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Abstract: This thesis is a case study research that look into the difficulty in engaging freight receivers in initiatives related to urban freight transport. The aim of the paper is to investigate how participatory processes could be formed for more successful outcomes and how the freight receivers could become more engaged in the processes. By conducting a qualitative research where primarily interviews with freight receivers and other concerned stakeholder were made, it was possible to distinguish differences and similarities in views and attitudes toward participation in freight related initiatives. The interviewed freight receivers were located in two different areas in the central business district in the city of Gothenburg, Sweden. In one area, the freight receivers have been included in discussions with the traffic and public transport authority regarding a newly implemented restriction for heavy freight vehicles, and thus have experience with participatory processes. These results show that the freight receivers appreciate the possibility to be a part of the discussion even though they are sceptic towards their possibility to influence on decisions. In the other area, the authority is planning on potentially implement the same restrictions, but as they have not started this process, no stakeholders have yet been included in discussions. Thus, the expectations and attitude towards participation in such a process could be studied among freight receivers in this area. Results in this area show that medium sized business, based on turnover, are more enthusiastic in participating meanwhile smaller business and businesses that are part of a chain store or a franchise are less interested in participating. By comparing the views and opinions between these groups with the interview with the authorities, results show that freight receivers and the traffic and public transport authority in Gothenburg have similar views on the importance of participatory processes, but they differ in their views on what influence the freight receivers have in these processes. By analysing the results with the theoretic concepts of participation, engagement and communication it was possible to identify issues in the case that must be considered in order to establish more rewarding participatory processes. It is concluded that freight receivers must be involved already in the process of defining the problem with urban freight transport to close the gap between how the freight receivers and the authorities experience the participatory process. This would enable finding solutions that consider all interests and thus have higher chance of long-lasting implementation rather that creating conflicts on power relations. Further it is stated that with the help of a combination of a scalon plan, quality circle and representative participation is possible to create an altruistic value in participating which could increase the will to engage in participatory processes and creating more sustainable urban freight transport systems.
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Summary: Urban freight transport has substantial impact on a cities’ overall sustainability with congestion, emissions and accidents as main problems. Yet they are needed in order to provide all businesses and citizens with goods and material that are essential for keeping the society going. There are already many solutions that theoretically can be implemented that would create more sustainable freight transports, but due to lack of collaboration among stakeholders, these solutions rarely last for long or have little positive effect on the existing problems. One of the main issues is to get important stakeholders to engage in the process of finding collective solutions that consider all the different interests in the system. This thesis looks specifically at how freight receivers could become more engaged in these processes and have a participatory role in freight related initiatives in urban areas. By conducting interviews with freight receivers in two different areas in the central business district in the city of Gothenburg, Sweden, it was possible to distinguish what the freight receivers expect from participatory processes and how to get them more engaged in finding mutual solutions. In one of the areas the city authorities have implemented restrictions for heavy freight vehicles to enter during certain hours to reduce movement of these vehicles when people are visiting shops and restaurants. As these restrictions has affected some freight receivers negatively, a few retailers where invited by the Traffic and Public Transport Authority in Gothenburg to participate in workshops where the problems and potential solutions were discussed. As these freight receivers had participated in discussions with the city authorities it was essential to get their views and opinions on this process and how it could be improved. The results from the interviews with these respondents state that there are some similarities and differences between the views and opinions about the process between the freight receivers and the Traffic and Public Transport Authority. The differences need to be reduced or overcome in order to establish more long-lasting and rewarding participatory processes.

In the other area the Traffic and Public Transport Authority are planning on potentially implementing the same restrictions for heavy vehicles, but this process has not yet started. In this area it was thus interesting to know how the freight receivers can be engaged in the process and participate in discussions on how solutions best can be implemented. The results in this area show that different sizes of businesses, depending on turnover, affect the possibility or will to participate in processes related to freight. Small businesses have less resources and thus they do not prioritize problems related to freight. Medium sized business does however have more resources and are thus more interested in participating and see more potential in doing so. Businesses that are part of a chain store or a franchise does not see the need to participate even though they often have the resources. This depend on that they have better ability to adjust to potential changes when solutions are implemented.

The results were discussed with responses from interviews with the Traffic and Public Transport Authority, an interest group that represent freight receivers in the concerned areas and a freight carrier. The empirical data was further analysed with the theoretic concepts of participation, engagement and communication which helped distinguish how participatory processes could be formed to have better outcomes and how to engage necessary stakeholders to participate in these processes. It is concluded that freight receivers must be involved already in the process of defining the problem with urban freight transport to close the gap between how the freight receivers and the authorities experience the participatory process. This would enable finding solutions that consider all interests and thus have higher chance of long-lasting implementation rather than creating conflicts on power relations. Further it is stated that with the help of a combination of a scalar plan, quality circle and representative participation is possible to create an altruistic value in participating which could increase the will to engage in participatory processes and creating more sustainable urban freight transport systems.
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Terminology

City and Urban could be defined differently, where “urban” could be described as a wider urban area, whereas “city” could be described as the central business districts. In this thesis, they have however been used more or less synonymously.
1. Introduction

Earth’s population continues to grow. It is expected that the world population will be 8.5 billion people by 2030, 9.7 billion by 2050 and increase further to reach 11.2 billion by 2100 (United Nations, 2015a). The increasing population will put pressure on natural resources but also challenge social systems. In addition to the growing population more people move to urban areas which challenges urban planners to manage sufficient resources, mobility and quality of life for all citizens in the cities. By 2014 over half of humanity lived in cities and by 2050 approximately 66% of the world population will be urban (United Nations, 2015b). This denser population creates new kinds of challenges and opportunities from a perspective of sustainability. However, to increase sustainability in the urban areas it is crucial to carefully and thoughtfully plan and execute urban development projects (Attard & Shiftan, 2015). One of the major challenges is to create sustainable transport systems that has low impact on environment but still meets the increasing demand of mobility.

Transport and mobility in cities have for several decades been discussed problems as they contribute to both environmental and social problems, such as emissions, congestion, noise, and accidents. Fairly to say, as of today urban transport is not sustainable, and with an increasing population and urbanisation the transport system in cities will increase the environmental and social problems associated with it (Kahn, 2006). Transport is however a necessary evil as it contributes to growth and employment as movements of people and goods is a backbone in a developing and functioning economy. The discussion of how to make the transport systems in urban areas more sustainable is broad and contains many different approaches (Attard & Shiftan, 2015). However, one aspect that often has been overlooked in urban planning and public discussion is how to make urban freight transport more sustainable (Creedy, 2006; Lindholm, 2012). An increasing population and urbanisation will result in more movements of goods to, within and from cities and lead to more freight vehicles that will put pressure on the transport system. In urban areas freight transport account for approximately 10 - 18% of all vehicles and account for up to 25% of transport related CO2 emissions and up to 50% of other transport related pollutants (ERTRAC, 2015). Overall, freight transports affect cities social, environmental and economic sustainability and its impact is expected to increase as more people in urban areas will result in higher demands of products being transported (Allen & Browne, 2012). Yet, it is not until recent years that freight has started being addressed in discussions and strategies for urban sustainability (Cui, Dodson & Hall, 2015; Lindholm, 2012). Generally, knowledge and awareness of freight transport is low among decision makers, private sector and the public, but still freight issues have to be dealt with to achieve sustainability (Lindholm & Blinge, 2014).

During the last few decades there has been several different project and programmes aiming to reduce the negative social and environmental effects of urban freight transport, although few have successfully been implemented on a larger scale (Quak, 2011; Lindholm, 2012; van Duin & Muñuzuri, 2015). The European Union has realized that transport related issues cannot only be solved on a local level, which is why they have set up several strategies to improve urban environment which include issues related to urban freight transport. In 2005 the European Commission set up a strategy for urban environment which advice cities with more than 100 000 inhabitants to set up a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan (SUTP)(European Commission, 2005). The SUTPs has later been developed into Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP) which are becoming more common to implement due to the increasing awareness of transport related issues in urban areas (Allen & Browne, 2012; May et al., 2017). Further urban freight transport is explicit mentioned as an important factor that needs to be implemented in urban planning to improve urban sustainability in the European Commission’s latest White Paper on transport (European Commission, 2011). In addition to this the European Union has developed a Decision-Makers’ Guidebook on how to develop sustainable urban land use and transport strategies for cities (May, 2003). The strategies and visions creates a picture on how a sustainable urban freight transport should be formed, but it is far more difficult to implement them and make them become reality (Vandergert, Collie, Kampelmann, & Newport, 2016). To make these strategies become reality there needs to be better cooperation between the operation stakeholders in the urban freight transport system in order to successfully find and implement long lasting solutions in relation to the strategies (Ruesch et al., 2012).
1.1. Problem formulation

Regarding urban freight transport, it is commonly difficult to engage private businesses when implementing new policies or projects that aims for more sustainable transports (Browne, Lindholm & Allen, 2015). Quak (2015) also mentions the difficulty in engaging private stakeholders in initiatives related to urban freight transport whereas the results and impacts of the initiatives are often low. It is highlighted by Lindholm (2012) that one of the major factors for this high rate of failure is lack of collaboration between stakeholders within an urban freight system. Often this is due to stressful environments where private stakeholders either do not have time to participate in meetings or that they feel that they do not know how to affect freight or that it is not their responsibility to make the system more sustainable (Lindholm, 2012; Ruesch et al., 2012). At the same time, it is difficult to implement necessary initiatives and policies if not all stakeholders accept the changes or participate in projects that generate more sustainable freight transports. It is also stated that voluntary initiatives where stakeholders are involved in the process of creating a solution have more overall benefits than if regulation is forcing a change (Holguín-Veras & Sánchez-Díaz, 2015).

One group in the urban freight transport system that is especially difficult to engage in necessary initiatives is the freight receivers in central business districts (dell’Olio, Moura, Ibeas, Cordera, & Holguin-Veras, 2016). As they are the ones ordering the goods and acts in the environment where the freight transports occur they have a central role in the system. Still, their involvement and willingness to try new solution is low, especially if it increases costs in terms of time or money (dell’Olio et al., 2016). However, to involve them is of utter importance since it is impossible to implement new solutions successfully without their opinions and agreement (dell’Olio et al., 2016). More cooperation and communication between authorities and private sector is thus essential to be able to implement necessary measures to ensure sustainability in urban freight systems (Ruesch et al., 2012). Therefor it is necessary to increase the knowledge on how to engage the freight receivers to participate in discussions and initiatives on sustainable urban freight transports. This will make it easier for cities to implement new solutions in order to make the strategies and visions that authorities set up for urban mobility become reality. Today there is a lack of knowledge among authorities on how to get key stakeholders, especially freight receivers, to participate in discussions related to freight in order to find solutions that fit all. This risk that authorities come up with solutions, related to the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, that either fails after implementation or affect the freight receivers negative as their opinions, needs or objectives are not included in the planning and implementation of the solution.

1.2. Objective and research questions

The objective of this thesis is to gain knowledge and understanding on how participatory processes in initiatives related to urban freight could be formed and how the freight receivers can become more engaged in the process. This could lead to better and more long-lasting solutions to existing problems related to freight and thus create a more sustainable urban transport system.

To address the objective the following research questions will be addressed:

- How can participatory processes be formed in sustainable urban freight transport initiatives?
- How can city authorities increase engagement from freight receivers to participate in initiatives related to sustainable urban freight transports?

In order to answer the research questions a real case will be examined where the relation between the local Traffic and Public Transport Authority and the freight receivers in the central business district in the city of Gothenburg will be studied.
2. Context of the study

For the reader to understand the conditions for this thesis the following chapter will introduce urban freight transports and its complex nature and how it relates to sustainable development. Further the reader will be briefly introduced to the case and the stakeholders involved in this thesis.

2.1. Urban freight transport and its relation to sustainability

Urban freight transport makes sure that all goods that are needed within an urban area are transported to its required location at the right time. It plays an essential role in cities economic development as its brings goods to businesses, restaurants, construction sites, private customers and offices, but also goods and waste out from cities. Its complexity originates from the unbalance of volumes in and out of the urban area and that cities constantly are changing with new shops, restaurants, residents and offices that affect transport movements and transport planning (Lindholm, 2012). Urban freight transport was early defined by Hicks (1977, p. 101) as “…all journeys into, out of, and within a designated urban area by road vehicles specifically engaged in pick-up or delivery of goods (whether the vehicle be empty or not), with the exception of shopping trips”. Later urban freight transport has been defined differently by various scholars. One of the more inclusive definition is made by Lindholm (2012, p. 6) whom define it as:

“Urban freight transport is defined as all movements of goods (as distinct from people) in to, out from, through or within the urban area made by light or heavy vehicles, including also service transport and demolition traffic, shopping trips made by private households and waste (reverse logistics).”

This broad definition includes all transports that are carrying goods. However, for the outline of this thesis the focus will lie on the distribution of goods to retailers, cafés, restaurants and hotels in the city centre. As it is these stakeholders that everyday receive goods it is also these who need to be part of the discussions in freight related issues in order to successfully implement strategies for more sustainable urban transport systems.

A sustainable urban freight transport system should keep nourishing the city development by providing all necessary goods movements in the city, and do so by minimizing all environmental and social effect to ensure a liveable, safe and clean city (Allen & Browne, 2012; Lindholm, 2012; Taniguchi & Thompson, 2015). Behrends, Lindholm and Woxenius (2008, pp. 704) gives a sustainable freight transport system the narratives that it should:

- ensure the accessibility offered by the transport system to all categories of freight transport,
- reduce air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, waste and noise to levels without negative impacts on the health of the citizens or nature,
- improve the resource- and energy-efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the transportation of goods, taking into account the external costs and,
- contribute to the enhancement of the attractiveness and quality of the urban environment, by avoiding accidents, minimising the use of land and without compromising the mobility of citizens.

This must however be in consideration to all different views and objectives of the many different stakeholders that are included in the system. The different stakeholders and their interest is shown in figure 1. In this sense, it is a concept open for interdisciplinarity as it includes issues related to environment, system engineering, land use planning, economy, transport planning, geography, information engineering and social science (Taniguchi & Thompson, 2015).
Fig. 1. Urban goods distribution in inner cities influences interests of various stakeholders (van Binsbergen & Visser, 2001).

To move toward a more sustainable urban transport system all approaches need to be addressed and innovation and changes are necessary both by private and public sector (Allen & Browne, 2012). Quak (2015, pp. 181) argues that there are mainly three directions to improve sustainability of urban freight transports which address that innovation and changes are necessary:

- Technology (innovative solutions that minimize emission, noise etc.)
- Policy implementation to stimulate stakeholders to improve sustainability
- Logistics (e.g. an urban distribution centre)

To establish a sustainable system for urban freight transport a mix of these three directions need to be implemented (Quak, 2015). Within these three directions there has been several initiatives the last decades trying to improve sustainability although the most common is that authorities implement policies that regulate vehicle movements to improve city environment (Allen & Browne, 2012). Policy implementations does however usually affect businesses in different ways and are not always the most popular measurement among other stakeholders as they get forced into a solution that they may not find suitable. To better implement policies an integrated view is needed where all interactions between stakeholders are regarded (Marchau, Walker & van Duijn, 2008). Even so, one of the most common policy to be implemented by city authorities to reduce negative effects of urban freight transport is time access restriction (Quak, 2015). It usually implies that trucks cannot enter or are limited to enter a certain urban area in order to reduce congestion, noise and pollutions, but also to increase attractiveness and accessibility of the streets. The restricted area is commonly in the city centre where during day time there are many pedestrians that can be affected by pollutions or accessibility problems associated with delivery trucks (BESTUFS, 2006). There are several different types of city access restrictions depending on objectives of the implementation of the restriction. Within the scope of this thesis focus will be on restriction of vehicles related to weight and time, meaning that freight vehicles exceeding a certain weight only can enter a specific area during limited hours of the day. These initiatives are usually easy to implement as commonly only road signs and proper enforcement is needed (BESTUFS, 2006). The positive effects of these restrictions have however been questioned as the carriers’ operation become less effective and smaller vehicles replace the restricted vehicles which could result in more pollution and congestion (Quak & de Koster, 2007; Quak, 2015). At the same time the restrictions must be implemented in a way so that it does not affect the private sector in a negative way. It is thus essential to bring in the aspects and objectives of several stakeholders in order to have the sufficient knowledge.
on how the system gets affected if restrictions are implemented and to be able to reduce the potential negative effects (Ballantyne, Lindholm & Whiting, 2013).

