

Network governance as a strategy for social sustainable development?

- A case study of the cross-sectoral collaboration project
Forward Malmö



Rickard Vidar

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to contribute to increased awareness and understanding of how actors collaborate to solve complex societal problems. The study also intends to contribute to increased knowledge of the relevance of theory network governance in describing collaborative processes. A third purpose was to study if Forward Malmö has the potential to contribute to the work on social sustainability in an effective manner. The empirical material was collected through four semi-structured interviews with representatives from actors who are taking part in the cross-sectorial collaboration platform called Forward Malmö. The interviews were complemented with document analyses of five documents, all of which are considered central for Forward Malmö. The result was analyzed within the framework of the theory of network governance.

The study has concluded that Forward Malmö can be described within the framework of network governance theory. Hence, network governance theory is relevant for the description of the cross-sectorial collaboration project Forward Malmö. The project has contributed to the work with social sustainability in Malmö by an increased understanding of how Malmö can be developed into a sustainable society and by identifying the biggest social problems in Malmö. The result also shows that Forward Malmö currently, based on network governance theory, not has the potential to act effectively.

Key words: Cross-sectorial collaboration, meta-governance, network, policy, sustainable development, social sustainable development

Words: 19 945

Table of content

1 Introduction	6
1.2 Research problem and purpose of the study	8
1.2.1 Research questions	9
1.3 Limitations of the study	9
1.4 Conceptual definitions	10
2 Background	12
2.1 Forward Malmö	12
2.2 Previous research	15
3 Theory	20
3.1 From government to governance	20
3.1.1 Network Governance	21
3.1.2 Network governance and outcome	25
3.1.3 Effectiveness	27
4 Methodological outline of the study	30
4.1 Research design:	30
4.2 Empirical material	31
4.2.1 Why Sweden?	31
4.2.2 Why Forward Malmö?	31
4.2.3 Who to interview?	32
4.2.4 Which documents to look at?	32
4.3 Interviews and document analysis	32
4.3.1 Interviews	33
4.3.2 Developing an interview guide	34
4.3.3 Ethical consideration	35
4.3.4 Document analysis	35
5 Analysis of the empirical material	37

5.1 Network governance.....	37
5.1.1 Mutual dependency	37
5.1.2 Voluntarism.....	39
5.1.3 Defined Policy problem.....	40
5.1.4 Organization of the network:	41
5.1.5 Forms of cooperation.....	43
5.1.6 Provision of information.....	43
5.1.7 Autonomy	45
5.2 Network governance and outcome	46
5.2.1 Prioritizing between possible actions and projects	47
5.2.2 Mobilizing resources	48
5.2.3 Carry out projects	50
5.2.4 Identifying a common measure instrument for evaluating their work	51
5.3 Effectiveness	52
5.3.1 Trust.....	52
5.3.2 Number of participants	54
5.3.3 Shared goal consensus	55
5.3.4 Need for network level competencies	56
6 Concluding discussion.....	58
7 References.....	62
Appendix 1. Interview guide.....	70
Appendix 2. Material Interviews & document analysis	74

Table of figures

Figure 1. Operationalization of network governance.24

Figure 2. Operationalization of organizational processes.....27

Figure 3. Operationalization of effectiveness.29

1 Introduction

On September 15, 2015, the UN General Assembly adopted the 17 Global Sustainable Development Goals. The goals aim to achieve socially, environmentally, and financially sustainable development by 2030 and were adopted under the name Agenda 2030. They differed slightly from the previous Millennium Development goals in that these goals should be achieved not only by developing countries but by all countries in the world. Regarding the Swedish approach to sustainable development, the country has a long tradition of working proactively with such issues. For Agenda 2030, the Swedish government has the ambition that Sweden should be the world leader in the implementation of Agenda 2030, both at home and through contributing to its global implementation (Hedström & Vasilves, 2018; Division for sustainable development goals, 2017). From an international perspective, Sweden is distinguished by the fact that municipalities instead perform many tasks performed in other countries by the state or by the private sector. Therefore, local actors play a central role in the work on sustainable development since many of the goals are put into practical action at a local level (Finance Ministry & Foreign department, 2018).

Despite Sweden's progressive work on sustainable development, and even though the starting position for Sweden is better than many other countries, much remains to be done in order to fulfill the goals by 2030. In 2017, the Central Bureau of Statistics made the first assessment and concluded that of 120 indicators that are relevant for Sweden, only 49 of them were fulfilled (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2017).

This study will focus on the Swedish city of Malmö. The city is geographically located in the southern part of Sweden. It is the country's third-largest city, and when it comes to sustainability work, the city is considered to be a compass towards sustainable development (Finance Ministry & Foreign Department, 2018; Nordregio, 2019). Malmö municipality, or Malmö City, which the municipality is called, has worked with sustainability for a long time and is the municipality in Sweden that first signed the Agenda 2030 and adopted the Global goals for cities. (Forward Malmö, n.d.a). Despite the positive description, Malmö is facing many social problems such as high unemployment, segregation, and inequalities between different communities, and is today considered to be the most economically and socially divided city in Sweden (Malmö Stad,

2014; Gressgård, 2015). Furthermore, Malmö also has the highest rate of child poverty in all of Sweden (Save the Children, 2018).

In order to succeed in meeting and solve complex problems such as unemployment, segregation, and child poverty, the importance of increased cooperation between different sectors of society has been emphasized (Division for sustainable development goals, 2017; Finance Ministry, 2019; Nordregio, 2019; Statskontoret, 2019). Although the awareness for collaborations between different social actors recently has increased, it should not be seen as a new phenomenon. Already in 1988, in the report called "Our common future," the UN emphasized the importance of increased cooperation between different sectors and actors in the society to succeed in solving complex problems (WCED, 1987). These recommendations have now started to result in concrete actions. In Malmö, several collaborations where society actors have joined together to find solutions to the complex problems have been created. One of these collaborations is what is described as a cross-sectorial collaboration project called Forward Malmö. One of the goals with the project is that it should lead to a sustainable development of Malmö (Forward Malmö, n.d.a, my translation). In this study, Forward Malmö will be the central object of a single case study.

A form of collaboration recently highlighted by researchers and politicians as a favorable organizational solution to a complex problem is the collaboration form called network (Provan & Kenis, 2008; Torfing, 2005a). The term network has today become popular and is used to describe many different types and forms of collaborations. However, in political science and public administrations, the various terms are conjoined in the notion of "network governance." Network governance usually consist of actors from the public sector, civil sector, business sector, social movements, and citizen groups, and can take both unorganized and organized forms (Torfing, 2005a; Hedlund & Montin 2009). Since both the organizational form and the outcome of networks are considered to be a favorable solution to complex problems, and the fact that networks can take different forms, I find it relevant to study if and how Forward Malmö can be described within the framework of the theory network governance. Therefore, it is relevant to point out that this thesis primarily not addresses social sustainability.

1.2 Research problem and purpose of the study

Governance networks are today considered, both by researchers and politicians, a suitable response to the question of how to tackle complex policy problems (Torfing, 2005a). The benefits of network governance are considered to be many. Common assumptions are that they are more efficient than other forms of collaboration, enhance learning, and increase the capacity to address complex problems (Johansson & Rydstedt, 2010; Hedlund & Montin, 2009; Provan & Kenis, 2008). However, since networks are created by actors with varying and perhaps even opposite interests and goals, there is a risk that the processes within networks can be interrupted by time-consuming negotiations, or in the worst case, being paralyzed (Rhodes 2000; Pierre & Peters 2000).

Although researchers have made much progress on various functions of networks over the past twenty years, the scientific relevance is that there is still a lack of knowledge about the overall functioning of networks (Provan & Kenis, 2008). By studying how Forward Malmö, a project described as a cross-sectorial collaboration, can be described within the theory of network governance, the purpose of this thesis is to contribute to increased awareness and understanding of how actors collaborate to solve complex societal problems. Moreover, the study intends to contribute to increased knowledge of the relevance of the theory network governance when it comes to describing collaborative processes.

Furthermore, since previous research has shown that governance networks most commonly act effectively, another purpose is to study if Forward Malmö has the potential to contribute to the work on social sustainability in an effective manner. To fulfil the purpose, the study will clarify Forward Malmö's accomplished work. After that, the study will examine if the accomplished work has been performed effectively.

Despite reports stating that the city has successfully begun its implementation of Agenda 2030, the relevance for the general public is that Malmö is a city characterized by high unemployment, segregation, and inequalities, where child poverty is highest in all of Sweden (Malmö City, 2014; Save the Children, 2018). Therefore, it is of utmost importance that the city quickly finds solutions to these complex societal problems. As a step towards solutions, a collaboration between municipalities and community actors is considered to be particularly

successful and recommended to succeed in achieving social justice both by the Swedish state and the UN (Division for sustainable development goals, 2017; Finance Ministry, 2019; Nordregio, 2019; Statskontoret, 2019). Forward Malmö is a result of such a form of collaboration, and it is, therefore, essential to study whether the collaboration has a positive effect on the work with social sustainability. If the analysis shows that the collaboration is not effective, it can be argued that certain changes should be made so that the project can proceed in a more socially sustainable spirit. If the analysis shows that collaboration has some positive effects on social sustainability, this study could potentially make a small contribution in designing future strategies for social sustainability. Thus, I would like to argue that the relevance of the general public in this thesis is strong. The fact that poverty harms children's opportunities for development, participation, and good life chances are, in my opinion, the most central.

1.2.1 Research questions

In order to meet the purpose of the study, it proceeds from the following questions:

- How can the cross-sectoral collaboration platform Forward Malmö be understood within the framework of the theory on network governance?
- How has Forward Malmö contributed to the work on social sustainability in Malmö?
- Has the accomplished work been performed effectively?

1.3 Limitations of the study

Due to the timeframe and scope of this study, some limitations have been made. Firstly, the study consists of one single project, and the work within this collaboration is exclusively explored. Hence, the conclusions are only covering how this certain project frame and conduct its work.

Secondly, Forward Malmö is located in Sweden. Hence, this study is not generalizable for countries that do not have a decentralized social model where municipalities are responsible for large parts of the community service.

Thirdly, the original idea was to interview five persons from five different organizations. The final number became four people from four different organizations, since one of the intended respondents canceled its participation due to impediments.

1.4 Conceptual definitions

In this study, several concepts are used when exploring and analyzing the questions. Therefore, some definitions of key concepts are necessary:

Cross-sectorial collaboration:

Cross-sector collaboration is a partnership of two or more of the organizational sectors: the public sector at all levels, the private sector (for-profit) and the non-profit sector (Forrer, Kee & Boyer, 2014).

Meta-governance:

It is a perspective on how an actor effectively and legitimately can manage networks from above. Meta governance can be understood based on, for example, how a government, a municipality, or any other actor influences the otherwise self-regulated networks (Sørensen & Torfing 2007).

Network:

Networks are organizations that have a structure of defined actors where there is a relationship between the actors. There is also a certain agenda and goals for the actors and the network's work (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005a).

Policy:

Consists of a set of formal rules based on a set of ideas and their practical action in institutional arrangements (Fell, 2008).

Sustainable development:

The most common definition of sustainable development today is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987). This definition was developed in the Brundtland report, also called "Our Common Future", published in 1987 by the World Commission on Environment and Development. In the report, both the concept of sustainable development and how it could be achieved was introduced. The report described how three dimensions are interconnected within the definition of sustainable development. The three dimensions are social, environmental, and economic sustainability.

Social sustainable development:

A common interpretation of social sustainability is that a socially sustainable society consists of social organizations that prevent poverty. It seeks to include citizens and enable them to participate in society. The values for society should consist of equity, institutional stability, and cultural identity. The society should seek to optimize resource use, prioritize resource allocation, and foster equitable resource distribution. Further, it should call for economic growth constrained by social equity (Basiago, 1999).

2 Background

This section of the study presents an overview of the cross-sectorial collaboration platform Forward Malmö. After that, previous research on collaboration between social actors is presented.

2.1 Forward Malmö

Malmö is the third-largest city in Sweden and is home to a population of three hundred thousand. The municipality's work on sustainable development is considered to be well-established and is described as holistic, with an integrated sustainability perspective at all administrative levels and in all operations (Nordregio, 2019; Statskontoret, 2019). The city is also considered to be a leader in the work toward sustainable development, and there is plenty of willingness showed by marginalized communities and business innovators to work for change (Kryeziu & Sarttila, 2018). Nevertheless, much of the work is based on individual attempts, and the organizers often fail to tackle problems due to a lack of knowledge and tools. The organizers repeatedly end up losing themselves in exhaustion, knowing that they are not able to reach the results that they are capable of achieving (The outside, n.d.). However, despite the attempts to develop Malmö into a more sustainable city, it is faced with high unemployment, segregation, and inequalities between different communities. During the latest twenty years, the differences between communities have increased (Malmö Stad, 2014), and today Malmö is one of the most economically and socially divided cities in Sweden (Gressgård, 2015).

A couple of actors from the civil society who was working on these issues saw that the current system failed to solve these problems. They saw no context, functions, or initiatives with a holistic and contextual perspective on an individual's living conditions. Therefore, they felt that all community actors must gather and jointly find new start-ups in order to achieve the necessary social development needed to solve the complex problems Malmö today faces (Forward Malmö, n.d.a). Therefore, Save the Children brought together a group containing of individuals and organizations from the private sector, public sector, and academia. Together they created the project Forward Malmö in

2017. Today, the project consists of a variety of actors, including the Save the Children, Sensus Study Association, Sweco, Malmö University, and Malmö Stad (Forward Malmö, n.d.b).

