فصلنامه مدیریت شهری
(ویژه نامه لاتین)
Urban managment
No.**39** Summer **2015**
79 - 88
Received *23 Sep 2014*; **Accepted** *11 Mar 2015*

Evaluating role of class in neighborhood management based on good urban governance indicators (Case study: the neighborhoods of Tehran)

Hassan Esmaeilzadeh[1]**-** *Assistant Professor of Geography and Urban Planning, Human Geography, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran*
Leila Masoomi - *Master student of Geography and urban planning, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran*
Majid Abdollahi - *ph.D in urban studies, Tehran, Irean*

Abstract
Everyone acknowledges the fact that good management is one of the necessary and sufficient conditions for urban development programs. The theoretical pattern of urban governance that is in Endeavour to configure the best ways of urban management refers to a process that decisions and power enforcement take shape in it and is a place that the government, citizens and the private organizations interact with each other. Since the city of Tehran has different classes (affluent and poor), so it is expected that urban governance indicators be executed by the same way in the management of neighborhoods. In this respect, this paper examines the state of neighborhood management in three neighborhoods such as affluent (Velenjak), medium (Alestom), poor (Ismail Abad) neighborhoods in Tehran, to be good indicators of eight urban governance. The type of this research is descriptive- analytical and assessment and questioning tools from the group of experts. The sample size is equal to 60 questionnaires (three groups of 20 people in affluent, average and poor neighborhoods). the method of Sampling was also simple random sampling. The derived data were analyzed in SPSS software using MANOVA statistical tests, One-way ANOVA analysis within groups, post hoc LSD test and single-sample T-test. The results show that the factor of class is not affecting the good urban governance and we haven't found any significant difference among different classes of neighborhoods. The results also show that Alestom neighborhood in respect of good governance indicators is in rather medium condition, in the Velenjak neighborhood, participation, fairness and transparency indicators are low and the other indicators has been reported as moderate and, ultimately, in Ismail Abad neighborhood, all indicators except indicator of consensus (consensus) are low.

Keywords: *good urban governance, class, Velenjak,Alestum, Ismail Abad.*

1. Corresponding Author, Tel:09125379322, Email Address: esmaeilzadeh2000@gmail.com

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

Introduction

Traditional and common approach to urban management is based on centralization at national level, the medium-term part planning, closed and exclusive system of government, regulatory and reactive actions of the extant part using technocratic solutions. In contrast, the new approach to urban management is based on the decentralization at national level and focus on national level, open system and pluralism in civil society, initiative and facilitative actions for desired status, social interaction, and Universal participation. (Lalepoor, 60: 1386). Discussion planning of decentralization and devolution of some powers and responsibilities of Governmental bodies to local institutions and municipalities to administration of affairs and to meet the demands of citizens. Governments Through the focus of affairs in them on long-term due to inability to meet the demands of the citizens were faced with a legitimacy crisis and therefore, by pursuing the policy of decentralization and empowerment of local institutions to achieve lost legitimacy, hence the issue of good governance or good urban governance was raised (Akbari, 138,137: 1383). In recent years, urban management faced with social, physical, economic, cultural and environmental challenges that for going out of this instability is looking for ways to facilitate the administration of cities that one of these ways is public participation and benefiting from neighborhood management. Management at neighborhood level is the link between citizens and urban management. If is accepted for improving the city administration that the participation of all actors of city development ranging from governmental and private sectors and civil society is essential, management in this level of will open the way for the cooperation of all actors and the culture making of democratic governance. (Sarafi, 4: 1383). For this reason, the management model requires the use of good urban governance indicators to execute the democratic governance in best. In this context, the most important issue of this study is to assess the management of urban areas based on indicators of good urban governance. According to the research, as well as the topics mentioned above, the purpose of this study is to answer the following questions.

1- Do the class factor influence on good urban governance?

2-Management of Velenjak (affluent), Alestom (middle) and Ismael Abad (poor) neighborhoods are in what conditions with respect to good urban governance indicators?