2.2. Some key features of the transport strategy in Gothenburg

Gothenburg, located on the west coast of Sweden has a growing population which is expected to grow by 17% between 2015-2025 (Västra Götalandsregionen, 2016) and is expected to continue to grow for at least 40 years (SCB, 2015). This will increase the pressure on the existing transport system and the amount of goods being transported in to, out from and within the city and thus create both social and environmental challenges. In order to face these challenges, the city of Gothenburg designed a transport strategy which the Traffic Committee in Gothenburg adopted in 2014. The strategy is considered when planning and implementing new projects, and is the foundation for present and future plans for different road-user categories. The strategy aims to mitigate negative impacts from transport and create accessibility, competitiveness and make everyday life better for citizens and business within and around Gothenburg. With this the hope is to create a more attractive and sustainable city (City of Gothenburg, 2014). The transport strategy in its whole concentrate on three main objectives, travel, urban space and transport of goods.

- **Travel** – how to create an easily accessible regional centre where it is easy to reach key places and functions irrespective of the mode of transport and other conditions.
- **Urban space** – how to contribute to more attractive city environments where people want to live, work, shop, study and meet.
- **Transport of goods** – how to contribute to consolidating Gothenburg’s position as the logistics centre of Scandinavia, where both new and existing industries can develop and create job opportunities without encroaching on quality of life, sustainability and accessibility.

Gothenburg city is thus one of the European cities that has included urban freight in its transport strategy. The summary of the strategy for goods related transports is presented below in which this thesis will concentrate on the third objective, aiming to stimulate innovation in collaboration with academic and business, mostly focusing on collaboration or communication with business.

### GOODS TRANSPORT STRATEGY

We will work in collaboration with other bodies to make Gothenburg a world leader in efficient, climate-smart handling of goods. This will be achieved by:

**Ensuring good accessibility for goods transport in Gothenburg while at the same time reducing negative local environmental effects**

Increased rail network capacity and prioritisation of freight traffic on designated routes not only improves accessibility for goods but also allows effective measures to be implemented to reduce the effects of noise, emissions and barriers. Optimising the choice of transport and the use of combined transport increase efficiency and reduce climate impact.

**Collaborating regionally in the establishment of logistics centres and transport-intensive operations**

By including goods transport in the urban planning process and applying a regional perspective to the establishment of transport-intensive operations, industry, retailing and logistics can be developed and conflicts between goals can be avoided.

**Stimulating innovation in collaboration with academic institutions and businesses**

An innovation platform for the city creates clarity and coordination in relation to other parties. Networks and other platforms for dialogue with businesses and public activities generate the conditions required for joint solutions and more rapid implementation.

*Fig. 2. Summary of the Goods Transport Strategy in Gothenburg (City of Gothenburg, 2014, pp. 7).*
To make the different objectives of the transport strategy in Gothenburg reality, four implementation principles have been developed. These are general and applies on all three major objectives of travel, urban space and transport of goods. These implementation principles consist of:

- Begin with investments that facilitate travel within, through or around the inner city
- Ensure that accessibility is maintained while the close-knit city is being realised
- Support innovation and the introduction of new solutions, and allow Gothenburg to be a testing ground
- Make use of the potential in a meaningful dialogue with businesses and inhabitants

As earlier mentioned it is usually difficult to include freight receivers in dialogues and discussions related to freight transport and thus many initiatives and projects aiming to create more sustainable urban freight transport are not successful. Accordingly, this thesis will mainly be connected to the last implementation principle, “Make use of the potential in a meaningful dialogue with businesses and inhabitants”.

2.3. Freight related initiatives in Gothenburg

There have already been a few freight related initiatives in Gothenburg that relates to the transport strategy above. One example is a freight network that has been established where stakeholder can discuss questions related to freight transport. It is a meeting point for people from local authorities, academy and private sector to inform each other on upcoming projects, policy implementations, new constructions sites and occurring issues. From the private sector there are representatives from freight carriers, property owners and freight receivers. The freight receivers are usually represented by the organization Innerstaden Göteborg (explained further in chapter 2.3). The freight network has meetings approximately three times a year with constructive discussion where all stakeholder can speak their mind on certain topics regarding freight. It is seen as a successful installation which has encouraged dialogue between stakeholders and also improved some freight related processes in the city and also an opportunity to inform others on upcoming initiatives. This network has encouraged opportunities for improved dialogue between decision makers and business (Fahlgren, 2012).

Another initiative to reduce the environmental and social impact of freight transport in the city centre of Gothenburg is Stadsleveransen (“The city delivery” (author’s translation)). This project was initiated by the Traffic and Public Transport Authority (TPTA) and aims to create a more attractive and safer city centre by reducing the amount of heavy freight vehicles. In short, freight carriers deliver goods to a terminal outside the city centre where the goods are consolidated and then distributed to the city centre with an electric vehicle and cargo bicycles. (Innerstaden Göteborg, 2016).

During 2016 concerned stakeholders were informed that the TPTA, on behalf of the Traffic Committee, planned to implement time access restrictions for heavy freight vehicles in a specified area in central Gothenburg (Fig. 3). The reason for the restrictions was to reduce the amount of heavy freight vehicles circling the city centre when people are present and create a more attractive urban area. Both freight receivers and freight carriers were invited to meetings with the TPTA where they could express their thoughts and opinions on the planned restrictions. The restrictions have been implemented for a trial period between January – June 2017 and entail that all goods which needs to be delivered in this area with a truck that weighs more than 3,5 tonnes must be delivered within the timeframe of 5am – 11am. The effects of the restriction will be evaluated afterwards to see if it has reduced the negative impacts of freight vehicles in the area. The evaluation will also look at how freight carriers, goods receivers and inhabitants have been affected by the implemented restriction. If results are positive and there are minor complaints the local authorities want to consider the possibilities to expand the area for the restriction. This is the initiative that has main focus in this study as it occurred during the timespan of the thesis and also that it is a typical case where a policy is implemented which affects private businesses in some way. By understanding how the businesses in the western area where the restriction has been implemented perceive the process of the initiative and understanding how the businesses in the eastern area where
they might be implemented want to be include in the process, it is possible to find ways to improve the process of implementation.

![Diagram showing Western and Eastern areas of Gothenburg.](image)

*Fig. 3.* The marked area to the left is the area where times restrictions for heavy vehicles above 3.5 tonnes has been implemented (Further mentioned as the “western area” in this thesis). The marked area to the right is potential area for expansion for the restrictions (further mentioned as the “eastern area” in this thesis).

### 2.4. The stakeholders in the case of Gothenburg

Within the studied case there are several stakeholders, some of which have not been included in the study due to short timeframe and in order to more deeply understand the dynamic between freight receivers and the TPTA. They will here be briefly explained to give the reader an understanding of the stakeholders included in the system. Mainly five stakeholders have been identified, consisting of:

- The Traffic and Public Transport Authority (TPTA)
- Freight receivers (retailers, restaurants/cafés and hotels)
- Innerstaden Göteborg
- Freight carriers
- Property owners

The TPTA in Gothenburg manages and maintains the municipality’s road and track facilities. They also manage the tracks for the tramway network. The TPTA implement policies, restore roads and tracks and have the agenda to create an accessible city which strengthen the region. They are bound to the Traffic Committee which has political objectives and are directly affected by local government elections, meaning that the set goals, orientations and strategies could change depending on the political agenda of the governing party. This means that change of governing party after elections could affect the practical every day job of the TPTA. The transport strategies, explained above, are accepted by the Traffic Committee and the TPTA has the responsibility to implement and realize them, thus many decisions made by the TPTA are based on the transport strategy. In addition, this study was initiated with help from the TPTA.

The freight receivers consist of many different enterprises within the studied area. In this empirical study there have been freight receivers such as retailers, restaurants/cafés and hotels involved. The common ground is that they all need freight deliveries to be able to run their business. It should be acknowledged that there are other freight receivers in the studied area, such as businesses receiving office supplies or other materials, but as retailers, restaurants/cafés and hotels receive most volume in this area, the study will focus on those.
Innerstaden Göteborg is an association of businesses in central Gothenburg. They have approximately 600 members which consist of retailers, hotels, restaurants and other businesses and acts for the common interest of their members to create a more attractive city centre that is more safe and clean. They often represent the freight receivers in discussions with decision makers such as the TPTA.

The freight carriers are the ones doing the physical transports of goods in the city centre. There are many different carriers that transport goods of different kind, such as parcels, pallets, groceries, and other supplies. Some of the most recognizable carriers and the ones with the highest volumes are Postnord, DHL, Schenker and UPS. These are also greatly affected by projects, implementations and other decisions taken by the TPTA as they are every day riding on the streets that the implementations affect.

In most cases freight receivers rent the place where they operate their business from a property owner. As this is the case the property owners have a part in the freight related issues in the city centre. It is in their interest to have an attractive city centre in order to retain their tenants. Further the property owners should provide suitable space for loading and unloading of vehicles within reasonable distance of the building.
3. Research approach

This chapter will discuss the choice of methodological approach and the choice of methods and why these were most appropriate to fulfil the aim this study. Further the benefits with a case study will be discussed and also the research process which changed a bit during the course of the thesis. Lastly the analytical approach and the ethical considerations will be discussed.

3.1. A qualitative approach

In order to fully understand the dynamics between the TPTA and the freight receivers this study has taken a qualitative approach which has the advantage of collecting data that is supported by participants own words and rationales. This means that the studied objects are studied in their natural being and it is thus more possible to understand social behaviours (Bryman, 2008). The qualitative approach can in this sense give data that is possible to analyse in a sense to understand why someone acts the way they do or why a certain phenomenon occurs in a social context (Seers, 2012). To understand how to get someone engaged in participatory processes it is a key element to learn what triggers different stakeholders to participate and in what way communication affects them. In this sense, the qualitative approach will generate data that is observing and interpreting reality in another sense than quantitative approaches would (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In qualitative researches both observations and interviews are common methodologies as they have the potential to understand the fundamental reasons why or how someone act, think or sees something as he or she does (Bryman, 2008). In this study observations and interviews has been used simultaneously.

In all scientific studies, both qualitative and quantitative, there are mainly three different forms of logical reasoning from with conclusions can be drawn. Induction, deduction and abduction are all different ways of connecting ideas and generating new ideas in scientific fields (Reichertz, 2014). The inductive form has its outline in empirical data, meaning that observations or other data collection lead to conclusions that are generalized over a broader field from what has been observed. Deduction however has its starting point in theory which then is tested by gathering empirical data. In short, the inductive form takes real life observations and create theoretic frameworks meanwhile the deductive form takes theoretic framework and test it in real life. The third form, abduction, approaches both induction and deduction but is not an infusion of them, more of a new form of logical reasoning (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). The abductive form starts of in the facts that something is in a certain way and by outlining theory and develop it with empirical data it is possible to understand the reason behind why something is the way it is (Reichertz, 2014). As this study has its start in the fact that it is difficult to engage freight receivers in urban areas it is essential to look at both theory and empirical data to understand this phenomenon and how this can be improved. In this sense, the abductive approach is more applicable as it sees to both theory and empirical data simultaneously (Reichertz, 2014).

3.2. The case study approach

The case study approach is one of the most common modes of inquiry to collect empirical data in social sciences (Thomas, 2011). Although its common appearance in social sciences there are no clear definition of what a case study implies (Dumez, 2015). The fundamental intention is to capture the complexity of a single case using different scientific methods. A case study should be a complex functioning unit, be investigated in its natural context with o multitude of methods and be contemporary (Johansson, 2007). This research paper will use the case study approach in the sense as a contemporary bounded system where the introduction of the restriction for heavy vehicles in the city centre is used. This coincide with the definition of Creswell (2013) whom describe case studies as exploring a real-life, contemporary bounded system over time, with detailed and in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information. Johansson (2007) argues that the usage of different methods is one of the strengths with case studies as it gathers information of different sorts. By using a case study approach, it is possible to find and draw a single set of cross-case generalizable conclusions (Yin, 2009). This means that even if the case used in this study is specific and customized to the culture and outline of
freight receivers in Gothenburg, it is still possible to find similarities with other cities and other set-ups. To specify on this case it is possible to see its distinct dynamics and relations which other approaches would not allow. The observations within the case could then be used to describe similar set-ups in other bounded systems.

3.3. Research methods

In this study interviews and observations were used to understand the complexity in the system and the rationales among different stakeholders. These two methods have the possibility to enhance each other and give deeper understanding of a studied phenomenon (Bryman, 2008). If a certain event occurs during the observations it is possible to form questions around this event during the interviews and thus understand why someone acted the way they did or what the rationale behind a phenomenon is. This increases the validity as it is a higher chance that the respondents are interpreted correctly and that the case is understood (Fangen, 2005). In the following subchapters, the methods will be explained further on how they have been applied and why they are appropriate for this study.

3.3.1. Individual interviews

In order to understand in depth the stakeholders interviewed in this case a number of semi-structured interviews were conducted. Semi-structured interviews are flexible and thus give the respondents the opportunity to emphasise what they find more important and it is possible as an interviewer to follow up on answers and dig deeper into the meaning behind the answers (Bryman, 2008). As this study aim to find out how freight receivers could become more participating in freight-related discussions or initiatives, the semi-structured interviews will give a deeper understanding of the freight receivers objectives, rationales and opinions than other possible methods. Gill et al. (2008) explain that interviews aim to explore beliefs, experiences and motives of individual matters, whereof it is a suitable approach in this study. In this sense it is possible to get a deeper knowledge on how the freight receivers experience different aspects of urban sustainability and if and how they perceive freight being a problem in the city centre of Gothenburg. The questions in the semi-structured interview is supposed to be more open to allow a more adjustable approach that extracts useful information. In this sense interviews should be characterized by short questions and long answers (Esaiasson et al., 2012). Further interviews should preferably be conducted in calm spaces where there is less risk to be interrupted (Bryman, 2008). One issue with related to this occurs as several of the interviews had to be carried out in the respondents’ facilities while operating their business and customers could enter and interrupt the interviews. However, during all interviews conducted there were only a couple of interruptions. These interruptions did however not affect the quality of the interviews.

For all interviews an interview-guide was used (see appendix), which was written in Swedish since all respondents except one were native Swedish speaking. If another language than their native language is used it is a risk that the respondents have trouble expressing their thoughts in the way they want (Bryman, 2008). Another practical consideration when conducting interviews is to send the respondents the interview guide some time before the interview is executed. This gives the respondent some time to prepare, understand the questions and think about possible answers which makes the interview process smoother (Bryman, 2008). However, in this empirical study where 13 interviews were conducted on a spontaneous approach it was not possible to send the interview guides to the respondents in advance. In addition, all interviews were recorded by either a mobile phone or a computer which is recommended when conducting semi-structured interviews (Yin, 2007; Bryman, 2008; Esaiasson et al., 2012). This allows the interviewer to go back and listen and use specific quotes, or controlling that a respondent expressed a certain phrase or opinion in a certain way. By recording the interviews it is less risk of misjudging expressions or opinions said by the respondents. For ethical reasons the respondents were asked if they felt comfortable being recorded before the interview started, which all respondents agreed upon.
3.3.2. Observations

Participatory observation is a qualitative method that allows insight into peoples’ ordinary lives and behaviour (Bryman, 2008). Observations can in this sense contribute to more understanding of why someone acts like he or she does and result in knowledge of a certain phenomenon or field (Sanger, 1996). The possibility for observations to in a broader sense understand a behaviour is thus greater than other methodologies. In relation to this study the observations role was to gather data to understand the relation between the TPTA and the freight receivers and thus better understand the case. The observations occurred during two workshops that were arranged and set up by the TPTA to which participants were invited in order to discuss problems and solutions to the implemented restrictions for heavy vehicles in the western area. For ethical consideration the participants in the meetings were early acknowledged that my role was to study the meetings and look at the dynamics and the participatory role of the participants for academic reasons. A dilemma with me revealing my identity as a researcher is that the participants may change their decisions, actions and behaviour as they know they are being observed (Bryman, 2008). However, by positioning myself at the far end of the table and keeping a low profile there was little impact on the participants visual and hearing senses. These occasions were not recorded, partly because it is difficult to record a workshop session where the participants discuss in different groups, but also to respect that all participants would stay anonymous.

3.4. Research process

The initial thought for the empirical study was to conduct two focus groups with four to five freight receivers in each group. The different groups would discuss experiences of participatory processes and expectations on potential processes. This approach did however not end up possible since it initially was difficult to come in contact with and engage freight receivers to participate in the study. The TPTA provided contact details to retailers, restaurants and hotels in the city centre whom were contacted by e-mail in order to initiate interviews. Due to the low number of responses it was considered that it would not be possible to conduct focus groups, resulting in the current approach with interviews. To get the freight receivers to participate in interviews it was decided to enact with them in their business while there were few customers visiting the city centre, normally in the mornings. This approach resulted in 13 interviews of a variety of freight receivers, meaning different kinds of business and different sizes. These respondents were located in the eastern area (figure 2.) and had no known relation to the TPTA. Considering that cafés/restaurants and hotels often have preparations or customers to see to in both the morning and afternoon these were however more difficult to engage in an interview.