Forward Malmö is described as a newly formed platform for collaborations that breaks with old ways of working with social change. They argue that the old structures for work with social change are organized in a drainage pipe and that the tools used in efforts are unable to address the underlying causes of individuals and groups' exposed life situations. "Children and parents came to us and participated in our activities, but then went home to the same living conditions as before" (Högfeldt, 2018). Instead of just working with the consequences that today's political decisions create, the actors want the decisions to hit the center of the problem directly. Thus, the actors argue that the current system is unable to cope with the complex problems that society today faces (Forward Malmö, n.d.a). This is what they now want to change in Malmö, with the hope that the working model will take hold in the rest of Sweden, and later spread to the world, something the project may have already succeeded with. New York City has been in contact with the actors since the city aims to transform the city's structure around childcare, a structure they want to develop together with Forward Malmö (Malmö Stad, 2019a).

Forward Malmö's primary purpose is to act in the space between the sectors and actors to create functions for coordination, shared knowledge, learning, and system-change. The targeted group has been people in organizations from all sectors who feel they need new partnerships, collaborations, or new tools to achieve their desired results in their ongoing project. To act in the space between the sectors and actors is performed through the platform, which will bring different local and regional players together to work and coordinate concrete solutions to the problems that prevent Malmö from becoming a sustainable city (Malmö Stad, 2019a). Hence, the platform's purpose is to get different organizations to use it to create new strategies that will succeed in replacing the current system (The outside, n.d.). Through this work procedure, Forward Malmö aims to contribute to Malmö's implementation of the global goals (Malmö Stad, 2019a).

Forward Malmö is organized with three key groups that plan and formulate the organization's work.

- The planning team, which consists of four actors who manage the logistics and continuity of core team meetings.
- The core team consisting of partner organizations working on the development phase. The group work as a large team.
- Stakeholder group who are giving feedback on the core team's work (The Outside, n.d.)

The core team's primary purpose is to develop strategies and processes for collaborations and deepen its knowledge about system change. They work on developing partnerships between actors that will create long-term strategies for sustainability work. The team consists of the actors Sensus, Malmö City, Malmö University, and Lund University. The planning team logistically supports the core team and its work with creating new processes. The idea of the planning team was to support the core team during the development phase. Therefore, the planning team has been inactive since 2018. The stakeholder group focuses on providing feedback to the core team in order for them to improve their work (The Outside, n.d.).

The organization has several goals. Some of the most particular ones are:

1. To create cross-sectoral collaboration to build collective capacity to achieve the global goals.
2. To create knowledge for system change.
3. Influence and drive change in local, regional, and national decision-making (Sensus, n.d.a).
4. Create new partnerships to change their current work procedures.
5. Creating a movement for system/society change to achieve a sustainable future in all systems, from the individual to structural level (Forward Malmö, n.d.a, my translation).
By achieving the common goals, the project will contribute to making Malmö the first

sustainable city in the world. A city where all citizens will feel that they have a sustainable living situation and feel part of society (Forward Malmö, n.d.a).

2.2 Previous research

The previous research on network governance has mainly addressed how the theory can be relevant for the description of different collaborations at the municipal and regional levels in Sweden. The studies have focused on how networks have changed the general view of governing, from the previously governmental hierarchal model to the more vertical model of governance, and in this case, network governance. Previous research has also focused on the problems attributed to networks. What has been highlighted as a problem for networks is the possible lack of effectivity and democracy. More recently, the theory has also been used to describe how networks can contribute to streamlining sustainable development work.

In her dissertation from 2008, Fell studied how network governance theory can be relevant for describing the structured work around policy-making at a municipal level. The study was conducted by studying a group of actors who were put together by the Swedish Energy Agency. The study result showed that the theory could describe the collaboration very well, which means that more compositions of groups should be studied based on the theory of network governance in order to find out the relevance of the theory. The dissertation also focused on how the theory can help to study how successful a network can be in the production of policies, as well as problems related to democracy that can arise when using networks in order to reach policy-decisions.

Another factor that has been studied is the impact that network governance has had on the political structure. In Gossas (2006) dissertation, he studied the frequency of network governance at the municipal level in Sweden and found that it had had a significant impact. He argues that Swedish municipalities are collaborating in ways that can be described by network governance theory. The development has been driven by both municipalities and the state to expand governance in various policy areas. Gossa's opinion is that the inter-municipal cooperation has been developed to the extent that it can be described as a new municipal reform, which means that individual municipalities cooperate with different

municipal conventions on different issues. Gossa's research on the impact of networks in today's political structures is confirmed by Andersson (2011), who, in his dissertation, studied collaboration between actors at a regional level. The study confirmed that network governance has not only had a significant impact at the municipal level but also on the regional level. The study also focused on factors that might be essential for successful networks, which he argues are resources, skills, instruments, and awareness.

Like other policy-making models, network governance is also struggling with difficulties. The difficulties that have been analyzed around partnerships and networks are issues with effectivity and democracy. The difficulties around effectivity that have been studied are the fact that networks consist of actors with varying and sometimes also conflicting interests and target images. The effectivity problems analyzed include the fact that governance networks consist of actors with varying and sometimes also conflicting interests and targets, which can lead to the process being affected by time-consuming negotiations, or even becoming paralyzed. Furthermore, if actors that participate in a network not have the same view of the main goal of the network, it can contribute to the lack of a common measure instrument when assessing projects and activities (Rhodes, 2000).

From a democratic perspective, several problems with network governance have been problematized. One problem that has occurred in several studies is that an increased prevalence of network solutions can contribute to an uneven distribution of influence among individual citizens. It is also discovered that network solution tends to increase the influence of private business over local policy issues, which might increase the risk of networks investing more in the short-term solutions than long-term solutions. A third problem addressed is the problems with transparency, accountability, and democratic anchoring of governance networks (Pierre & Peters, 2000; Elander, 1999; Kooiman, 2003; Finance Ministry, 2007). Further, Bogason and Musso (2006) discussed the potential problem of governing the network democratically when a more significant number of cross-sectoral actors from civil society participate in a network. When determining the governing of the network, the authors argue that a dimension of power comes into play. Mainly if a state actor participates, as the actor's organization most likely is constituted by a hierarchical model in which abuses of power tend to exist. If the state actors also fund the network, the entire network's empowerment is at risk. If a network runs falsely,

democratic principles such as equality and accountability may be neglected. Therefore, the authors argue that the process of steering a network should be studied more closely.

Given these problems, according to Fell (2008), there have been several reasons to analyze the development of networks, especially in Swedish municipalities, as they occupy a particular position in the Swedish political system. Fell argues that the development of networks, where they tend to start collaborating across the municipal, territorial border, should be problematized and studied. Gossas (2006) also claims that the fact that the increase of network governance means that municipalities are increasingly crossing their administrative boundaries in their operations and that municipal self-government can thus be problematized from a municipal self-government perspective. Swedish legislation states that the consent of its people sustains the state's authority and public power. It is realized through a representative and parliamentary state and municipal self-government (Constitutional law, 1974:152). Thus, municipalities may take care of matters related to the municipality's area or their members and which are not handled solely by the state, another municipality, another county council, or someone else (Municipal Law, SFS 1991: 900). The law means that a municipality may undertake to carry out tasks of general interest, but that the tasks according to the so-called principle of the locality must be done within its territory (Peterson, 2006, my translation). Sweden's municipal self-government can be interpreted as regulating relations both between municipalities and between municipalities and other local actors, such as the business sector. The locality principle can also be interpreted as the independence of the municipal political sphere in relation to the sphere of other municipalities and needs to be defended. Fell argues that several questions are being raised when municipalities participate in loosely organized projects and networks that work together on various issues beyond their territorial boundaries. For example, how it might threaten the municipal self-government. Hence, if networks tend to threaten the principle of local government was studied in the dissertation. However, the result concluded that the network that was studied was not significantly tending to threaten local democracy.

In another part of Europe, in Spain, Marc Parés, Jordi Bonet-Martí, and Marc Martí-Costa (2012) studied whether networking solutions to complex problems tend to increase democratic elements. By looking into ten different cities, the authors could conclude that in cases where networks were driving the policy, the citizens' opinions tend to be more emphasized.

In addition to studies on how relevant the theory is for describing collaborations at a municipal and regional level, as well as studies on democracy and effectivity problems, network governance has been studied from a sustainable development perspective. In these studies, the focus has been on how a developed collaboration between politics and citizens can contribute to a faster implementation of the sustainability goals. In Kanzler's master's thesis from 2020, he studied the impact of network governance on the implementation of Agenda 2030. The result shows that the network in focus managed to create a platform where people with interest in sustainable development could meet and exchange knowledge. To create such collaborations is in line with Sweden's action plan for Agenda 2030, where a platform for collaboration between different social actors is identified as an essential means of achieving the goals (Finance Ministry, 2019). The sustainable goals are to be achieved first in 2030. Hence, how and to what extent networks can contribute to the implementation remains to be studied. There are also other previous studies on how network governance can contribute to the implementation of Agenda 2030. One of these shows that the work on Agenda 2030 gets more comprehensive and efficient when actors develop strategies and identifies which actors that can contribute to which goals and by showing what actors can gain from collaborating, compared to if one actor tries to manage all 17 goals on its own (Gustafsson and Ivner 2018). Collaborations between divisions within municipalities, but especially between municipalities and civil society actors, have been highlighted as particularly successful and something that is recommended in order to succeed in achieving the goals by 2030 (Division for sustainable development goals, 2017; Finance Ministry & Foreign Department, 2018; Finance Ministry, 2019, Nordregio, 2019; Statskontoret, 2019).

From previous research, a certain strain is shown. When networks are studied, they are studied from an intra-municipal or intra-regional perspective, where a municipality or a region as a state actor has played a significant and essential role. Studies of networks in which a state actor participates with less crucial role have received limited attention. Hence, it is possible to discern a hole in the previous research on networks that I now have the ambition to fill.

This study is focusing on the project called Forward Malmö. Previously, one study has been focusing on this project. In Kryeziu and Sarttila's (2018) master thesis, they studied aspects of challenges and success with the network and how the network works for an exchange of the current political system to manage to achieve socially sustainable

development. They found that interdependence, commitment, coordination, a common agenda, and shared measurement were factors for success. At the same time, difficulties with the network were the recruitment of new members and financial support due to the uncertainty of the network's future. The network works for an exchange of the current systems that are set up for solving socially complex problems in today's political structures. Regarding this, the members of Forward Malmö argued that today's system cannot handle these issues and that these questions, therefore, should be based on the principle of representative democracy in order to give citizens even more power over the everyday challenges of society. These system-change thoughts were also a significant reason for the creation of the network.

3 Theory

In this chapter, the theory of network governance is outlined. The theory will help to describe Forward Malmö and the work the project has performed. Furthermore, the theory will help to explore whether the achieved result can be considered effective. The chapter begins by explaining the structural evolution of political governing, that is, the change from government to governance. This part ends with Garry Stoker's explanatory model of what governance refers to. The chapter continues with the description of network governance, which is one of many variants of governance. Network governance is described as a constellation of actors working together to solve complex problems, such as policy problems.

Further, an explanatory model of how a network's work should be studied based on the theory of network governance is outlined. The chapter ends by describing four factors that, according to the theory of network governance, can predict the successful attainment of network-level outcomes. These four factors are used in this study to explain whether the work performed by the network can be considered effective.

3.1 From government to governance

In previous studies on network governance, a general distinction between government and governance is being made. Government refers to a hierarchal model of political governing, where the formal institutions of the state, which possess formal and legal authority, are executing and implementing the policies and activities (Asaduzzaman & Virtanen, 2016). It tends to focus on control and command, starting from the government and then proceeds downwards to different projects in a hierarchal model. Terms attributed to government are bureaucracy, legislation, financial control, regulation, and force (Jordan, Wurzel & Zito, 2003).

Governance, on the other hand, refers to the creation, execution, and implementation of activities backed by the shared goals of citizens and organizations, which may or may not have formal authority or policing power (Rosenau, Czempiel & Smith, 1992; Stoker, 1998). The government approach was used in implementation and policy-making until the 1990's when the governance approach took over (Narang & Reutersward, 2006). The

change is explained by the new complexed challenges the society started to face, which the state could not handle alone. Hence, the change was necessary and needed (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003; Torfing, Peters, Pierre & Sørensen, 2012).

Governance also refers to the development of the style of governing in which the boundaries between public and private sectors have become blurred (Stoker, 1998). It functions as a policy instrument that is focusing its attention towards proposed, designed, and implemented cooperation by non-state actors working together with state actors (Jordan et al., 2003). Overall, it is about the relationship between state actors, non-state actors, citizens, and businesses (Asaduzzaman & Virtanen, 2016). The change from government to governance meant that the hierarchical model had been replaced by a vertical model, where actors from the private and non-profit sectors have become involved in decision-making (Hill & Hupe, 2002). Several researchers have provided a comprehensive description of what governance is. One of them is Gerry Stoker (1998), who describes governance with the following characteristics:

- Governance refers to a set of institutions and actors that are drawn from but also beyond government.
- Governance identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues.
- Governance identifies the power dependence involved in the relationships between institutions involved in the collective action.
- Governance is about autonomous self-governing network of actors.
- Governance recognizes the capacity to get things done, which does not rest on the government's power to command or use its authority. It sees government as able to use new tools and techniques to steer and guide.