To answer the research questions, two hypotheses have been proposed:

1. The class factor influences in the good urban governance.

2. It seems that neighborhoods of Tehran in terms of urban governance are not in a good condition.

Theoretical research

Since the governance in simple terms, is the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented, it can be described as old as human civilization (Farzin pak, 68: 1383). However, using the concept of urban governance in Africa began in the late 1980s, but "Bryan Mac line" first theorized it in 1973. (zibaee, 2: 1387). He knows governance as a process that is a interlocking system that includes "government" and "society". Followed by him, others such as "McKinley" and "Atkinson" also raised this issue (bark poor, 491: 1385). By definition, the urban governance is a kind of process and relationship between civil government and citizens that includes both civil government and urban governance and emphasizes on the truth and strengthening the public sphere (haman. 498). According to the theory of urban governance experts means, the effectiveness of all elements of the city on urban management should move with all the mechanisms to the development of the city and the citizens, not the public and private sectors will be abandoned and just government take care of these two. In other words, the source of power and

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

legitimacy in urban governance, are all citizens and their presence in all scenes and elements of civil society (Shahidi: 42: 1386).In Good governance, government rules that by them it is possible to navigate traditional functions of the government are well established and understood. (Lockwood, 2009, 755). It is thought that an essential thing for urban management is the existence of the good governance indicators, and has a positive correlation with the development. As a result, with respect to political cooperation, frameworks of accountability and participation of citizens to claim their rights, as key elements of good governance are introduced (roy.2002,677). Proper governance is a way to regulate social relations in the political and professional areas, which makes sustainable development achievable. Good governance tries for providing an environment in which citizens can agree to establish a variety of social, economic, political and cultural relations freely without defecting the rights of others (Taghvaie, 105: 1388). The main principles and indicators of good urban governance include: participation, transparency, rule of law, accountability, justice, responsibility, outlook, efficiency and effectiveness, monitoring, and specialization (UNDP, 2002).

Materials and methods

The research method is based on analytical-descriptive method. Data Collection is done with survey and documental. In the field method, questionnaires, observations and interviews with experts were used. The population of this research includes the Velenjak (rich urban class), Sattarkhan (middle urban class) and Ismael Abad (poor urban class) neighborhoods, respectively. Designing items for every

indicators	concepts
Participation	All citizens should directly "or through intermediary institutions involve in decision making processes that such partnership takes place on the basis of freedom of expression and associations.
Transparency	Is creating mutual trust between the government and the public through the provision of information by ensuring easy and enough access to information.
Role of law	Law enforcement is essential for all without exception between anyone of citizens, and attending to basic human rights, and respecting the traditional values of society.
Accountability	Responsiveness is determined through the processes of choosing owners of power and also through procedures that through them the process of public decision making and the results derived from them are supported in the context of public interactions and their feedbacks.
Equity	Emphasis on providing equal opportunities for citizens to improve their welfare without discrimination.
Responsibility	Increase in sensitizing government officials to public demands.
outlook	Having a clear strategy, and strategic outlook to achieve sustainability, development and progression of the regions with the participation of citizens by providing a sense of ownership and responsibility among them.
Supervision	Increasing regulatory efforts of the government and development processes with the participation of the private sector and the general public.
Efficiency and Effectiveness	Ensuring dedicating efficient services to the public with optimized and wise consuming and available resources.
Professionalism	Providing essential services quick and easy through the increasing capacities and the moral condition of principals.

