles of good urban governance**

| Index (principles)           | Definition of Indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Citizen participation        | Citizen participation is the main focus of good urban governance. Partnership requires organizing. This refers to the freedom to form an organization and freedom of expression on the one hand and organized civil society on the other.                                                                                            |
| Effectiveness and efficiency | Good governance implies that processes and institutions deliver results that meet the needs of the community and exploit the best of resources. The concept of efficiency in good governance means sustainable use of natural resources and environmental protection.                                                                |
| Receptive and responsive     | Reception and accountability means accepting the demands of the city's stakeholders with open arms and giving them an appropriate response. Not only governmental institutions, but also the private sector and civil society organizations should also be responsible for the public.                                               |
| responsibility               | This criterion is based on being responsible and, in other words, a more cautious, account of the return of officials and decision-makers to citizens. Therefore, mechanisms for responding to the authorities are necessary.                                                                                                        |
| Transparency                 | The opposite is secrecy in decision-making. Concealment increases the risk of corruption in decision making, while transparency prevents it from spreading. This criterion is the free return of information and ease of access to it, the clarity of actions and the continuous awareness of citizens of existing trends.           |
| Lawfulness                   | The rule of law in urban decision making, the existence of effective laws, fair observance of the legal framework in decision making and the inability of the hands of irresponsible individuals to make decisions. Adherence to the law requires citizens to be aware of the law as well as respect for the law by the authorities. |
| Agreed orientation           | City is the arena of different groups and interests, and sometimes contradicts each other. Agreed orientation means adjustment and an agreement between various interests. This requires joint communication and collaboration between government organizations, citizens and NGOs.                                                  |
| Justice                      | In terms of justice, creating opportunities for all citizens to improve their welfare status and strive to allocate resources equitably, and the participation of disadvantaged groups in making comments and decisions.                                                                                                             |
| Strategic insights           | Going over every day urban life requires a broad, long-term vision of the future or a strategic vision for urban development.                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Decentralization             | Assigning authority to various organizations and centers and the competence of local institutions to carry out tasks is emphasized. Decentralization is based on the principle of "passing responsibility to a low level".                                                                                                           |

Source: (Taghvayi & Tajdar, 2009; Meshkini & Moazzen, 2014)


### Introducing the study area

The city of Marivan is located in 125 kilometers west of Sanandaj. Marivan has an easterly longitude between 45 minutes and 46 degrees and a minimum of 58

minutes and 45 degrees, and latitude of 48 minutes and 35 degrees, and a minimum of 19 minutes and 35 degrees Greenwich poles, at a height of 1320 meters above sea level. Marivan is

located from the north to Saghez, from the northeast to Divandareh, from the east to Sanandaj, from the south-east to Sarvabad, from the northwest to the valley of Shlir, and from the west to Panjwin, the city of Sulaymaniyah, Iraq,

with a 100-kilometer common border. Marivan is also the third most populous city in the country with a population of 92,993 people in 2006 and 110,464 in 2011.



**Fig1. Location of the study area**

**Source: (Detailed plan of the city of Marivan, 2011)**

Table 4 lists the population of each of the surveyed neighborhoods.

**Table4. Population of the Neighborhoods (Detailed Plan of Marivan City, 2011)**

| Neighborhoods   | Population |
|-----------------|------------|
| Neighborhoods 1 | 3213       |
| Neighborhoods 2 | 4483       |
| Neighborhoods 2 | 9227       |
| Neighborhoods 4 | 13194      |

## 5- Results

Before analyzing the data of the questionnaire and the research hypotheses, it should be considered whether the data is normal distribution. If the distribution of data is normal, parametric tests are used and if the data are non-normal, then nonparametric tests are used. As a result, by using the Smimov-Kolmogorov method,

we obtain the normal data. As shown in Table 5, if the value obtained is smaller than the approximate value of the test, the test is significant and the data are not normal distribution.