3.1.1 Network Governance

Within the theory of governance, there is an ongoing discussion about the different forms collaborations between actors can take. The various forms of governance have been applied to analyze in different areas; for example, the form of collaborative governance has been used to analyze the role of private actors in networks. Another example is the multi-level governance theory, which is most commonly used in analyzing global agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol (Fell, 2008). Common for the various governance

perspectives is that they problematize the role of the social sectors or their importance in solving policy problems. In this study, network governance was selected as a theory. The choice is based on the theory being considered relevant for the description of collaborations between state actors, social actors, and private actors aimed at solving complex problems (Torfing, 2005). Hence, the theory is relevant for the description of the selected case for this study, Forward Malmö, since the collaboration aims to solve complex societal problems.

Hertting (2006) argues that the theory of network governance is about describing, explaining, and understanding new or more common ways of institutional forms of governing. Network governance can be understood as a constellation of actors working together to solve complex problems, such as societal problems. The purpose of this new form of governing is, according to Torfing (2005a), to develop mutual interactions between actors, which will lead to an increase in the capacity to fulfil public purposes. The networks could consist of politicians, administrators, interest organizations, private firms, social movements, and citizen groups, all of which take part in a constellation to produce public purposes (Torfing, 2005a). The theory argues that policy-making and governing are taking place within such networks instead of the former traditional hierarchal model where the state and the market were the only actors (Fell, 2008). Hence, the theory argues that network governance as a tool for governing is formulated in the distance from the representative democracy. Previously, the chain went from citizens voting on politicians who took decisions. Unlike that structure of governing, the way of governing with network governance can be situated in decentralized and self-organized forms without hierarchal relations, and it breaks the chain of delegation between politicians and government, citizens and elected politicians, and citizens as policy recipients (Hertting, 2006).

According to Hertting (2006), network governance can be described as today's typical structure and institutional forms of governing. In this structure, relatively independent actors try to create networks between themselves in order to secure control, information, and resources (Hertting, 2003). Hence, network governance is about actors working together to solve tasks that they cannot solve alone (Andersson, 2011). Network governance can take three different forms. The first one is called Participant-governed network. Such a network is jointly controlled by the participating member and is dependent on the commitment of all members to handle both internal and external tasks.

A participant-governed network may be highly decentralized, where all members participate on equal terms. However, it can also be highly centralized where a participating actor alone leads the work. The second form is Lead organization networks. In this form, the network is controlled by a single participant who makes all the decisions. The network thus becomes highly centralized with an asymmetric power structure. The third form is the Network Administrative Organization. In this form, the network is controlled by a separate administrative unit, which means that the governing unit is not a participating member of the network (Provan & Kenis, 2008).

There are two established sets of characteristics that can be used to define the term network governance. One is Torfing's five characteristics, and the other is Hertting's seven characteristics. The two sets of have many similarities, but differ in two aspects. Hertting's set holds a provision of information and maximum autonomy as two central aspects, something that Torfing's set does not cover at all. Thus, Hertting's characteristics of rules are broader than Torfing's, which is why this study is based on Hertting's set. These characteristics are:

1. a set of mutually dependent actors who
2. voluntarily organize themselves around
3. functional, and geographically defined policy problems in
4. informal forms of cooperation and which
5. coordinates their actions through negotiations based on
6. genuinely provided information in order to
7. increase their implementation capacity with maximum autonomy (Hertting 2003, my translation)

The characteristics above mean that a network is constructed to enable the participating actors to perceive themselves as mutually dependent on each other. Hertting (2003) refers to positions rules, which are the rules that regulate actors' relations with each other. The position rules should be designed so that all the actors perceive themselves as mutually independent of each other. Secondly, a network is based on voluntary participation, including both free entry and exit, without formal rules that keeps actors outside the group, or that forces actors to stay inside the group. The actors involved either act within a specific geographical area or

a specific policy problem. The specific problem can be social development, and the geographical area can be within a certain city or a certain part of the city. Fourth, the actors should not exert any coercive power on each other. The choice is between cooperation or isolation. The network itself is based on the fact that actors organize themselves to solve problems that each actor cannot solve alone. Actors can act on their own; however, every actor is dependent on collaborations with the other actors to mobilize maximum implementation capacity. Fifth, this means that collaboration and common agreements must be reached through some form of negotiation. Sixth, networks are based on the participants correctly informing each other of their conceptions and preferences on various relevant issues. Transparency and a genuine exchange of information are essential. Finally, actors' influence on the goals and preferences of others is invoked, without undermining their independence, which implies influence over other actors without undermining their independence with the purpose to increase the capacity of implementation with maximum retained autonomy (Hertting, 2003).

These seven characteristics are operationalized beneath and will later constitute the foundation for the analysis, which is performed to fulfill the purpose of increasing the awareness and understanding of how actors collaborate to solve complex societal problems, and to examine the relevance of the theory for describing collaborative processes.

Figure 1. Operationalization of network governance.

Characteristics	Operationalization
1. Mutual dependent actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of personnel • Allocation of financial resources • The infrastructure of the project
2. Voluntarism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgment of voluntarism • No compulsory rules • Free entry/Free exit
3. Defined policy problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim/goals of the network • Specific geographical area • Specific policy problem
4. Organization of the network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization of the process • Mutual collaboration between actors

5. Forms of cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forms of activities • Procedure around negotiations • Decision-making process
6. Provision of information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tools for provision of information • The actor's experience of the provision of information
7. Autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actor's experience of independence • The actor's experience of influence • Allocation of power

3.1.2 Network governance and outcome

As networks often are described as an effective approach towards complex problems, the third question of this thesis aims to answer whether Forward Malmö's accomplished work can be interpreted to be effective. As a background to the third question, question two will address the work performed by Forward Malmö. The theory of network governance relates to the organizational process to enable a study of a network's accomplished outcome. Studying the organizational process and how it produces outcomes, enables a study of Forward Malmö's accomplished work. The organized work and the related processes have previously been divided into different phases (Hjern & Porter, 1983; Carlsson, 1993; Premfors, 2000). In this thesis, the organizational process is operationalized into four functions; more specifically, the actors' organization of the work on:

- Prioritizing between possible actions and projects
- Mobilize resources
- Carry out project
- Identifying a common measuring instrument for evaluating their work

The operationalization made here is inspired by Fell (2008), who, in her dissertation, discussed ways to analyze the outcome of networks by distinguishing between phases in the production of outcomes.

According to the theory, the organizational process within a network is characterized by negotiations between independent and operationally interdependent actors. Through

negotiations, the actors must manage to organize and coordinate the network and its actions and effort in such a way that allows them to prioritize between conceivable projects to the extent that the networks manage to demonstrate concrete actions. Governance networks are claimed to have a large potential for proactive governance, as the actors possess the possibility to identify policy problems. Further, networks are considered important for their potential for aggregating information, assessment, and knowledge that can be needed to make political decisions (Torfing, 2005a). Networks are also recognized for prioritizing output over process (Goodwin & Grix, 2011). Secondly, once a network has succeeded in creating concrete actions, it has to mobilize resources in such a way that turns words into action. The mobilization process is facilitated if the network possesses knowledge relevant to political decision making. When the knowledge of all actors is aggregated, it represents an essential basis for making intelligent choices of a feasible option (Kooiman, 1993; Scharpf, 1999). Leading politicians have taken network governance in to heart, since the actors that networks consist of often are resourceful (Triantafillou, 2007). Thirdly, when the network has managed to coordinate resources, it should result in carried out projects. Governance networks are expected to reduce the risk of implementation resistance. When a network is involved in the decision-making process, they usually show a shared responsibility for, and ownership of, the political decision (Torfing, 2005a). As Forward Malmö does not yet have any impact on political decisions in Malmö, I will instead focus on the internal results Forward Malmö has achieved. Finally, Literature on network governance shows that there can be problems in assessing the success of accomplished work, both for external assessors and for network actors themselves (Hertting, 2003; Vedung, 2006). Therefore, to have identified a common measuring instrument can help the network to evaluate the accomplished work, since experience helps to improve and develop the network's future work. Hence, the four functions describe the network's ability to find strategies for coordinating the network.

If networks are not able to identify problems, mobilize resources, or solve the identified problems, they risk developing into "malfunctioning talk shops" (Jessop 2002; Sørensen & Torfing 2005a). Torfing (2005) argues that the potential of network governance only are fully realized in well-functioning networks. The fact that governance networks are made up of actors with varying and perhaps even opposite interests and goals can lead to the process being affected by time-consuming negotiations. Further, Complexed common goals can contribute to the lack of a common measuring instrument when the outcomes of various efforts

are about to be evaluated (Rhodes, 2000). These factors might lead to a situation where collaboration between actors becomes an endpoint, and the main purpose of the collaboration becomes to collaborate for the sake of collaboration.

Figure 2. Operationalization of organizational processes.

Characteristics	Operationalization
1. Prioritization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of complex problems • Prioritization of complex problems
2. Mobilizing resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilization of knowledge • Mobilization of personnel resources • Mobilization of financial resources
3. Carry out projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects that have emerged from identifying and prioritizing and mobilization of resources
4. Identification of common measuring instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of accomplished projects

3.1.3 Effectiveness

To enable a study on the underlying factors as to why a network is likely to be effective, Provan and Kenis (2008) have developed four factors. The factors are developed within network governance theory to predict the effectiveness of a network's accomplished work. Effectiveness is defined as the attainment of positive network-level outcomes that could not be achieved by an individual organization acting independently (Provan & Kenis, 2008). Before the factors can be applied to a network, Provan & Kenis (2008) argue that how a network is organized and structured must be identified. To identify organization and structure is essential as the effect of the four different factors depends on what type of organization a network has. The theory is explained based on the organized/structured form called Participant-governed network/Shared network governance. In section 5.1.3, it is described why the theory in this study proceeds from this particular form of network governance. The Participant-governed network is referred to as the most common and simplest form of network governance. In this form, the network is decentralized, and all actors are interacting on a relatively equal basis. One difference from other organizational forms is that the network is not controlled by a central actor who leads the entire network's work, which is the case in the form called lead organization. Another is that the network is not controlled by an external

actor, which is the case in the form of a network administrative organization (Provan & Kenis, 2008). Provan and Kenis (2008) have proposed that the successful adoption of Participant-governed network will be based on four key predictors:

- Trust
- Number of participants
- Goal consensus
- Need for network-level competencies

Trust refers to the distribution of trust across all members in a network. The Participant-governed network is specifically more likely to be efficient if a trust is prevalent throughout the network. Trust is studied by analyzing whether it is widely distributed across members, i.e., high density between all actors, or if it only is narrowly distributed, occurring only between individual dyads or cliques. Trust could not only be shared between some of the members; it has to be shared among and between all members of the network. If trust is not reached, the Participant-governed network governance will not be effective. A common problem for all networks is that activities and needs must be coordinated and accommodated. If the network consists of too many actors, it is more likely to become difficult to govern. Participant-governed networks are best suited for a small number of actors since it is easier to gather a smaller number of actors to meet up for active face-to-face participation when something needs to be done. The Participant-governed network is most likely to be effective when it constitutes fewer than six to eight actors and is considered to be even more effective when all actors are located in the same geographical area. If the number of actors exceeds eight, the Participant-governed network risk becomes highly ineffective since an excessive number of actors increase the risk of participants starting to ignore critical issues that the network must solve and increasing the amount of time trying to coordinate across too many actors.

Furthermore, it increases the risk of making frequent meetings of all participants difficult or even impossible. The third component refers to having a high goal consensus. The consensus in shared goals allows the network to perform better as the actors cooperate better when consensus is achieved (Park, 1996). A consensus among the actors also enables the actors to work together without a striking conflict. Concerning the last component, the Participant-governed network will be less effective when it requires too many competencies. Two issues

are critical here, internal and external competencies. First, if internal tasks require significant interdependence among members, the need for task-specific competencies and network-level coordinating skills such as conflict resolutions and quality monitoring are needed. Secondly, external tasks such as advertisement and seeking out new members require an act of the sort that would be extremely difficult for a Participant-governed network to accomplish. Such tasks should, therefore, be considered a disadvantage for Participant-governed networks since demands would be needed to be placed on individual network members for skills they may not possess. Such competencies favor networks that have a lead organization since they are more able to develop particular skills related to the needs (Provan & Kenin, 2008).

Based on these components, Provan and Kenin (2008) propose the following summarization:

“Participant-governed network will be most effective for achieving network-level outcomes when trust is widely shared among network participants (high-density, decentralized trust), when there are relatively few network participants, when network-level goal consensus is high, and when the need for network-level competencies is low”.

Figure 3. Operationalization of effectiveness.

Characteristics	Operationalization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust between actors • Trust towards the network among actors • Trust for the network among the organizations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of participating actors • Attendance at common activities • Geographical location
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal consensus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared perception of common goals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for network level competencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement of competencies

4 Methodological outline of the study

This section presents the methodological approach, the research design, and the selection of empirical material.

4.1 Research design:

The study took a deductive approach where the theory of network governance was applied to the project Forward Malmö to draw conclusions about the project from the theory formation. Hence, the study is theory-consuming where the theory is used to gain a better understanding of the case Forward Malmö. Furthermore, the study has been conducted through a qualitative methodological design and is of both descriptive and explanatory design. The descriptive design is used for the first and second questions, while the third question is of an explanatory design.