Table 1. principles and indicators of good urban governance; Source: UNDP, 2002, P 3

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

indicators	desired items
participation	Thinking and consultation room, participation in community activities, participation in planning, decision-building and decision-making, participation of civil organizations and the private sectors in planning, investing suction outside of the neighborhood, supervision of neighborhood people on decisions related to neighborhood, creating circumstances for people activation, submitting the management of the neighborhood to neighborhood people, delegation of authority to the people, facilitating the involvement of citizens in neighborhood development
accountability	local management accountability to their duties, holding public meetings to explain the actions, satisfaction of the local management accountability, the creation of a mechanism for transmitting the needs and desires of the residents of the neighborhood to high-ranking officials, convincing answers of local administrators to the people, the righteousness of managers on presenting programs, organizing public meetings to inform the residents of the neighborhood, accountability of the neighborhood managers as a matter of principle and belief, not having arbitrary and irresponsible activities, attracting participation through neighborhood managers accountability, solidarity between people and authorities through accountability of managers.
responsibility	neighborhood Managers Endeavour to encourage people to accept responsibility, competence of neighborhood managers in accepting responsibility, sense of responsibility of neighborhood managers, confession of neighborhood managers to their mistakes, pursuit of ongoing plans, decentralization, people responsibility.
role of law	Nepotism rule etc. in paperwork of the neighborhood, affecting influential groups in decisions related to the neighborhood (to measure corruption), participation of stakeholders in the management of the neighborhood, the volume of neighborhood people adhere to rules and regulations, and adherence of neighborhood Management to neighborhood residents' rights and civil rights and norms and customs of the neighborhood, the neighborhood management commitment to equality before the law, awareness of neighborhood management to the rights of the place of living, neighborhood management resistance the illegal actions of the residents of the neighborhood
consensus	cooperative labor, the success of group activities, engagement of neighborhood managers and residents of the neighborhood, the neighborhood management consultation with other organizations and institutions of the city, more collective agreement in result of management interaction with government agencies, protecting the interests of the major groups and social classes, creating a mechanism for consultation between the official urban development organizations and citizens
justice	Justice in equal and fair distribution of neighborhood resources, nepotism, the access to equal opportunities, performing neighborhood plans at the designated time, paying attention to the collective interests, providing citizenship rights, membership of women in neighborhood management , reasonable use of resources, gender justice
transparency	Transparency in decision-making, transparency in the performance, righteousness on giving information, surveying people about plans, determined to implement the decisions taken, saying the opinions of residents of the neighborhood about neighborhood management performance
effectiveness and efficiency	Continuous activities of neighborhood management, improvement of methods and activities based on new knowledge, improving ways of affairs, consideration of the consent and participation of people, reducing costs and improving service quality, satisfaction of the neighborhood residents from the neighborhood management, covering services in the level of neighborhood, leaving the service to other parts of society, the effectiveness of the neighborhood management activities to predetermined objectives, effectiveness of neighborhood management activities procedure

Table 2. indicators and items used to evaluate the condition of good urban governance

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]



Map 1. map of places in Tehran

indicator using Likert spectrum of experts of each level is set and the sample volume was equal with 60 people (3 groups of 20 people) of experts. sampling In this study, was simple random sampling and type of the study was of applied type. Obtained data were analyzed using MANOVA and ANOVA statistical tests , post hoc LSD tests and single-sample T-test using SPSS software. In designing the theoretical and good urban governance indicators, provided indicators of UNDP were used including: participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus, equality, effectiveness and efficiency, responsibility, strategic vision; delegating responsibilities to lower levels, and security (UNDP, 2000).

Finally, with investigation and performed studies in this research, eight indicators of participation, accountability, responsibility, lawfulness, consensus, transparency and effectiveness and efficiency were used.

Findings of research

At first in order to compare three urban classes, mean and standard deviation of each of the eight indicators of good governance presented separately.

As can be seen in the table above the mean and standard deviation of three groups studied are close together and we do not feel much difference. Then, to examine the differences between the three groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is used. In this vector product matrix of (T) is separated into two groups of the vector product matrix between groups (B) and -vector product matrix within groups (W) T = B + W.

