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Summary

How people in a city should be governed has been discussed since ancient philosophy. The complexity of today's society can no longer be govern without the co-operations of actors. In recent years the shift from government to governance has created new governance spaces. These spaces in which citizens are invited by the state open up opportunities for actors in communities to participate. But at the same time, research on community-focused initiatives suggests that these spaces are created and defined by the state and therefore have little room for citizens to influence over revitalize plans of their areas.

This thesis investigates a new tool and approach in the governance of urban development, which includes networks of actors and citizens' involvement, to see results of citizens' participation in the partnership and case BID Sofielund. The thesis wants to find out whether BID Sofielund allows the residents to have any influence, focusing on the network's professional actors views of citizens participation.

To answer the study's research aim, the theoretical framework is largely based on a model called "Arnstein's ladder", that describes gradations of citizen participation. The theory about citizen participation in the context of power and powerlessness between authorities and citizens helps us to understand what levels of participation there are in the BID model.

BID Sofielund is an example of a challenge in urban development when it explains that it wants to involve all parties in the process. BID is committed to give the community greater influence over policy making. However, the case study enables us to identify that there is a consultancy model in BID Sofielund according to Arnstein's ladder. It concludes that current policies in the BID model will need to address a number of important obstacles to community involvement in order to find ways of reconciling BIDs intention to give local people greater influence. The findings of this research, however, show that residents through the BID process can be able to influence and it indicates that it may be an opening for the residents to gain more power and "climbing on the ladder".
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1.0 INTRODUCTION, AIM & PROBLEM

1.1 The subject in the context of urban studies

The relationship between cities and political participation is a theme that can be traced back to ancient philosophy. How are people in a city governed, and how should they be governed, have been discussed since then. It has been very unusual that established nation-states are forced to give power to cities, and it is even more unusual for any of that power to be given to local, neighborhood groups within cities, according to the Department of Geography at the University of British Columbia in a summary to Sherry Arnstein's classic text “A Ladder of Citizen Participation” (University of British Columbia homepage, 2017).

Today, there are insights to focus on participatory urban planning at neighborhood scale for a sustainable development. Ongoing research at Malmö University states that to work with contemporary development processes requires a need of boundary-crossing work methods. To open up possibilities to deepen democracy and increase equality, it is a need for participatory processes to involve a wider and alternate groups in society. Not least by making use of everyday users' experience (Urban Studies Master Program homepage, 2017).

But how do partnerships and cooperation models benefit the residents? Recently, an architectural agency arranged a panel debate in Malmö. Topics like if urban environments are democratic and inviting and if they should be planned from above or grass-root initiated were up for debate (Think Tank 017: Commoning Kits, Facebook event, 2017). Participation is a prerequisite for sustainable urban development according to Magnus Johansson Ph.D. in pedagogy and Associate Professor in environmental science in the book *Urban Perspectives - A anniversary publication* (Johansson, 2011). Ongoing research shows that we must enable planners, decision makers and inhabitants to co-create socially and ecologically fair urban future scenarios. Martha Schwartz, in *Ecological Urbanism*, states that if we are to deliver a sustainable built environment, that offer good quality of life across socioeconomic boundaries, we must create places that people will value and to which they can connect emotionally. Without human connection to a site, even the best efforts to create sustainable environments will not succeed (Mostafavi & Doherty, 2010/2013).

Current policy of The National Agreement [Nationella Överenskommelsen] (2012) which is a collaboration between the government, Sweden's municipalities and county councils, as well as non-profit organizations in the social sector, debates that new social challenges with increasingly complex issues requires several actors' skills to find good answers. It states that we need political leadership with the ability to cooperate and open up the public sector's working method for other partners. It is important to give the officials mandate and signals to actively work with other actors. Collaboration may be about to benefit from each other's knowledge, coordinate activities and work together on practical issues. However, it should be kept in mind that often the various actors have their image of the purpose of cooperation and a desire to control what the outcome will give. Partnership models can be either a political control or a grasp of public administrations to obtain better conditions in their operations. However, many actors test new partnership models and see social challenges as a starting point for a dialogue and understand that cooperation is needed. A dialogue that hopefully invites and ensures that as many organizations as possible are included. It should also presents practical problems and open up to new solutions.
This study will look closer at a collaboration model at local scale, namely BID Sofielund. BID is a tool in urban development and a partnership between private and public actors used in the social and spatial development of the neighborhood Sofielund in Malmö. The BID process in Sofielund is based on the concept of participatory democracy and a spectrum of citizen participation (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017). Sofielund is an existing residential area with a mixed population. Challenges to work with development in an already existing area are different from developing a new area. In the first mentioned, one has to understand the area, its patterns, identity and the people living there. It is thus common to involve the people living in the area in the development projects.

But why should you involve the residents? Which normative ideas exist about citizen participation in a larger context? In the debate there are several proponents for a participatory approach. Working with participatory urban planning has gained legitimacy. A public policy or action is legitimate when citizens have a good motive to support or obey it. According to Sherry R. Arnstein (1969) participation is something that is considered as generally good. Participation of the governed in their government is in theory, the cornerstone of democracy. According to Fung (2006), participation serves three particularly important democratic values: legitimacy, justice and the effectiveness of public action. It is more desirable with a policy which has involved a wider range of parties when it is assumed that they operate with a greater level of consent, discussed by Rydin and Pennington (2000). Moreover, with an enhanced role for the local people, participation will increase local accountability (Foley & Martin, 2000). The inherent desirability of public involvement is part of a tradition aimed at "opening up" planning processes for democratic review and that the expanded extent of public involvement is an integral part of policy delivery improvements (Rydin & Pennington, 2000).

However, these claims about the benefits of participation have tended to be unpleasant with statements of the political process that emphasizes the inclination of introducing special interests and bureaucratization as the reality of participation in practice (Rydin & Pennington, 2000). If the government actually is run for the benefit of a few main interests, then that is a reason why many citizens most probably will not support the public policy or action (Fung, 2006). There are evidence of constraints on community's capacity to respond in the way envisaged by ministers and their advisers. A key problem has been the lack of real power and influence of the community sectors (Foley & Martin, 2000). There are several critical arguments concerning how to achieve successful public participation. One significant obstacle is the fact that in practice there are many voices that will never be heard. What Magnus Johansson Ph.D. in pedagogy at Malmö University points out, is that a wide participation can pose a threat to those who today have the problem-formulation privilege, as there are solutions that can challenge established views and power structures (Johansson, 2011). Economic constraints are another thing that often face community groups in what they can do when they seek to rework the processes that shape their urban spaces (Martin & Davidson, 2000). Even if the community sector is equal partners in formal terms in a partnership (number of seats on partnership boards), it usually lacks the resources, the power and influence possessed by business and authorities (Foley & Martin, 2000). The success to community involvement will therefore depend on the willingness of local councils to cede power and control of resources, decision making and implementation processes to communities. Equally, communities themselves will also have to become much more prepared to engage and have the will to be more involved. However, people with at greater risk of social exclusion intend to believe that there is no benefit for them to collaborate (Foley & Martin, 2000). Finally, Christine Wamsler (2017, oral communication), Professor at LUCSUS for Sustainability Studies, relates the involving of residents with institutional mainstreaming. It is something you begin with because it has positive outcomes,
and once we do it without knowing why, it is an act of institutional mainstreaming and has become part of the system.

Since citizen participation is a controversial concept and not that easy to follow, it is relevant to study the BID process in Sofielund and its challenge to face citizens' participation in their partnership model. To be counted as a citizen, National Democratic Institute declares on their homepage (2017) that it is about being recognized as a decision maker and as an agent of change. It is timely to study BID when the new networks are mushrooming around Sweden in cities such as Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö. By conducting interviews with actors working with the model and process in Sofielund, Malmö, made it possible to study the network in depth.

1.2 Aim of the study

The thesis aim is to analyze a new tool and approach in the governance of urban development, which includes networks of actors and citizens' involvement, to see the results of citizens' participation by looking at the case BID Sofielund.

The delimitation is to examine specifically the involvement of the residents in the process.

1.3 Problem statement and research questions

The thesis discusses whether BID as a tool and collaboration model in Sofielund allows residents to have influence in the process. It will investigate the empirical results of how different involved professional actors in BID describe the involvement of the residents in the process and analyze it in relation to “Arnstein's ladder”.

Based on the actors various roles, if they are public or private, the study will see which discourses of participation and what levels of Arnstein's ladder that are find in Sofielund. How high on Arnstein's ladder can the residents climb, according to the discourses the network members have? Why? Why not?

The study is designed by following questions: Why do the professional actors want to involve the residents? How much influence do the residents have and which decisions can they make? How do the professional actors perceive strengths and weaknesses with BID as a tool to involve the residents in the area's development?

1.4 Previous research/perspectives on BID in urban governance

To better understand the empirical BID model in this study and its aim to involve the residents, we need to review previous research about BIDs. In the relation to the involvement of the residents; what arguments are there for developing BID as a new governance framework? What criticism is there against?

First of all, what is BID? There is no general answer since the structure of a BID may differ from case to case. But you can find Business Improvement districts (BIDs) in USA as private entities, funded by an extra assessment on property owners, and present on the municipality's terrain, they provide supplemental sanitation, security, and social services to limited geographic areas within cities (Garodnick, 2000). The interest of BIDs is to establish long-term institutionalized cooperation and it is a trend in society, both in USA and Sweden, towards public-private cooperation about common assets (Holmberg, 2015).
Comments on benefits on the impact of Business Improvement Districts on urban governance in the United States, are that they conduct their operations with an efficiency that eludes city bureaucracies. They are flexible, nimble, and directly accountable to the local businesses that pay for the bulk of their operations. Its success is largely due to its ability to provide sanitation and security services, and make capital improvements quickly, and without municipal interference they success in solving complex municipal problems. Yet, there are some criticism of BID's constitution as exercising limited governmental powers by a board of directors elected through a process that weighs votes in proportion to the value of owned land which guarantees that property owners will always comprise a majority of the board. Therefore, the criticism of BIDs is how they subjugate traditional notions of equality. When a government scheme weight the votes of property owners more heavily than residents, citizens residing in a BID are disempowered from fully participating in the BID's management. Therefore BIDs violated the constitutional guarantee of one vote per person (Garodnick, 2000). If local property owners and other actors are organizing themselves and becoming a strong local voice which different authorities must listen to, does it eliminate democratic structures (Holmberg, 2014)? Moreover, one comment against BIDs are that residents and the businesses in the BID partnership might have dissimilar interests (Garodnick, 2000). In cities where BIDs are formed on the basis of a specific legal procedure, there is a greater risk of lack of transparency and that private interests overcome the general good (Holmberg, 2014).

A counter argument to that BIDs would put democratic structures out of play in Sweden, is when urban development is governed to a large extent of municipal political decisions of democratically elected politicians, then they must be accountable to the priorities and collaborations they choose to enter. In Sweden, moreover, they see opportunities for an increased citizen participation with a BID model. When political power is increasingly centralized, BID appears in a neighborhood or residential area where citizens feel place attachment (Holmberg, 2014). However, in an example from BID in Gamlestadten, there is criticism about how the residents are being heard. Tenants are only represented by the property owners who are members, and since the municipality is only an adjunct member, this means that the partnership lacks an actor who is responsible for monitoring the interests of the entire population in the area (Stenberg, 2010).

1.5 Previous research/perspectives on citizens' participation

The complexity of today's society can no longer be govern without the cooperation of actors. In recent years the shift from government to governance has created new governance spaces (Taylor, 2007). The negotiated self-governance is based on new practices of co-ordinating activities through networks and partnerships, states Newman (2001, discussed by Taylor, 2007). But as Cornvall reminds us (2004a, discussed by Taylor, 2007), these spaces in which communities/citizens are invited by the state are created and defined by the state (“invited spaces”) as opposed to spaces created and defined by citizen (“popular spaces”). Even if the new spaces have opened up opportunities for actors in communities (previously excluded) to be engaged in governing (Taylor, 2007), a substantial of research of community-focused initiatives at the same time suggest that most communities have had little influence over plans to revitalize their areas (Foley & Martin, 2000). Somerville (2005, discussed by Taylor, 2007) summarises three routes through which elite power in all governing coalitions is reinforced and reproduced. It is that they tend to favor their own people (privileged access to decision-making), exercise control from the center (recentralisation) and to mould citizens in their own image and likeness (responsibilisation). The responsibility for welfare is pushed down the line to local, community and individual levels. It can be seen as a technique for government, where they absolving its own responsibility for addressing social injustice onto responsible and rational individuals, who then accept a responsibility to seek ways of transforming their position themselves (Taylor, 2007). “The danger is that, having signed up to achieve the
unachievable, they will end up being condemned as the authors of their own exclusion (Atkinson 2003, referred in Taylor, 2007, p. 302).”