The purpose of this study was to contribute to increased awareness and understanding of how actors collaborate to solve societal problems, to increase knowledge of the relevance of network governance theory, and to study whether Forward Malmö's contribution to the work on social sustainability in Malmö has been accomplished effectively. To fulfil the purpose, a single case study design was conducted where the cross-sectorial collaboration project Forward Malmö constituted the central case. A distinguishing feature of a case study is that it focuses on a single case in-depth study (Jacobsen, 2002; Yin, 2003). According to Bryman (2001), a case study is more aimed at discovering and interpreting than testing hypotheses. It explores a case through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information, which should end up in a report of the case (Creswell, 2013).

To study only one case in this way is a good way of conducting a study since it enables a deeper understanding of the explored subject (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991). In this study, the case study aims to render the description of a collaboration project and its working process, which

are some of the most common cases for case studies (Kidder, 1982; Gilbert, 2005; Galunic & Eisenhardt, 2001; Edmondson, Bohmer & Pisano, 2001). The material was collected through interviews and document analysis, where the document analysis worked as a complement to the interview-study. The interviews were conducted with four actors, all of whom are embedded actors in the project Forward Malmö.

4.2 Empirical material

This section presents the selected empirical material that was used in this study. Firstly, it explains why Sweden was chosen as a country, followed by explanations on the case selected for the case study and who to interviews within the selected case. The section ends with an explanation of the documents that were selected for the analysis of the documents.

4.2.1 Why Sweden?

Sweden was selected since it is a fascinating country from a sustainable development perspective. The country is considered to be a world leader in the work on sustainable development, something that the Swedish government also strives to be (Sachs, Schmidt-Traub, Lafortune & Fuller, 2018; Nordregio, 2019; Finance Ministry, & Foreign Department 2018). The Swedish government has in several government declarations since 2015, specified that Sweden has the ambition to lead the world in its desire to fulfill the global development goals (Statskontoret, 2019). Another reason is that Sweden has a decentralized social model where municipalities are responsible for large parts of the community service. From an international perspective, this means that Sweden differs from many other countries in that many tasks performed in other countries by the state or by private actors are carried out at a local level (Gustafsson & Ivner, 2018). Hence, this study can be generalized to countries with a similar decentralized social model. Finally, practical factors such as shared language and geographical closeness played a part in selecting which country to examine.

4.2.2 Why Forward Malmö?

Forward Malmö was selected for two main reasons. The first is that the collaboration aims to solve complex social problems. Collaborating to solve complex social problems is in line with the chosen network governance theory, which is perceived as a suitable response

to the question of how to tackle complex problems. The other reason is that the participating state actor, in this case, Malmö City, not has a crucial role in Forward Malmö, which has been the case in many previously conducted pieces of research of this kind. There are also other minor reasons for the selection, such as Malmö has a geographical closeness to where this study is conducted and since there were many documents available for the document analysis.

4.2.3 Who to interview?

When the selection of interviewees was made, the principle of centrality was used. Centrality is about finding people who have a central role in the case studied and who have knowledge and experience on it (Esaiasson, et.al., 2012). This study consisted of representatives of the actors that have a central role in Forward Malmö. On Forward Malmö's website, the most central organizations were showed. I started by contacting one of these and then used the snowball effect where an informant pointed towards the next informant who pointed towards the next. The interviews ended when the informants could no longer identify more people or actors that have a central role in the project. The snowball effect resulted in interviews with one representative from each of the following organizations; Senus, Malmö University, Malmö municipality, and Save the Children. Interviewing a person from each central organization provided me with an overall picture.

4.2.4 Which documents to look at?

One of the methods for this study is document analysis. The documents that have been used for the analysis are those which are considered central for Forward Malmö. Since the documents were not available online, I contacted one of the central persons in Forward Malmö. The person sent me a total of five documents. These documents have all been included in the analysis and consist of four project descriptions and one process description. The study's demarcation related to time is between looking at the process from the start of Forward Malmö in 2017 to today, 2020.

4.3 Interviews and document analysis.

The empirical material for this research was collected through semi-structured interviews with representatives from each actor and a document analysis of the central documents for Forward Malmö. The selection of mixed-method was to reach a more comprehensive result.

4.3.1 Interviews

Conducting interviews is a suitable choice of method when the aim is to highlight how a certain phenomenon manifests, which in this study constitutes of Forward Malmö (Esaiasson, et al., 2012). One advantage of using interviews, as opposed to questionnaires, is that interviews possess the opportunity of asking follow up questions, which can make the exploration of the investigated area more thorough (Esaiasson, et al., 2012). The interviews provided a more in-depth study compared to the document analysis since first-hand sources provide more essential information about a phenomenon than second-hand sources such as documents.

For this study, semi-structured interviews were selected. When semi-structured interviews are carried out, the questions are determined before the interview and are formulated in an interview-guide (Kallio, Pietala, Johnson & Kangasniemi, 2016). The purpose is not to follow the guide strictly. Rather, it should be viewed as constituting the structure of the conversation and offer guidance on what to talk about. A semi-structured interview also offers to add or adjust questions during the interview. In this study, the interviewees were viewed as informants rather than respondents. When respondents are viewed as informants, they are used as truth owners who are contributing with information about reality, which in this case is Forward Malmö. When doing informal interviews, there is strength in asking different questions to the respondents. In this study, the questions were changed according to the information generated by the first respondents. It enabled me to ask more specific questions in the following interviews. The aim of using informant interviews is to provide the best possible illustration of the phenomenon (Esaiasson, et al., 2012). Therefore, the respondents were selected based on their previous knowledge on Forward Malmö.

The guide was based on the theory of network governance. The seven characteristics of network governance, the four functions to describe the accomplished outcome, and the four factors used to predict the effectiveness of Forward Malmö have all been operationalized into questions asked to the participants in order for them to provide an

understanding of the phenomena. The decision to interview one employee from each organization was made to get a more comprehensive study result. Every interview was conducted via telephone. Conducting interviews over the telephone has some shortcomings. For example, there might be technical difficulties resulting in the telephone line breaking, which makes transcribing and interpreting of the data more difficult, and the absence of facial expressions since these expressions might contain critical information per se. Further, questions that could be considered sensitive or complicated are more appropriate to ask face to face (Esaiasson, et al., 2012). However, since the prevailing circumstances around the ongoing pandemic offer no other alternative, I consider interviews over the telephone as the only suitable alternative.

4.3.2 Developing an interview guide

Characteristic for interviews of an informative character is that the questions asked do not need to be the same for all respondents. The questions were changed depending on what previous information the respondent had generated. In this study, I used a semi-structured interview guide. That means that I could adjust follow up questions, which depended on the given answer. When conducting an interview guide, it is essential to consider both the content of the guide and the shape of it. Content refers to making sure that the questions correlate to the actual problem and help the researcher answer the questions in the long run. Shape refers to creating a lively and friendly atmosphere that enables an open conversation. The creation of the atmosphere is done by following some basic rules, such as only include questions that are short, easy to understand, and without any academic jargon (Esaiasson, et al., 2012).

The questions connected to the study's aim were asked descriptively, so the respondent could answer the questions without being influenced by my way of acting. For that case, I avoided "why" questions as much as possible, as it might sound negative, which may cause the respondent to answer in a protective way instead of a spontaneous and detailed way, which is the goal (Esaiasson, et al., 2012). The guide is build up by two main sections. The first one is the "warm-up" section, which establishes contact between the respondent and me to create a good atmosphere. These questions were asked to provide more basic and general answers about the work the respondent were performing in the project. Secondly, the ground tour

questions were asked. This section contains more thematic questions that are highly relevant to answer the study questions. My job as an interviewer was during the thematic questions to have as little impact as possible. These questions were open and descriptive, and each of them was complemented with follow up questions. The follow-up questions were asked to produce a more content-rich answer if the answer from one of the open questions did not provide me with enough information (Esaiasson, et al., 2012). All four interviews have been recorded and transcribed.

4.3.3 Ethical consideration

When writing a thesis, there are several ethical considerations that the author must reflect on. First, it is fundamental that the participants know that they are taking part in a scientific study and on the premises they are participating in. Therefore, before the interview started, the participants were informed about the purpose of the study and in the way the interview-material would be used. Another important aspect is the importance of giving the participants access to the material before it gets published. Access was given to highlight any misunderstandings I might have made. A third aspect to consider is anonymity (Esaiasson, et al., 2012). In this study, I consider not the individuals themselves, but rather their knowledge, to be of interest. Thus, I chose to exclude their names in the analysis part. For those interested, the names are included in Appendix 2, which has been approved by the participants. However, it does not determine who has said what.

4.3.4 Document analysis

The selection of using two methods was based on the fact that examining data through more than one method reduces the impact of potential biases that can exist when using only one (Bowen, 2009). When a study conducts informant interviews, it is recommended to combine it with document analysis, since it enables a more credible and comprehensive result (Esaiasson, et al., 2012).

Document analysis is a suitable choice for a method when the aim is to review documents in order to understand and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The method applies to qualitative case studies when documents are analyzed to develop an understanding and discover insights relevant to the research problem (Stake, 1995; Yin,

1994; Merriam, 1988). Further, it is particularly applicable when studying single organizations (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). In this study, the document analysis has been used as a complement to the empirical material that the interview study resulted in, with the purpose of providing a more comprehensive result.

The documents have been analyzed through the use of thematic document analysis. Thematic analysis is used to form recognition of patterns within the data (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). It is conducted by analyzing the material through different themes. A common procedure is to take out the themes from the studied material. However, predefined categories can be used, especially when the document analysis is combined with another research method (Bowen, 2009). Accordingly, predefined categories were used in this study. The categories were shaped by the theory of network governance and are presented in tables in the theory section. When I conducted the document analysis, I searched for themes, motives, and assumptions, which then have been placed in one of the predetermined themes. In thematic document analysis, there is a distinction between a semantic or latent approach, where a semantic approach means that the explicit content of the data is analyzed. In contrast, a latent approach means that the underlying meaning of the data is analyzed (Javadi & Zarea, 2016). For this study, a semantic approach was used since the aim was not to examine the underlying meaning beyond the empirical material. Instead, it aimed to show patterns that existed in the empirical material, and the theory was used to enable the interpretation of it.

5 Analysis of the empirical material

This section presents and analyzes the empirical material that has been gathered through interviews and document analysis. Each question is analyzed separately, and it starts by examining the first question.

5.1 Network governance

This section analyzes the cross-sectorial collaboration platform Forward Malmö from Hertting's (2003) seven characteristics of network governance to determine if Forward Malmö's organizational form and structure take the form of network governance.

The seven characteristics are reviewed one at a time and analyzed in the following order: Mutual dependence, voluntarism, defined policy problems, organization of the network, forms of cooperation, provision of information, and autonomy.

5.1.1 Mutual dependency

For a collaboration form to be identified as a network, the participating actors need to perceive themselves as mutually dependent on each other.

Forward Malmö's work is based upon the core team, which consists of Sensus, Malmö City, Malmö University, and Lund University. No actor that takes part in the core team does noticeably invest more time or money than any other. By looking at the distribution of resources between the participants in the core team, nothing is indicating that the distribution put one or some actors in a position of dependency.

The core team's prioritizations steer the work. The complex problems that the team identifies are for the stakeholders in the stakeholder-group to carry out. The position rules that distinguishing in Forward Malmö are of the nature that the core team acts as the driving unit in the prioritization phase, and it is possible to argue that the core team carries out meta-

governance. What prevents the unit from fully actuate meta-governance is that the meta-governor is usually possessing the network's critical resources (Fell, 2008). Since no actors in the core-team possess critical resources, no meta-governor is alleged. The allocation of resources occurs during project applications, i.e., at a later stage. When a problem is distinguished, the core team brings together stakeholders that they think are relevant for the actual project. In this phase, a mutual dependency arises between the core team and the stakeholder group. The core team becomes dependent on the stakeholders since they are the actors who will carry out the projects, while the stakeholders become dependent on the core team's ability to identify projects. By creating this kind of mutual dependency, networks often tend to hold together (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007).

The actors describe themselves as formally independent of each other. "It is very much based on reciprocity, and the basic principle is that we create together, it is a fundamental part of Forward Malmö" (Respondent 3). Regarding financial resources, Malmö City has financed some parts of Forward Malmö. In one of the documents, it is said that the project has been able to develop with good preconditions due to the financial support and collaboration with Malmö City (Malmö Stad, 2019a). Network governance tends to favor elite participation, and since Malmö City participate in the project as a state actor and also contribute to the project with financial resources, there is, according to the theory, a danger that their participation can deepen the inequality within the project (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005b). However, no participant felt that they were put in a situation of dependency towards Malmö. "No, I have never experienced that, that they would have a certain power or veto or would control what we should do because of the financing, I have never experienced that" (Respondent 4). At the same time, there is some concern that the question of financial resources may lead to a power imbalance within the project in the future. During the interviews, it appears that there is a discussion and some concern over that there may naturally arise some competition in applications for financial resources since all actors are dependent on money. One of the respondents argues that a power balance is present at all time when it comes to collaboration in the non-profit sector. "There is a risk when you go into that kind of work /.../ there is a regime of power there, which is a huge part of the non-profit sector" (Respondent 3). However, distribution of power within networks is theoretically described as something natural. It is common for networks to have internal power struggles since actors try to realize their different interests (Sørensen, & Torfing, 2014).