T shows the deviation from the mean at any level of independent variable or the total mean of dependent variable. B matrix shows the different effects of experimental plans on the set of dependent variables. Finally W indicates that samples in each level or group of independent variable how deviate from the mean of dependent variables. There are four standard tests in this area: Pilayee effect, Wilks Lambda, the effect of Hotelling and the square root method. Wilks Lambda is the most widely used of these statistics that being created based on the ratio W on B + W. In practice, if the effect of independent variable be significant in respect of statistics, means if experimental plans be effective, , then the amount of B is relatively large and W is small.

As can be seen from the table 4, there is no significant difference between the three groups of eight indicators of governance. The results

مدیریت شهری
فصلنامه مدیریت شهری
(ویژه نامه لاتین)
Urban Management
No.40 Automn 2015

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

Standard deviation	mean	frequency	indicators	neighborhoods
1/15	2/45	10	participation	velenjak
1/13	2/58	10	accountability	
1/13	2/58	6	responsibility	
1/14	2/66	9	role of law	
1/13	2/55	6	consensus	
1/16	2/38	8	justice	
1/12	2/39	6	transparency	
1/28	2/58	11	Responsiveness and performance	
1/3	2/78	10	Participation	Alsetom
1/3	2/81	10	accountability	
1/34	2/8	6	responsibility	
1/19	2/93	9	role of law	
1/29	2/81	6	consensus	
1/28	2/85	8	justice	
1/3	2/95	6	transparency	
1/37	2/67	11	Responsiveness and performance	
0/7	2/32	10	Participation	Ismael abad
0/86	2/19	10	accountability	
0/92	2/28	6	responsibility	
0/79	2/37	9	role of law	
0/81	2/63	6	consensus	
0/86	2/31	8	justice	
0/88	2/29	6	transparency	
0/87	2/38	11	Responsiveness and performance	

Table 3. distribution of mean and standard deviation of eight indicators based on three neighborhood groups

Size of the effect	Level of significance	Degree of freedom	F	value	Change source	
0/254	0/011	16	2/17	0/508	Pilayee effect	group
0/255	0/012	16	2/14	0/555	Wilks lamda	
0/257	0/013	16	2/11	0/691	Hotteling effect	
0/299	0/014	16	2/72	0/427	square root	

Significance in level of 0/05

Table 4. the overall results of the multivariate analysis of variance to test the difference between governance indicators in the three groups studied

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

Size of effect	Level of significance (P)	F	Degree of freedom	Total square degrees	indices	source
0/032	0/39	0/94	2	2/21	participation	group
0/053	0/21	1/60	2	3/98	accountability	
0/032	0/40	0/93	2	6/92	responsibility	
0/047	0/25	1/20	2	3/14	role of law	
0/011	0/73	0/30	2	0/74	consensus	
0/045	0/27	1/30	2	3/33	justice	
0/068	0/13	2/07	2	5/17	transparency	
0/013	0/68	0/38	2	1/10	Responsiveness and performance	

Significance in level of 0/05

Table 5. Results of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to test the difference between the indices in Group

groups	Total square degrees	F	Degree of freedom	Level of significance	Size of effect
1	1/433	1/84	7	0/08	0/08
2	1/09	1/64	7	0/12	0/08
3	2/31	2/20	7	0/03	0/10

Table 6. total results in a one-sided analysis of variance to test the difference between governance indicators

Responsiveness and performance	transparency	justice	consensus	role of law	responsibility	accountability	participation	Small scale
0/83	0/78	0/96	*0/01	0/72	0/81	0/26		participation
0/12	0/43	0/27	*0/002	0/18	0/53			accountability
0/59	0/95	0/81	*0/008	0/36				responsibility
0/86	0/49	0/066	*0/003					role of law
*0/02	*0/012	*0/03						consensus
0/68	0/75							justice
0/68								transparency
								Responsiveness and performance

Table 7. the results of LSD test to compare pairs of indices

of multivariate variance analysis (MANOVA) to test the differences between the different dimensions of eight indicators according to eight times are presented in table5.