There were also interviews conducted with four freight receivers situated in the western area that had already established a relation with the TPTA. These were the participants in the workshops that were objects for observation in this study. The interviews aimed to understand how the freight receivers perceived their role in the workshops but also their role in the implementation of the restrictions in the area. The two workshops that were observed had the purpose to gather opinions and knowledge on problems that had arisen from the implemented restrictions for heavy freight vehicles and find potential solutions to these problems. In these workshops there were participants from the TPTA, retailers and freight carriers.

In addition to above there were three interviews conducted with key figures within the case; one representative from the TPTA, one representative from Innerstaden Göteborg and one freight carrier. The freight carrier was included in the study to get an alternative view on the participatory process. With the carriers view it was possible to get a wider and deeper understanding of the case that was studied.

All steps in the research process are summarized below (table 1.)
### Activities in the western area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First observation</th>
<th>13-03-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second observation</td>
<td>06-04-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>06-04-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>06-04-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>06-04-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>11-04-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activities in the eastern area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First e-mail send out</th>
<th>13-03-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second e-mail send out</td>
<td>22-03-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First walk around</td>
<td>04-04-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 interviews conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second walk around</td>
<td>06-04-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 interviews conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third walk around</td>
<td>20-04-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 interviews conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interviews with additional stakeholders

- TPTA: 13-04-2017
- Representative Innerstaden Göteborg: 03-05-2017
- Freight carrier: 24-04-2017

*Table 1. The different steps of the research process. The walk arounds indicate occasions where different businesses were approached for interviews.*

### 3.5. Data familiarization and analysis

#### 3.5.1. Transcription process

To transcribe or summarize all verbal content into written form is common in qualitative studies. For each recorded interview and observations in this study, a summary was written combined with notes taken during the observations. It was considered that transcribing would be too time consuming for this study and the summaries would give as much possibility to understand the respondents as transcripts. It has resulted in 34 pages of summaries for the interviews and nine pages of notes from the observations. All respondents were asked if they wanted a copy of the summary of their interview to check that they had been interpreted correctly and that no false statements were included. It also gives the respondents a chance to add, change or withdraw a statement or an answer.

For ethical consideration, it can be argued that an interview should be transcribed or summarized by an independent person not connected to the study per se to reduce risk of fabricating results (Wellard & McKenna, 2001). However, for economic reasons the summaries in this empirical study were done by the author himself. It should also be considered that all summaries were written in Swedish although the data presented in this study have been translated to English. Differences in the exact formulations in the responses are unavoidable since there are differences between the languages. These differences are however seen as too small to influence the interpretation of the results.

#### 3.5.2. Data analysis

The empirical data collected from the interviews and observations were analysed with existing theory in order to answer the research questions. Bernard (2011) argues that all analyses are qualitative as the researcher have an idea on what kind of answers he or she wants before the research is conducted. Thus it is a selective work of the researcher to use the parts from both empirical data and theoretical framework that is essential to answer the research questions. The data analysis consists of many subjective choices and it is essential to use both theoretical and empirical data to argue why these are the right choices (Seers, 2012). This study has accordingly followed a “descriptive – interpretative” approach which implies that empirical data gets analysed with pre-existing theoretic concepts and that the researcher subjectively interpret collected data (Elliot & Timulak, 2005). The descriptive part in this study is that the empirical data is analysed with the existing theoretical concepts of participation, engagement and communication. The interpretative aspect is my interpretation of the collected data.
An important aspect of data collection is to document all steps in order to keep the data organized for the analysis (Seers, 2012). In this study all the respondents were categorized and all summaries of the observations and interviews were connected to the rightful respondent. As this study is anonymous a simple coding system has been used for both categorisation and for the summaries. It has thus been easy to follow all steps and go back to see who said what. Further it is essential to make themes out of the empirical data in order to categorize the vast amount of notes and summaries (Seers, 2012). This makes it easier to see relations between the concepts and the real case and thus analyse the study phenomenon properly. In the analysis in this thesis the themes for the analysis derived from the literature.

3.6. Ethical consideration

In academic processes it is essential to take ethical considerations to ensure that confidential data is not leaked or that the presented results does not emotionally or in any other way harm the respondents participating in the study (Wiles, 2013). In this study all respondents are anonymous to ensure that no conflicts arise due to the presented and used results. As some respondents express opinions that could be considered sensitive it is better to conceal all identities. Further it gives the respondents more confident in expressing their true opinions on a subject without feeling constrained that their expressions will lead to any negative consequences. The respondents were informed before the interviews and observations on the reasoning behind the anonymous approach and in which way their answers would be used for the study which are key aspects when having an anonymous approach in qualitative research (Wiles, 2013). Even though several respondents expressed that it did not matter if their business or name were used in the study, it was decided to make all respondents anonymous in case of the respondents changing their mind afterwards. To conceal the identities the freight receivers has instead been given a letter A-K instead of their real name. The names of the representatives from the TPTA and Innerstaden Göteborg has also been excluded from the thesis since they represent their organization in this study and not themselves as individuals. Other ethical considerations were to construct the questions for the interviews so that political interests would be avoided.

Another essential ethical consideration is to inform consent. By doing this the respondents know what they are up to and what their answers will be used for and by this the respondent can make the active decision to participate or not (Wiles, 2013). In this study the respondents were acknowledged that I was a student at Uppsala University and that I were to conduct research on the participatory relation between freight receivers and the TPTA. They were also acknowledged that this research was partly initiated by the TPTA. In this sense all participants knew what they gave themselves into and also that they were observed. All participants during the interviews and observations had the opportunity to ask me to either stop observing or to exclude them from the study before, during and after the observations and interviews. The written summaries of the observations and interviews were also sent to the participants by mail so that they had the opportunity to ask me to exclude anything from the summary or change something that they felt I had interpreted differently from their intention. A few respondents wanted minor changes that did not have influence on the results.

3.7. Limitations

Limitations for this study mostly lies within the number of respondents and its influence on the results. It can be considered that more respondents potentially could give another kind of result, meaning that the interviewed freight receivers cannot represent all the hundreds of freight receivers that operates in the specified areas in central Gothenburg. Further the kind of businesses may also influence their answers which could be a subject for another research study. However, due to the outline and timeframe of this study, there is more emphasis on the deeper understanding of the freight receivers attitude towards participation rather than getting a quantitative number on differences among them. It would not have been possible in this thesis to collect both qualitative and quantitative data even though it would be preferable.
4. Theoretical framework

This chapter will explain the fundamental reasoning and interrelation between the theoretical concepts of participation and engagement but also the related concept of communication. Even if it easy to see the correlation between these concepts there are however different ways to approach them and explain how they affect each other. The chapter will begin to explain participatory theory involving concepts of democracy, rationality and the ladder of participation. Further the chapter focus on communication in participatory processes with a comparison between strategic and collaborative communication. Next focus lies on how to engage for participation with examples from both management and public participation. Lastly a shorter discussion combines the concepts and sets the reasoning for the analysis.

4.1. Participatory theory

During the last century, mostly the second half of it, participation by public or other stakeholders in planning, projects and decisions has increased considerably, especially in democratic societies where it has grown more important to maintain democratic values (Maier, 2001). Simultaneously the will and interest of the public and other stakeholders to participate and affect the society has increased during the 20th century (Arnstein, 1969; Pateman, 1970; Maier, 2001). Participation is praised as it increases the possibilities to plan and implement a project and decisions that increase quality of life or solves socio-economic issues (Kasemir, Jaeger & Jäger, 2003; Ramírez, et al., 2011). Participation in decision-making is considered as a fundamental part of democracy and has been included in the newly adopted sustainable development goals which states that participatory, integrated and sustainable settlement planning and management in all countries should be enhanced by 2030 (United Nations, 2016). That participation is becoming more integrated in urban planning and developing projects is not surprising as it is not unusual that participatory projects lead to more sustainable approaches (Martin & Sherington, 1996). Further, stakeholder and citizen view on policy making is essential for necessary changes related to issues in socio-economic activities. It can be argued that active involvement and participation is one of the most crucial challenges of our time since there are no other mechanisms in society guiding us into the future (Hansen, von Essen & Sriskandarajah, 2016). Except for a higher success rate in participatory projects, participation in the planning phase of a project or decision also lead to a better maintained physical environment, greater public spirit, assuring equitable involvement of community members, financial saving, users’ satisfaction and increased trust and confidence in governance (Mahdavinejad & Amini, 2011; Martin, Rice & Lodhia, 2014). In all, a well-developed method for participatory processes, in which good communication channels between decision makers and involved stakeholders is essential, may result in better decisions for sustainable development (Thrupp, Cabarle & Zazueta, 1994; Roseland, 2000; Mccormick, Neij, Anderberg & Coenen, 2011).

Definition of participation and its effect on society and democracy is widely discussed in academic literature. Glass (1979) simply describes it as opportunities for public to take part in governmental decision and planning processes. This view is shared by Haus and Heinelt (2004) who defines it as the process when stakeholders belonging to a local society take part in political decision-making and implementation. It can be seen as the “horizontal interaction” between the ones making a binding decision and the ones being affected by the implemented policy or decision (Schmitter, 2002). Participation is thus a way to practice the “democratic right” where public, communities and other stakeholders or interest holders can take part in planning, discussion, implementation and execution of projects or programmes initiated by decision-makers or the ones “in power”. Preferably the ones that are being affected by the decision, implementation, programme or project are involved in the participatory process, even though this is not always the case (Arnstein, 1969; Cleaver, 1999). Further participation can be defined as a process to legitimize certain decisions. The fundamental idea of participation is to include the full spectrum of existing opinions and rationalities in the planning, development and implementation of public policies and projects. Including more concerned stakeholders in planning and decision lead to better integration of existing values, knowledge and experiences, but at the same time it also helps to define desirable futures (Hansen, von Essen & Sriskandarajah, 2016). Participation can thus help develop and form goals that are desirable for more than only one stakeholder in a community. It can however be argued if this results in a “win-win”-situation or a “lose-lose”-situation as it often is difficult to reach a consensus in groups where there are
many different views, rationalities and opinions. This may end in settlements that no one is really pleased with (Cooke, 2001). However, it is stated that participation establishes a context where stakeholders in a broader sense can accept a certain decision (Pateman, 1970). Further Pateman (1970) states that a participatory approach also has the capacity to decrease the non-democratic attitudes in the individual. In other words, the more people engage in planning and decision, the more they believe in the decisions and the more they will continue to participate in questions affecting them (Pateman, 1970). In addition, Schmitter (2002) argues that the longer and more extensively participation or involvement is practiced, the interest from different stakeholders to participate increases since it becomes a part of the legitimacy process.

Even though participation is discussed in the academic community there are many cases where it has been involved as a part in creating more sustainable and democratic systems (Kasemir, Jaeger & Jäger, 2003; Hickey & Mohan, 2004; Mahdavinejad & Amini, 2011; Ramírez et al., 2011). Many cases are from developing areas where environmental or social concerns have been solved with the involvement of several stakeholders. In these cases, the decision-makers include scientists and the ones that are directly affected by the issues to include their point of view and together they come up with innovative solutions. In European cities participation has been most evident in decision regarding town planning (Haus, Heinelt & Stewart, 2004). This include dialogues or involvement of stakeholder in planning of new urban areas (Mahdavinejad & Amini, 2011), land use planning and environmental policy (Rydin, 1999), infrastructure and construction projects (Li, Ng & Skitmore, 2013; Rojanamon, Chaisomphob & Bureekul, 2012) and questions related to personal transport, such as travelling by car (Benwell & Brög, 1983), cycling and public transport (Sagaris, 2014). The role and impact of dialogue and participation in these areas has also been well studied (McAndrews & Marcus, 2015; NRC, 2008; Li, Ng & Skitmore, 2013). There are also initiatives within urban freight which have gathered stakeholders to discuss issues related to urban freight and tried to come up with sustainable solutions. These initiatives have led to increased discussion, awareness, information sharing and some solutions to existing problems. It is however often difficult to reach a consensus in important questions, engage important stakeholder, mainly from private sector, and to get the initiatives funded (Browne, Lindholm & Allen, 2015).

4.1.1. The ladder of participation

As seen above, the concept of participation is widely spread and not a newly adopted concept. However, its actual effect and its democratic value is extensively discussed. There is a broad complexity in governing local interests when different stakeholders are involved. It is evident that the complexity of including different and often conflicting opinions and interests puts pressure on leadership when participation is involved in the decision-making process. The lack of understanding of its complexity and non-adapted leadership often lead to failed attempts of mobilization and integration of programmes or projects, but also poor communication between policy and action (Stewart, 2004). In addition to this, critics of participation states that participation may in fact increase the power of those already in power and that participatory methods may take the place of more effective methods (Cooke & Kothari, 2001). A proposal or idea in planning or discussion which has adapted participation may very well be what the decision-makers legally and realistically can deliver, and thus the participation part can be seen as an act for the show where people feel more empowered although their opinions is within the decision-makers’ ambition (Mosse, 2001). This surely challenges the fundamental idea of participation and questions the democratic input of it. This also relates to the work of Arnstein whom in 1969 published an article where the “ladder of participation” was introduced. The ladder is a way to simplify the term participation and describe how and when participation could be described as a democratic process. It is concentrated on citizen participation, but it can just as easy be applied on other stakeholder’s participatory role and opportunity to affect planning and decisions. The ladder is obviously a simplification of the reality but it does however put a well-described frame of the reality.
Citizen control implies that the public has complete control of a certain installation, for example a school, a programme or a project. The ones in power are basically just the funders. Critique against it is that it may be inefficient, costly or that the powerful still have control as they control the funding.

Delegated power where public has achieved dominant decision-making authority for a certain plan or project. In this stage the decision-makers need to start to negotiate with the public rather than respond to thoughts and opinions from them.

Partnership implies that power is redistributed through negotiation between public and powerholders where people are more aware of their rights and have access to legal and technical advice.

Placation is to include public representatives in committees or boards where they participate in discussion and planning of certain policies or projects.

Consultation invites public opinion where decision-makers listen to the public and consider their opinions. However, this does not mean that the opinions are taken to account in the decision.

Informing means that the decision-makers distribute information only one-way without establish a channel for feedback.

Therapy means that people are exposed of therapy in the moment participation instead of actual participation. A sort of manipulation.

Manipulation means that the ones in power impose information and arguments for a certain agenda without giving the whole story to the other part.

Although its simplicity, Arnstein’s ladder can be used as a measurement and vision for where a participatory initiative wants to be and where it actually is in reality. However, there are some complications on the positive effects of being higher up on the ladder and where to place different kinds of participatory methods. Arnstein (1969) implies that the higher on the ladder a participatory process is the more democratic and more sustainable approach there is, however it is not always a participants’ desire to have full influence on planning or decisions and higher degree of citizen or stakeholder power does not always create better decisions (Taylor, 2001). This is because public or stakeholders not always have the necessary knowledge or competence to take the best decisions and also that more participants mean more opinions and rationalities which may lead to irrational outcomes. Regarding Arnstein’s ladder it is also stated that participatory processes can be dynamic where in one segment of the process the participatory role of stakeholders is high, meanwhile in another the active role of participants is low and it can thus be difficult to place the overall process in a specific segment of Arnstein’s ladder (Ward, 2011).

Critique of participation in projects, planning or decision-making usually include how the process often is constructed top-down and not bottom-up which also impose a manipulative approach where the ones to participate are not able to participate in setting the agenda or the framework for the process (White, 1996). This creates a sense of “them” and “us” and not the sense of “we-ness” which is essential for successful participatory processes. Thus, even if a process is high up on Arnstein’s ladder, it may still be the ones in power that control the process which eliminates the purpose of participation and may lead to mistrust in the system. To solve this Ruesch et al. (2012) argue that a key element for more successful processes is to include stakeholders before solutions are available and discussed. This means that necessary stakeholders need to be included early in the process of constructing a plan for a forthcoming implementation of a project or policy.
4.1.2. Important features for successful participatory processes

Participations has even though its criticism reached high implementation in different fields and many researchers emphasises the importance of different aspects for successful participatory processes. Stakeholder tend to see to their own interests, defend their part and fail to inquire into others, leading to polarisation of opinion and conflict, which is a result of an incomplete view of reality (Isaacs, 2002). In relation to this Mendelberg (2002) argues that such individualistic thoughts may be rational for the individual per se, but are harmful and irrational for the collective. The question is how to overcome this irrational behaviour to reach positive outcomes and successful participatory processes.

When going through literature there are especially three aspects that are seen as important factors for successful participatory processes; leadership (Haus & Heinelt, 2004; Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015), involving the right stakeholders (Webler, 1995; Haus & Heinelt, 2004; Deetz & Irwin, 2008), and trust (Odugbemi, 2008; Webler & Tuler, 2008). Within these there are several other essential aspects such as communication and engagement, and these will be described further in forthcoming chapters.