As a result, Kolmogorov-Smirnov is significant for good urban governance scores; therefore, the variables of the good urban governance indicators have a

normal distribution and parametric analyzes, one way ANOVA, can be used to examine

the difference between neighborhoods 1, 2, 4, 14, Marivan city.

**Table5. Examination of Kolmogorov-Smirnov for good urban governance index variables**

| variable | Citizenship Participation | Effectiveness and Efficiency | Accountability | Responsibility | Transparency | Legitimacy | Agreed orientation | Equity | Strategic Insight | Decentralization |
|----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------|------------------|
| Mean     | 1.46                      | 1.93                         | 1.67           | 1.32           | 1.21         | 1.73       | 1.12               | 2.41   | 1.99              | 1.81             |
| SD       | 1.707                     | 0.923                        | 1.162          | 1.428          | 1.623        | 0.826      | 1.153              | 1.81   | 1.953             | 0.981            |
| Z score  | 0.679                     | 0.798                        | 0.849          | 0.400          | 0.426        | 0.634      | 0.289              | 0.333  | 0.523             | 0.963            |
| Sig      | 0.000                     | 0.000                        | 0.000          | 0.000          | 0.000        | 0.000      | 0.000              | 0.000  | 0.000             | 0.000            |

Subsequently, the questionnaires were distributed in the study area's neighborhoods, the results of which are shown in Table 6. According to the results of Table 6, in the Marivan neighborhood 1, justice and lawfulness indicators are in the worst conditions. In contrast, citizen participation index, is better than other indicators. Therefore, it can be said that the average of all indicators is less than the average of 3 and good urban governance in this neighborhood is not in the desirable situation. In Neighborhood 2 of Marivan, the indicators of justice and legality are in the worst conditions. In contrast, transparency index is better than other indicators. Therefore, it can be said that the average of all urban governance indicators in the neighborhood 2 of Marivan, as neighborhoods 1, is less than the average of 3, and the good urban governance in this neighborhood is not well. In Neighborhood 4 of Marivan, the index of justice is in the worst position.

In contrast, acceptability and accountability index is in a better position than others are. Therefore, it can be said that the average of all urban governance indicators in the neighborhood four of Marivan, such as the first and second ones, is less than the average of 3, and the good urban governance in this neighborhood is not well. In Neighborhood 14 of Marivan, the effectiveness and efficiency index is in the worst case while transparency index is in a better situation compared to other indicators. Therefore, it can be said that the average of all urban governance indicators in the neighborhood 14 of Marivan, such as neighborhoods 1, 2 and 4, is less than the average of 3, and the good urban governance in this neighborhood is less than the normal average (3). In detail, the average value and standard deviation of each of the good urban governance indicators in the areas covered is shown in Table 6.

**Table6. Good urban governance indicators in the surveyed neighborhoods**

| Neighborhoods   | Indicators | Citizenship Participation | Effectiveness and Efficiency | Accountability | Responsibility | Transparency | Legitimacy | Agreed orientation | Equity | Strategic Insight | Decentralization |
|-----------------|------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------|------------------|
| Neighborhood 1  | Mean       | 2.77                      | 2                            | 2.23           | 1.25           | 2.01         | 1.10       | 1.19               | 1.03   | 2.18              | 2.43             |
|                 | SD         | 0.87                      | 0.63                         | 0.73           | 0.39           | 0.63         | 0.34       | 0.37               | 0.32   | 0.68              | 0.76             |
| Neighborhood 2  | Mean       | 2                         | 1.77                         | 1.98           | 1.20           | 2.22         | 1          | 1.06               | 1      | 1.90              | 2                |
|                 | SD         | 0.63                      | 0.55                         | 0.62           | 0.37           | 0.70         | 0.44       | 0.33               | 0.44   | 0.60              | 0.63             |
| Neighborhood 4  | Mean       | 1.65                      | 1.44                         | 2              | 1.23           | 1.78         | 1.20       | 1.01               | 1      | 2.10              | 1.73             |
|                 | SD         | 0.52                      | 0.45                         | 0.63           | 0.38           | 0.56         | 0.37       | 0.31               | 0.31   | 0.66              | 0.54             |
| Neighborhood 14 | Mean       | 1.03                      | 1                            | 1.50           | 1.43           | 1.60         | 1.08       | 1.20               | 1.09   | 1.01              | 1.49             |
|                 | SD         | 0.32                      | 0.31                         | 0.47           | 0.45           | 0.50         | 0.34       | 0.37               | 0.34   | 0.31              | 0.47             |