Perhaps the most cited work in the literature on participatory democracy is what Sherry Arnstein write in her article “A Ladder of Citizen Participation” in 1969 when she reflected on what she learned over several years of studying city elites, community groups, and federal bureaucrats as they were trying to get (or keep) power over crucial decisions (LeGates & Stout, 2007). Arnstein favors empowering individuals and communities by involving them directly in planning and decision making. What Arnstein suggests, as well as the contributors to Nelson and Wright's (1995, p. 1, referred in Jones, 2003), is that if participation is to be more than a palliative, then it must involve shifts in power. Arnstein has often been read as if more power is better. This is not necessarily correct. Instead, it is more that for really exposed areas, participation is the only thing that can help, and it should be done with the real influence by the residents (Parker, 2016). Unlike Arnstein who wants individuals and communities to be directly involved in planning and decision making, Paul Davidoff, an engaged liberal at the same time as Arnstein, favors planners and skilled professionals acting as advocates articulating the interests of poor and powerless groups as a lawyer represents a client. Davidoff had a pluralistic approach to city planning and argues in ”Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning” (1965) how to empower the powerless with the interplay of competing advocate planners. He thought that if we bring in different political, social, and economic interests it facilitates better choices in public policy to produce city plans. According to Davidoff, difficulties with citizens' involvement, though, are that citizens are more often reacting to what is being done than proposing their concepts of appropriate goals and future action.

Archon Fung, currently Ford Foundation Professor of Democracy and Citizenship at the Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, has developed Arnstein's thoughts of power distribution between power holders and have-nots citizens in planning and decision making processes to more contemporary. Societies have become more democratic since Arnstein's text 1969 and Fung handles more complex social issues for participation. Fung (2006) discusses that today's multifaceted challenges of contemporary governance demand a complex account of the ways in which those who are subject to laws and policies should participate in making them. If there is no institution of direct public participation in contemporary democratic contexts, then one important task is to understand the feasible and useful varieties of participation. In order to understand the range of institutional possibilities for public participation, Fung believes that it is about three dimensions: who participates; how participants exchange information and make decisions together; and the connection between their conclusions and opinions on one hand and public policy and action on the other. Fung wants to address important problems of democratic governance such as legitimacy, justice, and effective governance.

Victor Pestoff (2009) has investigated citizen participation and co-production of personal social services in Sweden. Pestoff discusses that there are few possibilities to directly influence decision-making in the provision of public services, both in municipal services and for-profit firms providing services. He states that perhaps this is logical from the perspective of municipal governments. They might consider citizens participation in the running of public services as a threat both to the representative democracy that they institutionalize and to their own power. As Pestoff continues, the logic of direct user participation is also foreign to private for-profit providers. They use exit rather than voice and the one who participate is seen as a consumer. This logic excludes any form of direct or indirect representation. This creates a “glass ceiling” for participation in municipal and for-profit providers in public provision and limits citizens to play a passive role as service users who can make demands on the public sector, but make no decisions nor take any responsibility in implementing public policy.
The “right to the city” movement, first articulated by the French philosopher Henri Lefebvre, has manifested in efforts by progressive urban policy-makers around the world to give more power to city inhabitants in shaping urban space. Although the movement has had some policy successes, some worries remains unclear what exactly is the “right” to the city and, specifically, the scale and scope of enhanced participation by urban inhabitants and an expanded access to urban resources (Foster & Iaione, 2016). Marcuse (2009) discusses in his “From critical urban theory to the right to the city” how a change of the system will happen depends on whom the actors of change are.

Yvonne Rydin and Mark Pennington (2000) suggest that the existence of social capital may alter the incentive structures of institutional redesign. Success factor is to create a platform where professionals working in close collaboration with grassroots organizations in which people who live or will be an actor on the street participate. Building social capital contributes to a project’s effectiveness in achieving its specific objectives and may be important as an implementation tool.

This study is part of the ongoing research about participatory processes with residents in the governance of urban development processes. Cooke and Kothari (2001, discussed in Jones, 2003) claim that participation is complicit in games of power which do not always produce the “desired” effects and even (re)produce inequality. Therefore it is timely to give attention to power relations in participatory and partnership methods within regeneration processes. With focus on the power-sharing between authorities-citizens’ interactions in the BID model in Sofielund, this study will contribute to knowledge and awareness of what different levels of citizen participation there are in the new partnership model. Based on that understanding, it will highlight the obstacles and opportunities in participatory processes. This thesis examines the prospects of Arnsteins approach in the light of previous research about community-based initiatives, as well as BID’s professional actors' views of citizen participation.

1.6 Layout/The disposition of the thesis

In the chapter that will follow, the thesis will first show what methods that are used and how the empirical data was gathered. The thesis then explains the motivation of why the main theory has been chosen. The study is largely based on a model that describes gradations of citizen participation, in the theory section. In the chapter that follow will the study presents the current case, i.e. the BID process in Malmö. This review gets a better understanding of how BID as a governance tool in urban development involves the residents. Thereafter the analysis section will present the empirical results that are analyzed in relation to the theoretical framework in order to answer the research problem and aim. The interest is to understand how BID’s key actors express citizen participation from their various positions, and what levels of citizen participation there are in the case. The thesis will end with a conclusion and discussion where the findings of the study are repeated as well as claim a possible opening. It also includes an evaluation of the results. In the very end you find an appendix with the questions in the interview guide.
2.0 METHOD

To analyze the case the study has chosen theories about citizen participation in the context of power and powerlessness between citizens and authorities. The current case, BID Sofielund, is explained as a tool that going to involve all parties in the process, and is analyzed as an example of today's challenges in urban development.

2.1 Research design and methods applied

The study is a discourse analysis that will examine discourses of participation identified in the chosen case and what levels of participation there are. A main principle with discourse analysis is that it is interpretative and explanatory (Van Dijk, 2015). What is said? How can we understand discourses? What is normal and taken for granted? The thesis will use two approaches to identify possible discourses. It is the City of Malmö's documents and text about BID as well as interviews with the professional actors in BID. What is the City of Malmö versus the property owners views about participation? Are there different discourses why they want participation among the actors? How can we understand possible tensions? In the discourse analysis we can see "Arnstein's ladder" as a normative model.

A discourse analytical research primarily studies the way social-power abuse and the way inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated and resisted. It wants to understand, expose, and ultimately challenge social inequality (Teun Van Dijk, 2015). The current case in this study tries to understand power relations in the BID process by examining various actors discourses of participation. The argument of Atkinson (1999) to use discourse analysis, is that it can help us to gain a better understanding of urban regeneration through its stress on the (often unconscious) processes which structure our understanding of the world, practice and the assignment of meaning to that world. Such an emphasis allows us to begin to rethink power, modes of domination, authority and policy in terms other than the sporadic sense (Clegg, 1989, referred in Atkinson, 1999). Giving attention to the institutional/organizational aspects of these processes highlight how some subjects are constituted as powerful and why others accept this situation in a more or less unquestioning manner (i.e. as natural). This approach allows us to acknowledge that certain groups/individuals are disadvantaged in terms of partnership and empowerment in urban renewal. Not only in terms of access to material resources but also in terms in which individuals and groups “think” about what is possible. At the same time, processes of partnership creation and empowerment may be a way of ensuring that (some of) the benefits of regeneration reach the disadvantaged. The processes may also have the effect of reinforcing existing relations of domination and control, of legitimating a particular re-presentation of reality that defines what is “reasonable” and the language in which demands can be made. This is not to say that those engaged in partnerships necessarily consciously engage in such processes, it is just to suggest that the discourses through which they think and express themselves are not neutral. Discourses construct problems, solutions and actions in particular ways that are congruent with existing relations of power, domination and the distribution of resources (Atkinson, 1999). Van Dijk (2015) summarizes the main focus in critical discourse analysis in a way that discourse structures maintain, confirm, legitimize, reproduce or challenge relationships with power abuse (dominance) in society.

A case study approach has been applied in this study to analyze the interactions between BID Sofielund's professional actors and the residents. The study uses qualitative interviews as a method to find out how the key actors in BID Sofielund describe the involvement of the residents.
study-specific documents are being used as well (as activity plan, business story, newsletters, policy documents as application for funds, information on website as presentations, descriptions and statutes). These have either been handed out or distributed by the development leader of BID or accessed via their website. In addition to qualitative interviews and case study-specific texts, the study has collected data using observations (e.g. actively listening at BIDs annual meeting, workshops and group discussions with local professional stakeholders in BID and international experts) and through an ongoing dialogue with the key informants. Methods applied are also a literature review where the study positions the chosen field, which is on participation in general and linked to power structures in particular.

According the data collection the study has used unstructured and semi-structured interviews. Each interview lasted between one and a half to three hours. Semistructured interviews are a good method when I wanted to deepen the subject and provide a meaningful discussion and dialogue with the respondents. Since my first question was to let them describe the process, the conversation could lead to different things. Though, the conversation revolved around some themes but the interviewees had the chance to develop their own reasoning about the subject. The advantage of semi-structured interviews is that it is sensitive and people-oriented and offers the chance for the researcher to have a more wide-ranging discussion than a questionnaire would allow, means Gill Valentine in the book Methods in Human Geography, a guide for students doing a research project. The researcher has the chance to ask the same questions in different ways in order to explore issues thoroughly and interviewees can explain the complexities of their experiences. One strength of this approach is that it allows respondents to raise issues that the interviewer may not have anticipated (Flowerdew & Martin, 1997). Interviewing the actors provided me with information and insights in the complexity of certain issues that just a questionnaire or observations could not give.

2.2 Selection of my respondents

A total of seven qualitative interviews have been done. The conducted interviews are with different key actors in BID, such as the development leader and three property owners. Also, I interview a board member in a housing association that are not a member in the BID network. This to get a picture of how a housing association and a non member perceives the BID cooperation. Another interview is with an adjunct board member in BID from the City of Malmö at the City Planning office, to get their perspective of residents involvement in BID. The interview with a researcher from LUCSUS, an expert in Sustainable city development with focus on inclusive climate change adaptation, was a good addition to my field citizens-authorities interactions. All seven interviews represent the core in the empirical results. In addition, I have conducted two interviews that I chose to not analyze, because they did not touch my field instantly, but gave me generally insights in the process. It was with a project manager at E.ON who is a business member in BID, and officials at the Department of Environment. They are not involved in BID but work with similar topics and are responsible for dialogues from the City's side to property owners in general.

The interviewees is neutral, that is to say, the thesis do not mention any names but instead their roles. The participants will be mentioned as the development leader, property owners (they will not be differentiated), a board member in a housing association and a representative from the City Planning office. The Professor at LUCSUS is referred to her name as Christine Wamsler.

2.3 Limitation of the study

This study focus on the professional actors views about the residents participation in the process, and not the opposite, what the residents themselves say. Since property owners are the most in
number among the around 35 members in BID, and they were willing to be interviewed, their views are predominantly the studies empirical data.

What is missing in the study is a housing association or a village community's perspective of citizens' participation in BID. Since the two mentioned are associations that have formed because they actually care about their neighborhood, it would have been interesting to hear how they perceive the cooperation and whether the residents are involved in BID. A board member of a housing association represents the residents and therefore, by interviewing them, the study would indirectly find out more of the residents' influence in the area. This shortcoming in the study is basically due to the fact that no housing association or village community that are members in BID responded that they wanted to be interviewed. By all asked there was only one village community that showed interest, but they did not recur.

