

## The Evaluation of Effective Indicators in the Implementation of Good Urban Governance in Metropolises (Case Study of Kermanshah)

Mostafa Shahinifar, PhD<sup>1</sup>

*Assistant Professor in Geography and Urban Planning, Department of Social Science, Payame Noor University, Iran.*

Farzin Charehjo, PhD

*Assistant Professor of Urban Planning, Department of Urban Planning and Design, Sanandaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran.*

*Received: 10 September 2018*

*Accepted: 16 March 2019*

### Extended Abstract

#### 1. Introduction

The subject of urban management seemingly arose ever since the emergence of cities. In the management process of cities, different groups play a variety of roles in managing urban affairs according to the extent of their power and awareness. During the recent decades, pluralist approaches in new fields of management have followed relativism which demonstrates a major paradigm shift in this context. According to the new paradigm, governments are no longer the sole players in the urban management field; new players include the government, people, and non-government organizations. Under the title of good urban governance, the new paradigm shows a shift from conventional policymaking systems to a multilevel and multirole approach. The present study seeks to provide answers to the following questions: What is the status of good governance indices in Kermanshah? What is the status of such indices among the different groups involved in the urban management?

#### 2. Review of Literature

Examinations into the background of Iranian city management in general and Kermanshah, in particular, especially during the recent years show the absence of necessary social and cultural platforms for the presence, interference, and the

participation of people in urban management or the lack of legal instruments for this end. The results of studies conducted by Sharifian Sani (2003), Kazemian (2003), Akbari (2006), Taghvayi and Tajdar (2009), Shamaei, Adinehvand, and Haji Zadeh (2012), Mortazavi (2013), Ebrahimzadeh, Adinehvand, Haji Zadeh, and Ghadami (2013), Ahad Nezhad (2004), and Azizi (2014) are in line with the global experiences of the World Bank, McKinley (2007) and others, all pointing to the fact that both the public sector and civil societies have not played a significant role in the field of urban management.

#### 3. Method

The general method used in this study compared the opinions of ordinary people and urban planning and management experts with respect to the good governance indices in Kermanshah. The present inquiry is an explanatory and comparative study. The total population of the study included the entire residents of Kermanshah who are more than 906754 individuals. The sample population was calculated using Cochran's formula with 5% margin of error and 95% of confidence level. The sample population included two groups consisting of 322 ordinary citizens and 34 urban experts who were all chosen randomly.

The reliability of questionnaires was calculated using Cronbach's alpha. The results showed the reliability of all

1. Corresponding author, E- mail : shahini@pnu.ac.ir

components was more than 0.7 which is acceptable based on the present recognized rules.

Using SPSS, independent sample *t*-test was administered to analyze the data. *T*-test enables a comprehensive assessment of both independent groups with regards to the mean difference between two sample populations using data from two independent samples. *T*-test can be employed when there is a normal distribution in both sample populations. If the distribution test of the two communities is normal and their variance is equal, the appropriate test statistic is selected. Therefore, the main objective is to examine the difference between the mean values of the two independent samples in the test.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

In this study, *t*-test was carried out for two independent samples. The test was conducted between the independent variable of people and experts as a nominal variable and the good governance indices as an interval variable. The obtained results from the demographic data showed nearly equal participation of men and women. Moreover, 33.4% of individuals were high school graduates, while 41.6% and approximately 25% were university undergraduates and graduates, respectively. To test the hypotheses, first Levene's test was conducted to test the equivalence of variances. The results of Levene's test was significant in statistical terms, i.e.  $F(354) = 16.7$ ,  $P = .000$ .

The results of *t*-test were also significant:  $t(55.062) = 12.046$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .

According to the results, the experts with a mean value of 3.79 and standard deviation of 0.641 had significantly a higher mean value compared to the people with a mean and standard deviation of 2.29 and 1.076, respectively.