**Table7. Levine test to measure the equality of variances**

| sig   | Df1 | Df2 | Levine statistic |
|-------|-----|-----|------------------|
| 0.513 | 3   | 376 | 0.682            |

The table above relates to the equality of variances of the groups. Given that the obtained value of sig= 0.514 greater than 0.05; therefore, it can be concluded that the variance of the samples is equal, and

the condition for the use of equality tests of variances is established. One-way ANOVA test was used to examine the differences between the indices and the results are shown in Table 8.

**Table8. Analysis of one-way variance of good urban governance index**

| group      | Sum squared | Degrees of freedom | Average squares | F     | Significance level |
|------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Intergroup | 20727       | 3                  | 7909            | 97.64 | 0.000              |
| Intergroup | 30321       | 376                | 81              |       |                    |
| Total      | 6048        | 379                |                 |       |                    |

Considering the significance level in Table 7, since the obtained value is less than 5%, it is clear that there is a significant difference between the groups, but for examining the minor and exact

differences between the groups and which of the neighborhoods have significant differences; the equality test of variances, Duncan test was used. Table 8 shows the results of Duncan test.

**Table9. Duncan test results**

| Sig   | Standard deviation | Average | Group |
|-------|--------------------|---------|-------|
| 0.023 | 2.87               | 25.6    | 1     |
| 0.910 | 0.31               | 16.8    | 2     |
| 0.257 | 2.56               | 19.5    | 4     |
| 0.043 | 2.91               | 4.6     | 14    |

Considering the results of Duncan test and the significance level of each of the good urban governance indicators in Marivan neighborhoods 1, 2, 4, 14 and the significance level obtained for each of the dimensions of the mentioned index, we can say that the neighborhoods 1 and 14 according to their significance level, which is less than 5%, have a significant

difference in good urban governance indices. Thus, according to Duncan's results, there is a significant difference between neighborhoods 1 and 14. Therefore, with the help of independent t-test, the two domains have the same differences in each of the variables of a good urban governance index. The results of this test are shown in Table 9.

**Table10. Independent T-test results for neighborhoods 1 and 14**

| Variable \ Test              | T statistic | Mean difference | Sig   | Bounds level difference 95% |           |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------------------|-----------|
|                              |             |                 |       | High bound                  | Low bound |
| Citizenship Participation    | 1.6         | -1.74           | 0.000 | 0.2598                      | 0.0456    |
| Effectiveness and Efficiency | 1.02        | -1              | 0.000 | 0.2345                      | 0.0428    |
| Accountability               | 0.34        | -0.73           | 0.000 | 0.2583                      | 0.0418    |
| Responsibility               | 0.54        | 0.18            | 0.274 | 0.2462                      | -0.0387   |
| Transparency                 | 0.27        | -0.41           | 0.000 | 0.2573                      | 0.0437    |
| Legitimacy                   | 0.16        | -0.02           | 0.000 | 0.2588                      | 0.0411    |
| Agreed orientation           | 0.09        | 0.01            | 0.118 | 0.2567                      | -0.0389   |
| Equity                       | 0.08        | 0.06            | 0.297 | 0.2598                      | -0.0432   |
| Strategic Insight            | 0.89        | -1.17           | 0.000 | 0.2598                      | 0.0417    |
| Decentralization             | 0.73        | 0.94            | 0.000 | 0.2444                      | 0.0448    |