It is interesting to wonder over why nobody of these members answered and was not willing to join. Does it show that they do not have time or that they do not care? Since they are representatives of their housing association's board in their spare time they might have no time to meet in an interview, as they do not participate in BID as their professional work. Or is it because they are fewer in number in BID so they feel that they nevertheless have nothing to influence? Or is it simply that they are not so active in BID as the property owners are? However, an interview has been conducted with a housing association located in the northern area of Sofielund. They are not a member, but were willing to participate, and enrich the study with their perspective.

The study applies a theory from the 1960s where the author discusses citizen participation and the interface between authority-citizens, but do not discusses a partnership model as BID that is this study's case. A limitation may therefore be that the theoretical perspective has not analyzed the new partnership and its involvement with the residents. However, this study analyzes the power-sharing between power holders and the powerlessness as the theory problematizes.

2.4 Type of data and the reliability of the sources

The study's primary data is the interviews. The empirical material gathered from the interviews help us to answer the research questions by examining how the professional actors describe the citizens' participation in the process. Disadvantages of qualitative research may be that data is considered less representative than, for example, a larger quantitative survey. Even the reliability may deteriorate, as the research becomes less objective. Since the aim of this study is to go deeper into the subject and allow the respondents to develop their own reasoning, I think that the qualitative approach is right for my purpose (Denscombe, 2010).

The results from the interviews have not been recorded, but the author has taken notes during the discussions. There may be a risk of misconceptions when a person is interviewed, and the study has taken this into account but has not found any examples of it. It is always a possible risk of bias when the actors' answers is based on their roles in a process. But when the respondents were allowed to develop their own reasoning I will say it gave truthfully results.

Secondary data in this study is documented sources. The literature review consists mostly of academic articles. This means that the sources are reliable as there are publications or books by theorists and professors and most of them are first-hand referenced. Denscombe (2010) discusses that relating to secondary data includes, in addition to one's own perception, now also another person's additional experiences as the source is based on another person's subjective view of reality, which the author also is aware of.
3.0 THEORY

3.1 The motivation of the theoretical starting point

The thesis is based primarily on one chosen theory that discusses power structures and the interface between citizens and authorities. The study applies the chosen theory of the case of the study and contextualizes and problematizes the theory. To analyze a new governance and partnership model where this thesis focus is on its impact on citizens' participation, the study assumes from a model called “Arnstein's ladder” formulated by Sherry Arnstein (1969). Arnstein was an engaged liberal and wrote her classic text “A Ladder of Citizen Participation” that was published in the Journal of the American Institute of Certified Planners in 1969. In her text Arnstein develops a metaphor of a ladder that show degrees of citizens participation. This thesis wants to apply this model to understand the potential of the partnership viewed in the light of the participation.

Arnstein writes about how power structures interact in the society. She discusses citizens' involvement and neighborhood organizations in planning processes in the United States during this time (Arnstein, 1969). Arnstein had experience of the tumultuous urban politics of the 1960s and takes her starting point in a conflicting political environment (Parker, 2016). In her "ladder" Arnstein uses examples from the response of the federal, national government of the United States to the “urban crisis” of the 1960s broad-based social movements. It includes large urban movements pushing for civil rights, fair access to housing, and economic justice. This examples where established nation-states are forced to give power to local, neighborhood groups within cities are rare. Arnstein started her career with helping communities develop programs to improve jobs, housing and schools. In the late 1960s and early 1970s Arnstein was the chief adviser on citizen participation in the Model Cities Program at the United States Department of HUD, Housing and Urban Development (Arnstein, 1969). It was here she designed guidelines that involved community residents in the local planning and policy-making activities, a practiced now referred to as “citizen participation” (Aacom, 2015).

A lot has happened in society since Arnstein's text in 1969. Democracy has developed and other dimensions exist today. Arnstein's power perspective does not cover the entire discourse about how participant processes can reach levels of power. Fung (2006) has developed Arnstein's thoughts to more contemporary. Fung means that Arnstein's classification still provides a useful corrective to naive enthusiasm for public participation but as an analytic tool, it is obsolete and defective in two main ways. First, not in all contexts public empowerment and "citizen control" is the most wanted, certainly there are situations in which a consultative role is more appropriate for members of the public. Second, there have been many advances both in the theory and practice of participation since Arnsten's essay was published. Fung does believe that Arnstein's dimension of control is important, but more civic control is not always better. There are more important dimensions namely. It depends on who is participating and how they communicate and make decisions. There are varieties of participatory democracy (Parker, 2016). Guijt and Shah (1998, referred in Jones, 2003) do also claim that rather than simply identifying which rung of the ladder is being achieved, we should rather be asking and observing how different players participate and why such forms are chosen. Nonetheless, without questioning the nature and desirability of the ladder itself, identifying the type of participation in question is useful for flagging-up its more common manipulative and passive guises.
However, to analyze the residents possible influence from the professional actors in BID's perspective, it is in the context of power and powerlessness this thesis wants to understand BID's partnership with the residents. Therefore it is interesting to focus at the power perspective between power holders and the have-nots citizen as Arnstein's ladder addresses. For example, Stewart and Taylor (1995) criticize that the discussion about empowerment lacks analysis of power relationships. The ladder was Arnstein's vehicle for articulating social hierarchy and the different ways in which citizens and public agencies interact. The ladder is a metaphor for understanding whether citizen participation is genuine, honest, and effective. Further, it concerns whether everyday people have a chance of influencing the outcome of a decision (Arnstein, 1969). “Arnstein’s Ladder” is a classic text.

The idea of citizen participation is in principle applauded by everyone, because it is good for you. Everyone is in favor of it in principle. Participation of the governed in their government is, in theory, the cornerstone of democracy. To use citizen participation in projects and processes is a democratic legitimacy. The applause vary in strength, however, depending on who advocates the principle. And when the have-nots clarify participation as redistribution of power, the American consensus on the fundamental principle is very easy to explodes in direct racial, ethnic, ideological and political opposition. Arnstein's documentation (1969) is an analysis of the content of the late 1960s controversial slogan: "citizen participation" or "maximum feasible participation". In other words it addresses what citizen participation is and what its relationship is to the social imperatives of our time.

3.2 Different authors' introduction to "Arnstein's ladder"

LeGates and Stout (2007) write in their introduction to "A Ladder of Citizen Participation" in The City Reader that in complex regimes around the world new compositions of actors is an important part of the global order. Plural actors (public, private and nonprofit sectors) can influence the outcome of policies and programs that affect their lives, why local government is important. This new order, public, private and nonprofit sectors working together, raises local citizens stakes in having their interest taken into account. How citizens participation might best be done in local government decision making, is what Arnstein's classic article is about. Arnstein defines citizen participation as the redistribution of power from haves to have-nots that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future. What Arnstein wants to see is empowering the poor and powerless to take charge of their lives and their surrounding. However, some political scientists discuss that the phenomenon of hyper pluralism can make it difficult to get anything done, because there may be too many contending groups and attention too much to participate (LeGates & Stout, 2007).

It is quite long time ago and about America when Arnstein wrote about the concept. However, Duncan Lithgow (2006) who has written a foreword to Arnstein analysis model means that you can apply the concept to any hierarchical society. Lithgow says that the most distressing is that actors who work with representing citizens views do not know about these principles that Arnstein discussed. Lithgow continues meaning that many planners, architects, politicians, bosses, project leaders and power-holders still dress all variety of manipulations up as "participation in the process" and "citizen consultation". He concludes that success stories are when giving power to communities in making decisions for themselves. Lithgow sees the difference between citizen control and manipulation that Arnstein describes.
3.3 Arnstein's ladder

There are eight rungs on the ladder, and these are then divided into three levels. The lowest rungs are labeled "manipulation" and "therapy," and are levels of non-participation. The next three rungs up, labeled "informing," "consultation," and "placation," is a progress to levels of tokenism. The top three rungs of the ladder, "partnership," "delegated power," and, at the very top, "citizen control," symbolize the degrees of citizen power. The eight-rung ladder helps to illustrate that there are significant gradations of citizen participation. The eight types of participation show participation ranging from high to low. Each rung corresponding to the extent of citizens' power in determining the end product (see figure below) (Arnstein, 1969).

Obviously, it is a simplification, but knowing these gradations makes it possible to understand the demands for participation from the have-nots as well as the gamut of confusing responses from the power holders. The underlying issues in the typology are essentially - "nobodies" in several arenas are trying to become "somebodies" with enough power to make the target institutions responsive to their views, aspirations and needs. The "ladder of citizen participation" describes gradations of citizen participation in urban programs that affect their lives. Arnstein wants to explore who has power when important decisions are being made (Arnstein, 1969).

Arnstein's Ladder (1969)
Degrees of Citizen Participation

3.3.1 Citizen participation is citizen power

According to Arnstein the question of citizen participation has been a bone of political contention and means that answers as "self-help" and "citizen involvement" are harmless euphemisms that are deliberately formulated. Those who say that to participate is about an “absolute control” is a misleading rhetoric, because no one can reach this, not even the leaders at the top who lead a country. Since the concept has been exposed to both understated euphemisms and misleading rhetoric, even scholars have found it difficult to follow the controversy which means it is quite impossible for the public. For Arnstein, citizen participation is a redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens to join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, programs are operated, tax resources are allocated, and benefits like contract and patronage are
parceled out. In other words, it is when the citizens can provoke significant social reform which enables them to share the benefits of the affluent society (Arnstein, 1969).

Participation without redistribution of power is equivalent to going through an empty ritual and process. It is a critical differences from this and to have the real power needed to affect the outcome of the process. French students explain the student-worker rebellion, in the spring 1968, by expressing: "I participate, you participate, he participates, we participate, you participate...they profit.” This view highlights the fundamental point that participation allows the power holders to claim that all sides were considered, but it is only some of those sides that can gain benefits. The status quo is maintained, that is the current structures. This is what has happened in most of the community action programs according to Arnstein (1969).

3.3.2 Limitations of Arnsteins typology

In order to highlight the fundamental division between the powerless citizens and the powerful, the ladder juxtaposes them. In actuality, there are no homogeneous blocs, neither the have-nots nor the power holders. Each group comprises a host of divergent points of view, significant cleavages, competing vested interests and splintered subgroups. Why these simplified abstractions are used depends on that the have-nots in most cases really do perceive the powerful as a monolithic "system", and power holders actually do view the have-nots as a sea of "those people", with little comprehension of the class differences among them (Arnstein, 1969).

There are significant barriers to achieving genuine levels of participation and one limitation is that Arnstein's typology does not include these barriers in her analysis. These barricades exist on both sides of the simplistic fence. They include racism, paternalism and resistance to power redistribution on the power-holders' side. On the have-nots' side, they include inadequacies of the poor community's political socioeconomic infrastructure and knowledge-base. Under these circumstances it is not the easiest to organize a representative and accountable citizen group in the face of futility, alienation and distrust (Arnstein, 1969).

Another caution is that there are of course more than the eight separate rungs in the real world of people and program, and with less sharp distinctions among them. At any of the rungs things that represent either a legitimate or illegitimate characteristic of citizen participation can occur. For example, depending on their motives, power holders can hire poor people to co-opt them, to placate them or to utilize have-nots' special skills and insights (Arnstein, 1969).

3.3.3 The "ladder"

It is in the context of power and powerlessness that the characteristics of the eight rungs are illustrated and examples are used from federal social programs that were current in the 1960's America (Arnstein, 1969).

(1) Manipulation

In the bottom rungs of the ladder we find (1) manipulation and (2) therapy. These two rungs have been invented by some to substitute for genuine participation and describe levels of "non participation". Non participation is when the real objectives is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable power holders to "educate or "cure" the participants. Manipulation is a form of participation which aims to get citizens to accept a predetermined course of action. Gullible citizens may think that they are participating in the decision making, but they are simply being used by decision makers. Citizens placed in advisory committees become "educated", persuaded and advised by officials. Examples of this structures can
be called “neighborhood advisory groups” and these bodies frequently have no legitimate function or power. They are just being used to “prove” that “grassroots people” are involved in the program. The topic has not been discussed with “the people”, they do not even know what the topic is about more than just generally and the only thing they are being asked to is to write their signatures. Some citizens, as a result of these experiences of participation, are demanding genuine levels of participation to be assured that public programs are relevant to their needs (Arnstein, 1969).