Differences in the average level of attitudes between experts and people was -1.508. This difference with a confidence interval of 96% was in a range of -1.878 to -1.138.

Cornees *D*. with a value of 2.17 shows the considerable difference between the mean

values of scores demonstrating the fact that individuals' affiliations with a specific group highly impact their attitudes and judgments. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected based on the results of two independent sample *t*-tests, while the other hypothesis regarding the presence of a significant difference between mean values of people and experts' opinions with respect to the good urban governance indices is confirmed.

#### 5. Conclusion

The results of the study showed that the good urban governance indices in Kermanshah still involve a considerable difference with the hypothesized mean value of 3 highlighting the need for a major development; the onset of such a development may involve conceptualization and institutionalization which can result in the transcendental stage of culturalization in the area of good urban governance. Evidence shows that regardless of the high allocation of resources in this city, the presence of numerous issues can be observed with respect to the absence of people's participation in managing the city and districts, low functionality of the ongoing projects by the conventional administrations, lack of responsiveness from urban managers, lack of adherence to the rules and unclear decision-making by the urban management, lack of compliance to the equity principle and fairness in the allocation of scarce resources to the entire population, particularly overlooking the vulnerable strata, and the absence of a strategic attitude through which a promising outlook could have been drawn for the city. Iranian cities require major developments in their administrative processes. As the first step, such developments require acknowledging the people as an essential part in urban management; the second step is to provide opportunities for the civil sector. It should be pointed out that synergy among the three governmental, public, and civil sectors is regarded as an umbrella term in urban management. This pattern is a new paradigm in the management of large cities, which has

been formed in front of a government run the cities, which often has low efficiency.

**Keywords:** Kermanshah city, Urban governance, Urban management

### References (In Persian)

1. Adinevand, A. A., Hajizadeh, M., & Ghadami, M. (2013) بررسی عملکرد شهرداری در چهارچوب [Investigation of the performance of the municipality in the framework of good municipal rule (Case study of Babolsar City)]. *Quarterly Urban Management*, 31(11), 41-64.
2. Ahad Nejad Raveshi, M., Vaisi Mofrad, S., & Hosain Zadeh, A. (2014). نقش مدیریت شهری در [The role of urban management in the distribution of social capital (Case study: Kermanshah city)]. *Quarterly Economics and Urban Management*, 7, 117-132.
3. Akbari, G. (2006). سرمایه اجتماعی و حکمرانی شهری. [Social capital and urban governance]. *Quarterly Geographical Research*, 21(83), 135-153.
4. Asadi, R. A., & Rahnama, M. R. (2014). تعیین وضعیت شاخص‌های حکمروایی خوب شهری در شهر مشهد. [Determining situation of indices of good urban governance in Mashhad]. *Urban Regional Studies and Research*, 5(20), 162-143.
5. Barak Pour, N., & Asadi, I. (2009). مدیریت و حکمرانی شهری. [Management and urban governance]. Art University, Research Assistance, Tehran.
6. Basirat, M., Azizi, M. M., Zebardast, E. & Akhondi, A. A. (2012). فرصت‌ها و چالش‌های حکمروایی. [Opportunities and challenges of good metropolitan governance in the globalization era]. *HONAR-HA-YE-ZIBA*, 17(1), 5-16.
7. Ebrahim zadeh, I., & Asadian, M. (2013) تحلیل و ارزیابی میزان تحقق‌پذیری حکمروایی خوب شهری در [Analysis and evaluation of the realization of good urban governance in Iran (Case study: Kashmar City)]. *Quarterly Geography and Urban and Regional Planning*, 6, 17-30.
8. Esmail Zadeh, H., & Sarafi M. (2006). جایگاه حکمروایی خوب برنامه‌ریزی شهری طرح متروی تهران. [Good governance: Tehran city metro planning]. *Quarterly Modares Human Science*, 10(48), 1-28.
9. GIS Unit of Kermanshah Municipality Computer Organization. (2019). طرح تکمیل پایگاه داده جی. *Completion of GIS Database in Kermanshah City*.
10. Kazemian, G. R. (2004). تبیین رابطه ساختار حاکمیت و قدرت شهری با سازمان‌یابی فضایی. [Explaining the relationship between governance structure and urban power with spatial organization] (Unpublished raldoct dissertation). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.
11. Kazemian, G. R. (2007). درآمدی بر الگوی حکمروایی شهری. [An income on the Pattern of Urban Governance]. *Journal Urban Development Quotes* (19-20), 5-7.
12. Laleh Pour, M. (2007). حکمروایی شهری و مدیریت شهری در کشورهای در حال توسعه. [Urban governance and urban management in developing countries]. *Journal of Urban Development Quotes*, 19-20, 60-71.