The significance level in the results of Table 9 shows that with respect to the upper and lower boundaries, because the values obtained in both upper and lower bounds are positive, the mean of good urban governance parameters in neighborhood 1 is larger than that of neighborhood 14. Thus, there is a significant difference in the components of governance between the two neighborhoods. Although the negative values in the table above indicate that, the neighborhoods one and fourteen are not significantly different in the indicators of accountability, consistency orientation and justice. In other indicators, these two neighborhoods have a significant difference. This significant difference is due to the difference average of the indicators

surveyed in both neighborhoods is not high, and it can be said that the status of urban governance indicators in these two neighborhoods is not like the neighborhoods of two and four, and they are all in almost the same level.

## 6- Conclusion and Discussion

Urban population growth and urbanization have led to the development of uncontrolled urban areas, the reduction of human well-being, suburban areas, and the emergence of many problems for various cities, especially in developing countries, and the set of these factors has caused concerns for urban planners and politicians, caused managers, urban planners, as well as politicians to enter this field and ask for the cause. Therefore, in the first step,

understanding the environment and the need to deal with the pressures of environmental variables, regardless of the issue of gaining competitive advantage, is imperative that strongly influenced the type of decision-making and performance of managers. This requirement is of considerable importance to urban executives because the lack of attention to the status of each of the influential variables leads to inclusive issues such as poverty, unemployment, inflation, environmental pollution, infrastructure destruction, conflict and anomalies, etc. in the urban environment. Therefore, it can be said that urban management can seek to create a better, more favorable, healthy, easier, more efficient and pleasant environment for all urban residents. During the last several decades, various approaches have been proposed in the field of urban management that good urban governance is one of the most prominent of them. This model is currently considered in international forums and circles to be the best way out of the impasse of poverty and underdevelopment of cities. Poverty, informal sector, lack of access to urban services, illegal settlements and the deterioration of the quality of the environment in cities led to the emergence of a good governance approach. In developing countries, rapid urbanization and traditional management in these countries have created unfavorable conditions in the cities, which inevitably necessitated the strengthening of local governments and the participation of other actors from the public and private sectors in the administration of city affairs. One of the main problems of traditional management practices is that citizens and stakeholders in the city area are not aware of the center of decision-

making and of managers, and this lack of knowledge makes manager's programs and policies not be accepted by citizens, and ignored with the lowest effectiveness and efficacy. In good urban governance management approach, this issue has been well recognized and citizens and stakeholders' rights in urban management have been considered, so that all urban policies and plans are put together during the pre-implementation and prioritization, and ultimately endorsed by their outflow. The result of the research showed that in neighborhood 1, the average of all indices is below 3, which is lower than the normal mean. Among these indicators, citizens' participation with the mean of 2.77 has the highest average and justice with 1.03 has the lowest average. In Neighborhood 2, the average of all indicators is below 3, the mean of the standard. Among these indicators, legality and justice with the mean of 1 have the lowest mean, and transparency index with the mean of 2.22 has the highest average.

In Neighborhood 4, the average of all criteria is below the mean of the criterion, namely, the number 3 and among them the strategic vision criterion with the mean of 2.10 has the highest mean and the agreement orientation index with the mean of 1.01 has the lowest average. In the neighborhood 14, the average of all indices is below the average of the criterion of 3, and the transparency index with the mean of 1.60 has the highest mean, and the index of effectiveness and efficiency with the mean of 1 has the lowest average. The result of Levine test showed that the variance of the samples is equal, and the condition to use equality tests of variances is established. In one-way ANOVA analysis of variance analysis, there was a significant difference between