As can be seen in the table above, according to F statistics and calculated significant levels of under study group any of the indicators do not show a significant difference. So that Table 2 was proven. Also for examining the differences of Good urban governance indicators in each group, the intra-group analysis of variance (ANOVA with repeated measures) was used. The results are presented in table 6.

As can be seen in the table above, according to F statistic and calculated level of significance, it can be concluded that there is no significant differences between eight indices of governance in two first groups and in other words all indices are in same level. but in the third group, given the significant level seen in the table above, we can conclude that there is a significant difference between governance in-

مدیریت شهری
فصلنامه مدیریت شهری
(ویژه نامه لاتین)
Urban Management
No.40 Automn 2015

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

dicators, to determine the status of these differences, the post hoc LSD test was performed and the results are presented in table7.

According to the table above and also the mean of eight indicators presented in Table 1, it can be concluded that the rule of consensus between the various indicators is significantly higher than other indices. also , to compare the difference between the mean of eight governance indicators in any of the groups and severance of three study groups with the amount of mean (according to the Likert scale number 3 was considered as moderate) single-sample T-test is used.

Given the results of single sample t-test between the mean of some of governance indices and the average value of it (number 3) there is difference in first and third groups, anyway, there was no significant difference in the second group. In the first group, between the indicators of participation, justice and transparency with average level had significant difference and there named indices are significantly lower than average level and other indices in this group are at average level. In the second group, all related indices are in average

Difference of means	significance	Degree of freedom	value t	Statistical indicator	neighborhood
0/55-	*0/04	19	-2/12	Participation	Velenjak
-0/44	0/11	19	-1/65	accountability	
-0/41	0/16	19	-1/44	responsibility	
32/-	0/20	19	-1/32	role of law	
-0/45	0/09	19	-1/77	consensus	
-0/61	*0/03	19	-2/35	justice	
-0/60	*0/02	19	-2/43	transparency	
-0/41	0/16	19	-1/44	Responsiveness and performance	
-0/22	0/46	19	-0/75	participation	Alestom
-0/81	0/53	19	-0/63	accountability	
-0/20	0/51	19	-0/66	responsibility	
-0/06	0/80	19	-0/25	role of law	
-0/18	0/53	19	-0/63	consensus	
-0/15	0/60	19	-0/52	justice	
-0/04	0/88	19	-0/14	transparency	
-0/32	0/30	19	-1/05	Responsiveness and performance	
-0/67	*0/0001	19	-4/30	participation	Ismael abad
-0/68	*0/001	19	-4/18	accountability	
071/-	*0/003	19	-3/47	responsibility	
-0/62	*0/002	19	-3/52	role of law	
-0/36	0/06	19	-2	consensus	
-0/68	*0/002	19	-3/54	justice	
-0/70	*0/002	19	-3/6	transparency	
-0/64	*0/004	19	-3/2	Responsiveness and performance	

Table 8. comparison of difference between the means of indicators with the average of the indices using single-sample T-test

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

level and finally third group of indices except consensus indicator are lower than average level and only consensus indicator is reported in average level.

Conclusion

For examining the first theory and whether the class affects in the level of good urban governance or not, multivariate variance analysis (MANOVA) is used and results indicated that there is no difference among three under study groups, thus the proposed theory denied and it has been determined that among three named neighborhoods, the class factor is not affecting the level of good urban governance.For examining the second theory the matter that neighborhoods are in what condition in respect of good urban governance in each group one -way analysis of variance (ANOVA repeated measure) was used and the results indicated that eight indices of governance, Velenjak and alestom neighborhoods are in same level and have no difference with each other but in the third neighborhood (ismael abad) the difference is felt with significant level and to examine this difference, LSD test was used,and it was found that the consensus indicator is higher than other indices.Then, to compare the differences between the means of indices with its average level of it (number 3) single-sample t-test was used and it was determined that alestom neighborhood in relation to good urban governance indices is in average condition and Velenjak neighborhood, participation indicator, justice and transparency are in low level and other indices were reported in medium level, also in ismael abad neighborhood all indices except the consensus indicator are in low level. So the second theory was proved.