(2) Therapy
Therapy is a dishonest form of non participation since the intent is to “cure” participants of attitudes and behaviors that local government officials do not like under the guise of seeking their advice. Administrators assume that powerlessness is synonymous with mental illness. Masked as citizen participation, decision-makers get people together to allegedly participate in decision-making, but in reality the experts subject the citizens to group therapy. When the focus is on curing citizens of their "pathology" rather than changing the victimization that create their "pathologies", this form of "participation" is so unfair, no matter how much the citizens may be engaged. These therapy sessions under the guise of participation are worse than no participation at all, as well as manipulation. Tenant groups are used as vehicles for promoting control campaigns. The tenants are helped to adjust their values to those of the larger society, and in this way they are diverted from dealing with things that are not in their favor (Arnstein, 1969).

(3) Informing
In the next rungs we have (3) informing and (4) consultation, where the have-nots are now allowed to hear and have a voice. It is a progress to levels of tokenism. When the power holders offer them to be a total extent of participation, citizens may hear and be heard. The most important first step toward legitimate citizen participation must be to inform citizens of the facts about a government program and their rights, responsibilities and options. Particularly if it is designed to go beyond a one-way flow of information. However, the problem is that the emphasis is placed on a one-way communication, from officials to citizens, and there is no opportunity for feedback. Participation is restricted in this level because there is no follow-through, and therefore there is nothing that can be granted to change the status quo. The citizens lack the power to insure that their views will be considered by the powerful and will have little opportunity to influence (Arnstein, 1969).

At the rung informing the tools used for "participation" can be, among others, the news media, pamphlets, posters and responses to inquiries. For example, unequal distribution of facilities in an area can also be answered by the officials with legalistic jargon or prestige to make citizens accept the "information" and approve the proposals (Arnstein, 1969).

(4) Consultation
A legitimate step toward full participation can be to invite citizens' opinions. If the process is honest and citizens' opinions are really considered, it is even better. Surveys, for example, may provide real input from citizens to decision makers, but if they are the only form of participation and they still not offer any assurance that the citizens' concerns and ideas will carry weight, the level of consultation can not be seen as participation. The most common methods used for consulting people are attitude surveys, neighborhood meetings and public hearings (Arnstein, 1969).

When input of citizens' ideas are restricted by power holders at this level and not combined with other modes of participation, participation remains just a window-dressing ritual. Participation is measured by how many people that come to meetings, take brochures home or answer a questionnaire. People are primarily perceived as statistical abstractions. In all this activity, citizens achieve that they have "participated in participation.” Power holders achieve the evidence that they
have gone through the required motions of involving "those people". An example is residents who live in slum neighborhoods that are increasingly unhappy by the number of times they are surveyed about their problems and hopes. It takes a lot of their time and some are so annoyed that they are demanding a fee for research interviews. Attitude surveys are not very valid indicators of community opinions if you also add that the majority who respond to them do not know the options available in the program. A classic misuse of the consultation rung is that residents do not participate in the drafting of the proposal. But sometimes it is explained that residents will be deeply involved in planning once the received funds have been well received. By way of contrast, even if the best intentions is there, technicians are often unfamiliar with and even insensitive to the problems and aspirations of the poor (Arnstein, 1969).

(5) Placation
Though the level of tokenism is still apparent, it is at the rung of placation that the citizens begin to have some degree of influence. The ground rules allow have-nots to advise and the government gives in to some citizen demands, but retain for the power holders the continued right to decide. An example of placation strategy is to place a few hand-picked "worthy" poor in boards of Community Action Agencies. If the traditional power elite hold the majority of seats, the have-nots can be easily outvoted. They allow citizens to advise but power holders retain the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice. Citizens who succeed with a higher degree of participation at the placation rung of the ladder have good quality of technical assistance that help them to articulate their priorities. But first and foremost, the community has been organized to press for those priorities. As a result of the provision stipulating "maximum feasible participation" in poverty programs at the department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the standards for citizens participation only demanded that citizens have clear and direct access to the decision-making process. Some of the findings that led to a new public interpretation of HUD's approach to citizens participation are that most local City Demonstration Agencies (CDAs) were not working with citizens' groups that were genuinely representative of the neighborhood. In addition, those who were involved in many of the poverty programs were more representative of the upwardly mobile working-class. Furthermore, the agency technicians do not suggest innovative options, and they react bureaucratically when the residents push for innovative approaches. Most CDAs were not engaged enough to expose and deal with the roots of urban decay and they work in a traditional manner with approaches which in slums emerged in the first place. Even after these findings HUD's repeatedly advocated that cities share power with residents in their technical bulletin on citizen participation. But in general, citizens are finding it impossible to have a significant impact on the comprehensive planning. A model in which government throws complaining citizens some crumbs to placate them is not really a satisfactory relationship. What is lacking is the means of insuring continued participation during the stage of implementation. By and large, people are once again being planned for, means Arnstein (Arnstein, 1969).

(6) Partnership
At rung six and further up on the ladder there are levels of citizen power with increasing degrees of decision-making clout. The rung (6) is named partnership because power is now redistributed through negotiation between citizens and power holders. Citizens can enter into a partnership that enables them to negotiate and engage in deliberations with traditional power holders. Power holders agree to share planning and decision-making responsibilities through such structures as joint policy boards and mechanisms for resolving impasses. After the basic principles have been established through some form of give-and-take, citizens are not subject to unilateral change. Where local government, private corporations, and neighborhood nonprofit community-based organizations form joint planning and decision-making structures, citizen views can have real weight. Local
partnership may have stresses and strains and each party will have to give a little. Everyone's interests are considered if the partnership is to be maintained (Arnstein, 1969).

Partnership can work most effectively when there is an organized power-base in the community to which the citizen leaders are accountable. The citizens group must also have the financial resources to pay its leaders for their time-consuming efforts. When the group also has the resources to hire (and fire) its own technicians, lawyers and community organizers, citizens have some genuine bargaining influence over the outcome of the plan. Power-sharing with residents is however almost never a city initiative. It is angry citizen demands from sophisticated enough citizens that refuse forms of alleged participation (Arnstein, 1969).

In most cases where power has come to be shared it was taken by the citizens, not given by the city. There is nothing new about that process. Since those who have power normally want to hang onto it, historically it has had to be wrested by the powerless rather than proffered by the powerful (Arnstein, 1969, p. 222).

Citizens must take control and show that civic participation is not a weak citizens' advisory role, but a strong shared power agreement. Instead of the city's description of the neighborhood from a paternalistic description of problems, citizens are now doing their own realistic analysis of its strengths, weaknesses and potentials. It resulted in neighborhood organizations which have the power to initiate plans of their own, to engage in joint planning with CDA committees and to review plans initiated by city agencies. It is important to maintain the neighborhood organizations once they are there (Arnstein, 1969).

(7) Delegated power
At the topmost rungs, (7) delegated power and (8) citizen control, there are full managerial power for the have-not citizens and they obtain the majority of decision-making seats. Citizens do not need to respond to pressure anymore when they achieved dominant decision-making authority over a particular plan or program. Rather the power holders need to start the bargaining process to resolve differences. However, city councils have final veto powers, even when the citizens have the majority of seats on the CDA Board. During the "War on Poverty" in the 1960s, local government delegated power to plan and/or run programs to some resident dominated groups or gave them full control over decentralized neighborhood programs components. Some of the subcontracts are so broad that they border on models for citizen control. These contracts usually include a specific statement of the significant powers that have been delegated, for example: policy-making; hiring and firing; issuing subcontracts for building; buying or leasing (Arnstein, 1969).

(8) Citizen Control
Demands for community controlled schools and neighborhood control were on the increase during the time Arnstein wrote the article. Probably, new models for control will emerge if the have-nots continues to fight for greater degrees of power over their lives. The most frequently advocated model is a neighborhood corporation with no intermediaries between it and the source of funds (Arnstein, 1969).

In experimental programs the have-nots can improve their lot by handling the entire job of planning, policy-making and managing a program. But they have to, at the same time, deal with a continuing barrage of local opposition triggered by the announcement that a federal grant has been given to for example a community group or an all black group. These experimental programs have been capitalized with research and demonstration funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity in cooperation with other federal agencies. The examples include loan guarantee program for local building contractors to create companies using unexperienced management and unskilled minority
group personnel. The funds can also be used to demonstrate that a community-based development corporation can catalyze and implement an economic development program with broad community support and participation (Arnstein, 1969).

Though, several citizen groups (and their mayors) use the rhetoric of citizen control, the criteria is not completely satisfied, since final approval power and accountability rest with the city council. Some argue that city councils are representative of the community, but Adam Walinsky illustrates the non representativeness of this kind of representation by saying: who exercises "control" through the representative process and highlights a ghetto area that has not received any help of urban renewal funds. Clearly, the area has some special needs; yet it has always been lost in the midst of the city's eight million. During the long years of neglect and decay, in what sense can the representative system be said to have "spoken for" this community? Walinsky's point has general applicability on ghettos. It is therefore likely that programs, in which residents in ghettos have achieved a significant degree of power in planning processes and understand that achieving a genuine place in the pluralistic scene subjects them to its legitimate forms of give-and-take, might begin to demonstrate how to counteract the various corrosive political and socioeconomic forces that plague the poor (Arnstein, 1969).

Opponents of citizen control advance many of the arguments that Arnstein identifies. They argue that citizen control arguably balkanized public services; it supports separatism; it is more costly and may be inefficient; it enables minority group to be just as opportunistic and contemptuous of the have-nots as their white forerunner; it is incompatible with merit systems and professionalism; and ironically enough, it can turn out to be a new Mickey Mouse game for the have-nots by allowing them to gain control but not allowing them sufficient dollar resources to succeed. These arguments has to be taken in consideration. But we have to remember the arguments of embittered advocates of community control - that every other means of trying to end the citizens' victimization has failed (Arnstein, 1969)!

3.4 Why to involve the residents?

Yvonne Rydin (2007) writes in "Re-examiing the role of knowledge within planning theory" about the importance of acquiring different kinds of knowledge in a planning process. A number of studies supports this approach. As Foley and Martin (2000) point out, the present government's approach values communities primarily for the “tacit” local knowledge that representatives may bring to policy debates and the enhanced legitimacy associated with a wider sense of ownership. As Rydin (2007) as well as research by Cairns (1996) and McArthur et al (1996, both referred in Foley & Martin 2000) suggest, that with a strong community voice, participation contributes to making better decision making and programme outcomes which are more attuned to local needs. Rydin (2007) argues for the specific contribution of knowledge within planning, while being aware of its challenges, it opens the way to rethink some of the claims of contemporary planning theory about multiple epistemologies and allows for planning to hear multiple voices in the name of democratic participation and empowerment. There is a need to claim the value of knowledge within planning alongside the value of hearing diverse stakeholders.

A primary argument in favor of more participation suggests that the involvement of the public provides information to the policy process. This information may relate to the public’s preferences but can also be more specific, relating to local knowledge (Rydin & Pennington, 2000). To address social problems effectively, especially in areas such as public safety, citizens may possess essential local knowledge that comes from close exposure to the context in which problems occur (Fung, 2006). The production of such locally specific information, unavailable to professional agencies, may help avoid the inappropriate developments often associated with centralized planning schemes.
Like Rydin and Pennington (2000) discuss, to involve parties in the decision making as an early process will better avoid disagreement later on.