In summary, the actors experience not to be dependent on each other. Even though Malmö participates as a state actor and has financed parts of the project, the actors experience no dependence towards Malmö City.

5.1.2 Voluntarism

A network is based on voluntary participation without formal rules that keeps the actors outside the group or forces actors to stay inside the group.

In the process description, it can be read that the actors who choose to participate in Forward Malmö should reject such work that risks drawing attention away from work with Forward Malmö (The Outside, n.d.). To prioritize work in such a manner can be interpreted as a mandatory regulatory framework, which thus does not fall within the terms of the theory set for voluntarism. However, from the interview study, it appears that the terms formulated in the document are not applied. Throughout the interview study, the actors argue that the most fundamental principle of Forward Malmö is based on voluntary participation. "There is only one basic rule; it is about having to do a shared job" (Respondent 1). Further, there are no formal rules or agreements that neither bind an actor to the project nor exclude an actor from the project. "It is very much like, take what you need, do what you want, everything is good. It is thus quite easy to join" (Representative Malmö University).

The theory of network governance does not discuss any problems that may arise with a non-existent regulatory framework. However, it is not said that ambiguities are not problematic for networking. The absence of regulations regarding what it means to participate in Forward Malmö has created a perceived ambiguity in among the actors. Throughout the interviews, a problematized picture is described, where the participating actors not really know if they are members or not. This has led to actors having difficulties with legitimizing their participation in their own organization. "It is not always obvious what it means to be part of Forward Malmö" (representative, Malmö University). Therefore, a consensus has been established concerning clarification on the regulations. The actors do also agree that the regulations should strive for being norms rather than rules and policies.

To sum up, participation in Forward Malmö is described as being based on volunteerism. There are no agreements or rules that bind participants to the project and the actors are

free to both join and leave the project. Hence, it falls within the conditions on which the formation of the theory rests, and Forward Malmö can be described as being voluntarily established by formally independent actors. Accordingly, Forward Malmö is in line with how the theory describes voluntarism, where participation is voluntary, and exit always remains a possibility, and where no actors can command another actor (Torfing & Sørensen, 2014).

5.1.3 Defined Policy problem

According to the theory, a network should limit its work to either a specific policy problem or a specific geographical area. The actors in Forward Malmö decided to limit their geographical area to Malmö, which feels pretty reasonable when looking at the name. The process description states that the entire focus should be on making Malmö a city for everyone. By implementing that, the project wishes to make an example on how to work with socially complex problems (The outside, n.d.). The actors are also determined to make Malmö the world's first sustainable city (Forward Malmö, n.d.a). The specific policy problem is social sustainable development. The main focus is on issues concerning democracy, housing, education, health, and income (The outside, n.d.). "The common goal is to encourage an equal society" (Respondent 2).

The actors are currently in a negotiation phase, where they jointly discuss how to solve the problems that Malmö is facing. One basic assumption that the actors make is that the structures and systems in which politics today operates, not succeed in solving complex problems. Therefore, the actors strive to change the system. "The basic assumption lies in the fact that the structures and systems that we work with today cannot solve the complex challenges. So we need to find new systems to work in" (Respondent 2). Forward Malmö is described as a movement with the ambition to promote collaboration in a new way and wants to replace the old system with a new problem-solving system. In the interview study, it emerges that the participating actors have seen other actors in the civil society having good ideas for how to solve some of the complex problems Malmö is facing, but that these ideas are not captured in the current system. How to change the system and how the new system should be designed are other factors that are currently discussed and negotiated. According to the theory, it can be assumed that the policy area is preceded by negotiations, which could jeopardize the effectiveness of the network (Herting, 2003). Thus, if the ongoing

negotiation process gets stuck in the negotiation phase, there is a risk for Forward Malmö to become ineffective.

In summary, it appears that Forward Malmö consists of actors from the civil sector and the public sector, where the common goal is to find solutions to the social complex problems Malmö faces. Such a form of collaboration has been identified as an increasingly common phenomenon (Gossas, 2006). Furthermore, the action plan of Forward Malmö states that the goals of the collaboration are to solve complex problems related to social sustainability and to work together to achieve the global goals. The fact that actors who possess knowledge about sustainable development work together to achieve the global goals are a form of collaboration that Kanzler (2020) previously identified. That this kind of collaboration has been established can be explained by the fact that such forms of collaboration are in line with Sweden's action plan for Agenda 2030, where a platform for collaboration between different social actors is identified as an essential means of achieving the goals (Finance Ministry, 2019).

5.1.4 Organization of the network:

A network is based on actors organizing themselves to solve problems that each actor cannot solve alone. Although all actors are free to act alone, every actor is dependent on collaborations with the other actors to mobilize maximum implementation capacity.

Forward Malmö is a platform that cross-sectoral brings together various local and regional actors to jointly coordinate and work out concrete solutions to the challenges that prevent Malmö from becoming a sustainable city (Malmö Stad, 2019a). Forward Malmö was initially organized through three groups, the planning team, the core team, and the stakeholder team. Today, Forward Malmö is structured around the core team and the stakeholder team.

The core team is Forward Malmö's expertise group, and in the interview-study, the team is presented as the main responsible group. It does not possess any specific resources, but they are responsible for identifying projects and finding actors who can carry out the projects. The idea is that these actors should be part of the stakeholder group, which means that the larger the stakeholder group is, the more actors are available to carry out identified

projects. Hence, the actors want this group to grow bigger. The actors has also created a think tank that consists of representatives from Malmö University and Lund University, where some of the goals include evaluating the accomplished work and acting as a "critical friend" who gives suggestions on how the work can be improved (Forward Malmö, n.d.a).

The theory of network governance argues that the structure of a network should be built to allow actors to choose between cooperating or acting on their own. When asked about participating actors who do not take part in the process, one of the respondents answers: "You can as an actor sit in the audience and cheer, and we are very grateful for that, but it is better if all actors instead join to play with us" (Respondent 1). Further, in one of the project descriptions, it is stated that the joint ownership of a project is greater than the project itself (Sensus, n.d.b). Thus, the basis for the collaboration is collaboration per se. This is also expressed in the process description, stating that acting jointly for change is greater than organizational boundaries, politics and the economy (The outside, n.d.). This demonstrates the freedom that, according to theory, should exist in a network, where a participating actor can choose between being an active or passive participant in different processes. Nor does it appear that any actor exerts any coercive power on other actors. It also emerges that the organizational structure is based on the belief in the joint work and its capacity to come up with solutions to problems that individual actors cannot solve alone. "The structure is based on an actor being able to join the project around an issue that the actor needs to solve and which the actor thinks we can solve much better together with other actors than we can alone" (Respondent 3).

When studying the organization, it is evident that Forward Malmö takes participant governance as a form. The structure is highly decentralized, where all members participate on equal terms and where all participants are interdependent. Although the core team is described as the leading unit, the interview study shows that the core team does not decide over other participants, or makes its own decisions. According to Hertting (2003), this open structure is a prerequisite for the network to function as a coordination institution.

In summary, it appears that the participating actors can choose how active they want to be. It is also stated that no actor performs any coercive power on other actors, and that the actors believe that the joint work is larger than the work performed by each actor. Finally, since the structure of the organization is decentralized, where all actors participate on

equal terms and collectively operate the work, the project takes the form of Participant-governance.

5.1.5 Forms of cooperation

A network should reach collaboration and common agreements through some form of negotiations.

Forward Malmö's organization around meeting procedures consists of a standing coordination-meeting every two weeks. At the meetings, the core team meets to review what tasks to carry out and decide which actor that will perform the tasks. The meeting culture that has been created is based on consensus where the distribution of tasks is not based on competence, but rather on will and opportunity. "We often sit and talk and say we need to work with these things, who can do that? Who is interested? Who has the energy and the opportunity?" (Respondent 1). Thus, agreements and coordination are reached through negotiations, where decisions are based on energy and opportunities, which is in line with the theory (Hertting, 2003). Hence, it is during these meetings that the foundation for collaborations and common agreements are laid out.

5.1.6 Provision of information

One of the basics for a network is that participants inform each other of their conceptions and preferences on various relevant issues. A network is built on transparency, where a genuine exchange of information is one of the foundation pillars. If Forward Malmö consists of actors who gather to solve complex problems without informing each other of their ideas and preferences, it does not act in line with the theory on network governance.

In the process description, it is stated that all actors that participate in Forward Malmö are jointly responsible for developing internal communication (The Outside, n.d.). The interview-study showed that the largest exchange of information takes place during the meetings that are arranged. Other ways of communicating are via mail and telephone. The actors have also made attempts to communicate via digital tools, unfortunately without any success. Thus, it can be argued that Forward Malmö has an exchange of information.

However, the question is if the provision of information is genuine and transparent? In the interviews, the respondents provide mixed responses.

First and foremost, it appears that there is no organizational structure for the exchange of information. Instead, the exchange of information takes place at an individual level. When asked how participants experience the communication, one of the respondents replied: "The communication is informal, sometimes very flexible, might even be messy sometimes. It is based on individuals spreading the word, and we have no formal documents or anything that can be put together. There is no administration around it" (Respondent 1).

Furthermore, in the interview study, it appears that the respondents perceive Forward Malmö as a platform surrounded by openness and flexibility. However, it also shows that those attributes seem to have negative consequences for the spread of information. When asked what the consequences might be, one of the respondents gives the following answers:

"It creates this lack of clarity, the openness is a great asset, but because there is a lack of clarity, it sometimes feels like things are happening, that people are not involved, that things happen randomly and quite suddenly, and then someone asks, why was I not part of this meeting for example? Was there any agenda behind this? It easily creates those kinds of perceptions" (Respondent 2).

Another respondent believes that the downside of having an exchange of information at an individual level is that it does not get disseminated to other participants. Overall, all respondents argue that the trust between the participants is high, where all actors are perceived to be transparent and genuine. Nevertheless, the lack of a formal information source is apparent, which contributes to the fact that the members of Forward Malmö sometimes feel that the information within the project is not transparent. However, the awareness of the problem is high, and discussions are taking place regarding how to address the problem quickly. One of the respondents argues for using more digital tools for improving communication:

"I think, if you look at various organizations, many use teams and workplace and slack and stuff like that, and that is the way we need to go too, to be able to share, the conversations must be transparent, you cannot be that by using mail, telephone calls, physical meetings" (Respondent 1).

In summary, it can be stated that Forward Malmö has informal dissemination of information where individuals are spreading the word further. The actors have strong confidence in each other, but the openness on which the project is based proves to have negative consequences for the dissemination of information. The openness creates the feeling that the information is not always transparent. A proposed solution that has been identified is a more formal structure of information dissemination. Since the information is not always perceived as transparent, forward Malmö does not live up to the assumptions the theory rests on concerning the dissemination of information.

5.1.7 Autonomy

The theory emphasizes that actors should, through collaborations, be able to increase their implementation capacity with maximum retained autonomy (Hertting, 2003). That means that actors must cooperate in a way that allows them to influence each other without undermining their independence to reach the best product. However, the process cannot be permeated by too much influence, as it risks creating an elite within the network, where a few actors control the other actors (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005b). In the interview study, the respondents consistently argue that the actors in Forward Malmö have an excellent opportunity to influence each other and that the environment is such that the actors are allowed to question each other's preferences. "We challenge each other to develop ourselves, which I think is something positive. It can get intense, and it is not like everyone just sitting there and nodding their heads. We have different opinions and different personalities" (Respondent 1). The opportunity to influence each other is perceived as positive, as criticism seems to develop the project faster. That is also why the actors have involved the universities, so as not to risk becoming a group of actors with the same vision where they never encounter any resistance.

"The academy is involved as a neutral actor for facilitating this type of development. The other actors usually have their own interests, and certainly, the academy has it too, but it still has a claim of neutrality based on producing knowledge". (Respondent 2)

The perceived autonomy forms the horizontal governing structure, which is significant for a network (Hertting, 2003).

When actors in a network are allowed to influence each other, the opportunities to participate in policy-making increase, which strengthens the legitimacy of the network (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005b). Furthermore, it is good that the actors experience high autonomy since there is a risk for actors from the civil society to participate in networks where a state actor also participates. This is because state actors might manage to seize power and control the network through their resources. Thus, they also risk indirectly undermining citizens' autonomy through their participation in civil society organizations (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005b).

In summary, Forward Malmö's process becomes informal, with no actor controlling the power or demanding responsibility from another actor. This is, according to Hertting (2006), a part of network governance. The informal character risks making it difficult to identify which actor that takes the decisions and which actor to hold accountable. Since no actor formally possesses any power, the informal process can risk leading to a struggle for power. On the other hand, what indicates that an actor in Forward Malmö will not be able to claim authority is that the actors have been identified as mutually dependent on each other (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005b). However, in this respect, network governance has a gap to fill when it comes to the question of who is controlling and who should be held accountable for its outcome (Fell, 2008). Based on the results from the analysis, Forward Malmö can be referred to as a network from now.

5.2 Network governance and outcome

In this sub-section, the outcome of Forward Malmö is analyzed by using four functions. The functions are examined one at a time and analyzed in the following order: Prioritizing

between possible actions and projects, mobilize resources, carry out projects, and identifying a common measuring instrument for evaluating their work.