13. Lotfi, H., & Edalatkhah, F., Mirzaii, M., & Vazir Pour, S. B. (2009). مدیریت شهری و جایگاه آن در [Urban management and its place in promoting citizen's rights]. *Quarterly Journal of New Attitudes in Human Geography*, 2(1), 101-110.
14. Mortazavi, M. (2013). مدیریت محلی و حکمروایی شهری، با نگاهی به ساختار مدیریت شهری ژاپن، کره [Local management and urban governance, looking at the urban management structure: Japan]. South Korea, Turkey and France: Publications Center of Tehran Studies and Planning.
15. Parhizgar, A., & Kazmian, G. R. (2005). رویکرد حکمروایی شهری و ضرورت آن در مدیریت منطقه [Urban governance approach and its necessity in managing the metropolitan area of Tehran]. *Quarterly Economic Research*, 5(16), 29-50.
16. Rafieian, M., & Hosain Pour, S. A. (2011). حکمروایی خوب شهری از منظر نظریات شهرسازی [Urban good governance; from the urban planning theories perspective]. Tehran: Tahan.
17. Sarafi, M., & Abdoulahi, M. (2008). تحلیل مفهوم شهروندی و ارزیابی جایگاه آن در قوانین، مقررات و [Urban management & analyzing the concept of citizenship and assessing its status in the laws, regulations and urban management of the country]. *Quarterly Journal of Researchers in Geography*, 40(63), 115-134.
18. Shammai, A., Adineh Vand, A. A., & HajiZadeh, M. (2012). ارزیابی عملکرد شهرداری‌ها بر اساس [Assessment of municipality function base on the urban good governance (case study: Yasuj city)]. *Quarterly Urban Management Studies*, 4(11), 1-20.
19. Sharifian Sani, M. (2001). فرهنگ شهری: مشارکت شهروندی، حکمرانی شهری و مدیریت شهری [Citizen participation, urban governance and urban management]. *Journal: Urban Management*, 2(8), 42-55.
20. Shieh, E. (2003). لزوم تحول مدیریت شهری در ایران [The need for urban management in Iran]. *Geography and Development*, 1(1), 37-62.
21. Statistical Center of Iran. (2016). سرشماری عمومی نفوس و مسکن شهرستان کرمانشاه. <http://www.ostan-ks.ir/>
22. Tadbire Shahr Consulting Engineers. (2003). طرح امکان‌سنجی بهسازی شهر نگر و توانمندسازی اجتماعی [The feasibility study on urban improvement and social empowerment in Kermanshah, First step]. Kermanshah, Iran: Kermanshah Municipality.
23. Taghvaii, A. A., & Tajdar, R. (2009). درآمدی بر حکمروایی خوب شهری در رویکردی تحلیلی [Income on good urban governance in an analytical approach]. *Quarterly Urban Management*, 7(23), 45-58.
24. Tarh and Amayesh Consulting Engineers. (1999). برنامه تجدیدنظر طرح جامع شهر کرمانشاه [A plan for the reform of the comprehensive plan of the city of Kermanshah]. Kermanshah, Iran: Kermanshah Municipality.