Leadership: Haus and Heinelt (2004, pp. 33-34) emphasises the importance of leadership and identifies three levels of decision making where participation and leadership of governance could lead to sustainable urban policies:

- National or regional decision for cities that form the framework or encourage cities to approach participatory methods.
- Cities within the given framework make decision or choices to involve concerned stakeholders in policy implementation or discussion etc.
- The stakeholders themselves make the decision or choice to participate or not.

Leadership can in these three levels influence, motivate and mobilize stakeholders to generate innovation (Haus & Heinelt, 2004). Further leadership has a central role in urban planning where issues regarding consensus building, dealing with conflict, mobilizing stakeholders, negotiation and produce efficient decisions are constantly present (Webber, 1969; Balducci & Calvaresi, 2004). Leadership can improve partnership between stakeholders and lead to more meaningful and inclusive collaboration in participatory processes (Stewart, 2004). Needless to say, a supposed leader has to consider all opinions and at the same time have a broad perspective which include both society in whole and interests of participants.

Involving the right stakeholders: The importance of involving the right stakeholders in the participatory process is argued to be a crucial part for a successful outcome (Lindblom, 1965; Haus & Heinelt, 2004, pp. 31). Firstly, the participants are ‘holders’ of certain resources, such as competence and knowledge within a certain field or process, which make the participants dependent on each other, but at the same time the participants are autonomous as they have their own interests to protect. To include relevant stakeholders is thus important to include these competences, but also to ensure that every interest is taken to account (Haus & Heinelt, 2004). Secondly, to include stakeholders that are affected by a decision, policy or project are important to protect democratic rights and have a fair system (Webler, 1995; Haus & Heinelt, 2004). Further the persons that are involved need to be well represented for their group and well accepted, emphasising the importance of including the right stakeholders (Ruesch et al., 2012). Cooke (2001) does however argue that there is today a lack of knowledge on how to engage the necessary stakeholders, so even though the necessary stakeholders are identified and invited, it may still be difficult to motivate these stakeholders to actually participate to the degree that is necessary. This is exemplified by initiatives in urban freight forums where it usually is difficult to engage private stakeholders and goods receivers (dell’Oliò et al., 2016; Browne, Lindholm & Allen, 2015).

Trust: This aspect is important in all facilities where different individuals meet to solve a common problem. Trust is clearly important for stakeholders to be willing to participate and for the discussions to be open, creative, efficient and productive (Odugbemi, 2008; Webler & Tuler, 2008). To increase trust, it is important that produced information is shared with all concerned stakeholders during the process so that there are no doubts or suspicions concerning the decision-making (Webler & Tuler, 2008; Ramírez, et al., 2015). Further, sharing information is important to ensure the participants that their opinion matter and that they understand what their resources are being used for (Prokopy, 2005).
share the information, it is important that a well-based platform for communication is established where all stakeholders can make themselves heard and all opinions, knowledge and thoughts can be shared.

Even though these three aspects are important factors for successful participatory processes there is still the matter of defining a successful outcome. Just as there are different views, opinions and rationalities in planning, discussions and decisions, there are several different opinions and views on the aftermath of the process. Simply, participants may have different views on what a successful process implies (Cooke, 2001). Further there can be social psychological limits in participatory processes that affect both the outcome and participants view on the process. One of these limits is the “Abilene paradox” which implies that decisions are made with the assumption that everyone is satisfied with the decision even though in reality, everyone is quite unsatisfied with the outcome. In other words, a group of people take actions that they think the other participants want, even though no one actually wants to take that specific action, and thus the whole purpose of the action is defeated (Harvey, 1974). In relation to participatory processes there are chances that a decision goes a long with the Abilene paradox as psychology is a main part of group dynamics and thus the risk to make decision based on assumptions that are wrong increases (Cooke, 2001). However, it can be argued that a solid forum with strong leadership, right stakeholders and built trust among stakeholders can overcome the psychological issues that can be present in participatory processes.

4.1.3. Summary on participatory theory

There are both possibilities that participatory processes generate decisions, projects and policies that enhance sustainability and development, but also that participatory processes enhance power of decision-makers, increased conflicts and less fact-based decisions. Obstacles for successful outcomes in participatory processes include the false impression of democratic allusion, indifference of power-relationships and increased risks for social psychological obstacles. To overcome these issues there is the need to include leadership, right stakeholders and trust into the process, which desperately need skills of how to engage the right stakeholders and uphold good and constructive communication. The following subchapters will thus delve deeper into the concepts of communication and engagement.

4.2. Theory on communication in participatory processes

The word communication is linguistically related to words such as communal, communion, common and communism and fundamentally means make something common or to do together. This means that a communicative process (more known as a conversation) has occurred when people understand the others message and opinion, even though they may not agree and the actual matter (Engquist, 2009). Krauss and Fussell (1996) describe communication as the process of sharing information within a shared interpretative framework that allows that information to be meaningful and useful. It can also be argued that communication is not only about expressing something verbally, written or in gestures, but it is about if the receiver manages to intercept the message correctly according to the messengers meaning (Barnlund, 2008). In relation to participatory processes the importance of communication has been proved several times as group discussion lead to better decisions and solutions than individual efforts or other methods, such as voting (Barnlund, 2008).

Communication has the functions to exert influence, reduce uncertainty, obtain feedback, to coordination group performance and to serve affiliative needs (Mitchell et al., 1988). Being able to communicate clearly is generally associated with more successful results in both personal life, work and development (Sommarstrom & Huntington, 1999). In addition, fully functioning communication environments can facilitate decision-making processes and build up trust between decision-makers and stakeholders which earlier was described as an essential aspect of successful outcomes in participatory processes (Jacobson & Lambino II, 2008). It might seem obvious that good communication can accomplish great things, but the skills of it is rarely mastered and many times the importance of a two-way communication is forgotten. Two-way communication help establish trust and lead to more desired results for several parts as it is far more effective than one-way communication (Leavitt, 1972; Duram & Brown, 1999). Handy (1976, pp. 356) also impose the importance of two-way communication in his three general recommendations for effective communication:
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Use as many communication channels as possible
- Encourage two-way rather than one-way communication
- Use as few linkages as possible in any communication chain

Although two-way communication opens the possibilities for greater collaboration and better understanding, some scholars argue that one-way and two-way communication only is best used in low-stake issues (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). For more complex issues it is however more productive and effective with multi-way communication, which enable communication between all participatory stakeholders (Gastil, 2008). Two-way communication is commonly related to strategic communication and multi-way communication is more related to collaborative communication (also known as deliberative communication) which both have different functions and can create different possibilities in participatory processes (Deetz & Irwin, 2008). The general differences between strategic and collaborative communication is explained further in the table below, but to understand more about their affects in participatory processes, the following sub-chapters will delve deeper into the two different approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Communication</th>
<th>Collaborative Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members are adversaries.</td>
<td>Members are joint problem solvers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking comes from a position or outcome to be accomplished.</td>
<td>Speaking comes from an outcome to be accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction becomes polarized around positions.</td>
<td>Interaction focuses on identifying complex interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued interaction narrows available options</td>
<td>Continued interaction broadens available options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts are used to support positions.</td>
<td>Joint search is used to discover facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants seek winning arguments.</td>
<td>Participants seek workable options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of problems is accomplished before meeting.</td>
<td>Definition of problems is a joint achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final responsibility for decisions rests with others.</td>
<td>Final responsibility for decisions rests with the group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. Strategic and Collaborative Communication, adopted from Deetz & Irvin (2008, pp. 173).*

### 4.2.1. Strategic communication in relation to participation

Strategic communication refers to a stakeholder-centred approach that intend to promote voluntary changes in behaviour among crucial stakeholders to make it easier to implement necessary decisions, programs or policies (Cabañero-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009). Strategic communication can in this sense be used by leaders in the beginning of a change process to explain the necessity and rationale behind the needed change and thus get crucial stakeholders engaged in the change process (Cabañero-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009). If effectively planned and executed, strategic communication can according to Calabrese (2008) increase sustainability by establish a forum for dialogue and stakeholder participation in the decision-making process. This is exemplified by several cases where strategic communication has been used to change behaviour or opinions among stakeholders that first oppose a change (Calabrese, 2008). In this sense a strategic communication strategy is more of a top-bottom approach where decision-makers identify an issue, formulate the necessary change and try to get necessary stakeholders to agree on that change is the only option. As in participatory theory it is essential by decision-makers to identify key stakeholders and determine if they are opposing or supporting a specific change (Cabañero-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009). The change is more likely to be accepted and be more effective as supporters can help persuade opponents that a certain change is needed.

Deetz and Irwin (2008) does however argue that strategic communication is more valuable within management or less complex environments where control, hierarchy, persuasion and motivation are central concepts. As it is top-down approach the democratic value of the participatory process where strategic communication is present can be questioned (Arnstein, 1969). In this approach the decision-makers set the agenda and push for change that they see necessary which manipulative tone usually lead to less successful outcomes in participatory processes (White, 1996). These power-relations can hinder the full potential of the group and end up in less successful processes (Deetz & Irwin, 2008). Cabañero-Verzosa and Garcia (2009) does however argue that strategic communication increases the changes of constructive dialogues as the leaders in this approach can chose appropriate communication channels in relation to information on supportive or opposing stakeholders. This approach also ensures a two-way check and feedback mechanism during the whole process.
4.2.2. Collaborative communication in relation to participation

In contrast to strategic communication where decision-makers want to change an opinion or behaviour in favour for a necessary change, collaborative communication aim to jointly solve a common problem. Its multi-way communication approach specializes specifically on problem solving (Gastil, 2008). The collaborative process enables all participants to express not only pros and cons on a specific decision or change based on facts, but also weigh in values, emotions and other technicalities (Gastil, 2005). It enables a respectful discussion where all participants’ opinions and values together form a decision. The dialogue between all participants should lead to complete understanding of differences in opinion and each other’s views and rationale. In this way it differs from strategic communication which aims to change behaviour, whereas collaborative communication aims to understand and respect different views and solve the problem from that criteria (Englund, 2006). There is thus a high importance of listening and negotiating to achieve a successful participatory process when using a collaborative communication method (Deetz & Irwin, 2008). Collaborative communication also enables the participants to focus more on interests rather than position and power-relations which stimulate cooperation and productive conflict management (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). It is however times-consuming and labour-intensive, and thus not always applicable in all setting, even though it sometimes is essential for complex problems (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015).

In relation to above collaborative communication implies a high level of democratic inclusion where power-relations between participants are excluded. Instead concentration and energy can be put on problem-solving where values and rationales from all participants are included. In relation to participation this will generate more successful participatory processes as decision-makers need to negotiate with participants, instead of changing opinions or in any means manipulate views for own interests (Arnstein, 1969). In addition, it could be argued that a process where collaborative communication is applied has the potential to avoid the sense of “them” and “us” and instead create a necessary sense of “we-ness” as participants are included already in setting the agenda which is essential for successful participatory processes (Ruesch et al., 2012).

4.2.3. Summary on communication in participatory processes

Communication has the power to change things for the better or worse depending on how it is used and how the framework in which communication is occurring. To create constructive and effective conversations it is especially important to define the relation between the ones that communicate or the conversation may end up on a level which is more of a struggle of the relation and power between participants (Watzlawick, Weakland & Fisch, 1974). Only when individuals define themselves in terms of a common sense of “we-ness” will their motivation and attempts to communicate ultimately ensure a full transfer of information and meaning. In this way, communication produces and is produced by a shared cognitive framework that has the capacity to transform potentially idiosyncratic inputs into coordinated action which is fundamental to share experience and organize collective action (Haslam, 2001).

In relation to participation as many channels of communication as possible needs to be available to ensure open sources of information. A two-way communication can thus sometimes not be enough to get all participants to understand views and rationales of others so that inclusive and fair decisions can be made (Gastil, 2008). At the same time a strategic communication approach can persuade or motivate stakeholders to engage in a certain process or decision that need participation. The role of well-established communication is prominent in both leadership, inclusion of right stakeholders and especially when establish trust among participants and this an essential part of participatory processes. Although a well-established communicative method, it may however still be difficult to engage people or stakeholders to participate in necessary actions. Next sub-chapter will delve deeper into the aspects of engagement in relation to participatory processes.
4.3. Theory on engagement in participatory processes

To engage or motivate people is closely related to communication, although not the same. One can surely use communication to persuade or create conditions for behavioural change, but if communication is used wrong the person you want engaged might oppose the idea and become critical towards the concept (Pelletier & Sharp, 2008). To get people engaged in certain questions is sometimes highly valued, especially in urban development as earlier stated. It is however not possible to make someone interested or motivate to engage by force, but it is possible to create conditions where the other part may become interested or motivated (Engquist, 2009). To force something rarely solves the actual problem, but may instead create new ones (Watzlawick et al., 1974). Thus, to force someone to participate in dialogues may create more tension and less possibilities to create a well-functioning platform that is needed for a successful participatory process. Engquist (2009) explains it quite simple how stakeholders can engage reluctant parties by narrowing it down to four points of action:

1. Communicate knowledge on correlations on the different options (but do not enforce either option).
2. Present several alternatives in different levels of ambition (It is better that you do something than nothing at all). Be sure to keep the option of doing nothing at all.
3. Describe how you think when considering different options but do not push your own opinion.
4. Let the other part make the decision.

However, it is rarely this simple in real life as different scenarios need different measures. Further it can be questioned what the results would be if the other part always makes the decision. This sub-chapter will explore further into the concept of engagement and discuss the complexity of it by analysing a range of theories on engagement in different fields that will be argued that it can be applied on the relation between local authorities and stakeholders. Employee motivation and engagement has been studied within management for decades with pioneers such as McGregor (1960), Herzberg (1966) and Alderfer (1969). However, in participatory processes in policy implementation and projects the relation between authorities and other stakeholders the theory on engagement is less explored. This segment will explore engagement in management and engagement of public to understand some fundamental thoughts on how to engage other people in decision-making that can lead to more effective and productive decisions and processes.

4.3.1. Engagement in management

It is common to engage employees in dialogues and decision-making to improve and develop organizations (Henderson, 2014). Previous studies show that a cohesive group may be more effective than people working separately when achieving goals in organizations (McGregor, 1960). Participation in management is defined as the encouragement of employees to share or participate in decision-making in organizations (Probst, 2005). To involve employees in decision making and managing processes makes it easier to identify problems, innovative solutions and to solve problems (Sarti, 2014). Engaging employees are also more likely to lead to more positive results and more satisfied employees with more effective collaborative relationships and stronger internal bonds within teams and between employees and managers (Anitha, 2014; Cowardin-Lee & Soyalp, 2011; Soane et al., 2012). Due to these positive effects of employee engagement organizations have started to indulge employees more in decision-making processes and increase the communication to build trust among employees and decision-makers (Mishra, Boynton, & Mishra, 2014). Studies also show that involvement of employees in decision-making processes also lead to the employees wanting to return the favour and become more motivated to perform and also become more engaged in both the working place and decision-making (Yoerger, Crowe & Allen, 2015).

There are different methods to engage employees in decision-making. Cotton (1993, p. 31) enhance six methods of engaging employees in decision-making, all off different functionality, level of democracy, and potential to lead to successful outcomes:
• Quality circles - Programs that involve lower lever workers to discuss production and service issues and make recommendations for management to consider. In this scenario, the employees have low power and the method rarely lead to the expected positive outcomes.

• Scalon plan – Employees get a financial reward for sharing productive recommendations to management. This kind of gainsharing system usually have positive results, but it is however argued why it has positive results. Some argue that it is simply economic incentives (Geare, 1976), and some argue that it depends on improved communication and cooperation (Hanlon & Taylor, 1991).

• Representative participation – The employees are not involved directly, but are represented by a worker council or employee representatives in i.e. the board of directors.

• Work redesign – Change individual jobs so involvement is increased through the individual job, rather than on the work group or organization.

• Self-directed work teams – The employees work as a group, eliminating the first-level supervisor and as a group the workers are involved in decision regarding their operative processes.

• Employee ownership – Although not always engaged in the overall management of the organization, the employees owns a significant portion of it and can thus have rightful opinions on its operation.

Not all these methods are relevant in a local authority - stakeholder context, but some of them are already used when trying to engage both public and other stakeholders in planning and decision-making.

However, it is not as easy as just implement one of the above methods to achieve better results and better problem-solving. The similarity between them is that all of them require management commitment, as well as education for employees and management. They all work differently in different settings and some do not work at all if not implemented correctly (Cotton, 1993). To achieve high levels of employee engagement there is also a need for key participants to provide both socioemotional and technical support (Bono & Judge, 2003; Cowardin-Lee & Soyalp, 2011). The technical support should be in form of information that goes two ways. Establishing a platform for open communication is a fundamental part of successful engagement for participatory processes in management, just like in any participatory process (Karanges, 2014).