5.2.1 Prioritizing between possible actions and projects

Negotiations between independent actors characterize networks. Through these negotiations, with the aggregated knowledge the network has managed to gather, a network should be able to identify complex problems that the society is facing. When that is accomplished, the network should be able to prioritize work so that they can start working with the most complex problems. Hence, the question is how Forward Malmö has structured its work concerning the prioritization of identified problems. Moreover, what are the accomplished priorities?

In one of the project descriptions, Forward Malmö states that the identification and prioritization of problems are based upon three steps, listening, observing reality, and acknowledging (Forward Malmö, n.d.a). How are those practices in daily work? When asked about what complex problems Forward Malmö has identified and prioritized, one of the respondents said: "At first, we do not know what the problems are. We need to listen to what challenges people are seeing" (Respondent 1). That the actors who collaborate in order to solve complex problems related to social sustainability do not know what social challenges the city is facing can seem strange at first glance. However, further on in the study, a clear structure emerges regarding how Forward Malmö identifies and prioritizes problems. The prerequisite is that the core team acts on what the stakeholder groups say. By being in contact and having discussions with the circa fifty actors that are part of the stakeholder group, the core team gets attentive to reality. Through the stakeholder group, the actors in the core team come into contact with the citizens. By listening to what the citizens have to say, the core team can identify the biggest problems in society. The foundation for this structure is based on the actor's low confidence in the current system's ability to solve complex societal problems.

"If you start at the system level, it is about new ways of working to meet complexity. We have seen that this is an overall problem. We are not good at dealing with complex societal challenges. We need to find a new way to organize ourselves to meet the complex societal challenges and build a

sustainable society/.../How do we turn the population into active citizens, rather than reacting to what the public sector is saying all the time? How do we together create something that goes far beyond Agenda 2030?" (Respondent 1).

While reflecting on this structure, the respondent argues that they have been able to identify problems that not have been approached before:

"If you think about Malmö's challenges, then you will immediately think of the media and politicians who say that it is about unemployment. It is about gang criminality, maybe young people's meaningful leisure time. Nevertheless, as you begin to listen, you will realize that it is about completely different issues" (Respondent 1).

According to the theory, actors in a network should structure the work in a way that makes them able to identify and prioritize problems (Torfing, 2005). Through the mutual relationship between the core and the stakeholder groups, Forward Malmö has identified and prioritized the following work:

- Develop a new way of working to deal with complex problems.
- Learn more about self-leadership and collaborative leadership.
- Focus more on rights, inclusion, representation, young people's influence, participation, and justice.
- Test and develop new tools that can help to solve complex issues and problems.
- Develop an infrastructure that can lead the work, as no individual actor alone can carry this work (Respondent 1).

5.2.2 Mobilizing resources

The mobilization process is facilitated if the network possesses knowledge relevant to political decision making. When the knowledge of all actors is aggregated, it represents an essential basis for making intelligent choices of a feasible option (Kooiman, 1993;

Scharpf, 1999). Leading politicians have taken network governance into heart, among other things, since the actors that networks consist of often are resourceful (Triantafyllou, 2007).

Forward Malmö aims to bring together actors from all sectors to facilitate mobilization relevant to political decision-making. The actors believe that the differences will increase the aggregated experience and hence also the aggregated knowledge. That Malmö City is part of Forward Malmö is also considered a great opportunity as it can help to anchor Forward Malmö's confidence among politicians (Malmö City, 2019a). This is also confirmed in the interview study. "Forward Malmö is mentioned in politics, and I can imagine that there are politicians who talk about it as an example" (Respondent 2).

To increase the aggregated knowledge and experience within Forward Malmö, Forward Malmö has taken two measures. Firstly, they have started to use a digital tool called Sensemaker. The idea of using Sensemaker is to collect qualitative material by interviewing people in Malmö. When asked about what the material can add, one of the respondents replies like this: "From a democracy perspective, all people have some experience and knowledge that is worth something when we are developing society" (Respondent 1). Hence, the respondent argues for collecting as many voices as possible, since the universal truth does not lie with individuals, organizations, or politicians. Instead, the truth consists of the aggregated experience of all citizens. The second measure is that the network has started to collaborate with both Lund and Malmö University, where two scientists will analyze the material the network collects by using Sensemaker. "Research can help us navigate forward" (Respondent 1). Thus, the purpose with analyzing the results is that the researchers should be able to propose improvements on how Forward Malmö can be developed.

Once a network has identified and prioritized problems, it has to mobilize resources in such a way that turns words into action. The mobilization of resources that has been accomplished to proceed with Forward Malmö consists of personnel resources in one employee from Sensus, two employees from Malmö City, one researcher from Malmö University, and one researcher from Lund University. None in the personnel works full time with Forward Malmö. Instead, the development of Forward Malmö is a task that is part of the people's assignments within their own organization per se, and everyone

allocates the time that the organization allows them to set aside. The financial resources that Forward Malmö has mainly mobilized consist of the 980,000 SEK provided by Malmö City, which Save the Children applied for in 2018. This money was the basis for the development of the network. In the decision from Malmö City, it can be read that the money aims to develop "a function for co-ordination, deepening of knowledge, learning and system change for sustainable development" (Malmö City, 2019b). Other funding consists of indirect money from the participating organizations by allocating staff who are commissioned to develop the network.

From the identification and prioritization phase, Forward Malmö began to mobilize resources around three projects, Malmö Academy, Democracy Lab, and My Malmö. The Malmö Academy derives from the prioritization of learning more about self-leadership and collaborative leadership. To move forward with the project, Forward Malmö mobilized personnel through Sensus together with independent consultants. The financing of the projects came from organizational money from Sensus and participation fees.

Democracy Lab was developed from the identification of the desire to test and develop new tools that can help solve complex issues and problems. To develop the project, the actors mobilized personnel resources by bringing in students from the KaosPilots School in Copenhagen. Kaospilot is a hybrid business and design school, a multi-sided education in leadership and entrepreneurship. As part of the students' education, they developed a working method that was based on testing and developing new tools to solve complex problems. Funding for the project came from external actors, including Region Skåne.

My Malmö was developed from Forward Malmö's idea of becoming better at identifying and prioritizing among the problems in Malmö. The personal mobilization consisted of Sensus, Malmö City, and the two organizations together in association and Cognitive edge. Funding for the project was mobilized through Malmö City and the department Labor Market and Social Administration. Malmö City financed the implementation of the project, while the Labor Market and Social Services department financed the 40 schoolchildren who conducted interviews that would form the basis of the project.

5.2.3 Carry out projects

When a network has managed to coordinate resources, it should result in carried out projects (Torfing, 2005). By mobilizing resources, Forward Malmö managed to proceed with the three projects, Malmö Academy, Democracy Lab, and My Malmö.

The Malmö Academy is a project described as a knowledge alliance on work for making Malmö an equal and sustainable city. It consists of Malmö University and organizations from the business sector and the public sector. The purpose is to bring together individuals, groups, and organizations who all want to work for a sustainable and equal Malmö. The process consists of the participants challenging each other and themselves to create new perspectives on how the complex problems can be solved (Malmö Academy, n.d.).

The Democracy Lab emerged from the desire to test and develop new tools that can help solve complex problems and is described as a process where people can meet across borders and work together with the challenges Malmö meets. The purpose is to function just like a real lab, where the participants can gather and jointly experiment and develop new solutions that can solve the complex problems today's society is facing. The project lasted for three months in 2019 and consisted of 35 people. The next step for the project is to develop the most promising proposals and will take place in late 2020 (Democracy Lab, 2019).

The third project, My Malmö, was a collaborative project between the public and civil sectors where a total of 1500 citizens in Malmö were interviewed to understand better the city and the people living in it. The interview study stated that the 1,500 Malmö citizens mainly demanded measures regarding segregation, security/insecurity, and inequalities (Mitt Malmö, n.d.).

5.2.4 Identifying a common measure instrument for evaluating their work

Since it is difficult for internal actors to assess the work that a network performs, a common measuring instrument that can evaluate and assess performed work is considered an advantage. Hence, the question is whether Forward Malmö has developed a common measuring tool? The short answer is no. The reason why the network does not have a measuring instrument is that the network is still young and possesses scarce resources.

Since the creation of Forward Malmö, discussions concerning the development of a common measure instrument have been frequent. In one of the project descriptions, it can be read that "We met many people, both inside and outside our organizations, who want to measure effects rather than quantitative results, which is a general trend that emerged in response to the classic New public management results" (Malmö Stad, 2019a, my translation). One of the respondents followed up on that argument and stated that organizations as a result of new public management are too focused on quantitative data: "we will work to make children feel better, but when the organization wants to collect the results you are asked, for example, how many children have you met? It says nothing about the well-being of the children" (Respondent 1). Therefore, the network instead wants to use stories to understand what effects an action has had.

At the current time, Forward Malmö has two concrete goals concerning the measurement of effects. The first goal is to successfully measure values and results based on those who will benefit from the work. To fulfill that, the actors will make use of the digital tool Sensemaker and interview the concerned people. The second goal is to be able to measure the participants' learning during the process. To learn more relates to the fact that four of the five goals deal with system change, which Forward Malmö aims to create more knowledge about. To create a measuring instrument for measuring learning, Forward Malmö has taken help from Lund University.

5.3 Effectiveness

This sub-section analyses the potential effectiveness Forward Malmö possesses. To enable a study on a network's potential to be effective, Provan and Kenis (2008) elucidated four factors that they consider fundamental for a network to work effectively. These are: Trust, number of participants, goal consensus, and need for network-level competencies and are examined one at the time.

5.3.1 Trust

For the network to be considered to be based on trust, there must be a distribution of trust across all members in a network. The trust could not only be shared among some of the

members, it has to be shared among and between all members of the network. If trust is not reached, a Participant-governed network will not be effective.

Forward Malmö is based on eight principles, where principle number six states that the work within the network must be built on honesty and trust (The outside, n.d.). The fact that one of the network's principles covers trust should be viewed as positive since the principles form the basis of the project. Honest and trust are also two essential factors in elucidating the mutual dependence between the actors (Hertting, 2003). Nevertheless, that does not necessarily mean that the principles are followed. Thus, the question is, do the actors comply with the principle?

Three themes related to trust emerged in all four interviews. The first theme is that trust between the participating individuals is high and that they trust each other to a great extent, which is emphasized by one of the respondents. "I have almost more confidence in the people I work within this context than I have for my colleagues in my organization" (Respondent 3). The trust is explained by the fact that the individuals share the same view of the world, how complex problems should be solved, and shares a common, prestige less approach to each other and towards the common work.

The second theme that emerges is that the trust towards the potential of Forward Malmö is high among the individuals. The trust towards the project is explained by the participants believing that Forward Malmö has the potential to solve many of the complex problems Malmö is facing. The way trust is experienced in should be considered an excellent benefit for Forward Malmö, as trust, according to the theory, is the essential glue and lubricant for a stable, efficient, and longstanding network (Calton & Lad, 1995).

The third theme that emerges is not as festive as the first two. The actors describe how difficult it is for them to create trust towards Forward Malmö within their organizations. That is, the participants who represent their organizations in Forward Malmö find it challenging to establish confidence in their respective organizations for the work performed in Forward Malmö. The absence of confidence is highlighted in one of the interviews: "I think what we are doing is quite questioned/.../ so trust, it is quite questioned" (Respondent 3). In another interview, this is emphasized, and it appears that the next goal is to anchor confidence in the respective organization. The fact that trust

among the organization for the project Forward Malmö can be considered low might cause further problems. For example, it may harm the mobilization process, as a lower trust is likely to lead to less allocated resources and less allocated funding.

In summary, it appears that the trust between and the trust towards the project among the individual actors is high. However, it also appears that trust among the organizations for the project Forward Malmö is low. For Forward Malmö to be effective, trust must be anchored among organizations.

5.3.2 Number of participants

The second factor to study is the number of participating actors. Forward Malmö is a decentralized network, where all actors participate on equal terms. A network of this kind is most effective if it consists of less than eight actors since a larger number of actors make the network more difficult to control, as the coordinated work must be improved (Provan & Kenis, 2008).

The work in Forward Malmö is based on the core group, which consists of four actors: Sensus, Malmö City, Malmö University, and Lund University. Every respondent points out that the number of actors is currently at an acceptable level: “When it comes to this particular group, I think that the numbers of actors are at a good level. I think there are a lower limit and an upper limit for groups to function optimally. I think we are four actors, and I think eight in such group is the upper limit and maybe three as the lower limit” (Respondent 3). According to the theory, a high number of attendances at the coordinated activities indicate that the number of participants is at an acceptable level. In none of the interviews, it appears that participation in common activities is low or problematic. All respondents agree that all actors who are part of the project also participate in regular activities. Although the number of participants is at a good level, there is another aspect that, according to the theory, can create problems for networks. If the participants are geographically dispersed, it becomes more challenging to coordinate the work and frequently meet (Provan & Kenis, 2008). In this case, it will not be a problem, as all actors in Forward Malmö are located in Malmö.

5.3.3 Shared goal consensus

The third component refers to having a high goal consensus. A high consensus in shared goal enables the network to perform and cooperate better since it is more likely that the actors are involved and committed to the network. The consensus in goals means that the network performs better since the absence of consensus in goals often leads to conflicts, which negatively affects the network (Provan & Kenis, 2008).