the groups. The result of Duncan test indicates that neighborhoods 1 and 14, with a significant level of less than 5%, have a significant difference in good urban governance indices. However, urban management in Iran faces major constraints and challenges. On the one hand, these restrictions are associated with the growth of urban population (absolute and relative) and the rise of urbanization, and on the other hand, it faces the traditional structure of local institutions that are still not prepared for structural change. In this regard, the results of researches conducted in the city of Iran in the area of good urban governance (Peshizkar & Kazemian, 2005; Esmailzadeh & Sarrafi, 2006; Daghabi & Rasoul Tajdar, 2009; Abbas Akhundi and Naser Barakpour, 2010; Darban Astan & Rezvani, 2012; Ebrahimzadeh & Asadian, 2013; Meshkini & Moazen, 2015) indicate that the management conditions governing the cities of Iran and the non-flexible structure of traditional management have not yet allowed this management model. Confirming these studies, the present study was conducted in the middle of the city of Marivan and the results showed that good urban governance indicators are not in good condition and there is still a traditional model and non-participatory management. It should be noted that the most important obstacle to the urban management model is the centralized structure of policy making, decision-making and planning that does not allow citizens and stakeholders to involve in the administration of urban affairs. Urban good governance approach is proposed as a conceptual framework for modifying and directing interactive processes versus urban governance approach at various levels related to cities. Considering the increasing amount

of complexity of urban management problems in developing countries, including Iran, is increasing day by day, the application of the principles of good urban governance is an undeniable necessity for the future prospect of city management. Components such as citizen participation, effectiveness and efficiency, acceptance and accountability, responsibility, transparency, legitimacy, consensus orientation, justice, strategic vision and decentralization can change the non-flexible and inefficient structure of current urban management in the interest of all the beneficiaries reside in the city. Despite the widespread political, economic, social and technological changes in the country and, consequently, increasing the level of public awareness and public knowledge, the state of the city administration in Iran has not changed much and goes on the same style. The major part of this leak and in concentration is due to the centralized structure of the country and hence urban management. Therefore, despite the institutionalization and urbanization of urban management problems in Iran, the feasibility of the principles of good urban governance seems somewhat difficult. In this top-down structure, without identifying the social, economic, environmental and physical potential of a specific region and considering the interests of stakeholders in this area, urban managers make policies and plans for these areas behind closed doors. It is clear that the effectiveness and efficiency of such policies will be minimized. In the current approach to the cities of Iran, known as urban governance approach, urban managers who are representatives of the central government in the city consider themselves citizens' lawyers and would like their policies and plans

without the slightest involvement with the stakeholders. The result of this type of urban management is the elimination of stakeholders in the decision making process, which has significant consequences for the city and its citizens. In other words, the citizens and the stakeholders that the city belongs to them and should be built and developed in order to create a sense of belonging to the city among them, as if they were displaced people who convicted to reside in their homes.

The results of this research showed that the surveyed neighborhoods in the city of Marivan are in an undesirable situation regarding good urban governance indicators, and still there is a long way to reach the desired status in these indices. Therefore, in order to achieve this, the following suggestions are made

- Creating a platform for sustainable citizen participation in all matters that somehow relate to the citizens' lives and city

- Taking actions by managers who have the maximum efficiency and effectiveness, and avoiding things that are causing the city lose its funds and assets

Creating a platform where officials and managers are responsible and accountable for the things they are doing, so residents and civil society actors should follow the work of managers and officials

- Increasing public spaces for the presence of more and more citizens and strengthening the public sphere within the scope of the study

Creating conditions where managers' activities are completely transparent and people are aware of the activities of the authorities and follow up their affairs

- Creating a suitable environment for educating citizens and promoting a culture of citizenship among them

- Efforts to bring justice and equality in order to make residents more accessible to the services and facilities available in the city and to avoid concentrating services in one area

- Providing an appropriate context for supervising the public sector on the activities of various organs in the administration of city affairs

- Having strategic and long-term vision of city managers for the future of the city and citizens