4.3.2. Engagement of public

Public participation has as described earlier become more established in urban planning and decision-making (Abbott, 2012). How to engage the public is however an entirely different question and more difficult to address. Some people participate deliberately meanwhile some do not participate at all, even if a decision directly affect them. As public participation generally is seen to have many positive effects on society there needs to be different ways to get the public to actually participate (O’Riordan & Fairbrass, 2014).

It is generally difficult to engage citizens in public decisions and planning (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). It is however important to engage as many people as possible to make decisions as democratic and legit as possible (Hansen, von Essen & Sriskandarajah, 2016). A common mistake when wanting to engage the public in participation is the lack of trying to understand the citizens which of course is a difficult task as it is full of contradictions (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). It is also quite difficult to get to understand the public if they are not engaged. One way to include stakeholder opinion and have them come up with an idea is to let them set the agenda and timetable for a process, project or meeting. Letting the participants set the agenda guarantees that people will be able to protect their interests and therefor it is an important part in participatory processes (Dahl, 1989; Weblor 1995). However, Weblor and Tuler (2008) states that it is not as easy as just letting the participants set the agenda all by themselves. Having the process too open may lead to delays and the agenda going outside the actual scope of the process. It is thus important that the initiators set the agenda together with participants to ensure a reasonable and just agenda. Further it is essential to create engagement FOR something and not AGAINST something. This pro-attitude evokes associations to solve conflicts, to help, sustain nature,
and creativity, meanwhile the contra-attitude has a more destructive character (Eigner & Schmuck, 2002).

There are several different platforms for public engagement such as elections, focus groups, public meetings, surveys to engage the public with mixed results. Technology has also brought new solutions on how to engage more people in planning and decision-making processes (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). More concrete suggestions would include elections, focus groups, town hall meetings, surveys, workshops, competitions and more (Lukensmeyer, Goldman & Stern, 2011). New online tools include solutions to participate and come with suggestions and ideas over online forums which may have mixed results and the real effect and level of democracy can be discussed (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). However, it cannot be neglected that online forums can contribute to more participants, thus higher degree of engagement (Cochrane, 2015).

4.3.3. Engagement in relation to behavioural change

Well-established examples where engagement has been crucial is within change of behaviour regarding environmental aspects such as recycling or use of public transport. Wanting to increase recycling by public has been of interest by communities for decades where different methods has been tried, such as the use of material incentives (Geller, Winett, & Everett, 1982) or social-psychological principles (Burn & Oskamp, 1986). It can however be stated that wanted behaviour usually ceases when material incentives are withdrawn, meaning that long-term change is not achieved with this method even-though initial engagement was increased (Pardini & Katzve, 1983). Thus engagement of this sort is more successful when approaching attitudes, awareness of consequence and altruistic values (Burn & Oskamp, 1986; Hopper & Nielsen, 1991). The study by Burn and Oskamp (1986) show that right formulated information of an issue is more likely to change behaviour and engage public in recycling than other methods. In this sense a persuasive and manipulative approach can be a successful approach for engagement. Further the study of Hopper and Nielsen (1991) conclude that encouragement of recycling of public increases when people in the surrounding area recycles. They also conclude that information on benefits increased recycling but did not affect norms and attitudes which is essential for long-term engagement. It can thus be concluded that solemnly material incentives or communication is not sufficient when engaging public in recycling, but to reach an altruistic engagement with changed norms and attitudes there need to be others showing the path. However, material incentives and communication can set the wheels in motion and start a process of engagement. Similar results can be shown in studies in behavioural change regarding use of public transport where initiatives such as free-passes has engaged an increased amount individuals to use public transport short-term. However long-term behavioural change and continuous use of public transport comes with change of norm and attitude towards the concept of public transport (Abou-Zeid & Fujii, 2016).

4.3.4. Summary on engagement in participatory processes

Engagement is a complex process as it tries to change a behaviour or enhance a known or unknown and sometime unwanted need, behaviour or desire among people. It is thus a psychological process where different methods have different results. What is common is that engagement of people in planning and decision-making in either management or public participatory processes increase democratic values and commonly result in more productive and positive outcomes. To get people interested to engage is also a strategic process. As stated within the studies of recycling and public transport use the importance for long-term change in behaviour lies within self-reflection (Abou-Zeid & Fujii, 2016) and have the ability to make own choices based on facts (Burn & Oskamp, 1986). This correlates with Engquist (2009) who state that the art of engagement lies within the action of letting the other part make the decision based on distributed knowledge and the possibility to choose freely among different options. The distributed knowledge, shared through communication, is surely a part of engagement and can increase participation is a certain matter, however it has to be used carefully not to create opposition and mistrust (Pelletier & Sharp, 2008). As stated by (Engquist, 2009) it is not possible to get someone interested to engage by force, but it is possible to create conditions for motivation and engagement. Regarding engagement in management and public engagement material incentives can function as the launch pad into an initial change, but more in-depth change in norms and attitudes need to happen to reach a long-term altruistic engagement.
Surrounding and supporting tools can help increase engagement such as the use of communicative approaches and socioemotional support (Bono & Judge, 2003; Cowardin-Lee & Soyalp, 2011). Communicative approaches are useful in both management, public engagement and behavioural change where technical tools such as online forums can increase the potential of dialogue and multi-way communication. The role of communication is essential as in all cases it is crucial to create mutual understanding of values, opinions and rationales to be able to create necessary basis for change or engagement. Further it has been stated that it is essential in all aspect to have optimistic approach in the engaging process where positive reasons for participating should be enhanced (Eigner & Schmuck, 2002).

4.4. To conclude

Even though participatory processes in projects, decisions or planning generally have a positive approach in academic literature, the success of these processes does not come automatically when appropriate stakeholders are placed in the same room. Participatory processes may lead to more democratic, sustainable and satisfactory decisions, but it is still difficult to engage necessary or affected stakeholders in the planning or decision-making process. Many cities or governmental agencies have their techniques which has been developed during the last century, but it is safe to say that it is still room for improvement (Webler & Tuler, 2008). To have a successful outcome both the communicative and engaging part has an essential role and the leaders of participatory processes need to improve the skills of democratic communication or deliberative communication that is necessary for coordinating different interests and to facilitate interaction that may lead to satisfactory and innovative solutions (Deetz & Irvin, 2008). As shown above there is a close relation between participation, communication and engagement, although the skills to master the different aspects differ. It is however possible to increase democratic and stakeholder satisfaction of decisions, planning, policy implementation and projects if the three is combined. This sub-chapter will try and combine the three concepts in an analytical approach.

To include stakeholders in the whole participatory process from initiative to decision-making is seen as essential by several scholars (Arnstein, 1969; Pateman, 1970; Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015; Hansen, von Essen & Sriskandarajah, 2016). Effective and well-established communication between stakeholders seems particularly essential in participatory processes because people often do not articulate their values easily or may not even understand them (Lesser et al., 2000). To enable better participatory processes with mutual understandings there is a necessity of a deliberative communicative approach where all participants in a dialogue are listen to and all opinions, values, emotions and technicalities are considered before any decision is taken (Gastil, 2008). Webler (1995) narrows all the attributes of communication into two main categories: fairness and competence. Fairness in this sense meaning that concerned stakeholders are given proper information about a certain decision and how it may affect them. Fairness also include the role of government to reach out to concerned stakeholders so that they get involved in discussions on decisions that may concern their interests (Andrews & Shah, 2003). Simply put, fairness has to do with giving the ones that become affected by a decision to be able to have a say on the matter. This relates to participatory theory that state the importance of involving the right stakeholders for successful outcomes (Lindblom, 1965; Haus & Heinelt, 2004). Competence has to do with access to information and its’ interpretations (Webler, 1995). This goes into the fundamental description of communication which is the process to understand the others message and opinion, even though it is not a necessity to agreeing on the matter (Engquist, 2009; Krauss and Fussell, 1996). The quality and availability of information in participatory processes is linked to satisfying decisions and acceptance of the decision (Cole, Stevens, Lally & Watts, 1996; Leach, Pelkey & Sabatier, 2002; Leach & Sabatier, 2003). This is also argued in participatory theory where mutual information sharing is essential for democratic values in the participatory process is to be consistent (Stewart, 2004). There are thus several similarities between communicative and participatory processes where one of them does not come without the other.

In close relations to above is the concept of collaborative communication which is a fundamental part of successful participatory processes. Stakeholder governance together with well-developed collaborative communication can lead to more efficient and creative decisions that is more satisfactory for all involved parties (Deetz & Irvin, 2008). The collaborative assessment must be applied all through
the process, from engaging, initiating, during meetings, during planning and during decisions. Weblert
and Tule (2008) emphasize that initiators should in this sense set rules for communicative actions from
the start that must be tolerated by all participants. These rules should be set jointly by all participants
and it may be necessary with a facilitator that make sure that the rules are followed. It is also essential
that there are no misunderstandings in the process. In this process, it is important that all facts of the
case are known and that discussion continue until all disagreements among stakeholders are real and not
based on misunderstanding or misinformation (Jacobson & Lambino II, 2008).

To share information and knowledge is also essential in engagement theory. To increase engagement
from employees in more successful management decision making it is essential that information is open,
fair and correct (Bono & Judge, 2003; Cowardin-Lee & Soyalp, 2011). Further in public engagement it
is common to misunderstand the public opinions when wanting to engage public in planning and
decision in participatory processes (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). A thoughtfully designed
communication strategy can lead to increased levels of commitment and engagement from crucial
stakeholders for participation in planning, decision-making, projects or policy implementation
(Cabareo-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009). It can however be argued if the strategic or collaborative
communication strategy is most effective in these processes. The strategic communication strategy
imposes change within the stakeholders’ behaviours through negotiation and persuasion meanwhile
collaborative communication focus on joint problem solving with collaborative responsibility for the
whole process.

Strategic communication can be seen as a more top-down approach as the ones imposing a change are
the ones creating the strategy for communication and takes the initiative. This is commonly the critique
against participatory methods as the top-down approach undermines the fundamental idea of
participation and its democratic values (White, 1996). Instead the participants should be involved
already in setting the agenda in a more bottom-up approach to have more successful participatory
processes (Dahl 1989; Weblert 1995). This impose that deliberative communication which include all
stakeholders from the very beginning should lead to more successful processes.

The thorough review of the theoretical concepts above will later be essential to understand the dynamics
between freight receivers and the TPTA in Gothenburg. As there is difficulty in engaging freight
receivers to participate in freight related issues these theories will give a deeper understanding on what
can be done to enhance engagement. In order to perceive the perspectives of the freight receivers on
these matters some data have been collected on a case in Gothenburg. This will be described further in
the next chapter.
5. Results

In the following chapter the collected data from the interviews and observations will be presented which will give an understanding the different objectives and rationales of the respondents. This is made by presenting a summary of relevant data from the 34 pages of summaries from the interviews and 9 pages of notes from the observations. Quotes are used directly in the analysis in order to strengthen the logic in different arguments. First the result from observations and interviews with stakeholders in the western area will be presented, followed by results from freight receivers in the eastern area. Lastly the results from the interviews with the three additional respondents will be presented.

5.1. Grouping of the respondents

The freight receivers represented in this study have been divided into three groups depending on turnover and if the establishment is part of a franchise or a national or international chain store. This was made to easier see potential similarities and differences among various freight receivers. As there are 13 freight receivers in this study and all have different relations to and opinion on freight it is easier to analyse when they are divided into different groups. The division to the separate groups and separate areas are shown below (table 3) together with the additional respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents in the western area</th>
<th>Respondents in the eastern area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (Turnover &lt; 10MSEK)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (Turnover &gt; 10MSEK)</td>
<td>H, I, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise/chain store</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional respondents</td>
<td>Representative TPTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative Innerstaden Göteborg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freight carrier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Grouping of respondents.

5.2. Results from the western area

The respondents in the western area consists of retailers who were invited to participate in the workshops that were arranged by the TPTA. In this area the restrictions for freight vehicles above 3,5 tonnes were implemented in January 2017 to minimize the number of heavy vehicles in the city centre and thus create a more attractive and safer environment. This is within the scope of the implemented transport strategy presented earlier. The plans of this restriction were presented to other stakeholders such as freight receivers and freight carriers about a year before they were implemented. The other stakeholders had opportunities to express their opinions and thoughts on these restrictions, whereas the restricted time were changed from 5am – 10am to 5am - 11am. This is due to the fact that many stores do not open until 11am and thus cannot receive their goods before then.

After the restrictions had been implemented, the TPTA arranged workshops with affected stakeholders to gather information on how the newly implemented restrictions had affected them. These workshops have been called “improvement groups” which aimed to identify emerged problems and try to find solutions to them. These workshops were the occasions that were subject for observation. The problems that were expressed by the freight carriers were that it had gotten more congested with heavy freight vehicles in the morning and the drivers had gotten more stressed as they need to do all deliveries before 11 am. As many retailers do not have staff on site until 10-11 am that can receive the goods it had become more difficult to make all deliveries within the given time frame. Further the carriers stated that goods after the implemented restriction now were delivered by smaller vehicles. As smaller vehicles
cannot handle the same amount of volume as heavy trucks the number of vehicles had increased in the restricted area which could have negative effect on both congestion and environment. The freight receivers on the other hand recognized that their goods had started to arrive later than usual and that it was more difficult to arrange transport for outbound goods. In addition, a few of the freight receivers experienced that the area had become more congested in the mornings after the restriction had been implemented. The main similarities and differences between the views and objectives of the participants that were observed are outlined below in table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- View on urban attractiveness</td>
<td>- How to achieve urban attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- View on dialogue and its importance</td>
<td>- If freight transport is considered a problem and in what way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All see the importance in hearing others</td>
<td>- Knowledge on decision making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives</td>
<td>- If right stakeholders are invited to the meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Summary of observations*

The observations show that all participants find it important to meet in person to get better understanding of each other’s views and objectives. This encourage a dialogue that focus on finding solutions that in some way fit all, and not only the own organisation. At the same time a couple of participants think that it should be more stakeholders invited to be able to express their views, and also that a representative from the Traffic committee should be present who can give the perspective of the politicians. As stated above, they all have a common view on urban attractiveness, but the way to get there differ and also what they believe these meetings can contribute with. Further it was stated by a couple of freight receivers during the workshops that they often feel that they are not listen to and that they become worried when new projects are initiated as it may affect their deliveries negative. As previously explained, the freight receivers that participated in the improvement groups were also interviewed in order to get their perspectives on the process of the implemented restrictions and how they perceive their ability to form workable solutions for the urban freight transport system in Gothenburg. These were all medium sized businesses except one who is a part of a franchise/chain store. Their views and opinions did not differ much from each other regarding what they thought on the process of implementing the restrictions, the workshop or their overall view on participation, engagement and communication. They all believe that it is important to have possibility to influence decisions and that authorities must consider their opinions before new initiatives. However, all state that it does not always seem like the TPTA listen to their reasoning or value their opinions. Further the freight receivers stated during both the observations and the interviews that they do not concur with the problem statement that the TPTA presents. For them freight transports do not create such big issues, so to regulate them seems unnecessary. The results from these interviews are summarized in table 5.