Leonie Sandercock (1998, discussed in Rydin, 2007), is an urban planner and academic who pulls down the pillars of modernist city planning and raises in their place a new postmodern planning, a planning sensitive to community, environment and cultural diversity. Sandercock says that the view of knowledge has shift from the modernist model, seeing the planner as the holder of knowledge, to that in which knowledge is inherently multiple. Contemporary planning theory puts considerable emphasis on knowledge being held outside the planning organization and by groups other than professionally trained planners. Rydin (2007) continues that the purpose of planning is to listen to unheard voices and hence previously unheard knowledges. To bring in multiple sources of knowledge poses difficulty into planning though, how to engage different knowledges with each other and how to change decision-making as a result. The answer that has emerged from sociology science, environmental policy and planning theory literatures, is a greater reliance on deliberative and collaborative approaches. But this reliance on this processes within planning have some limits and general concerns, which is to handle multiple knowledges. Such processes are normally promoted on the basis of exploring the values of local communities and generating trust between parties. The orientation towards reaching agreement (if not real consensus) may not be best suited to ensuring that the most appropriate knowledge affects decision-making, because such processes need to handle multiple knowledges and concerns whether it is possible to distinguish knowledge from other bases for involvement. In addition, Sandercock (1998, discussed in Martin and Davidson, 2014) encourages planners to rather than being like a employees of government, radically position themselves as members of communities. As Thomas (1999, referred in Foley & Martin, 2000) declares, the long-term success of government intervention depends crucially on releasing social capital so that local people are able to develop and express their capacity for self-help and mutual aid. Rydin (2007) discusses a new orthodoxy that clusters around the idea that the core of planning should be an engagement with a range of stakeholders, giving them voice and seeking to achieve a planning consensus. However, when community institutions work to engage in activities like planning and policy-making, they can function very much like the “police” sphere described by Jacques Rancière (discussed in Martin and Davidson, 2014). It limits the possibilities for radical voices to be heard because of the emphasis on form and consensus-building.

Another argument why Rydin (2007) as well as McArthur (1993, referred in Foley & Martin, 2000) highlight increased participation is that it generates a sense of local ownership and stewardship, which in turn increase the likelihood of communities to take a role in maintaining their neighborhoods. That participation contributes to better maintenance, goes in line with Elinor Ostrom's design criteria for collaborative management, which we will examine in the next part.

3.5 How to let the civil society in?

The expression “the tragedy of the commons” is an economic theory that has to do with when a number of people will collaborate, but where the most effective way of doing things is poor from the common resource perspective. Solutions to this problem have been private ownership, government control or taxes (Walljasper, 2011). Elinor Ostrom's (1990) research show that it exist an alternative to the diatomic state-market and another way forward. Ostrom has set up a set of design criteria that indicate that common resources can be managed effectively without recourse to privatization or direct government control. Ostrom believes in institutional cooperation that creates common clear rules. In the governance of a shared resource in a cross-sector collaboration Ostrom (2000, discussed by Parker & Johansson, 2012) describes the need to conduct a balancing act. The governmental presence may not be excessive so it crowd out civic engagement, yet it have to maintaining enough governmental control to avoid pitfalls of lack of accountability. If such a
balancing act can be achieved then there is a reason to believe that government can support and enable effective collaboration, for instance by supporting access to relevant knowledge and in monitoring of rules and thereby decreasing costs of coordination and monitoring.

Ostrom's rich body of research reveal that all successful cases of self-governance had in common eight principles how commons are best managed. Parker and Johansson (2012) have summarized the key points of these principles in a simple form. If appropriators of a resource can communicate pretty easily and create common rules of use, and if the appropriators can monitor each other's use in a cost free way, then there is good reason to expect that they will develop locally appropriate rules and put them in use. For the system to work, appropriators should also have access to low cost means of conflict resolution and their system of administration needs some level of recognition by relevant external parties. In the following chapter we will now have a closer look of the current case in this study.
In the area of Sofielund in Malmö, property owners have had problems during a long time with an unsafe neighborhood with vandalism, crime, drug trafficking and a large relocation. There were a lot of unserious and slum property owners and due to this, the serious property owners had enough and realized that they must do something. In September 2014 the association Property Owners Sofielund [Fastighetsägare Sofielund] was started on the initiative of Malmö City and the association Property owners South [Fastighetsägarna Syd] (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017). After the discovery of illegal contracts and neglected properties in the area, the district's coordinator in the program Seved-Södra Sofielund run by the City of Malmö, saw a need to get property owners to sign a kind of moral agreement, which led to the start-up of the association Property Owners Sofielund. The association was formed as a non-profit association with the motto: “Together we make Sofielund to a better neighborhood”. The aim was to increase well-being, safety and cohesion in Sofielund. A key component for the association was to inspire the work with a BID model, a tool of urban development (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017). The BID process can be seen as a spinoff from the municipal neighborhood program Seved-Södra Sofielund between 2010-2015, to an upscaling of a public-private collaboration that included the whole area of Sofielund (Southern Sofielund, Northern Sofielund, Sofielunds Industry area, Annelund and Lönnängen).

BID stands for Business improvement districts and is an internationally proven tool for urban development to create local area development. BID is a new form of private–public partnership in the realm of local governance. For more than three decades the model has operated and proliferated throughout North America. In recent years, the BID model has transferred to other continents including Africa, Europe and Asia (Hoyt and Gopal-Agge, 2007). With American and Canadian origin, the concept is about getting property owners to fix up an area using commercial incentives. Abroad there is a mandatory law for how the work should be conducted (Olsson, 2017). In Sweden, we have no BID legislation so the forms of cooperation that have arisen have been done on a voluntary basis. The municipality also has a much greater influence on local development than in
many "BID countries" such as the United States and the United Kingdom. The municipality has a clear monopoly and is responsible for the physical planning in Sweden (Olsson, 2017).

In Sofielund the concept has been adapted to local conditions and BID stands therefore for Housing, Integration and Participation [Boende, Integration och Delaktighet]. In the collaboration model in Sofielund the property owners and business sector (private) wish to collaborate with civil society (non profit enthusiasts, residents and visitors) and the City (municipality) to invest in and improve the area together. It is thus a partnership between private, public and the civil society. Several major business actors in BID together with Malmö City contribute economically and with resources. Members of BID pay a membership fee and a service fee and the City of Malmö finances a development leader, who governs and coordinates the work because they look with great interest in this work. The City of Malmö are not members in BID, but are the public actor assisting the collaboration. The strength of using BID as a tool is the awareness that the situation in Sofielund need to be solved together. In april's newsletter from Property Owners BID Sofielund, it explains that due to the existence of the successful partnership there is now a model in Malmö where the City do not need to solve all problems alone, but many actors will do it together. The BID process serves as the cohesive kit between the different actors. BID has received financial support from the City and other funds to create long-term solutions in Sofielund (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017).

In Sofielund, BID focuses on making the area safer, but also cleaner with sustainable solutions. The model have seven priority areas since its inception in 2014 which are safe and secure, nice and clean, traffic and accessibility, urban environment, ecological-social-cultural sustainable development, membership and communication. With the BID tool the network want to solve the problem-image in the area. A first physical effort has been to make the area clean and tidy which create a feeling of safer streets. Through increased attractiveness, they hope the willingness for businesses to invest and establish in the area will increase (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017).

The statutes for property Owners BID Sofielund state that the association has the purpose of promoting cooperation between property owners, housing associations, village communities (associations of house owners), tenants and businesses in Sofielund and also between property owners, the City of Malmö and other actors in order to benefit from a positive development in Sofielund. The aim is that the long-term efforts will increase the collective strength among property owners and residents in the area (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017).

BID Sofielund has around 35 members. They consist of 16 private property owners (The three big ones are Stadex, EROOM and Pågen); MKB which is the public housing company owned by the City, eight housing associations; two village communities; one association (Somali-Swedish); one institute (housing support for homeless) and six businesses (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017). About 60% of the households in Sofielund are members of the BID process, that is, those whose property owners are members (Development leader, 2017).

BID's board has 14 board members. Among them there are representatives from nine private property owners; the public housing company; two housing associations and two village communities (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage 2017). There are many small housing associations in Sofielund. Just at Seved, one block in Sofielund, there are 15 small housing associations. At the BID Annual meeting 2017, the board decided to lower the membership fee for housing associations to get them more interested in joining (BID Property Owners Sofielund's annual meeting, 2017).
BIDs exist in Sweden since 2000 in the city of Gothenburg; Property Owners in Gamlestaden [Fastighetsägare i Gamlestaden], since 2007 in Stockholm; Property Owners in Järva [Fastighetsägare i Järva] and since 2014 in Malmö; Property Owners Sofielund [Fastighetsägare Sofielund] (Olsson, 2017). The BID process in Sofielund is thus the first in place in Malmö. It is a test arena which is persistent, where the actors are geographically bonded to the area. The impact that BID wants to achieve, is that residents and associations in the whole area will feel part of the change, in order to increase the social cohesion (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document).
5.0 ANALYSIS

This thesis investigates the new partnership model and how it involves the residents. The partnership is analyzed from the professionals actors discourses of citizens participation. Thus the study provides a largely “top-down” view and is less concerned with how the partnership and empowerment are received and understood “on the ground”. In this chapter we will use the empirical results, how different involved professional actors in BID partnership describe the involvement of the residents in the process, to analyze it in relation to ”Arnstein’s ladder”. How high on Arnstein's ladder can the residents climb, according to what discourses the network members have? Why? Why not?

Through qualitative interviews with key actors and members of BID in relation to Arnstein's model, I will try to answer the thesis research questions; Why do they want to involve the residents? How much influence do the residents have and which decisions can they make? How do the professional actors perceive strengths and weaknesses with BID as a tool to involve the residents in the area's development?

5.1 Limitation of the analysis

The analysis is based on Sherry Arnstein's “ladder” (1969). In Arnstein’s typology she do the limitation to see the power holders and the have-nots citizen as two homogeneous blocs. In actuality, there are no homogenous blocs, but in order to highlight the fundamental division between the powerless citizens and the powerful she juxtaposes them in her ladder. As mention before, Archon Fung (2006) has met the social issues more when he discusses who has the prerequisites for participation. He believes that it is not enough with Arnstein's argumentation, that we want more power, but who are we? How do they talk to each other, what methods are being used? Fung discusses who are allowed to participate and are they appropriately representative of the relevant population or the general public (Fung, 2012). This concerns the issue of who is eligible to participate and who you should participate with. But in this study's analysis we will go deeper with the power perspective. It was stated in an interview with one of the property owners (2017) that they see the residents more generally, but indirectly they know that there are different groups of residents. In the same way the documents from the City of Malmö present the residents as a homogeneous group. With this background, it is relevant to analyze Arnstein's concerns of power distribution between power holders and the have-nots citizen, where the have-nots do perceive the powerful as a monolithic ”system” and power holders do view the have-nots as a sea of ”those people” (Arnstein, 1969). Arnstein's thoughts is still important today.

Statistical data shows that there are less educated people in southern Sofielund compared to northern Sofielund. Many have not graduated from high school. Due to that Sofielund is a segregated neighborhood and is perceived as one of the poorest regions of Malmö (The City of Malmö homepage, 2017), the discussion who has the prerequisites for participation is of utmost importance. The situation might affect how far they can climb or not on Arnstein's ladder. In an interview with Christine Wamsler (2017), Professor at LUCSUS, she mentions that the ones who are involved in participation processes are often from a certain group. Usually it is the privileged who knows how to speak the right language. Furthermore, it is people with a relatively high level of education, Swedish language skills, and administrative and legal knowledge who can rethink to our topics. Fung (2006) means when methods for selecting participants are open to anyone who wants to participate, the people mentioned above is the ones who participate, and this method is also the
ones that the majority use. Therefore, it is difficult to reach the excluded and unorganized who may lack the advantages to participate. Hence, it is hard to ignore this discussion when to analyze what levels of participation there is in an area like Sofielund. With a socio-economic weak population those people might be excluded from participation when it is the ones we should involve most for sustainability. But if you do not even have the basics, how could you then engage in the areas development? If the stove may not work tomorrow, how can you care about long-term solutions that will be visible first in several years in the area. Some residents in Sofielund may not even know what they may require, if they come from other cultures etc. Perhaps they refrain from participating and criticizing if they do not want their names revealed. Still this thesis need a limitation and consider it relevant to analyze the power distribution between actors, who have power and who have not, in a process in which the two actors, power holders and citizens do participate. The intention is to assume from the question: what does residents have influence over in the BID process in Sofielund?

5.2 Empirical results in relation to "Arnstein's ladder"

As mention before the BID process in Sofielund focuses on Housing, Integration and Participation. Just by the name it sounds like participation is an important part in the process to improve the area. It is this thesis purpose to analyze what levels of participation there are to be find in Sofielund.

The case study-specific documents for BID and interviews with professional actors are the empirical results of this dissertation. It describes how different key actors in BID talk about citizens' participation and citizens' influence in the process. The data from the City of Malmö is both from their documents as well as interviews. The documents are written by the development leader for the BID process, who is employed by the city.