The common goals of Forward Malmö are discussed in the process description and in one of the project descriptions. Of the five most significant goals, four are about working to implement a system change. Therefore, it is most likely that the participants in the interview study reflect on that issue. The goal that does not cover system change is the goal to achieve the global goals (The outside, n.d; Forward Malmö, n.d.a).

In the interview study, all respondents mention the goal of working for an equal society and making Malmö a socially sustainable city. Thus, there is a consensus among the participants about what they work towards. However, a more interesting question is whether the participants share the same view of how the network plans to achieve the goal of turning Malmö into a sustainable city? How does Forward Malmö plan to go from words to deeds? Here, the respondents start to touch upon what four of the five goals deal with, system change. A fundamental assumption for system change emerges throughout the interview study, which is that the structures and systems that the actors today work with cannot manage to solve the complex challenges society today faces. Concrete perceptions about how the current system is expected to be exchanged do not emerge from any respondent. Instead, all the participants state that all individuals in Forward Malmö probably have different views and opinions concerning how it is supposed to be developed since everyone represents different organizations that all come from different backgrounds. At the same time, it appears that the ambiguity was and is a prerequisite for the collaboration. Through the various experiences and knowledge, the actor wants to increase the knowledge about system change, which is the second goal for the project. Thus, it can be argued that the actors in the network share the same picture of the common goals, but different views on how the goals should be achieved. However, although the actors themselves argue that the discrepancy is part of the purpose of Forward Malmö, a network is, according to theory, more effective when participants generally can agree on

the common goals (Provan & Kenin, 2008). The fact that it harms the collaboration is also evident in the interview study, where one of the respondents responds to the challenges the discrepancy can cause:

"It is difficult for people to navigate around it. To feel the feeling, tell me exactly what to do and what mandate I have. Or show me what the result of my work should be. There were several people who maybe expected that okay, we will change the system. Then we mean that this should happen. And it has been difficult for organizations to handle it because it is a challenge in itself, especially when we come from different employers or when we have a specific task to fulfill" (Respondent 4).

The same respondent experiences the discussion about how the actors are expected to carry out system change as philosophical, and that it risks entailing consequences when the actors explain the purpose of the work to their own organization, which previously was explained as problematic as it leads to a lower density of trust. Another disadvantage of not being able to, in concrete terms, formulate how to achieve the common goals is that the network risks losing financial resources, as financiers usually want to know in concrete terms how the network is accomplishing its work.

The differences in how the goals are to be achieved are not perceived as unfavorable among the participants. Instead, they claim that it is part of the purpose of Forward Malmö. Regardless, the theory means that a network becomes more effective when there is a high consensus in shared goals (Provan & Kenis, 2008). Hence, according to the theory, and as one of the respondents touched upon, Forward Malmö could encounter problems due to the different views regarding what a system change means.

5.3.4 Need for network level competencies

The fourth factor is the need for network-level competencies. According to the theory, a network will be less effective when it requires too many competencies. Competencies refer to both internal and external ones.

The interview study shows that the core team handles the tasks that require particular competencies, such as recruitment and communication. It is also the core team that develops the work on project grants, external communication and internal communication. When the core team works on these issues, they do not divide work based on competencies. Instead, the person with the most energy and time takes on the work. "We do not work on the basis of competence profiles. It is more about energy and opportunity" (Respondent 1). That the core team can control the development of the network without having to take into account specific competencies is in line with the theory, which argues that the need for special competence in a Participant-governed network should be considered a disadvantage since demand would be needed to be placed on specific actors for skills they may not possess (Provan & Kenis, 2008).

External tasks such as dissemination of information are also taken care of by the core team. Regarding such tasks, it appears that the network has not yet developed any structure around it, and no actor in Forward Malmö is working specifically on issues for which they have no competence. Thus, the work with external tasks is also in line with the theory. However, it appears that the network wants to improve and develop its work on both internal and external communication. Internal communication as it risks excluding actors, and external communication for making it easier for actors to join the network. One of the respondents expresses himself concerning to development of communication like this: "One of the big pieces we need to develop is the communication around this. What is Forward Malmö? How do we work and how do I become involved? And that work is in progress" (Respondent 1). As previously mentioned, the network has today developed a working structure where actors who feel most energetic take on external and internal working tasks. When Forward Malmö now starts to develop the working structure around these issues, there are some concerns that the actors should watch out for. According to the theory, if Forward Malmö develops the structure in a direction where the core group begins to distribute work that demands actors to work with tasks that require task-specific competencies, it is essential to reflect on how the network should be governed. Since task-specific competencies, according to Provan & Kenis (2008), favor lead organization or network administrative organization models, it might be appropriate to change the operational structure into a structure where one actor possesses more power than the others.

6 Concluding discussion

The first purpose of this thesis was to increase the awareness and understanding of how actors with different tasks, organizational principles, and traditions collaborate to solve complex societal problems. Therefore, this study has focused on the cross-sectoral collaboration project called Forward Malmö, where actors from different sectors of the society participate. The study has been based on the theory of network governance. Thus, the study also intended to contribute to increased knowledge of the theory's relevance to the description of collaborative processes. A third purpose was to study whether Forward Malmö's accomplished work has been performed effectively.

In this chapter, it is, therefore, time to ask what we have learned through the case study about actors collaborating to solve complex problems and how relevant the theory of network governance is for the description of such collaboration processes.

To enable an analysis, the following question was formulated:

- How can the cross-sectoral collaboration platform Forward Malmö be described within the framework of the theory on network governance?

The analysis has shown that the cross-sectoral collaboration project called Forward Malmö consists of actors who are mutually dependent on each other. The actor's participation is voluntary, without any formal rules that keeps actors outside the group or that forces actors to stay inside the group. The actors operate within the specific policy area social sustainable development in the geographical area Malmö, and the collaboration process is organized in a way that allows the actors to choose if they want to participate or act on their own. Agreements and coordination are reached by the actors negotiating with each other. Concerning the sixth characteristics, provision of information, Forward Malmö deviates from the theory formation in that the provision of information is not always perceived as transparent. Finally, the actors show that they influence each other to increase the capacity of implementation with maximum retained autonomy.

Hence, the analysis shows that the collaboration process can be described within six of the seven characteristics of network governance. Thus, Forward Malmö can, to a large extent, be described within the framework of network governance. In previous research,

the theory has proven to be relevant for networks that work with urban development (Hertting, 2003) and municipal cooperation (Gossas, 2006). The results of this study show that the theory is also relevant for analyzing collaborations in the field of social sustainable development. I also want to point out that the actors have shown awareness concerning the problems with provision of information. If the actors succeed in finding a solution to the problem, it might soon be possible to describe Forward Malmö fully within the framework of network governance.

The second research question aimed at clarifying Forward Malmö's accomplished work. The study has looked closely at how Forward Malmö identifies and prioritizes problems, how they mobilize resources to solve the identified and prioritized problems, what concrete results the mobilization has led to, and how the actors evaluate the accomplished work.

To explain and analyze this, the following question was formulated:

- How has Forward Malmö contributed to the work on social sustainability in Malmö?

By studying the organizational process, the analysis has shown that Forward Malmö has identified and prioritized five different problems. These have been identified through the mutual relationship between the core team and the stakeholder group. Part of the mobilization process is to gather knowledge relevant for political decision making. To achieve that, Forward Malmö has tried to gather actors from all sectors, since it is believed that their differences will increase the aggregated experience and knowledge. That Malmö City is a participant actor in Forward Malmö is considered a great opportunity as it can help to anchor Forward Malmö's confidence among politicians.

To increase the knowledge within the network, Forward Malmö has started to use a digital tool to gather knowledge and experience from the citizens in Malmö, and begun to collaborate with Lund and Malmö University. In order to develop on the prioritized problems, Forward Malmö has mobilized personnel and financial resources around three projects related to the prioritized problems. The mobilization has led to Forward Malmö having completed three projects, the Malmö Academy, the Democracy Lab, and My Malmö. Concerning common measurement, the actors in Forward Malmö have not yet

developed such an instrument. According to the theory, the lack of a common measuring instrument can lead to experiences and knowledge not being apprehended (Hertting, 2003; Vedung, 2006). Therefore, the project misses an essential factor that can help improve and develop the future work.

Thus, the analysis has shown that Forward Malmö has contributed to the work with social sustainability by gathering knowledge from different actors from different sectors. Together, they have carried out three projects: Malmö Academy, which has contributed to an increased understanding about how Malmö can be developed into a sustainable city, the Democracy Lab which has contributed to an increased knowledge about the tools that can be used to achieve a sustainable city, and My Malmö, which has contributed to an increased understanding about the biggest social problems in Malmö.

The third research question was asked to study if Forward Malmö's contribution to the work on social sustainability has been performed effectively.

For this purpose, the following question was formulated:

- Has the accomplished work been performed effectively?

The analysis shows that the trust between individuals and the individual's trust towards Forward Malmö is great. However, it also indicates that the trust among the organizations that participate in the project is small. Further, it shows that the number of participants in the core team is considered to be at a good level, both according to the respondents and the theory. Concerning shared goal consensus, the actors have high consensus concerning the goals of make Malmö a sustainable city and to change the current system. The actors have also reached a consensus concerning not agreeing on how to succeed in changing the system. According to the actors, it is immanent in the Project Forward Malmö, as the purpose is to learn from each other's different opinions and experiences. However, according to the theory, networks are more likely to be effective when the participating actors agree on the goals since a lack of consensus risks leading to conflicts, which already has appeared when it comes to organizations' trust in the project. The analysis also shows that no certain competencies are required when the participating actors work with internal

or external tasks. This is in line with the theory which highlights that Participant-governed network will be less effective when it requires too many competencies.

Thus, the analysis shows that two of the four factors that Provan & Kenis have developed to predict whether a network is likely to be effective are fulfilled by Forward Malmö. Therefore, Forward Malmö does not currently possess the potential required to be described as an effective network. Hence, it is likely that the performed work has not been performed effectively and that it could have been achieved by an individual organization acting independently. That networks are not always perceived to be effective has been identified in previous studies. In those studies, the lack of effectiveness was explained by the fact that the participating actors had different interests and goals, which led to processes within the networks being interrupted by time-consuming negotiations (Rhodes 2000; Pierre & Peters 2000), which is similar to the results in this study.

Nevertheless, it is important to point out that the result is based solely on network governance theory. Hence, Forward Malmö can be interpreted as effective based on other factors that have not been used in this study. It should also be said that the actors in Forward Malmö have shown a high level of awareness of the problems they are facing. The project is still young, and do they soon find solutions to their problems, Forward Malmö will hopefully soon constitute a good example of how social actors can work together to achieve the global goals. Initiatives such as Forward Malmö are needed to erase segregation, alienation, and child poverty. And without the knowledge and commitment that the actors in Forward Malmö possess, it would not be easy to achieve the global goals until 2030.

7 References

- Andersson, R. (2011). Mainstreaming av integration: om översättning av policy och nätverksstyrning med förhinder inom den regionala utvecklingspolitiken, 1998–2007 (Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University Electronic Press).
- Asaduzzaman, M., & Virtanen, P. (2016). Governance theories and models. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. New York, USA: Springer.
- Basiago, A. D. (1998). Economic, social, and environmental sustainability in development theory and urban planning practice. *Environmentalist*, 19(2), 145-161.
- Bogason, P., & Musso, J. A. (2006). The democratic prospects of network governance.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27.
- Bryman, A. (2001). Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder. (1. uppl.) Malmö: Liber ekonomi.
- Calton, J. M., & Lad, L. J. (1995). Social contracting as a trust-building process of network governance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5(2), 271-295.
- Carlsson, L. (1993). Samhällets oregerlighet. Stockholm: Symposion Graduale.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2017). Statistisk uppföljning av Agenda 2030. Stockholm.
- Constitutional law. (SFS 1974:152). Retrieved 2020 13 April from:
https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/kungorelse-1974152-om-beslutad-ny-regeringsform_sfs-1974-152
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Democracy Lab. (2019). *Demokratilabb Malmö: Projektöversikt 2019*. Retrieved from <https://malmoideella.se/wp-content/uploads/demokratilabb.pdf>
- Division for Sustainable Development Goals. (2017). *Sweden and the 2030 Agenda: Report to the UN High Level Political Forum 2017 on Sustainable Development*. New
- Dyer Jr, W. G., & Wilkins, A. L. (1991). Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *Academy of management review*, 16(3), 613-619.
- Edmondson, A. C., Bohmer, R. M., & Pisano, G. P. (2001). Disrupted routines: Team learning and new technology implementation in hospitals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(4), 685-716.
- Elander, I. (1999). Partnerskap och demokrati. Omaka par i nätverkens tid. Demokratiutredningens forskarvolym IX. SOU (1999:83) (s. 327-363).
- Erikson, L-T. and Widersheim-Paul, F. (2014) 'Att utreda, forska och rapportera'. Stockholm: Liber AB.
- Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H., & Wängnerud, M. (2012). Fjärde upplagan. *Metodpraktikan—konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*.
- Fell, A. (2008). Nätverksstyrning för en hållbar utveckling: En fallstudie av Energimyndighetens program Uthållig kommun 2003-2007 (Doctoral dissertation, Luleå tekniska universitet).
- Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80–92. Retrieved 2020 12 January, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_1/pdf/fereday.pdf.
- Finance Ministry & Foreign Department. (2018). Handlingsplan Agenda 2030: 2018-2020 (Fi. 2018:3). Retrieved 2020 January 29 from: <https://www.regeringen.se/rapporter/2018/06/handlingsplan-agenda-2030/>