### 5.3. Results from the eastern area

These respondents have various experiences with city authorities, different level of knowledge or interest in freight and also different views on engagement and participation regarding initiatives related to urban freight transport. The three groups of small, medium and franchises/chain stores distinguished themselves from each other, but also had some similarities. The most common among these freight receivers were that they had a similar view on urban attractiveness, but it was mainly the medium sized businesses that could relate this view to problems with urban freight transport. The retailers that belonged to a franchise or chain store had little interest in questions related to freight, as they rely on that their goods will arrive to them sometime during the day. They all expressed that they had the possibility to adjust schedules of their staff in order to receive their goods from early morning until late evening. As this is not seen as a problem they are less interested in freight related initiatives carried out by local authorities. It can also be stated that these respondents often referred to regional or national managers in relation to several questions as they have company policies to consider. Small or medium sized businesses on the other hand mentioned how they lack resources to participate and that they could get more affected by different initiatives. Overall the respondents in this area request better information on things that will happen and that simple ways of communication can be established. The key notes from these interviews are summarized in table 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Medium (3 enterprises) | - Everyone wants to participate in some way but expect that it gives something in return, meaning that the authorities listen to their opinions.  
- All express that it is difficult to influence decisions since the decision makers already have their mind set up.  
- Processes are informative, not participatory.  
- Important to have concrete solutions when inacting with authorities, otherwise they will not listen.  
- Requests a proper agenda with a well stated problem so solutions can be discussed instead of what the problem is. | - Engage all relevant actors, including interest groups, property owners and politicians.  
- Smaller discussion groups are requested so that everyone can make their voice heard and engage in the discussions.  
- More eager to participate if their opinions matter, otherwise it is a waste of time/money. | - All affected actors by a decision should be informed early and be able to express opinions.  
- Dialogue is needed to understand the vision and get mutual understanding of different objectives which will lead to better decisions.  
- Two respondents state that the TPTA are more informing on their meetings rather than considering different opinions.  
- Make it easy to know who to contact by creating simple information channels.  
- Encourage active listening and transparency.  
- Meeting in person is encouraged when information needs to be shared.  
- Electronic communication is a possible way of communicating, but effective dialogue is more difficult this way. |
| Franchise/chain store (1 enterprise) | - Have the resources to participate but it is only interesting if it has a value and their opinion matter.  
- Want to participate in discussions in order to understand others’ point of view and to develop solutions that fit all.  
- Not sure if it is possible to influence on decisions.  
- Hope to see changes after the ideas that was brought up during improvement groups. | - Engaged since they are affected by the restrictions every day.  
- A mutual understanding of the problem would increase engagement since that would make all know what they participate for.  
- More willing to participate if their opinions matter, it cost time/money to participate. | - Openness, honesty and transparency is essential.  
- Use communication to get understanding for others objectives an visions.  
- Would like a forum where everyone is heard and all opinions are valued.  
- Communicate via real person or by e-mail, although e-mail is difficult for effective dialogue.  
- Want better information from evaluations and statistics that states the actual problem before they participate and discuss solutions.  
- Request better and earlier communication from TPTA on why decisions are made and how it will affect their business. |

*Table 5. Summary of interviews with respondents in the western area.*
### Table 6. Summary of interviews with respondents in the eastern area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Summary of interviews with respondents in eastern area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Small** (3 enterprises)  | Participation: - Mainly one who is interested in participating proactively, but only if opinions are valued and listen to.  
 - The other two do not see any need to participate proactively as they do not see any problem with urban freight transport.  
 - All express less will to participate due to lack of resources.  
 - All express that it is difficult to influence decision makers on their own.  

 Engagement:  
 - Want to engage if they are affected by a decision in a negative way, but find it difficult with no resources.  
 - All express that large stores or Innerstaden Göteborg should engage in these discussions as they have more resources and more influence.  
 - All express that a common formulation of the problem with freight is needed before engaging.  

 Communication:  
 - Transparency is essential, request early information so they can adapt to changes.  
 - Understanding of others views and objectives are important but difficult.  
 - Dialogue needs to be established early between concerned actors in order to reduce negative effects of implementation.  
 - Needs to be easy to communicate and to know who to contact if problems arises.  

**Medium** (3 enterprises)  
**Participation:**  
- All willing to participate in some form and all but one have resources to participate.  
- All see potential in participation and that it is possible to influence to some extent, unless it is a political decisions.  
- Two have had queries with the TPTA:  
  - I express that it was possible to influence decisions as a good dialogue was established and is thus more positive to participate.  
  - I express that the TPTA did not consider the views of retailers and is thus less positive to participate.  

**Engagement:**  
- Both businesses and Innerstaden should engage for best result.  
- One way to gather information among freight receivers could be through mail or questionnaires.  
- TPTA should engage by coming in person, establish communication channels via Innerstaden Göteborg or create forums for discussion.  

**Communication:**  
- A more united vision and problem formulation for the city centre is needed for better communication.  
- All affected actors should be informed early to be able to express their opinion, which is not sufficient today.  
- Desire that decision makers understand the problems freight receivers are facing.  
- Better communication to understand each others’ opinion and vision is needed.  

**Franchise/chain store** (3 enterprises)  
**Participation:**  
- Not willing to participate to any larger extent in freight related discussion, and do not see the need of it.  
- All say that it is difficult as a single store to influence decision makers.  
- Needs to be cooperation and they see the potential in participation but are not interested themselves as they do not get affected.  

**Engagement:**  
- The ones that get affected or interests groups should engage.  
- Not the store owners themselves that handles these things, they have regional or national managers that are more suitable.  

**Communication:**  
- Important to be able to see problems from different perspectives, which can be achieved with better communication.  
- Openness and honesty is essential.  
- Make sure that there is a clear and defined contact person if one is needed.
5.4. Results from additional stakeholders

The additional stakeholders that have been interviewed in this study is the TPTA, a representative from Innerstaden Göteborg and a representative from a freight carrier that every day operates within the restricted area. The TPTA is the authority that initiated the restrictions for heavy vehicles with consent from the Traffic Committee. For them it is essential to create an attractive and sustainable city centre that also withholds good mobility and accessibility for both public and businesses. Their overall objective is to find solutions that fit all concerned stakeholders, but that may be difficult in relation to the political agenda. Further it is important for them that more freight receivers participate in initiatives so that it is less risk that someone get affected negative by a new implementation. The more information they have from different stakeholders, the easier it is to make decisions and implement new solutions that increase sustainability without having negative affect on businesses. The representative state that the TPTA has to become better in informing and communicating with concerned stakeholders in order to find the best solutions.

Innerstaden Göteborg was mentioned several times during the interviews with the freight receivers as an organization that should take responsibility in freight related discussions with the TPTA. Their mission is to develop a living and attractive city centre in Gothenburg together with other actors. Today Innerstaden cooperate with city authorities, property owners and their approximately 600 members, consisting of different businesses in the city centre of Gothenburg. They do today function as a channel for distributing information for the city authorities since they have the possibility to reach out all their members at once with newsletters or through their website. Thus, information on decisions or changes initiated by city authorities can be distributed with the help of Innerstaden Göteborg. Further they continuously collect information from their members regarding what the members believe should be improved in the city centre. The respondent state that information is important in order to come up with solutions that works for all concerned stakeholders. Further the representative state that most stakeholders in the city have the same goal, but different ways to get there. In this sense Innerstaden Göteborg could help to guide the different stakeholders in order to work for a collective goal.

The freight carrier is one of the major distributors of goods in the city centre and is every day affected by the implemented restrictions. The respondent participated in the improvement groups which was considered to be a good initiative although few stakeholders attended. The overall view is that more stakeholders, with emphasis on freight receivers, has to participate in various discussions in order to find solutions that works for all concerned. The respondent state that the company is willing to test different solutions but it is difficult if not freight receivers are able to meet them half way and can consider trying different approaches. They have a good cooperation with the city authorities today, but would like that more stakeholders are involved and that solutions can be created together among all concerned stakeholders.

A more thorough summary of the responses of the additional stakeholders are presented in table 7 below.
### Table 7. Summary of interviews with additional stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TPTA            | - All actors should participate in some way as all perspectives are important when making changes for the better.  
|                 | - There are solutions to the problems, but more participation is needed in order to get knowledge on how different stakeholders get affected by the solutions.  
|                 | - It is important that all see pros and cons of different approaches and understand the political goals.  
|                 | - Would be irresponsible not to include freight receivers in decision making as more perspectives increase possibility to find solution that suits all.  
|                 | - Opinions they receive from stakeholder cannot always change a political decision, but the TPTA can spread the message to the decision makers.  |
|                 | - Engagement:  
|                 | - It is difficult to engage freight receivers as freight is not a prioritized problem among them.  
|                 | - When not all stakeholders are involved it is bigger risk that conflict of interest arises.  |
|                 | - Communication:  
|                 | - Good to have personal contact with stakeholder as it increase understanding, but it is time consuming.  
|                 | - TPTA have plans for distribution of information when implementing new policies or projects as it is important to reach all who gets affected.  
|                 | - Important to communicate the initial values.  
|                 | - Be clear with the agenda and also what the TPTA can and cannot do so no false hopes or expectations arises.  
|                 | - Important that other actors can express their opinions thorough good communication channels.  
|                 | - Sometimes it is needed to adjust the information that they give as some want more information and some less.  |
| Innerstaden     | Participation:  
| Göteborg        | - They only conduct projects which the city, business and facility owners are interested in as solutions has to be found together.  
|                 | - Important to include stakeholders early in a project to find better solutions.  |
|                 | - Engagement:  
|                 | - Engage already in planning.  
|                 | - Ask for opinions after an idea is created instead of after it is implemented, otherwise there is a risk of not establishing the idea among the businesses.  |
|                 | - Communication:  
|                 | - They have continuously contact with their members, e.g. with annual questionnaires which let them know what the businesses want to change or improve.  
|                 | - They have a responsibility to gather information on what is going to happen and to inform their members (mostly done with newsletters or through website).  
|                 | - More information is needed early with a clear agenda as businesses get anxious if they do not know what is going on.  
|                 | - Important that decision makers listen to the opinions of the businesses but also that businesses understand decision making processes.  
|                 | - Important with dialogue to establish a common vision to aim for.  |
| Freight carrier | Participation:  
|                 | - Collaboration is important and they have a continuous dialogue with the TPTA.  
|                 | - More freight receivers should participate in order to find solutions that suits all.  
|                 | - If there are big changes there must be more stakeholders involved in the discussions in order to get a successful implementation.  
|                 | - Uncertain if their opinions can influence decision making.  
|                 | - It is about giving and taking, but is difficult if not more stakeholders engage in the process.  
|                 | - Stakeholders have different visions but if more are included it is easier to get a common view and thus find solutions.  |
|                 | Engagement:  
|                 | - Difficult to know how to engage freight receivers as freight is rarely a prioritized issue among them.  |
|                 | Communication:  
|                 | - Today communication usually is two-way, either with the TPTA or with the fright receivers, rarely all three together.  
|                 | - Request an open dialogue where all are listen to and stakeholders do not only see to their own interest as it is important to see the whole picture.  |
5.5. Overall results

There are some overall similarities, such as all respondents express that well distributed information at an early stage is important and that dialogue is essential in order to establish good cooperation and solutions that works for all stakeholders. Further as good as all respondents express a common view of what an attractive and sustainable city centre is like, but at the same time most acknowledge that the way to get there probably differ among different stakeholders. Differences lies within how the TPTA value the freight receivers’ opinions and how the freight receivers feel that their opinions are valued. However, all have similar views on the importance of dialogue and that it is important to understand others’ views in order to come up with better solutions.

Within the different groupings of freight receivers there are differences and similarities regarding views and opinions. As an example the medium businesses are more willing to participate in discussions related to freight than smaller store or franchises/chain stores. The common denominator for all freight receivers is that they want conditions to be able to run their business without interference of political influences or municipal decisions that increases costs or affect their customers or goods supply negatively. Several of the freight receivers mention how running their business is their biggest passion which political agendas may disrupt. Another similarity is that all the respondents express that they believe that all stakeholders have a common vision of what an attractive and sustainable city centre looks like, but they differ in the way to get there. The following analysis will look into this problem and see if participation and increased engagement in freight related initiatives could lead to better and more long-lasting solutions.

The above stated results will in the next chapter be analysed with the theoretic review in chapter 4.
6. Discussion and analysis

This chapter will analyse the theoretical framework with the collected data presented above. Firstly, some issues that have been identified regarding discrepancies among the freight receivers and the TPTA will be discussed. Further two cases will be presented, the case that was made and one that could have been. These will give a picture of what aspects that needs to be considered when conducting participatory processes with freight receivers. The chapter continues with analysing the results with theory on engagement where it is discussed how different approaches can increase the will to engage in participatory processes related to freight.

6.1. The dilemma of participation in the implementation of restrictions in Gothenburg

As mentioned in the chapter on theory, participation is a way to increase democratic values and to increase sustainability and generally projects with a participatory approach have a higher success rate (Kasemir, Jaeger & Jäger, 2003; Martin & Sherington, 1996; Mccormick et al., 2011; Ramirez, et al., 2011; Roseland, 2000; Thrupp et al., 1994). However, to carry out a participatory process is not simple as there are many sociodynamic elements to consider. The empirical results in this study provides a modest understanding of the complexity in participatory processes and the difficulty in engaging the right stakeholders to participate in discussion related to urban freight transport. Although most small and medium sized businesses want to have an influence on freight related decision that affect them, they rarely have the resources to participate, and those who have participated rarely believe that they have the possibility to influence the discussion or decisions which reduces the will to participate. In addition, the TPTA want more stakeholders to participate in discussions to express their views and opinions as it is important to gather information from all affected stakeholders on how a supposed implemented project or policy would affect them.

So essentially there are three statements in the studied case that need to be considered:

1. The TPTA want more stakeholders to engage to be able to come up with better solutions that fits all.
2. Freight is not a prioritized problem among many freight receivers and it is thus rarely possible to spend resources to participate personally.
3. Freight receivers that have participated in discussions with the TPTA feel that they do not get listened to and do not have the possibility to influence.

These three statements are entwined and could create a negative trend on which fewer freight receivers participate and thus the TPTA get less input from them. As is it difficult to engage the freight receivers it is possible that the TPTA implement restrictions or projects that affects some stakeholders negative as they do not have the range of knowledge from all the receivers, which in its turn may reduce the trust in the TPTA and reduce the will to participate. The representative from the TPTA states it as following:

It would be irresponsible not to include freight receivers in decision making, it is important with openness and transparency to find solutions that works for all. To be able to do that it is important to have all perspectives. The TPTA cannot predict all problems that will arise with an initiative, thus it is crucial to gather information on the different aspects and the problems that may arise. But since not all stakeholders show up in the meetings we arrange it is difficult to see all perspectives. (Respondent from TPTA)

This statement coincides with existing theory that implies that inclusion of concerned stakeholder in planning and decision lead to better integration of existing values and knowledge (Hansen, von Essen & Sriskandarajah, 2016). So, inclusion of more freight receivers would lower the risk of implementing restrictions or projects that have negative effect for some freight receivers, but at the same time the freight receivers in many cases do not have the resources to participate, do not see the need to participate or that they distrust that their opinion will affect the TPTA’s decision. This distrust is expressed by two respondents:
Today, and as it has been during a long time in Gothenburg, decision makers act after two models, either they pretend to listen then make a decision after own volition, or they make decisions without including opinions from concerned stakeholders at all. (Interview, Respondent H)

The respondent’s experience is that decision makers often are finished with their decision before they invite to dialogue. (Interview, Respondent K)

These statements show a sense of “them” and “us” mentality which is expressed among several respondents, mainly medium sized businesses. This mentality could potentially hinder initiatives and create distrust between participants and thus create a negative outcome in participatory processes (Ruesch et al., 2012). To decrease this sense of “them” and “us” it is stated that participants should be included early in the process to understand the problem, set the agenda and find a collective solution (Ruesch et al., 2012). In order to understand the difference between involving the freight receivers from the beginning in a process of implementing a policy, project or restriction, the following two subchapters will analyse two different realities, the case that was made, and the case that could have been.

6.1.1. The case that was made

In relation to the studied case, the time restrictions were presented by the TPTA as a solution to a problem that many freight receivers did not agree upon, which makes it more difficult to get stakeholders to understand the reason behind the implementation and also creates a feeling that their opinions are not considered. As stated in table 4 (Summary of observations) the freight receivers had a different opinion than the TPTA on what the problem with freight is, or even that it is a problem with freight in central Gothenburg at all. With this difference of viewpoint, the solution with the planned implementation of the restrictions for heavy vehicles become more of a forced solution rather than a participatory process. The participatory process would encourage the different stakeholders to jointly formulate the problem and from that standpoint find a collective solution. The used procedure, which is more of a top-down approach, resembles to the theory on strategic communication where definition of problems is accomplished before a meeting and the members are adversaries (Deetz & Irvin, 2008). It is possible that this approach establishes a functioning dialogue where the initiator can explain the necessity behind the change and get other stakeholders to understand the need for that specific change and why that specific solution is the right one (Cabañero-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009). Although, according to White (1996) it common that these initiatives have less successful outcomes as the initiator sets the agenda and push for change. It is argued that this approach is more functional in systems that are less complex where there are fewer rationales present (Deetz and Irvin, 2008). As the urban freight transport system contains many different objectives and rationales this approach has its potential risks and create the sense of “them” and “us” as stated above.

The TPTA did however include the freight receivers when trying to find solutions to problems that had arisen after the implemented restrictions in the observed workshops. This initiative was well received by all freight receivers that attended the workshops. The main positive responses regarded that participatory process was that it increased the knowledge of others’ objectives, rationales and view on urban freight transport. This is a key point in participatory processes, as it creates a foundation of which mutual understanding of the vision can be achieved and a similar mindset on how to reach the vision can be established (Gastil, 2008). This could also increase trust among participating stakeholders and increase the will do participate further in upcoming processes (Odugbemi, 2008; Webl & Tuler, 2008; Yoerger, Crowe & Allen, 2015). As Pateman (1970) states, a participatory approach can decrease the non-democratic attitudes, in this case the freight receivers would feel that the TPTA listened to their views and thus a pro-attitude to participate in future discussions can be established. However, it is important to see to the extent that the participants have the ability to influence the implemented restrictions. As all the respondents stated after the meetings, they are not sure that their opinions are considered and that changes will be made in their favour. Further, if it in this case does not lead to any changes it is possible that the trust in the participatory process is reduced and that the participants do not feel the meaning of engaging in the future since their opinions are not accounted for (White, 1996). In addition it can be stated that the TPTA has a political agenda and changes cannot be made too easily
as they are bound to decisions established by politicians. The process of the practical case is summed up below (figure 5).
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Fig. 5. Process where freight receivers participate actively in consultation.