As BID is a partnership model and a cooperation between; business (private), municipality (public), non profit organizations (enthusiasts) and civil society (residents and visitors), the degrees of citizen participation could be at rung six of Arnstein's ladder, which is rung partnership. Arnstein places true partnerships relatively high on the eight-rung ladder and calls it levels of citizen power (Arnstein, 1969). This kind of partnership between sectors and with involvement of the community is popular today (LeGates & Stout, 2007). According BID's development leader (2017), to work from bottom-up with associations and residents is the key to success, and he called BIDs work a penta helix society. Citizens' views can have real weight where local government, private corporations and neighborhood nonprofit community-based organizations form collective planning and decision-making structures (Arnstein, 1969). What we will do now is to begin from the bottom on Arnstein's ladder and clearly state what rungs there are in Sofielund.
Rung 1 and 2, Manipulation and Therapy
Rung 1 and 2 on Arnstein's ladder, manipulation and therapy, are not visible in the BID process in Sofielund. In this rungs, the power holders are dishonest and assume a passive audience, which is given information that may be partial or constructed. At the very bottom, manipulation fulfill participation requirements, but with no genuine desire on the part of the “haves” to share any power with the “have-nots”. The citizens agree without knowing what it is about. Rung 2, therapy, is the most dishonest rung when uses “citizen participation” in a misleading way when the real intention is modifying the behavior of the have-nots. We will now go on to a step further up, informing at rung 3, where people have been informed of what is going to happen or has happened, which is the lowest level on the ladder that are found in Sofielund. The empirical results in this study begins on this rung.

Rung 3, Informing
Wamsler (2017, oral communication) asks, do the inhabitants have a member representative in BID? As the case is, the residents do not have this and the process is then about informing them. The rung informing is one of two of the most present rung in the BID process today. It is thus on a level higher than non-participation and is a level of tokenism according to Arnstein (1969). The involvement of the residents in BID appears on the level of tokenism, which means that it looks like the partnership involves the residents, but in fact they do not.

At BID's annual meeting only BID’s board members attending, such as property owners, representatives from housing associations and village councils, businesses and officials from the City of Malmö. In my interviews with the development leader (2017) and with property owners (2017) they all said that residents are not invited to make any decisions in their meetings. Therefore, the residents have no channel in to BID as also one of the property owners (2017) declared. When residents never meet the representatives of the board, the city-citizen dialogue tends to be limited to the top-down provision of basic information as Wamsler (2016) discusses in her text "From Risk Governance to City-Citizen Collaboration: Capitalizing on individual adaptation to climate
change”. The representative from the Department of City Planning at the City of Malmö and adjunct board member of BID (2017), discusses that residents are invited to a broader context in the BID process, but they have no particular influence. All three property owners (2017) said they “ensure the best conditions for their tenants”, and in that way they mean that they include their tenants in the process. Housing associations and village communities associations are members in BID and some of them have also a representative in the board, and in that way some residents have their representative in the process. But they are very few in the context and the representatives may speak from their own interest means the representative at the City of Malmö (2017). Furthermore, those residents whose property owners or housing association are not affiliated with BID, or worse, those who have a property owner who does not care, who put forward their voices? They can be seen to be outside the decision engine in the participatory process.

The rung of informing on Arnstein's ladder in Sofielund is also visible in other activities. Property Owners BID Sofielund's intention is to inform all inhabitants in the area about the ongoing work of BID and what it means for the area, and do this by sending a newsletter to all households (BID's Activity plan, 2017). This can be seen as an example of when the residents hear (if they read it want to say) and BID is informing them. The most important first step toward legitimate citizen participation according to Arnstein, must be to inform citizens of the facts about a government program and their rights, responsibilities and options. The problem is though, that the emphasis is placed on a one-way communication, from officials to citizens, and there are no opportunity to provide feedback (Arnstein, 1969). In BID's newsletter it is more about the ongoing process and less about how the residents can interact and their rights to transform the area. However, the latest newsletter informs that BID focuses on residents and influences, but it shows less on any practical examples where and how this is going to happen (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017).

Another example of a one-way communication is that residents have an opportunity to give viewpoints to the cleaning patrol, namely Sofielundspatrullen, which is implemented by BID Sofielund. In addition to cleaning, the patrol has a secondary function, that is to help gathering viewpoints from the residents in the area (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document). But if the suggestions only end up in a binder and will not be reviewed, as the development leader (2017) admitted, the citizens are not heard anyway.

Rung 4, Consultation
We are now at rung consultation in Sofielund, the fourth rung. In this rung, citizens may hear and be heard according to Arnstein (1969). Together with rung informing, the BID process are at this rung today, they consult with the residents. Property Owner BID Sofielund's slogan is ”Together we make Sofielund into a better neighborhood” and also ”With the help of the residents” (Property owner Sofielund homepage, 2017). When the power holders offer citizens to be a total extent of participation, that BID's intention is, it is a legitimate step toward full participation. Inviting citizens' opinions is at this rung as well as activities that are held to gather residents’ views and priorities, but with no guarantee that the input will actually make a difference (Arnstein, 1969). In Sofielund, residents and entrepreneurs do have the opportunity to leave proposals to the BID process through the cleaning patrol as mentioned before. If Sofielundspatrullen receives a proposal and give it to the development leader who considers to read it, then the residents have been heard. At the rung consultation, people are given a voice, but no power to ensure their views are heeded. The question is, how likely is it that residents do know about this function? The secondary function of the cleaning patrol was even unclear for the professionals actors themselves. It was only one of the three property owners (2017) who know about this function, and the development leader (2017) himself, who have implemented it. According to the property owners (2017) they were not even
sure if their tenants know that their property owners are members and work with the BID process. However, even if the residents know about this function to leave a proposal, how likely is it to have time to find the cleaning patrol to do it? Contrary, those who have time, but not a day job, might not have the courage to be part of the area's change, at all?

According to Davidoff (1965), difficulties with citizens' involvement are that citizens are more often reacting to what is being done than proposing their concepts of appropriate goals and future action. If we assume that a citizen have a proposal for the area, another concern is how effective the interface is between Sofielundspatrullen and the citizens as well as between the patrol and the authorities in BID. Certainly, the idea is nice that the patrol acts as advising, but are the citizens and the patrol speak on an equal level? Daniel Sestrajcic, Parliamentary member for the left, emphasizes the importance of speaking the same language to understand a problem (Holmberg, 2017). If instead inhabitants from two neighborhoods with shared experiences would meet, they speak the same language that would give a better exchange, according to Wamsler (2017, oral communication). With this arguments it would be more appropriate in the current case to bring Augustenborg inhabitants and Sofielund inhabitants together. Augustenborg is a neighborhood next to Sofielund, where a successful work with the area was held a few years ago with the help of the residents (Rolfsdotter-Jansson, release year not specified). Sofielund residents can then understand Augustenborg residents' good examples and solutions and would become aware of alternatives in their own area. Participants engage with one another directly as equals who reasoning together about public problems, as Fung (2006) argues. Participation can enable local communities to raise their issues in the area and stand up for their rights. However, it is a problem if they do not have the tool to speak the same language as planners and those involved.

The problem to get an understanding on what really can be done is also highlighted by Arnstein (1969), who means that residents that respond to surveys or fill in a proposal might not even know about their possibilities. One example Arnstein mentions is when residents wished a new playground in a survey, but they did not know they could get a new hospital. She means that in a program or process residents may not know the best options available for them. As in BIDs case, to leave a proposal are not a very valid indicator of community opinion then if you not know what really can be done in the area as Arnstein means. In this mode, participants can not find the best available option to deepen the common preferences they have, as Fung (2006) discusses. According to Arnstein (1969) a classic misuse of the consultation rung is that residents do not participate in the drafting of the proposal. So at that stage when BID professionals just throwing out a loose question to people what they want and residents only submit their views to the cleaning patrol and nothing more, participation remains just a window-dressing ritual according to Arnstein. At these rungs on the ladder, powerful people and institutions are not making any sacrifices and giving any power (Arnstein, 1969). How can we understand this in relation to that the BID process is based on participation?

According to Crush's (2016), Critical Urban Sustainability Hub', Thirteen myths about the housing issue, the safety perspective of urban renewal can be an expression of an "outward perspective". A perspective where politicians, landlords, builders and the media paint a preconceived picture of how the neighborhood is perceived by residents and businesses, who rarely get to speak. Such a lack that the residents themselves are not covered by the plans, often produce solutions that do not meet their needs and wishes.

**Rung 5, Placation**

According to BID's Activity Plan 2017, dialogue meetings are planned with residents in some projects in the area. Residents will have the opportunity with BID professionals, relevant officials
from the municipality and businesses on the street, to express their wishes and views when streets, parks or areas are planned to be transformed (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document). The desired effect is if residents are involved in the development work they will take responsibility for the site (BID's Activity Plan, 2017). For example, a park is planned to be developed together with the citizens, in terms of link farming opportunities in the park to pre-school activities nearby. The goal of the process is that preschool children and associations are naturally linked as users of the park. The activity to develop the park will provide answers to how responsibility is shared between public, private and non-profit activities in the area (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document). Another form of citizens' participation mentioned in the Activity Plan 2017, is that residents should participate in the design process. Together with architects who are active and living in the area, residents will be able to contribute to illustrate how blocks can be developed. Though, this has not yet happened, but if the strategy will be implemented the rung of placation will be visible in Sofielund, where citizens begin to have some degree of influence. With this planned activities, BID's actors' intention is to understand the residents' views in the area. However, the level of tokenism is still apparent, but this rung allows have-nots to advise and government gives in to some citizen demands (Arnstein, 1969).

According to the development leader (2017), residents have had influence several times already when there has been a practical change in the area. It has been about traffic solutions such as bus stops and crossings, shutdowns and green areas. One of the property owners (2017) also agrees that there have been practical changes in the area where the wish came from the residents. According to South African creator Danielle Ehrlich (2017) in her talk "Engagement's ability to create changes in physical space", one of the key factors for successful urban development projects is “active listening”, to deeply listen to all involved parties to understand culture, values and needs, and to mentally open up opportunities. Similar, the development leader for BID (2017) mentions dialogue meetings as a method to increase the collective strength that can contribute to a positive feeling in the area of Sofielund.

In rung placation people's voices have some influence, according to Arnstein (1969), but institutional power holders still make decisions. An example of placation strategy, is to place a few hand-picked "worthy" have-nots on boards of Community Action Agencies. If the traditional power elite hold the majority of seats, the have-nots can be easily outvoted. They allow citizens to advise but power holders retain the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice. We can link this strategy to BID's board meetings in Sofielund, where housing associations and village communities association have representatives in the board, but they are very few in the context and major property owners hold the majority of seats. Today, citizens in Sofielund lack the power to insure that their views will be considered by the powerful. Citizens' involvement are not granted to change the status quo in BID. The activities rather refers to maintaining current structures, when residents have a weak advisory role, and the ones who have the ultimate power to decide remains unchanged. What is lacking is the means of insuring continued participation during the stage of implementation. By and large, people are once again being planned for, as Arnstein means (1969).

When citizens are not only allowed to advice but have the right to decide, then we can start to see levels of citizen power in BID Sofielund, that is discussed next.

**Rung 6, (a tendency of) Partnership?**

We can see a vague tendency of the rung partnership in the BID process in Sofielund today. One example where Property Owners BID Sofielund together with the city actually invite public participation, where all groups and associations in the area are given the opportunity to participate based on their conditions, is in form of a street party called NGBG in Sofielund. Property Owners
BID Sofielund will not control the project in traditional terms they say, but will support and facilitate arrangements that actors along the street want to implement. Local involvement and togetherness are central to the project (NGBG street party Facebook event, 2017). Here, the residents are actually continued participating during the stage of implementation.

In a partnership on Arnstein's (1969) ladder everyone's interests are considered. Citizens negotiate with institutional power holders over agreed roles, responsibilities and levels of control. In the project with the street festival, which took place for the first time in 2016 and will be back in 2017, citizens can negotiate what to implement with traditional power holders, as property owners and officials at the City of Malmö. Within the limits of the festival's permission, citizens' views can have real weight as on the partnership rung at Arnstein's ladder. Citizens both have empowerment and responsibilisation in the project, that is owning as well as being responsible for the process, as Brink and Wamsler (2017) discuss. Linked to this street festival, residents and organizations can negotiate with power-holders to resolve different priorities that is associated to this one day street festival. However, they can not negotiate about joint structures such as policy boards, planning committees and they are not daily invited in the decision engine in BID, as Arnstein's level of citizen power requires.