In this between, examining each of the urban governance indices in each of the neighborhoods and given the mean (table 3) and using single-sample t test (table 8) and using analytical results , following suggestions are proposed:

In Velenjak neighborhood that participation, justice and transparency indices are in low level and in ismael abad neighborhood except the consensus indicator, rest of the indices also were reported in low level and also for alestom neighborhood for promoting the indices, offers are considered as follows:

Participation

1.to Express views freely and to ensure continued effectiveness and efficiency of participation

2.Cooperation and competition with other groups to achieve better community

3.Providing the field for participation in the activities of decision-makers, as well as share in profits

4.existence of a online system for urban residents to understand the rules.

5.The need for cooperation not only introducing to the neighborhood members

6.Participation of women and men as the main point of good governance.

Accountability

1.attaining the trust of citizens through being responsive without the public and private sectors and local government to stakeholders

2.solving The problem of distrust to authorities among people

3.Create a special section in the local government for more communication of citizens with managers

4.Increase in economic efficiency in the areas through accountability, legitimacy and legal values

Responsibility

1.to Meet the needs and desires of the people and to provide the necessary services within a reasonable time

2.performing The duties of local authorities not only to deal with our political work lawfulness

3.existence of just and fair and impartial legal frameworks

4.Lack of nepotism and selection criteria instead of relationship in selecting officials

5.Protect the rights of the poor

Consensus orientation

1.Understanding of the historical, cultural and

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]

social areas concepts

2.Guiding the different interests and tastes in neighborhoods to a broad consensus that most beneficial

Justice

1.to Create opportunities for improving and maintaining the well-being of communities

2.Adequate protection of vulnerable groups to increase their capabilitiesTransparency

3.Free access to applications and information in a clear and understandable way in the context of laws and regulations

4.Putting information in the hands of citizens and not hiding anything

5.Clarity of objectives and actions of the authorities and local people's awareness of it

Effectiveness and efficiency

1.to Meet the needs of neighborhoods

2.Best use of available resources in neighborhoods, for example (using the wastelands to create facilities such as banks, clinics, boarding houses, vegetable fields, etc.)

3.to Improve traffic and paying attention to people's problems for real

4.to Increase motivation and hope in neighborhood youth to service

5.Surveys on neighborhood problems

6.to Pay more attention to respect to rules and provide the same facilities for all neighborhoods

References

Akbari, Ghazanfar (1385), Social capital and urban governance, Journal of Geographical Research, No. 83

Burke poor, Naser, (1385), urban governance and management systems in cities, urban planning management conference.

Taghvaie, Ali Akbar Mousavi tajdar (1388), Introduction to good urban governance in analysis approach, Journal of Urban Management, No. 23

zibaee Nayyereh (1387), urban governance, ground maker of urban sustainability, http: city manager bolgfa.com ,, 25 January.

Shahidi, MH. (1386), urban planning, transport and urban governance, urban threads, number 20-19

sarafi, M., 1383, Introduction of the applied document of community development, Scientific-practical conference on community development, sustainable development prospects of Tehran, Tehran

Farzin pak, shahrzad, (1383),of the town learing materials,what is the good governance municipalities, the sixth year, No. 69

lale Pour, Manizheh (1386), urban governance and urban management in developing countries, urban threads, numbers 19-20.

Meshkini A., poormousavi and muazzen (1392), assessment of neighborhood management model based on good urban governance indicators (case study: the neighborhood of Tehran's Evin), Journal of Urban Studies, No. VI

lockwod,Michael(2009) good governance for terrestrial protected areas. jurnal of environmental management.

roy,indrajit(2007) civil society and good governance. worold development. vol. 36,no,4

[Downloaded from ijurm.imo.org.ir on 2026-11-03]