## 7-Resources

- Adegbite Emmanuel. (2014). Good corporate governance in Nigeria: Antecedents, propositions and peculiarities, *International Business Review*.
- Adinehvand, A., & Aliyan, M. (2016). Good urban governance in Iran: prioritizing components and references, *Strategy*, 25(81), 305-338. (In Persian).
- Akhundi, A., & Barakpoor, N. (2010). Strategies for the establishment of a governing system in the metropolitan area of Tehran, *strategy*, 19(57), 297-324. (In Persian).
- Alizadeh, H., Nemati, M., Rezayi, K. (2015). An Analysis of Good Urban Governance Criteria Using Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process, *Urban and Regional Researches*, 6(24), 105-128. (In Persian).
- Barakpoor, N. (2002). Transition from Urban Governance to Urban Sovereignty in Iran, Ph.D. thesis of urbanization, University of Tehran. (In Persian).
- Barakpoor, N. (2006). Urban Governance and City Administration in Iran, *Conference on Urban Planning and Management*. (In Persian).
- Bartlett, W., & Popovski, V. (2013). Local governance and social cohesion, *Seventh Work Programme*.
- Buizer, M., & Van Herzele, A. (2012). Combining deliberative governance theory and discourse analysis to understand

- the deliberative incompleteness of centrally formulated plans. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 16, 93-101.
- DarbanAstaneh, A., & Rezvani, M. (2012). Explaining Effective Factors on Rural Governance in Local Governments, Case Study: Qazvin. *Journal of Urban Management*, 10(29), 179-197. (In Persian).
- de Oliveira, J. A. P., Doll, C. N., Balaban, O., Jiang, P., Dreyfus, M., Suwa, A., ... & Dirgahayani, P. (2013). Green economy and governance in cities: assessing good governance in key urban economic processes. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 58, 138-152.
- DE Oliveira, J., Doll, C., & Balaban, O. (2013). Green economy and governance in cities: assessing good governance in Key urban economic processes, *Journal of Cleaner production*, 58, 138-152.
- Ebrahimzadeh, I., & Asadiyan, M. (2013). Analysis and assessment of the degree of realization of good urban governance in Iran, case study: Kashmar, *Regional-urban land use planning*, 3(6), 17-29. (In Persian).
- Esmailzadeh, H., & Sarrafi, M. (2006). Good Governance Status of Urban Planning of Tehran Metro Project, *Humanities*, 10(48), 1-28. (In Persian).
- Esmailzadeh, H., Koozegar, L., Aliyan, M., & Adinehvand, A. (2015). Meta-analytical research of urban governance in Iran, *Spatial planning*, 20(2), 1-40. (In Persian).
- Esmali, A. (2012). A Study of resources and constraints of good urban governance in Tabriz metropolitan area, Master thesis of urban management, Allameh Tabatabaei University. (In Persian).
- Frank, M. et al. (2013). Social capital and governance for sustainable rural development, *Studies in Agricultural Economics*, pp 104-110.
- Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watts, M., & Whatmore, S. (Eds.). (2011). the dictionary of human geography. John Wiley & Sons.
- Halsall, J.P. (2012). Community Governance Where did it go Wrong. *JOAAG*, 7(2), 1-8.
- Hataminejad, H., Sharifzadeh, E., & Sheykhi, A. (2015). Assessment of good governance in the sustainability of urban neighborhoods of Piranshahr. *Journal of Sustainable City*, 2(2), 105-126. (In Persian).
- Hendriks, F. (2013). Understanding good urban governance, essentials, shifts and values, *Urban Affairs Review*, 50: 553-576.
- John, P. (2001). Local governance in Western Europe. Sage.
- Jose A. puppim de Oliveira, Christopher N.H. Doll & Osman Balaban. (2013). Green economy and governance in cities: assessing good governance in Key urban economic Processes, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, No. 58, PP: 138-152.
- Kazemiyani, Gh. (2007). An Introduction to Urban governance Models, *Urban Planning*, 6(19-20), 5-7. (In Persian).
- Kerley, R. (1994). Managing Finance. In *Managing in Local Government* (pp. 85-106). Macmillan Education UK.
- Khalid Zaman. (2015). Quality guidelines for good governance in higher education across the globe" *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences* 1 (2015) 1-7.
- Latifi, Gh. (2008). Urban Management, Publications of the Organization of Municipalities of the country, Tehran. (In Persian).
- Lewis, D., & Mioch, J. (2005). Urban Vulnerability and Good Governance 1. *Journal of contingencies and crisis management*, 13(2), 50-53.
- Mallik, V. (2013). *Local and community governance for peace and development in Nepal*. Deutsches Institut fur Entwicklungspolitik.
- Mattingly, M. (1994). Meaning of urban management. *Cities*, 11(3), 201-205.
- Mc Cann, E. (2016). Governing urbanism: urban government studies 1,2 and beyond, *Urban Studies*, 54, 312-326.
- Meshkini, A., & Moazen, Sh. (2015). Urban Demographic Governance Analysis in City Sustainability Case Study: Ajab