To be speculative, the street festival can show the residents what is possible to do when they are given control over a street one day. The level of citizen power is awakened on the street that day. One example from Arnstein's rung 7 delegated power, is that during the "War on Powerty" in the 1960s, the local government delegated power to plan and/or run programs to some resident dominated groups or gave them full control over decentralized neighborhood programs components (Arnstein, 1969). The street in Sofielund where the festival takes place can be seen as one of Arnstein's neighborhood components, where the actors in BID give the local residents some power to make the street more attractive.

However, BID Sofielund is not on Arnstein's rung of partnership and levels of citizen power yet. This became clear when a property owner (2017) tells that some residents were first afraid that BID came as private actors to determine over their area, and the property owner replied: "let them be held". This shows that citizens do need to respond to pressure as long as they not have any decision-making authority over a particular program, as Arnstein (1969) declare. This also concludes that Arnstein's rung 7 and 8, delegated power and citizen control, are not visible in the current case of BID Sofielund.
5.3 Are there different discourses on citizens' participation in the partnership?

Why do the professional actors in BID want to have citizens' participation in the process? What is their interest to involve the residents? Do they have different views on participation? What are the property owners' discourse versus the City of Malmö and their development leader for BID? According to the property owners (2017) they want satisfied tenants, but they are the ones who decide. The policy of the City of Malmö states that participation is one of the most basic conditions for achieving common goals and to get influence over the circumstances that affect one's life (Mynewsdesk homepage, 2016). In the latest newsletter from BID, April 2017, the development leader writes that the BID model in Malmö aims to create long-term sustainable development in the area by focuses of residents in the urban development (Property owner BID Sofielund homepage, 2017). Are there different views then on residents' involvement between the actors in BID? BIDs actors have different background, objectives and mandates. The development leader is employed by the city, so is it he who represents citizens' participation and dialogue in the BID process in order to adhere to the policy of the city? Yet, the property owners (2017) as well as the development leader (2017) argue that the residents have no power to decide anything in the BID process, which is in conflict with the city's policy. In the property owners' discourse there is little room for participation. They mean they take care of their tenants, and BID should not do that but focuses on major issues in the area (Property owners, 2017). The property owners (2017) seem to see citizens' participation in BID as when citizens are satisfied with the networked outputs then everything should be fine. But as Arnstein (1969) clarifies, citizens' participation is when you participate in the implementation and have the right to decide.

In the application where the development leader seeks funds to BID from "Safe Malmö" ["Trygga Malmö"], he writes that in the development work they want support from associations to anchor the process. In order to increase safety in the area, BID wants to take advantage of the skills of different actors in order to gain knowledge of structural, social and economic factors that help them to focus on concrete efforts. Here, they want participation and dialogue meetings with the residents, and see BID as a possibility to become more inclusive (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document). Can it be due to BIDs development leader that BID invites the residents to make it a more legitimate process? The fact that the city owns a part of the process can mean that they want to achieve something? When the City of Malmö means that various actors and residents are invited to solve the problems together, is it to push responsibility to others actors? BID's newsletter explains that there is now a model in Malmö where the city will not solve all problems, but all actors together (Property Owners BID Sofielund homepage, 2017). This can mean that the City of Malmö has initiated the partnership because they want to share the responsibility with the property owners as well as the residents. According to Magnus Johansson, Ph.D at Malmö University, the requirements for a wide participation can be a way for actors to avoid taking responsibility (Johansson, 2011).

Furthermore, scholars have discussed whether citizen engagement is a process of 'empowerment' or a process of ‘responsibilisation’ (i.e. of transferring the burden of risk to citizens) (Wamsler & Brink, 2017; Taylor, 2007). Wamsler (2017, oral communication) discusses that the wish to cooperate can be a way to remove responsibility. Collaboration may utilizes the notion that participation is a democratic legitimacy, but risk to push responsibility to actors who might not want to be involved. Contrary, is it clear that the property owners do not want to share the process with the residents in terms of decision-making, when the property owners (2017) mean that the actors that pay the member fee are also the ones who decide. Is there any chance that residents' involvement in BID is a process of empowerment then?
5.3.1 How do the professional actors perceived strengths and weaknesses with BID as a tool to involve the residents

What challenges and opportunities to involve the residents arise among the actors who work with the model? All three property owners (2017) believe that the strength of BID, with around 40 members, is that they get a stronger voice towards the city when they want to convey something. The strength of the tool to involve the residents is then that BID become even a stronger voice with the residents. A reportage in SVT News Skåne [SVT Nyheter Skåne], available at Property Owners Sofielund homepage (2017), is about how the different actors in BID together can develop Sofielund and they highlight the big challenge to engage the residents. Anna-Karin Ivert, researcher in criminology, comments in the reportage that a very important part of the success of BID's work is that those who are living in the area see the benefits of such a project. The residents have seen projects come and go for decades in Sofielund, but the BID process should be permanent. The hope is to reduce the lack of trust in “new” project with BID as a permanent process that is based on the concept of participatory democracy and a wide spectrum of citizen participation. The strength with BID as a tool to involve the residents can then be that its long-term efforts are perceived as positive and makes the residents willing to participate. As the property owners (2017) also argue, the efforts will not disappear as when you are done with a project, and that can convince those living in the area to be engaged.

According to the representative of the City Planning Office (2017), in the former Seved-Södra Sofielund neighborhood program run by the city, they had a lot of focus on citizens' dialogues and worked with social issues. The focus was more around public meeting places when the focus now in BID is more on the members' properties. Further on, the interface to the residents is different now compared with the previous municipal neighborhood program. With BID the interface is more between the property owners and the residents, than between the city and the residents as before. The representative from the city continues that it can be a strength for the residents to have an interface with the property owners. Citizens' dialogues represented by the city should be a strength for the residents to gain more influence, but when projects such as area programs are for a limited project period and those who conduct the dialogues have no power over the final product, dialogues can instead create project fatigue among the residents, which they also did, according to the development leader (2017). The benefits to have the interface with the local property owners that are involved and act in the geographically defined area and address local priorities based on the situation, can gain the residents some influence. In line with one of Ostrom's (1990) design principle, it may be more congruence between the resource environment and its governance structure or rules, as the example of the property owners. When property owners possess local experience and knowledge about the area and can make fast and flexible decisions about certain things they can be seen as more transformative than bureaucratic authorities. The development leader (2017) argues that the wishes they receive from residents can be implemented relatively fast. The residents can therefore feel that they are closer to the negotiating process. Thus, the strength of BID as a tool to involve the residents may be that the BID professional actors may enable for residents to influence rather than the top-down dialogues do. As Fung (2006) states, when political decision makers operate in distance from ordinary citizens, the public opinions and wishes also gets harder to reach the decision makers. Hence, the BID process may have more capacity for responding to residents wishes when they are more closely linked to them, than municipal neighborhood program are. Manzo & Devine-Wright (2014) confirm this discussion when arguing that individual and community participation in voluntary associations are determined by both residents' capacity to respond, both individually and collectively, and local institutions capacity for responding to those affected and to involve them in making decisions. Parker and Johansson (2012) argue that collective management can have advantageous in providing greater responsiveness to
local needs and greater knowledge of local conditions and thus outperforming more distant
government control.

However, it can be discussed that the social skills that existed in the municipality area programs
have disappeared when property owners are usually more technically knowledgeable, and this may
be a weakness with BID as a tool to involve the residents. Arnstein (1969) discusses this dilemma,
even if the best intentions are there to involve the residents, technicians are often unfamiliar with,
and even insensitive to the problems and aspirations of the have-nots. The fact that BID will take
help of municipal officials at the Department of Streets and Parks to make the dialogues, according
to the development leader (2017), indicates that the actors believe that the City of Malmö possesses
this knowledge.

The development leader (2017) means that the strength with BID to involve the residents is that the
process is a penta helix society, a concept that has been used in the context of innovation. The
figure of penta helix is that the relationships between different categories of actors are winding and
interwoven rather than linear (Björk, 2015). Archon Fung (2012) clarifies, approaching a
democratic ideal requires political leaders who push not just for their policy preferences but for
improvements in the processes of democratic governance. As BID can be seen as an innovative
platform with the encouragement of experimentation we can assume that the intention is to make
transformational changes in contrast to incremental changes. With the BID tool professional actors
work interdisciplinary and systematic to may address bureaucracy and how to take decisions in the
end. If the intention is to create an organizational culture with greater ownership by stakeholders, it
seems that they must "be the change". If BIDs work challenges traditional structures where the
property owners may want more ownership over the process, the step towards improvements in the
processes of democratic governance for the residents may also be closer. But though, as Arnstein
(1969) clarifies, power-sharing with residents is however almost never an initiative from those who
have power, so even if BID improve in the processes of democratic governance it might not change
the residents power.
5.3.2 Tricky to let the civil society in

Professional actors do perceive weaknesses with BID as a tool to involve the residents. One property owner (2017) said that it is tricky to let the civil society in. He means that it is hard to solve it administratively, to get all residents heard, and the development leader (2017) agrees that the residents are difficult to bring in. How commons can be governed sustainably and equitably in a community as BID Sofielund, Ostrom's (1990) design criteria for collaborative management can be helpful. A number of criteria are believed to affect the success of self-organized governance systems, and the question is how they can be viewed in the context of how to manage the residents' involvement in the governance of commons.

Some of Ostrom's basic design principles about how groups are able to organize and govern their behavior successfully can be find in BID. The BID actors' intention are to communicate pretty easy through their newsletter to the residents. In the newsletter they can also add rules how commons as parks should be used, as to add cultivation as one use of the park (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document). With the collective use and cultivating of the park, the BID actors managed to match rules governing the use of collective goods to local needs and conditions, which is one of Ostrom's
criteria. It is also an example where they build responsibility for governing the common resource in nested tiers from the lowest level up to the entire interconnected system, that is another of Ostrom's design criteria for collaborative management (Walljasper, 2011). In this example, BIDs actors want to interact with the citizens who want to grow and when the residents will experience the area as safer BID would like to see housing associations in the area open up their courtyards (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document). Responsibility for the commons will in this way be the whole way from the lowest level up to the nested enterprise among BIDs professionals actors. By inviting users to the park, BIDs intention might be a better maintenance of it, which is one of the outcomes with participation, as Rydin (2007) state.

What makes collective governance difficult in an urban setting is that there is a large number of appropriators of a resource as Parker and Johansson discuss (2012). However, as Ostrom believes, if there is a clear framework in the institutionalized cooperation, it will make it easier for residents to know what to do. But there are of course a challenge of maintaining boundary rules or for a group of appropriators to gain recognition for their locally generated rules (Parker & Johansson, 2012). A board member in a housing association in Sofielund (2017), believes it is hard to involve the residents in the area, and for that to be possible, it must be simple solutions for communicating.

When the property owners (2017) say that they work with the "ear to the ground" to create a collective strength among the residents, it can be related to conduct a balancing act in the governance. The actors can not be too present so that the civic engagement passively waiting for top-down solutions, yet they have the accountability (Ostrom 2000, discussed by Parker & Johansson, 2012). When the BID actors listen to and involve the residents they hope for strengthened the ties between people. If the neighbors feel committed they might can, as one of Ostrom's design criteria (Walljasper, 2011 ) monitor each other's use and locally appropriate rules can be developed. If such a balancing act can be achieved in BIDs governance then there is a reason to believe that it can be an effective collaboration, following Ostrom's criteria, with decreased costs of coordination and monitoring. The BID process meets Ostrom's design criteria when its appropriators have access to low cost means of conflict resolution when the partnership has a close anchoring. BID's system of administration has also got recognition by relevant external parties, which is another criteria from Ostrom in the success of governance of the commons (Ostrom, 2000, discussed by Parker & Johansson, 2012). One of Ostrom's design principle (Walljasper, 2011) that BID do not meet, is that they do not ensure that those affected by the rules can participate in modifying the rules, as the residents.