### References (In English)

1. Atkinson, R. (1998). The New Urban Governance and Urban Regeneration: Managing, Community participation. Paper presented at International Network for Urban Research and

- Action (INURA) Conference, *Diverse City. Sustaining and Governing the Multicultural city*, Toronto.
2. Auclair, C., & Jackohango, A. (2009). *Good urban governance: Towards an effective private sector engagement*. Retrieved from [http:// www.unhabitat.org/ downloads/ docs WG\\_B\\_Background\\_Urban\\_Governance&the\\_Private-Sector\\_draft0.pdf](http://www.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/WG_B_Background_Urban_Governance&the_Private-Sector_draft0.pdf). 3-11.
  3. Bhuiyan. S. (2011). Transition towards a knowledge-based society in post-communist Kazakhstan: Dose good governance matter? *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 46(4), 404-421.
  4. Dekker K., & Kempen, R. (2000). Urban governance within the big cities policy. *Journal of Cities*, 21(2), 109-117.
  5. Gani, A., & Duncan, R. (2007). Measuring good governance using time series. *Journal of the Asia Pasific Economy*, 12(3), 367-385.
  6. Greer, C. R., S. A., Youngblood, & Gary, D. A. (1999). Human resource management outsourcing: The make of buy decision. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(3), 85-96.
  7. Kadago, J., Sandholz, S., & Hamhaber J. (2010). Good urban governance, actor's relations and paradigms: Lessons from Nairobi, Kenya, and Recife, Brazil. *Paper presented at 46th ISOCARP Congres, Brazil*.
  8. Kardos, M. (2012). The reflection of good governance in sustainable development strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* , 58, 1166-1173.
  9. Mattingly, M. (1994). The meaning of urban management. *Journal of Cities*, 11(3), 201-205.
  10. McGill, R. (1998). Urban managemant in developing countries. *Journal of Cities*, 15(6), 63-471.
  11. McLoughlin, B. (1973). *Control and urban planning*. London. England: Faber and Faber Press.
  12. Plumptre, T., & Graham, J. (1999). *Governance and good governance: International and aboriginal perspectives*. Retrieved from [https://iog.ca/docs/1999\\_December\\_govgoodgov.pdf](https://iog.ca/docs/1999_December_govgoodgov.pdf)
  13. Rakodi, C. (2001). Forget Planning put politics first? Priorities for urban management in developing countries. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observations and Geoinformation*, 3(3), 209-223.
  14. Rakodi, C. (2003). Politics and performance: the implication of emerging governance arrangements for urban management approaches and information systems. *Habitat International*, 27(4), 523-547.
  15. Roberts, M., Wright, S., & Onlin, P. (2007). Good governance in the pacific? Ambivalence and possibility. *Geoforum Journal*, 38(5), 967-984.
  16. Soksreng, T. (2007). Good governance in Cambodia: Exploring the link between governance and poverty reduction. *Yokohama Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(6), 647-668.
  17. Stewart, K. (2006). Designing good urban governance indicators: The importance of citizen participation and its evaluation in Greater Vancouver. *Journal of Cities*, 23(3), 196-204.
  18. World Bank. (2003). *Better governance for development in the Middle East and North Africa: Enhancing inclusiveness and accountability*. Retrieved from [https:// openknowledge. World bank. org/ handle/10986/15077](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/15077) License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.”
  19. Yetano, A., Roya, S., & Acerete, B. (2009). *What is driving the increasing presence of citizen participation initiative?* Zaragoza, Spain: University of Zaragoza Press.

#### How to cite this article:

Shahinifar, M., & Charehjoo, F. (2019). The evaluation of effective indicators in the implementation of good urban governance in metropolises (Case study of Kermanshah). *Journal of Geography and Urban Space Development*, 5(2), 201-219.

URL <http://jgusd.um.ac.ir/index.php/gud/article/view/74554>

ISSN: 2538-3531