6.1.2. The case that could have been

Assume that the freight receivers were included in the process from the beginning, already at the state of formulating the problem. This is according to Ruesch et al. (2012) one of the main things in successful participatory processes. As several respondents expressed that they did not share the problem with freight formulated by the TPTA this is a crucial first step. The observation showed that all participants more or less had the same vision for an attractive and sustainable city centre, but the way to get there differs, meaning that there are different views on the existing problems. If these problems can be concatenated and formulated to a unanimous problem it is easier to find a solution that in some way is functional for all involved stakeholders (Ruesch et al., 2012). Including the different participants already in the phase of setting the agenda has the potential to increase democratic values and encourage more participation since the longer an involvement progress is, the more interest from different stakeholders to participate as they are a part of the legitimacy process (Schmitter, 2002). Further it gives the possibility to share information with concerned stakeholders which is one of the main collective similarity among all respondents in this study. It is important to get early information in order to adapt to potential changes and most of all, be able to influence the change before it happens if there is a better solution. In the studied case there are two considerations regarding early information:

1. All respondents, including the TPTA, claim that it is important that information is distributed early when a change is going to be implemented, and
2. Many of the respondents express that this is insufficient today which creates an uncertainty and anxiety.

However, respondent M expresses how he/she once was able to influence planning with the TPTA along with construction workers before an initiated road work outside the hotel which ended up in solutions that had less negative impact on the business. Although, in this case the problem is stated ahead as the road work is something that has to be done from time to time, meanwhile the problem with freight is an ongoing complex issue including more objectives. In this complex system an even earlier approach would help to increase knowledge on the stakeholders’ various agendas and formulate a problem that all can agree upon from which a solution can be created. This collaborative communicative approach aims to understand and respect different views and solve the problem from that criteria (Englund, 2006). Would the freight receivers be involved this early it is important that all produced information is shared early which increases trust and ensure the participant that they are valued in the process (Prokopy, 2005; Weber & Tuler, 2008; Ramírez, et al., 2015). The collaborative communicative approach also focuses on finding various alternatives to a problem instead of focusing on one solution that may not be suitable for all included stakeholders (Deetz & Irvin, 2008).

Further this approach could enable the participant to focus more on interests rather than power-relations which may increase cooperation and better collective solutions (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). As most respondents in the study state that it is difficult to influence decision makers and other local authorities, this approach could lower this feeling of “them” and “us” and instead focus on problem solving and create a more democratic process. As this approach more focus on negotiating instead of changing opinions it has a higher potential of leading to a successful outcome. However, even though this approach has its advantages and sometime essential for complex problem, it can be difficult to implement as it is both time-consuming and labour-intensive (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). The problem that arises in this sense is that most respondents in this study, mainly small and franchise/chain store businesses, state that they lack either the resources or the interest to participate on this level. If these stakeholders do not have the will or time to participate on this level it will be difficult to bring out its full potential. This will however be analysed further ahead. The theoretical case is summed up below (figure 6).
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*Fig. 6. Theoretical case with freight receivers participating from the beginning.*

### 6.2. The case in relation to the ladder of participation

Arnstein’s (1969) ladder puts a perspective on participatory processes and so also in the studied case as the ladder expresses a simplified picture of how democratic a participatory process is. In the studied case the view on the possibility to influence on freight related issues differs between the TPTA and the freight receivers. At the same time, as many of the freight receivers express difficulty in being able to influence on decisions or initiatives, the TPTA encourage more participation in order to develop solutions that fits all. In addition, most of the respondents that were included in the workshops in the improvement groups expressed that when the restriction first was introduced it felt like the TPTA...
already had made up their mind and consulted them in order to get an approval to initiate the process. This would put the freight receivers in more of a consulting role rather than a participatory role in the formation of the restrictions. Further, some freight receivers express that the TPTA are more sharing information and not inviting for dialogue. In this sense, when relating to the ladder of participation, the viewpoint of the freight receivers is that the TPTA act in the range of tokenism (Arnstein, 1969). Meanwhile the TPTA express that they do invite for dialogue and consider different opinions, and that they did adjust the restrictions after some opinions that were brought in during an early state of the planned restrictions. For them it is also important to have freight receivers to participate on a higher level in order to make changes for the better. In relation to the ladder, their view is more in the range of citizen power, meaning that the participants have the ability to influence decisions (Arnstein, 1969). This discrepancy between how the freight receivers experience their participatory role and what participatory role the TPTA experience they give the freight receivers is shown in figure 7.

This gap between the different perceived ability to influence in participatory processes can create some fundamental problems. One being that instead of finding a collective solution, the process may get infected if one side consider that they are not listen to meanwhile the other believe that they do listen. It can create a dilemma where no stakeholder is neither right or wrong and arguing is founded in the rationales of “no, we did not have the ability to influence, you did not consider our opinions” versus the “yes, you did, and yes, we did”. Yet again a sense of “them” and “us” is at stake rather than the sense of “we-ness” which is essential in participatory processes (Ruesch et al., 2012). Further a not defined relation between the involved stakeholders can end up in a struggle of the relation and power rather than discussing the actual problem (Watzlawick et al., 1974). Thus, it is important to reduce the gap in order to concentrate on the actual reason for the participatory process and find collective solutions. An important aspect of this would be to increase the understanding of others reality and increase the trust between the stakeholders. This would reduce doubts and suspicions regarding the decision-making process (Webler & Tuler, 2008; Ramírez, et al., 2015). This is also acknowledged by the representative from the TPTA who states:

It is important to communicate better in advance on how the city works with implementation issues regarding e.g. restrictions (internal preparation, political etc.) in order to not create false assumptions or expectations that things can be changed right after a meeting, but that they make a statement (yet an important one) in a larger process. (Interview, respondent TPTA)
This would explain the roles of the participants in the process and reduce the risk of false assumptions or expectations. In this sense, the gap would decrease since the participants could get an understanding that the TPTA are listening and consider the freight receivers opinions, but it is sometimes not possible to create changes fast or in the way that everyone wants due to political processes or political agendas. This information could also increase the understanding of what the participants’ opinions are used for and that they matter, which is an important aspect to reduce distrust or suspicion (Prokopy, 2005). In addition, it could also increase the possibility to see other interests and thus make it easier to reach a consensus (Isaacs, 2002). Several of the freight receivers expressed how important it is that the TPTA understand their point of view and their interests, but in order to reduce the gap between perceived possibility to influence and the TPTA’s perceived given ability to influence it is also important that the participants understand the TPTA’s agenda and possibility to make changes. This is also stated by the representative from Innerstaden Göteborg who express that it is important with understanding both ways, not only that the TPTA understand the freight receivers’ perspective.

It should however be acknowledged that a participatory process is dynamic and the perceived and actual level of participation can differ during the process (Ward, 2011). In this sense, the gap could potentially sometimes be wider and sometimes narrower during the process. It is however regardless important to minimize this gap in other to achieve a sense of “we-ness” and thus a better chance of finding collective solutions that fit all and not one-sided solutions (Ruesch et al., 2012).

6.3. How to engage the right stakeholders

One of the crucial aspects when addressing participation is to engage the right stakeholders or to get stakeholders to participate in the process. This is also one of the most important aspects of the case studied in this thesis as it would be impossible to execute a functional participatory process without managing to engage right stakeholders to participate (Lindblom, 1965; Haus & Heinelt, 2004). As the freight receivers are ‘holders’ of certain knowledge, for example how they get affected by different implementations, their input is essential to find solutions that looks to the interests of all participants. Haus and Heinelt (2004) mentions that including right stakeholders with the right competence is a fundamental part of successive participatory initiatives. Including the right stakeholders from the beginning could also reduce the risk of manipulative tendencies that top-down approaches may entail as the participants can be a part of setting the agenda and the framework for the process (White, 1996). However, as mentioned throughout the thesis there is a difficulty in engaging key stakeholders, especially in freight related issues (dell’Olio et al., 2016). The studied case in this thesis implies that this is a complicated matter where different freight receivers have different interest, different priorities, and different mentalities towards the freight transport system. Meanwhile some believe that it is important to engage in queries that regards their goods shipments, others express less will to discuss these issues. The problem in engaging freight receivers in initiatives is expressed by the representative from the TPTA and the freight carrier:

[…] it is difficult to engage them and get them into a discussion. Freight is not a high prioritized issue as it should be. Would you invite 100 businesses in the city centre to a meeting only a handful would show up. Freight receivers wants to see it work and not participate in the development. The TPTA are actively working in order to try to get them to participate, but it is a difficult challenge. (Interview, representative TPTA)

The improvement group meetings have been a good initiative, but the interest seems low if it only is nine people that show up from an area where there are hundreds of businesses and operating carriers. It is difficult to know how to increase the engagement since freight is a low prioritized issue, it is just something that has to work. The freight issue is not as prioritized as it should be. (Interview, freight carrier)

The freight receivers that express interest in participating in freight related initiatives are mostly medium sized businesses which have the resources to engage unlike smaller businesses who do not prioritize time to engage in freight related issues. The smaller businesses instead encourage larger businesses to engage or that these issues should be handled through Innerstaden Göteborg. The third group, consisting of franchises or chain stores do however have the resources, but freight is a low prioritized issue and
these things should rather be dealt with by regional or national managers. As one of the retailers expressed it:

Should such big changes be implemented so that it is not sustainable to run the business then higher managers will engage in dialogues, or they will just change facilities. As an individual store they cannot express will or possibility to engage in discussions related to freight. (Interview, respondent C)

Further, it can be stated that it is not always that the essential stakeholders have the desire to have more influence in participatory processes and also that more inclusive processes do not always lead to better decisions (Taylor, 2001). More included participants mean that there are more rationales to consider and it is not always that the participants have the essential knowledge on the discussed topic in order to make the best decisions. In the studied case this is expressed a few times:

The respondent mention that he/she is no expert in the field and have not considered freight as a problem. It is thus not interesting to participate since it would probably not bring any benefits to the shop and also there are no resources to engage in a question that is not seen as a problem. (Interview, respondent F)

Above statements aligns with other scientific papers stating that freight receivers are difficult to engage in participatory initiatives related to urban freight transport (Browne et al., 2015; Holguín-Veras & Sánchez-Díaz, 2015; dell’Olio et al., 2016). Yet it is important to the TPTA to include the opinions and viewpoints from these stakeholders in order to find suitable solutions to existing problems. How to address this is difficult and there are different aspects to be considered which will be considered in following subchapter.

### 6.4. Ways to engage the freight receivers

In the studied case it can be stated that it would not be possible to force the freight receivers to participate in freight related processes as they have other priorities. The risk would be that forcing can create more aversion to participating and create more problems than solving (Watzlawick et al., 1974). It is however more important to create condition where the other part becomes interested or motivated to participate (Engquist, 2009). This is exemplified by those who have participated in the improvement group meetings who are motivated to participate in order to understand what is going on around them. Further one freight receiver state that the results are usually better when their opinions are considered (Respondent H). Another freight receiver is also more positive towards participating in processes with the TPTA since their business have good experiences from occasions when their opinions have been taken to account and the information feed has been satisfactory (Respondent M). In this relation, to know what is happening, what will happen and how will it affect them creates the motivation to participate in the discussions. In this sense, well-established channels for communication could increase the amount of engagement as increased amount of information on what is happening can lead to even more desire of knowledge (Karanges, 2014). Stating this in relation to that all respondents request that information from the TPTA on potential initiatives and how it could affect them is distributed earlier could potentially encourage the freight receivers to give feedback, state their viewpoint and perhaps engage in the discussion. Better information from the TPTA could thus increase the engagement from the freight receivers. For instance, those respondents who has been contacted by the TPTA well in advance before different initiatives, such as road works, have more will to cooperate with the TPTA and has a more positive view on the processes. However, this is already to some extent practiced by the TPTA as they have campaigns for distributing information when implanting new initiatives. The representative state that it is important to inform and consult all freight receivers that get affected by a certain implementation. However, this does not relate to the discussion in chapter 6.2.2 where freight receivers need to be included in the participatory process before a solution has been developed. This could however be overcome by letting the participants be a part of setting the agenda. As both freight receivers and the representative from Innerstaden Göteborg states, the feeling is that the TPTA often has the solutions ready without consulting with the other stakeholders before. By letting the freight receivers be a part of setting the agenda it is certain that the freight receivers interests are protected and thus the will to participate increases (Dahl 1989; Webler 1995).
Cotton (1993) proposed six different methods of engaging employees in decision-making and developing new solutions. In relation to the studied case, there are mainly three that can be discussed, a quality circle, scalon plan, and representative participation. These three will be analyzed with the studied case below along with a fourth approach that focuses on behavioral change.

The quality circle suggests that a program is started that involves key stakeholders where ideas and information can be distributed. One issue with this approach would be the fundamental problem of engaging the freight receivers in freight-related initiatives. As stated early by the representative from TPTA, only a handful show up at the meetings they arrange. However, as earlier stated, the initiative with the improvement groups were appreciated and were considered as a good approach as long as the participants' views and opinions are considered. Several of the participants encouraged similar approaches but with smaller groups where it is easier to get your voice heard. This would enable all participants to express their opinions without eruptions which increases both fairness and other fundamental aspects of participation. Smaller groups would also enable the discussions to focus on one specific topic and it would be easier to jointly set the agenda and jointly form the problem and solution. Smaller groups would however lower the amount of opinions included in the discussions at a certain occasion, risking that specific aspects are overlooked. Further Cotton (1993) argue that quality circles rarely empower the participants which result in less positive outcomes than expected. In order to increase the positive result, it is essential that the participants have the ability to influence the agenda so that power relations are minimized.

The scalon plan implies that the participants get a financial compensation for participating. This could have potential positive outcomes as many of the respondents in the study mention the lack of resources as the reason behind not being able to participate. This is exemplified by respondent J who claims that participating in the improvement group took too much time which produces a cost for the company. Could this cost be reduced there is a potential to increase the will to participate and also get those who lack resources to find a small financial benefit in participating. In the long run, this could potentially improve communication and cooperation (Hanlon & Taylor, 1991). It is however common that monetary incentives do not have long-lasting effects on behavioral change and interest to engage cease when the incentives are withdrawn (Pardini & Katzev, 1983). It can be questioned to what degree a scalon plan is possible from a political viewpoint in this study. This aspect would need deeper investigation in order to conclude if it is possible to fund this initiative. Further, it is must be established how the freight receivers should be compensated.

The representative participation implies that a group of stakeholders are represented by an organization or someone they trust who can represent the group in a just and fair way. Several respondents mention Innerstaden Göteborg as this representative. As an organization that acts for its members’ interest and which objective is to create an attractive and flourishing city center, Innerstaden Göteborg would be the most likely candidate to participate in initiatives and discussions initiated by the TPTA. This approach is although already considered as Innerstaden Göteborg is both participating in the project “Stadsleveransen” and the freight network where they represent the interest of the freight receivers. The difficulty is to represent all 600 members in a sense so that all objectives and viewpoints are included. In relation to Arnstein’s ladder (1969) a well-developed communicative infrastructure where Innerstaden Göteborg plays a central role would be a form of placation which has both positive and negative aspects to it. Although more views and opinions are included in the process, it is however difficult for one representative to bring forward statements that cover all affected stakeholders (Arnstein, 1969). However, with the ability to reach all freight receivers in the city center Innerstaden Göteborg has an important role in both informing and gathering information which is one of their responsibilities today. In this sense, it is possible to gather information from freight receivers that are not interested in participating in person or not willing to spend time on participating. In addition, several of the freight receivers request a better channel of communication, meaning that they do not really know where to turn if there is a problem. As Innerstaden Göteborg is a common denominator among all respondents, they could have a role in creating well-established ways of communication. This is important not only in order to increase engagement, but also to increase fairness as concerned stakeholders are given proper information about a certain decision that may affect their interest (Andrews & Shah, 2003).