Another concern is who to involve when letting the civil society in. As Wamsler (2017, oral communication) discusses, how to choose someone representative in an area where all the residents have in common is that they live in the same area. On the other side, who among the residents want to join? As the board chairman in a housing association (2017) had experienced, even in individually owned apartments in a housing association, people do not want to engage. Fung (2006) discusses that the typical participant has little or no expectation of influencing policy or action. Instead, perhaps she or he participates to fulfill a sense of civic obligation. Not everyone in a neighborhood wish to participate. It is interesting to address this to Arnstein's ladder where citizens who reach the top of the ladder reach levels of citizen power. Do you need to be an active citizen to reach this? Do you have to be fully engaged as a citizen only because you live in a city? Can you not just be a citizen walking on the sidewalk? Magnaghi (2005) introduces in his book The Urban Village, the concept of self-sustainable local development, and promoting the inhabitants capacity for self-organization in the territory as producers when participation becomes the social production of the territory. This kind of utopia stands in contrast to the discussion if you have time as a resident to participate and actively be involved in the development of your neighborhood. Martin et al
(1999, referred in Foley & Martin, 2000) reports in his research that residents favored passive forms of consultation such as postal survey as opposed to more interactive approaches such as public meetings and citizens’ juries. The board chairman in the housing association (2017) discusses that people in cities want a situation where they can be sure that the city take care of “the situation outside their door”. As Brink and Wamsler (2013) discuss, when confidence in authorities support is high (hierarchy), the citizens passively waiting for top-down solutions. And as in contrast, in the absence of institutional assistance (when confidence in authorities support is low), the engagement of citizens is higher and it has been shown that citizens coming together with far-reaching benefits. However, strong echoes in recent policy initiatives are that the perception that rootlessness, individualism and a disregard of communal obligations have weakened communities and therefore some scholars suggest it is a need to “recreate” a sense of belonging (cf Elshtain 1995; Etzioni 1995, referred by Foley & Martin, 2000).

Further, what is engagement? Is it possible to measure? Is it what you do for yourself or does it has to be for your area? We can discuss if the neighborhood itself is relevant for the residents. For example young people might not differ the area they are living in with nearby areas, but value other aspects such as where they walk the dog or the way to the grocery store etc. Moreover, it is recognized that individuals may belong to more than one community and group (i.e. have multiple identities and interests) (Atkinson, 1999).

5.4 Why to involve the residents?

Why the BID actors want to involve the residents in the process, the property owners (2017) highlight the importance to build bonds between people that is to increase the social cohesion and the informal social control, as well as documents from the City of Malmö, written by the development leader, declare that BID wants to increase the collective strength in the area by
creating places and activities that invite to social meetings (Falck, 2017, case study-specific document). The property owners (2017) continues that they support a football club and they also enable events in the neighborhood, and declare that community capacity and business benefits goes hand in hand. The actors in BID can be the engine, the injection into things, but the neighborhood has to live its own life that not ends when the property owners leave work. To get the residents involved in the area so they feel part of Sofielund and the society, will increase their responsibility for the local environment, they mean. For example, if you enable the residents in the area to find motivation in activities, there will be less vandalism in the area. It is about to develop the collective strength among the residents and a trust for the local authorities, conclude the property owners (2017). A positive outcome from participation as Rydin (2007) mentions, is that it contributes to a better maintenance. Furthermore, Rydin and Pennington (2000) discuss other positive outcomes from a participatory process are factors as a sense of belonging, a sense of ownership and a value of local knowledge. The existence of social capital contributes to a project’s effectiveness in achieving its specific objectives and that the outcomes will be better implemented. A profit for the professional actors in BID to engage the resident can be that the citizens continue to work "for them" and for the best for the area when they are not there, as it results in neighbors feeling more tied to each other and monitor each other's behavior in the neighborhood. Rydin and Pennington (2000) discuss that in small-scale communities, where individuals repeatedly communicate and interact in a localized physical setting, they build rich social networks, ‘social capital’. The desire of an individual or group to maintain their reputation in a close-knit social context may lead to the development of behaviors that facilitate co-operation. Another term related to this situation is collective efficiency, first articulated by Robert Sampson who is an urban sociologist. The term includes behaviors, norms and actions that residents of a given community use to achieve public order. It refers to the ability of members of a community to control the behavior of others in the community (Ronald et al., 2005). In order for collective efficacy to develop in a specific neighborhood, it is necessary that members of the community have strong feelings of trust and solidarity for each other and feel strongly bonded to each other, Sampson & Raudenbush (1999) conclude.

In Yvonne Rydin's (2007) "Re-examing the role of knowledge within planning theory", she discusses the importance of acquiring different kinds of knowledge in a planning process. The benefits of engaging with local people, who have a close relationship with their physical environment and therefore have developed knowledge of the environment through their everyday experience, are that it provides local, experiential and contextualized knowledge in the planning process. According to the development leader (2017) he wants to involve the residents in the process so that they naturally become users, and because the knowledge of those who live in the area is important. To achieve the collective strength between the actors, the property owners (2017) also highlight the importance to listen to the residents wishes. It is about finding the soul in the area, or in a staircase or in a backyard, and to include everyone's different wishes. However, Rydin (2007) highlights the necessity to acknowledge that engaging different knowledges is fundamentally different to engaging different voices, as heterogeneous voices have multiple knowledges. To handle multiple knowledges involves more than just bringing together the different actors to formulate those knowledges in a context oriented towards mutual understanding. It is difficult to generate agreement between actors whose knowledge of an issue is rooted in very different experiences. When the property owners (2017) said that they want to listen to residents' wishes because everyone has different and unique wishes, they might know how to pick up different voices, but can they deal with the multiple knowledges and make them useful in the BID process?
6.0 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study has reviewed a new governance and partnership model in the context of power and powerlessness, focusing on how much influence is given to residents' participation. The case study enabled us to identify many common difficulties and barriers to reach a high level of participation, which Arnstein (1969) also highlights. The findings shows that there is a consultancy model in BID Sofielund, where it looks like they involve the residents but in fact they do not. BID's strategies are formulated to a large extent by local and central authorities, where residents' involvement is limited to being informed by the professionals actors' plans for the area. The residents have an advisory role in BID and they are consulted about a narrow range of options over which they have little or no influence. In this mode, officials and actors maintain their authority and power in the partnership, while they have accepted to receive inputs from the residents. The professional actors may give in to some citizen demands if their planned activities and intentions to give people more influence in the process will be realized.

BID is committed to give the community greater influence over policy making in the neighborhood process. However, it requires that BID's current policies need to address a number of important obstacles of community involvement to find ways of reconciling BIDs intention to give local people greater influence. In the current case, there are few possibilities for residents to influence the decision-making in the area's development.

Based on the way BID's actors describe residents' participation in Sofielund as well as BID's documents and statutes, the study claims following:

1. Influence from residents is important to create a legitimate process, but they have no real power.

2. BID sees its role in trying to create collective strength/collective efficiency among the residents.

From claim 1 and 2 the outcome can results in claim number 3, which is, a small opening. If the residents are able to create a strong collective efficiency, they can be able to mobilize and organize themselves collectively. Since the residents have a legitimate role to play in the BID process, their participation is also justified. The result is that residents can thus get more influence through BID's partnership. They have their window dressing where they can be visible, be heard, may ask questions and influence, factors that can enable the residents more power. This would not be possible if there was no interest for a participatory process among the authorities or if there was no willingness to improve the area, intentions that BID's partnership has. Hence, the claim above indicates that the possible opening will be that the residents in the BID process can gain more power and "climbing on the ladder" and reach levels of citizen power.

The street festival that BID Sofielund arrange where the residents have been delegated some power, can be seen as a first step towards citizen power. If the citizens continue to engage in organized collective groups, perhaps they may succeed in requiring more control over the street and ultimately contribute or take control of the street's future development. If residents manage to create citizen organizations, they can be seen as a vehicle through which they gather their interests, vote their preference and exert the power required to influence a continued change.
The purpose of the study was to analyze a new tool and approach in the governance of urban development in the light of citizens participation, by interviewing several key actors in BID Sofielund. Data how they describe the citizens' involvement as well as case study-specific document has been analyzed mainly by using Arnstein's ladder. The study fulfills its aim and discusses what levels of citizen participation is found in BID Sofielund and the outcome claims a possible opening.

The conditions for citizen participation in BID Sofielund problematized by Arnstein's ladder, shows the importance of contextualizing the model in present times. Arnstein's ladder based on conflicted neighborhoods in the 1960s America can be found in a similar variant in Sofielund today, which shows that the ladder can be applied to hierarchical societies even today. A weakness to add and problematize Arnstein's ladder in this study, is that Arnstein do not problematize citizens' different circumstances and interest to participate in her ladder, but addresses power perspectives between authorities and have-nots citizens. However, the professional actors assume that the residents are a homogeneous group that goes in line with the theoretical perspective. Yet, everyone has not the same prerequisites for participating, but the study can be seen as a call characterized by if the real fight and conflict may stand between those who have and those who do not have. The BID process do not meet their own expectations when they express that they work together with the residents but do not sacrifice any power.

The concept citizens participation has been exposed to both understated euphemisms and misleading rhetoric, and scholars have found it difficult to follow the controversy (Arnstein, 1969). The thesis findings contributes to what previous experience of citizens participation suggests; there are significant obstacles to reaching increased influence of citizens' involvement. However, it also suggests that participation processes provides residents with opportunities. The BID partnership's commitment to involving the local people in the regeneration process can be used by the residents as an instrumental driving force for democratic and socio-economic change. The study claims that the explicit interactions in the process are at levels of tokenism, but the implicit interactions, namely the interactions that were not intended at the beginning, can get higher up on the ladder. This finding supports previous research as Taylor's (2007) governmentality theory. Taylor explains that even in the shift from government to devolved governance, the state power however remains with the partnership's professional actors. However, at the same time, the theory acknowledges the potential for communities to become "active subjects" who can shape and influence the new spaces into which they have been invited. They can manipulate prevailing discourses to their own advantage, drawing on social movement theory to identify the opportunities that new governance spaces have opened up. According to Parker (2016), there is potential for residents to influence as long as there exist an organized and knowledgeable interest as well as a well functioning civil society organization, which can increases the democratic influence. However, to decrease the power gap and empower the residents, it requires time, flexibility and community resources as well as a major cultural shifts within the state (Taylor, 2007).

The current debate is aware that it is a need that processes involving a larger group in society to deepen democracy. But in debates of participatory processes, the aim that citizens should gain more power is not so often mentioned. Rather a consultancy model is often an discussed outcome, which does not deepen democracy and increase power equality in practice, only in theory. If the discussions only is about how citizens achieve to “participate in participation” as Arnstein (1969) highlights, our neighborhoods face a problem with social sustainability. If power holders do not change their status quo, the political activities can be better understood as a self-interested behavior.
of key actors who merely legitimize the power and political agendas of elites than a redistribution of power (Goldstein & O. Keohane, 1993).

The concept of citizens' participation takes place in a political context and is accepted today in the BID process, as they have invited the residents to solve the area's problem together. But what happens if their area becomes more attractive and their residents get more power? Is it any risk that the professional actors refrain from the participatory process then, if they still decide to say? I hope that the outcome of this research will provide a better understanding of power structures and show that the real struggle still is between those who have and those who do not have in the governance of our democratic societies. The real test to what degree the BID's actors are willing to give participation to the residents, encourages to further research. A proposal for further research can also be to investigate the opposite, if citizens' power always are the desirable effect for citizens' participation.
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APPENDIX: Interview guide

The interviews were conducted between February to April 2017. The duration of the interviews varied between one and a half to three hours. The questions was prepared before the interviews, but worked more like a guide to lead the conversation around some themes. The interviewees were given the chance to develop their own reasoning about the process and go deeper into some subjects, which reminds more of a dialogue. The interview guide was the same for all actors to get comparable answers of citizens’ participation from different perspectives.

Questions:

How would you describe the involvement of the residents in the process?

Why do you want to involve the residents in the BID process? Why should the residents be a part of it?

How much influence do the residents have and which decisions can they make?

Strengths and weaknesses with BID as a tool to involve the residents?

How do you as a non-member in BID experiences the involvement of the residents in the BID process?