- Shir City, *Journal of Environmental Planning*, 8(2), 99-131. (In Persian).
- Peris, J., Acebillo-Baqué, M., & Calabuig, C. (2011). Scrutinizing the link between participatory governance and urban environment management. The experience in Arequipa during 2003–2006. *Habitat international*, 35(1), 84-92.
- Poormohamadi, M., Hosseinzadeh, K., & Piri, I. (2011). Good Urban Governance based on Social Capital: An Examination of Institutional Order-Spatial Communication and Non-Economic Feasibility, A Case Study: Tabriz Metropolis, *Geographical studies of arid regions*, 1(1), 35-52. (In Persian).
- Popovych, O. (2008). *Good Governance and Policy Addressing Poverty Alleviation in Ukraine* (Master's thesis, University of Twente).
- Rakodi, C. (2003). Politics and performance: the implications of emerging governance arrangements for urban management approaches and information systems. *Habitat International*, 27(4), 523-547.
- Sadashiva, M. (2008). Effects of civil society on urban planning and governance in Mysore, India (Doctoral dissertation, Dortmund, Techn. Univ., Diss., 2008).
- Sajadi, J., Yarmoradi, K., Kanooni, R., & Heydari, M. (2017). The role of a competent authority in improving the quality of the urban environment from the residents' perspective. Case study: Bagh Ferdows neighborhood in Tehran District1. *Journal of Research in urban ecology*, 8(15), 97-110. (In Persian).
- Sharma, S. K. (1989). *Municipal Management*. Urban Affairs Quarterly, India. Vol.21.
- Stewart, K. (2006). Designing good urban governance indicators: The importance of citizen participation and its evaluation in Greater Vancouver. *Cities*, 23(3), 196-204.
- Sukmadilaga, C., Pratama, A., & Mulyani, S. (2015). Good Governance Implementation In Public Sector: Exploratory Analysis of Government Financial Statements Disclosures Across ASEAN Countries. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 513-518.
- Torabi, A. (2004). Sustainable urban management depends on good governance, *Journal of Municipalities*, 6(69), 5-10. (In Persian).
- UN Habitat (2002), the global campaign on urban governance, concept paper, Nairobi: Un- Habitat.
- UNDP. (2008). Characteristics of good governance' the urban governance initiative (TUGI).
- Van Dijk, M. P. (2006). Managing cities in developing countries. *Books*.
- Virtudes, A. (2016). 'Good' Governance Principles in Spatial Planning at Local Scale. *Procedia engineering*, 161, 1710-1714.
- Williams, D., & Young, T. (1994). Governance, the World Bank and liberal theory. *Political Studies*, 42(1), 84-100.
- Woods, M. (1995) "Discourses of Power and Rural it, Local politics in Somerset in the 20<sup>th</sup> century". *Political Geography*, 16.