- Finance Ministry (2007). Hållbar samhällsorganisation med utvecklingskraft, ansvarskommitténs slutbetänkande. SOU 2007:10.
- Finance Ministry: Statens offentliga utredningar. (2019). Agenda 2030-delegationen. Retrieved 2020 January 29 from: <http://www.sou.gov.se/agenda2030/>
- Forrer, J., Kee, J. J., & Boyer, E. (2014). *Governing cross-sector collaboration*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Forward Malmö. (n.d.a). *Forward Malmö*.
- Forward Malmö. (n.d.b). Kunskapsallians för ett hållbar Malmö. Retrieved 2020 April 7 from: <https://www.malmoakademin.se/om-forward-malmouml.html>
- Galunic, D. C., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2001). Architectural innovation and modular corporate forms. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1229-1249.
- Gilbert, C. G. (2005). Unbundling the structure of inertia: Resource versus routine rigidity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 741-763.
- Goodwin, M., & Grix, J. (2011). Bringing structures back in: The ‘governance narrative’, the ‘decentred approach’ and ‘asymmetrical network governance’ in the education and sport policy communities. *Public administration*, 89(2), 537-556.
- Gossas, M. (2006) Kommunal samverkan och statlig nätverksstyrning. Doktorsavhandling, Institutet för Framtidsstudier & Örebro Universitet
- Gressgård, R. (2015). The power of (re) attachment in urban strategy: Interrogating the framing of social sustainability in Malmö. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(1), 108-120.
- Gustafsson, S., & Ivner, J. (2018). Implementing the global sustainable goals (SDGs) into municipal strategies applying an integrated approach. In *Handbook of sustainability science and research* (pp. 301-316). Springer, Cham.
- Hajer, M.A. & Wagenaar, H. (red.) (2003). *Deliberative policy analysis: understanding governance in the network society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hedlund, G. & S. Montin (red.) (2009). *Governance på svenska*. Stockholm: Santérus Academic Press Sweden.
- Hedström, H., & Vasilev, D. (2018). *Lokal implementering av Agenda 2030 och Globala målen: en kort översikt av regioners och kommuners erfarenheter, möjligheter och utmaningar*.
- Hertting, N. (2003). *Samverkan på spel: Rationalitet och frustration i nätverksstyrning och svensk stadsdelsförnyelse*. Doktorsavhandling. Stockholm: Égalité.
- Hertting, N. (2006). *Hyresgäster i nätverk: makt och demokrati i stadsdelsförnyelse*. Gävle: Institutet för bostads- och urbanforskning.
- Hill, M., and Hupe, P. and Ebooks Corporation (2002) 'Implementing public policy. [Elektronisk resurs] : governance in theory and in practice'. London : Sage Publications Ltd., 2002.
- Hjern, B. & D. O. Porter (1983). *Implementation Structures: A New Unit of Administrative Analysis. Realizing Social Science Knowledge*. (s. 265-277)
- Högfeldt, F. (2018). *Forward Malmö för en hållbar stad. Nöjesguiden*. Retrieved 2020 April 9 from: <https://ng.se/artiklar/forward-malmo-for-en-hallbar-stad>
- Jacobsen, I. D. (2002). *Vad, hur och varför? – Om metodval i företagsekonomi och andra samhällsvetenskapliga ämnen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Javadi, M., & Zarea, K. (2016). Understanding thematic analysis and its pitfall. *Demo, 1*(1), 33-39.
- Jessop, B. (2002). *Governance and Metagovernance: On reflexivity, Requisite Variety, and Requisite Irony*. On-line Papers published by Department of Sociology, Lancaster University.
- Johansson, J & Rydstedt, J. (2010). *Att styra regionala utvecklingsprocesser: demokrati, jämställdhet och lärande i Region Halland och i Gnosjöregionen*. Halmstad: Högskolan i Halmstad.

- Jordan, A., Wurzel, R. K., & Zito, A. R. (2003). *Has governance eclipsed government? Patterns of environmental instrument selection and use in eight states and the EU* (No. 03-15). CSERGE Working Paper EDM.
- Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 72(12), 2954-2965.
- Kanzler, O. (2020). Globala mål på lokal nivå.
- Kidder, T. (1982). *Soul of a new machine*. New York: Avon.
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as Governance*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kooiman, J. (1993) *Modern Governance: New Government-Society Interactions*, London: Sage.
- Kryeziu, V., & Sarttila, E. (2018). Enabling systems change through the development of cross-sector collaboration-case study of Forward Malmö.
- Malmöakademin. (n.d.). Om. Retrieved 2020 May 10 from:
<https://www.malmoakademin.se/om.html>
- Malmö Stad. (2014). *Malmö's väg mot en hållbar framtid: Hälsa, välfärd och rättvisa*. Malmö: Malmö Stad. Retrieved 2020 April 6 from:
https://malmo.se/download/18_693435e1616fea8abdc029f/1519310350066/malmo%CC%88kommissionen_slutrapport_2014.pdf
- Malmö Stad. (2019a). *Uppföljning av projekt med finansiering från kommunstyrelsen i Malmö stad*. Retrieved 2020 24 April from:
<https://motenmedborgarportal.malmo.se/welcome-sv/namnder-styrelser/kommunstyrelsen/mote-2019-03-06/agenda/aterrapportering-forward-malmo-dokument-pdf-1?downloadMode=open>
- Malmö Stad. (2019b). *Återrapportering av bidrag till Forward Malmö*. Retrieved 2020 3 May from: <https://motenmedborgarportal.malmo.se/welcome-sv/namnder-styrelser/kommunstyrelsen/mote-2019-03-06/agenda/g-tjansteskrivelse-aterrapportering-av-bidrag-till-forward-malmo-pdf-1?downloadMode=open>
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Municipal Law. (SFS 1991:900). Retrieved 2020 13 April from:

https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/kommunallag-1991900_sfs-1991-900

Narang, S., & Reuterswärd, L. (2006). Improved governance and sustainable urban development Strategic planning holds the key. *European Journal of Spatial Development* <http://www.nordregio.se/EJSD/-ISSN,1650,9544>.

Nordregio. (2019). Globala mål för lokala prioriteringar: Agenda 2030 på lokal nivå (2019:5). Stockholm: Nordregio.

Parés, M., Bonet-Martí, J., & Martí-Costa, M. (2012). Does participation really matter in urban regeneration policies? Exploring governance networks in Catalonia (Spain). *Urban Affairs Review*, 48(2), 238-271.

Park, S. H. (1996). Managing an interorganizational network: a framework of the institutional mechanism for network control. *Organization studies*, 17(5), 795-824.

Peterson, O. (2006). *Kommunalpolitik*. Stockholm: Norstedts Juridik.

Pierre, J & Peters, B. G. (2000). *Governance, politics and the state*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Premfors, R. (2000). *Policyanalys. Kunskap, praktik och etik i offentlig verksamhet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 18(2), 229-252.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (2000). *Debating Governance*. Oxford: University Press.

Rosenau, J. N., Czempiel, E. O., & Smith, S. (Eds.). (1992). *Governance without government: order and change in world politics* (Vol. 20). Cambridge University Press.

Sachs, J., Schmidt-Traub, G., Kroll, C., Lafortune, G., Fuller, G. 2018: *SDG Index and Dashboards Report 2018*, Bertelsmann Stiftung and Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN): New York.

- Save the Children. (2018). Barnfattigdom i Sverige: *Rädda Barnen*. Stockholm: Save the Children.
- Scharpf, F.W. (1999) *Governing in Europe – Effective and Democratic?*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sensus. (n.d.a). *Arbetsätt för att möta komplexa samhällsutmaningar*. Retrieved 2020 April 5.
- Sensus. (n.d.a) Processmodell för pilotfas samverkansplattform.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Statskontoret. (2019). *Agenda 2030 i myndigheter, kommuner och regioner: Delrapport*. (SOU 2019: 15). Stockholm.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: five propositions. *International social science journal*, 50(155), 17-28.
- udgave.) Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2005b). Network governance and post-liberal democracy. *Administrative theory & praxis*, 27(2), 197-237.
- Sørensen, E & Torfing, J. (red.) (2007). *Theories of democratic network governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian.
- The Outside. (n.d.). *Forward Malmö Foundations document- Process description*.
- Torfing, J. (2005). Governance network theory: towards a second generation. *European political science*, 4(3), 305-315.
- Torfing, J., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J., & Sørensen, E. (2012). *Interactive governance: Advancing the paradigm*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Torfing, J., & Sørensen, E. (2014). The European debate on governance networks: Towards a new and viable paradigm?. *Policy and Society*, 33(4), 329-344.
- Triantafillou, P. (2007). Governing the formation and mobilization of governance networks. In *Theories of democratic network governance* (pp. 183-198). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

- Vedung, E. (2006). *Konsten att utvärdera nätverk*. Stakes Rapportserie 5/2006, Helsingfors.
- WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development). (1987). *Our Common Future*. New York: Oxford University Press. Retrieved 2020 February 22 from: <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>.
- Wiedersheim-Paul, F., & Eriksson, L. T. (2014). *Att utreda, forska och rapportera*. Stockholm: Liber
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Yin, K.R (2003) 'Case Study Research - Design and Methods. Applied Social Research Methods Series, vol 5. Sage Publications.

Appendix 1. Interview guide

All interviews were performed and transcribed in Swedish. The material was translated into English in order to be used in this study. Since the questions were exchanged in all interviews, this guide consists of the standard questions. Each transcript consists of the specific questions that were asked in that specific interview. The transcriptions are available upon request.

- = Questions that explicitly were asked during the interview.
- = Questions that were asked depending on the given answer.

Warming up and background-questions

- Tell me about your role in Forward Malmö, and for how long have you been working in Forward Malmö? – Mutual dependence.
- How many from your organization works with Forward Malmö, and how is the allocation of personnel distributed in general? – Mutual dependence

About Forward Malmö

- What does Forward Malmö work with? – Defined policy problem/Shared goal consensus
- What is the goal of Forward Malmö? – Shared goal consensus/Defined policy problem
 - Do you have a common goal?
- How far have you reached in your work? – Carry out projects
 - Have you seen any concrete result yet?

Actors within Forward Malmö:

- What actors are members of Forward Malmö? – Number of participants
- Do you consider that the number of actors is at a good level? – Number of participants
 - Why not?
 - What could be improved?
- How are the participating actors in Forward Malmö selected? – Voluntarism

- Who decides which actors are allowed to join?
- Under what conditions do actors participate in Forward Malmö? - Voluntarism
 - What rules are there for the players in Forward Malmö to relate to?
 - Are there any rules that players need to adhere to if they want to be part of, or leave the network?
- Do all actors participate in the joint activities? – Number of participants
 - Does that create any problems?
- What influence do actors have on each other at Forward Malmö? - Autonomy
- What influence do actors have on each other at Forward Malmö? – Autonomy
 - How do you experience the actors influence on each other? – Autonomy
 - Have you ever experienced the influence as negative?
- How do actors communicate within Forward Malmö? - Provision of information
- How do you experience the communication? – Provision of information
 - Do you experience any problems with the communication?
 - Can you give an example of a problem?
- How do you experience the trust between the players in Forward Malmö? – Trust
 - What does that depend on?
- How do you experience the players' confidence in Forward Malmö? – Trust
 - What does that depend on?
- What actor/actors are responsible for internal tasks, such as application processes or work evaluation? – Need for network level competencies
 - How do you view the work on internal tasks?
- What actor/actors are responsible for external tasks, such as recruiting new members and dissemination of information? – Need for network level competencies
 - How do you view the work on external tasks?

Organization:

- What are the most common forms of activities within Forward Malmö? - Forms of cooperation
 - Is it meetings, seminars or other activities?
- During which activities do you take decisions? - Forms of cooperation
 - Does everyone participate at those activities?
- How do actors collaborate within Forward Malmö? - Organization of the network
How do you experience collaboration? – Organization of the network
 - Do you think it works well or less well?
 - Is there anything that can be improved?
 - Do you consider that the collaboration within Forward Malmö gives maximum results considered the potential of Forward Malmö?

Prioritizing between possible actions and projects

- What projects and actions have Forward Malmö identified?
- How do Forward Malmö prioritize between the identify projects?
 - How do you know that something is more important than something else?

Mobilize resources

- What knowledge has the network mobilized?
- What human resources has the network mobilized?
- What financial resources has the network mobilized?

Carry out projects

- Has the prioritization between projects and mobilization led to the network completing any projects?
 - What are the projects?

Identifying a common measuring instrument for evaluating their own work

- How do you assess completed projects afterwards?
 - Have you elaborated on a joint plan for how projects should be assessed?

- What is the plan?

- Is there anything you would like to add?

Appendix 2. Material Interviews & document analysis

Actor	Name	Type of interview and duration
Sensus adult educational association	Joel Veborg	Telephone / 49:54
Malmö University	Jens Sjölander	Telephone / 39:10
Malmö municipality	Tom Roodro	Telephone / 47:51
Save the Children	Rodolfo Zuniga	Telephone / 43:00

Documents	Year
Uppföljning av project med finansiering från kommunstyrelsen I Malmö stad	2019
Forward Malmö foundation document. Process description	n.d.
Forward Malmö	n.d.
Processmodel for pilotfas samverkansplattform	n.d.
Arbetsätt för att möta komplexa samhällsutmaningar	n.d.