Behavioral change can be used in order to increase voluntary engagement by creating altruistic will or moral values in participating. This has the potential to create more long-lasting and more rewarding processes as it would be more meaningful to engage since there is a personal will and motivation to get
involved. This approach would be the ultimate since the freight receivers would participate on own will to improve the system, and not in order to complain on things that does not work. It would create a mentality to work for something and not against something and thus creating a more helping, conflict solving and creative environment (Eigner & Schmuck, 2002). Several of the participants in the western area stated that they attended different meetings in the process of implementing the restrictions since they were worried on what the new restrictions would imply and how they would be affected. This does not consider the natural will to engage, more an engagement due to anxiety and worrying. Instead encouragement for engagement should build on the ability to influence for the better, and not criticise existing implementations (Eigner & Schmuck, 2002). This requires that more information is distributed to the freight receivers so that they have the possibility to make the decision to engage based on facts and with knowledge that their opinions matter. This distributed knowledge can make the freight receivers engage on their own terms, thus making the process more democratic, and increased possibility for a successful participatory outcome (Burn & Oskamp, 1986; Engquist, 2009). This is also requested by several respondents who see it unnecessary to participate without knowledge on if their opinions will improve the existing system. Further Burn and Oskamp (1986) states that right formulated information of an issue or problem is more likely to change behaviour and encourage engagement. In this way, it is necessary that the TPTA states the issue in relation to the freight receivers, meaning that the problem formulation should be in a way that the freight receivers would want to engage in order to work for improvement. This relates to discussion above on how freight receivers should be included in forming the problem formulation to create better solutions. Could the freight receivers be included in forming the problem formulation it is more likely that it is formed in a way that encourage other freight receivers to engage. In relation to this it is stated that engagement increases when surrounding people adopt a certain behaviour (Hopper & Nielsen, 1991). In this sense, if one freight receiver engages it is more possible that other engage as well. One freight receiver mentions the importance of freight receivers to organize in order to influence. However, this is not likely to succeed if not attitudes toward engaging in these issues are changed, which needs both good information, the need to work for something and others leading the way. In this way, it is possible to create the altruistic will to create better solutions.

The different approaches have different potential in creating well-functioning participatory processes, but also different levels of applicability as shown below in figure 8. Meanwhile a scalar plan could easily be implemented to engage freight receivers (if necessary financing is possible), it is not creating the long-term altruistic engagement that is needed for successful participatory processes. On the other hand, behavioural change may create the necessary motivation and engagement for a more successful participatory process. It is however difficult to create that change among freight receivers since freight still is a low prioritized issue and it is challenging to find the kind of incentives that make the freight receivers find it worthwhile, both in relation to time, and money. Quality circle has both potential to create better participatory processes and is fairly applicable. As an example, the improvement groups that were observed during the study can be used. They were both well accepted by participants and fairly easy for the TPTA to set up. Representative participation is also already to some extent already practiced in the studied case where Innerstaden Göteborg represent the freight receivers on various occasions.

![Fig. 8. Potential and applicability level of different engagement approaches.](image_url)

However, as stated by several freight receivers, Innerstaden Göteborg does not always have the possibility to represent in a sufficient way and it is not entirely within the scope of the organizations duty to represent the freight receivers in such a way.
In relation to discussion above it could be considered to combine the different approaches in order to engage freight receivers in freight related initiatives. Financial compensation in form of a scalon plan could minimize the issue regarding lack of resources that is mention by several freight receivers as a reason not to participate personally. In the case where the cost of labour of attending a participatory event, a financial supplementary could increase the ambition to participate. This could encourage participation in smaller groups in form of a quality circle which was requested by respondents who has been in participatory processes with the TPTA. These smaller groups containing few stakeholders could jointly create the problem formulation in the way shown in figure 6. This problem formulation creates the platform on which willingness to find solutions to improve, thus work for something, is encouraged. Within this creates a behavioural change where freight receivers get encouraged by others to engage as they see a value in participating. Thus, it can be considered that financial compensation could set the wheels in motion to encourage participation, but that long-term commitment has to be formed in altruistic values.

Figure 9 shows a potential setup for a method combining the different approaches, meeting both respondents’ requests and theoretic guidelines. TPTA functions as the base and initiator, providing financial compensation if necessary and possible in order to engage freight receivers to participate in a quality circle which defines a common problem with urban freight transports. From this statement it would be easier to create altruistic desire to come up with solutions that work for all stakeholders. The involvement of freight receivers in this process could potentially encourage other freight receivers to engage since the solutions are developed in relation to their conditions and also because they see how other freight receivers have had the potential to influence. In relation to this, Innerstaden Göteborg function as facilitator and communicative platform, distributing necessary information from authorities to concerned freight receivers and from concerned freight receivers to the authorities. When a common ground for a problem statement is fixed, it is possible with influence from already engaged participants, well established information-channels and creating the sense of working for something, to engage necessary stakeholders to find solutions to the defined problems.

![Fig. 9. Model including the different aspects of engagement in participatory processes related to freight.](image-url)
6.5. Necessary considerations for more successful initiatives

The analysis above has considered various aspects related to participation and the case studied in Gothenburg. The aspects originate in the three statements that were presented initially in this analysis, namely:

1. The TPTA want more stakeholders to engage to be able to come up with better solutions that fits all.
2. Freight is not a prioritized problem among many freight receivers and it is thus rarely possible to spend resources to participate personally.
3. Freight receivers that have participated in discussions with the TPTA feel that they do not get listened to and do not have the possibility to influence.

In order to solve above issues there are a few considerations. The first aspect is to include the freight receivers early in the process of formulating a problem. By doing this there is a better chance of finding a common agenda and work for something rather than complaining on existing conditions and avoid conflict on power-relations. This does however require that the gap between the expected participatory role of the freight receivers and the TPTA’s view on given participatory role to the freight receivers is minimized. As discussed above that can be achieved by better communicate what the participants’ opinions will be used for and also what the objective of the TPTA is. In addition, well established communication channels have the possibility to ensure a full transfer of information and meaning and thus decrease idiosyncratic views on decisions and initiatives taken by the TPTA. This would result in participants feeling more included and that they have more possibility to influence, thus potentially solving the third issue above. The two first issues are strictly related to engagement in which was discussed in chapter 6.4. Essentially a mix of different engagement approaches could potentially generate a self-created desire among freight receivers to participate in one way or another in order to find solutions that fit all and creates a more attractive city centre. Within this there is an overlapping importance of distributing knowledge and information which needs to be established both directly between the freight receivers and the city authorities. Within this a representative organization can have a substantial importance as they more easily can reach out to a greater amount of freight receivers. The representative organization, in the case signified by Innerstaden Göteborg, thus have the importance of spreading important information in order to fulfil both freight receivers and the city authorities need of knowledge.
7. Conclusion

The objective of this paper has been to increase knowledge and awareness on how freight receivers could become more engaged in participatory processes for more sustainable urban freight initiatives. As initiatives related to sustainable urban freight transport rarely are successful due to lack of participation from freight receivers it is essential to find potential approaches to increase their participation. This would potentially result in more long-lasting solutions for a sustainable urban freight transport system. To fulfil the aim of this paper the initial research questions will be answered separately below.

How can participatory processes be formed in sustainable urban freight transport initiatives?

Participation has its advantages and may contribute to more sustainable approaches to complex issues where there are many different views and rationales colliding. An urban freight transport system is complex in its nature as there are many different interests to consider and many different aspects to acknowledge. The studied case show that there are difficulties in engaging freight receivers although there is a great potential in doing so, as long as the process is transparent and there is a possibility to understand the different rationales of the involved stakeholders. Better communication and understanding of others’ objectives and rationales is essential to reduce power relations and closing the gap between how different actors experience the participatory process. By including freight receivers in the process of forming the problem statement with freight there is a higher potential in creating long-lasting participatory processes and solutions that works for all concerned stakeholders. Thus, creating a group including freight receivers to discuss the problems with freight would be an initial step to establish more trust and more knowledge among the different stakeholders. When a common problem statement can be acknowledged, it will be easier to implement different solution in relation to adapted transport strategies.

How can city authorities increase engagement from freight receivers to participate in initiatives related to sustainable urban freight transports?

The problem that initiated this thesis is that it is challenging to get freight receivers to engage in participatory processes in order to come up with collective solutions. This study show that a mix of various approaches would be most efficient in order to get more freight receivers engaged in a participatory process related to freight. Initially it may be necessary with financial compensation to deal with the problem that some freight receivers lack the resources to engage. This could encourage them to participate, not only in order to gather the freight receivers’ views and opinions, but also to get them to spend time on working for something together with other stakeholders. This approach must however consider political objectives, fairness and in what way the freight receivers want to be compensated. However, a financial compensation may encourage participation in a forum that has the will to improve, rather than identify what does not work. This group needs to establish a collective problem statement with urban freight transport which tend to all the stakeholders’ interests which potentially could encourage other freight receivers to participate in process of finding a solution to the problems. During the whole process, it is important information is continuously distributed to other freight receivers so they know what is happening and also that their views and opinions matter. This can be achieved with the help of a representative organization.

It is certain that increased participation from freight receivers in freight related initiatives is needed in order to find sustainable solutions. This thesis has increased the knowledge on this importance and how such participatory processes can be established. There are still several questions to be answered to be able to establish a well-functioning process of participation in order to make urban freight transport systems more sustainable. Subject for further research would be to include all concerned stakeholders including freight carriers, property owners, suppliers, city planners and politicians in a study. This would elaborate further on all interests that exist in the system and come up with solutions where all stakeholders are participating in order to create a more sustainable and attractive city centre.
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10. Appendix

10.1. Interview guides

Interview guide goods receivers in the eastern area:

- What type of business do you operate?
  - How many deliveries by truck/van do you receive per week?
- How do you define urban sustainability in relation to your business? (e.g., city environment)
  - How do you believe this can be achieved in the city centre?
- Are you interested in being included in conversation and development of projects or policies that lead to more urban sustainability?
  - Why/why not?
  - How would you like to be involved?
  - How do you think your opinions and thoughts would influence decision-making?
  - How could you become more engaged?
- Are you interested in being included in the conversation and development of projects or policies that affect your freight deliveries?
  - Why/why not?
  - How would you like to be involved? (Group discussions, mail, phone, etc.)
  - How do you think your opinions and thoughts would influence decision-making?
  - What role should the TPTA take in such a process?
- How do you define good dialogue?
- Have you previously been in contact with or received information from the TPTA?
  - What was it about?
  - How did you perceive the information that you got from the TPTA?
  - How did you perceive the communication between you and the TPTA? (refer to question on dialogue if appropriate)
  - In what way did you communicate?
    - What was good/bad regarding the communication between you and the TPTA?
  - Have the TPTA previously included you in discussions about freight-related questions?
    - In what way?
    - What was good/bad in that process and why?
- What influence would you like to have in decisions made by the TPTA?
  - What strengths do you see with this?
  - What weaknesses do you see with this?
  - What opportunities do you see with this?
  - What threats do you see with this?
- If the TPTA were to implement new projects or policies that they believe will increase the sustainability in the city centre and improve the urban environment, but that may affect your freight deliveries in one way or another, in what way and to what extent would you like to be able to influence the decision?
  - How would you like to be informed?
  - How would you like to be able to express your views and opinions?
- What opinions do you have about the TPTA in relation to your business? (For example, about implemented policies or projects that may have affected your business)
Do you think you ever been affected by decisions taken by the TPTA? Positive or negative
  ▪ If yes, how?
    • Did you have any opportunity to influence the decision?
    • Did the TPTA contact you before the implementation?
    • What was the process like?
    • How were the conversations?
  • What general opinions do you have on the TPTA in relation to projects or policies that are not specifically related to your business? (Västlänken (The West Link), other policies i.e. parking, etc.)
    o If yes, does this affect your view of the TPTA positively or negatively?
      ▪ How does this affect your willingness to be engaged in dialogues with the TPTA?

Interview guide goods receivers in the western area:

  • What type of business do you operate?
    o How many deliveries by truck/van do you receive per week?
  • How do define urban sustainability in relation to your business? (e.i city environment)
    o How do you believe this can be achieved in the city centre?
  • How come you are interested in being included in the conversation and development of projects or policies that affect your freight shipments?
    o What has made you engaged in this matter?
  • How do you define good dialogue?
    o How does the improvement group relate to your definition of good dialogue?
  • How were you informed on the implementation of the "11 rule"?
  • What is your opinion about the communication between you and the TPTA?
    o What have been good / bad regarding the communication between you?
  • How do you perceive the influence you have in the improvement group?
    o What strengths do you see with this?
    o What weaknesses do you see with this?
    o What opportunities do you see with this?
    o What threats do you see with this?
  • Do you think that you have the opportunity to influence decisions made by the TPTA?

Interview guide TPTA:

  • What is your role at the TPTA?
    o How long have you had that role?
    o What do you do specifically?
    o What are the biggest challenges in that role?
  • How do you communicate with the goods receivers in the city today?
    o How do you think it works from the TPTA’s perspective?
    o How do you think the goods receivers perceive it works?
    o Do you think that there is opportunity for improvement, and if so, what?
  • Have you previously contacted goods receivers before implementing new projects and/or policies?
    o Did you prepare a plan for how you would inform the goods receivers of the project/policy?
How did you inform the goods receivers?
- How did they receive the information? (E.g. email, brochure, meeting etc.)
- What were your thoughts on participation of goods receivers in the development of the project/policy?
  - How did they have the opportunity to participate?
- Did the goods receivers have thoughts or objections to the project or policy?
  - What kind of thoughts and objections were expressed?
  - How was this expressed?
  - How did you act in order to reduce any negative thoughts about the project/policy?
- Did you have thoughts on how you would engage goods receivers to participate in discussions about the project/policy?
  - What do you generally believe is the best way to get goods receivers engaged in discussion regarding project or policy implementation?

- What influence would you like goods receivers to have decision making?
  - What strengths do you see with this?
  - What weaknesses do you see with this?
  - What opportunities do you see with this?
  - What threats do you see with this?

- How do you define dialogue?
  - How do you define a good dialogue?
  - How do you define a bad dialogue?

- How do you define urban sustainability? (e.g. city environment)
  - How do you achieve sustainability in the city centre?
  - What role does the TPTA have to achieve this?

---

**Interview guide freight carrier:**

- How many deliveries do you make to the city centre each day (number of vehicles or volume)? Vans as well as trucks?
- What does a sustainable transport system in the city centre look like to you?
  - Do you see any problems with urban freight transports?
  - Do you think your view of the problem differs from other stakeholders?
  - What role does other stakeholders have in realizing the vision of a sustainable transport system? (TPTA/freight receivers etc.)
  - What challenges are there to achieve that vision?

- How established is your cooperation with the TPTA?
  - Do you have the opportunity to participate and have influence on decisions?
  - How is the communication with the TPTA?
- How was the information regarding the implementation of the restrictions of heavy vehicles?
- What kind of relationship do you have with the freight receivers?
  - Do you think that freight receivers should be more involved in discussions on urban freight transport?
    - In what way?
  - How do you look at the relationship between the TPTA and the freight receivers?
    - How do you think receivers can get more engaged in these discussions?
- What is your opinion on the improvement group meetings?
  - How come you participated in the meetings??
  - Has it been a good way to share knowledge, opinions and thoughts?
Do you think it's a good way to get engaged?

How do you define good dialogue?

**Interview guide representative from Innerstaden Göteborg:**

- How many members do you have and what is your role in relation to these?
  - In what way do you help your members?
  - How do you communicate with the members and how do you manage their thoughts and opinions?

- How would you like to create an attractive city centre in relation to freight transport and your members?
  - What challenges are there to achieve that vision?
  - What problems do you see with freight transports?
  - How do you believe other stakeholders view the problem with freight transports?
  - What role does other stakeholders have in realizing the vision of a sustainable transport system? (TPTA/freight receivers etc.)

- How established is your cooperation with the TPTA?
  - Do you have the opportunity to participate and have influence on decisions?
  - How is the communication with the TPTA?

- What role do you have in participating processes?

- How was the information from the TPTA on the implementation of the restrictions of heavy vehicles?
  - What was Innerstaden Göteborg's role in the process?
  - Were you able to influence the decision?
  - Did you in any way represent your members in this process?  
    - Have any of your members been involved in the process?

- Do you think it is important that freight receivers participate in these questions?
  - Do you believe it is possible to get them more engaged?

- How do you define good dialogue?
  - How could the dialogue between the TPTA and the freight receivers be improved?

**10.2. Observation schedule**

**Observation schedule for improvement group meetings**

- Who says what? (Keep it anonymous)
  - Who talks the most and how?
  - Do opinions have negative or positive tone?
  - Is it a dialog or monologue?

- What role does Trafikkontoret take?
  - In what way do they include the participants in the discussion?
  - How do Trafikkontoret guide the discussions/invite opinions from the participants?
  - How is the agenda set?
  - Are there rules for the meeting? (regarding discussions)
    - In that case, what are the rules? Are they clear? Are they followed?

- What role does the participants take?
  - Do they speak or mostly listen?
  - What kinds of opinions? Constructive/destructive?
  - How do they participate in the discussions?
• How are potential decisions made?
  o Inclusive?
  o Are all opinions considered?
  o Is it a compromise or not?