

Małgorzata CZORNIK*

COLLECTIVE BENEFITS AS AN IMPULSE FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT¹

KORZYŚCI KOLEKTYWNE JAKO IMPULS DLA ROZWOJU MIAST

No. DOI: 10.25167/sm.1922

ABSTRACT: The development of modern cities is subject to many influences. They include social and cultural inspirations, whose impact results from the local will to adopt new trends, such as the currently popular demands of the postmodern world. Among other things, they promote initiatives intended to integrate urban communities. Cooperation between inhabitants results in the development of urban communities and creation of urban common goods, offering specific types of benefits, such as collective benefits. The purpose of this article is to define and establish the concept of collective benefits substantively among the achievements of urban economy. It has to be stressed that economic relationships which arise in the processes of integrating city users deserve special attention, because the relationships connecting them contribute to the development of unique conditions for living and conducting business. They can be regarded as a broadly understood set of agglomeration economies.

KEY WORDS: common goods, economy for the common good, collective benefits

ABSTRAKT: Rozwój współczesnych miast podlega wielu oddziaływaniom. Wśród nich są inspiracje społeczno-kulturowe, których wpływ wynika z lokalnej woli adaptowania nowych trendów, takich jak popularne dziś postulaty świata ponowoczesnego. Promują one między innymi inicjatywy zmierzające do integrowania społeczności miejskich. Skutkiem współpracy mieszkańców jest powstawanie miejskich wspólnot i tworzenie miejskich dóbr wspólnych, oferujących szczególnego rodzaju korzyści, do jakich można zaliczyć korzyści kolektywne. Celem artykułu jest zdefiniowanie i ulokowanie merytoryczne pojęcia korzyści kolektywnych w dorobku ekonomii miejskiej. Zależności ekonomiczne, jakie powstają w procesach integracji użytkowników miast, zasługują bowiem na szczególną uwagę, gdyż łączące ich relacje sprzyjają powstawaniu wyjątkowych warunków zamieszkania i prowadzenia działalności gospodarczych. Można je zaliczyć do szeroko rozumianego zbioru korzyści aglomeracji.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: dobra wspólne, ekonomia dóbr wspólnych, korzyści kolektywne

* University of Economics in Katowice, Department of Strategic and Regional Studies, 50 1 Maja Str., 40-287 Katowice, Poland, e-mail: malgorzata.czornik@ue.katowice.pl, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5841-3367>.

¹ The paper presents results of the research project titled "The Economics of Urban Commons" (No. 2015/19/B/HS4/01695) financed by Polish National Scientific Centre. Head of the project: Dr Adam Polko.

Introduction

Urban development is a complex process, oriented towards recognition of the positive impact of various factors on the direction of changes in the urban reality. It uses the potential of these factors for inducing transformations, such as motivating to better adapt to the constantly arising new needs of urban area users. Inspiration can be drawn from behaviours of many different people, technological novelties, political events, as well as social, economic, cultural events, etc. The set of development inspirations is infinite: the strength of their impact and effects is impossible to predict. The improvement of city's operating conditions, which is crucial for its development, may even be the result of a decision enforced due to the behaviour of external entities or occurrence of risks. All inspirations are connected by their causal link with the elements of urban reality, which can be noticed and used by the local development leaders. It is their susceptibility to influences that affects the direction and rate of changes. The decision-makers, in turn, are driven by potential benefits, not necessarily financial, but always to an extent corresponding to the demand of one of the city user groups.

These benefits include collective benefits, which arise in connection with the activity of communities in the city area. The purpose of the article is to define and establish the concept of collective benefits substantively among the achievements of urban economy. The economic relationships that arise in different processes of integrating city users deserve special attention, because the relationships connecting them promote the development of unique conditions for living and conducting business. They can be classified among a broadly understood set of agglomeration economies (the term "agglomeration" originates from the Latin word *agglomerare*, meaning "to gather"), which constitute a type of benefits drawn from the concentration of a significant group of people, economic units and institutions within a small urban space. The direct reason why this type of benefits occurs is the proximity of multiple operating entities, including the activity of communities that are established by city users.

Impulses for urban development

Changes are an integral part of how every entity is operated. They result from the discontinuity of operating conditions, whereas the determination of change directions is the main element of any forecasting and planning processes. The high number of actors and plurality of modern impacts results in countless relationships, which makes it necessary to monitor behaviours on an ongoing basis. Z. Bauman wrote about "liquid modernity", concluding that the postmodern world is characterised by a constant transformation, including its modernising tendency, in line with the belief that every "new thing" is better than the previous one, as well as promotion of the highest possible rate of changes designed to search for opportunities to satisfy one's needs better (Bauman 2000, 2004). This is because the context of consumption is nowadays the most important justification for changes, which are designed to expand the offer and

improve the form of consumption. Opportunities to gain new pleasures, which many people regard as their goal in life, are constantly sought. All city users are satisfied when they are able to participate in the consumption which they desire (Czornik 2012). The more such consumption takes into account changes in the city's operating conditions (including the proper recognition and appreciation of development impulses), the more valuable it is.

The set of impulses of this kind is very extensive and depends not only on objective urban features, such as city surface, population,² population density, number of business entities and institutions, but also on the assessment of local utility of an impulse. Many authors have paid attention to the increasing inspirational impact of various groups of endogenic factors, emphasizing the significance of decentralisation and technological innovations (Gorzela 2000), authority of power (Tuziak 2016) and historical heritage (Kulawiak 2016). Other important factors include external influences, related to transfer of EU funds, state subsidies or construction of translocal infrastructure, as well as the results of attracting investors (Gorzela 2000), cultural import (Hryniewicz 2000) and assumptions of central spatial plans (The Role and Scope of Spatial Planning 2006). Taylor and Stöhr (1981, 9) conclude that the ultimate meaning of development is manifested in personal values, conditioned by social reality. This is due to the fact that none of the impulses has a universal application at any time or in any city. Time, geographic reality, social and economic conditions, as well as external context, is decisive regarding the power of influence. An impulse is important when it is considered to be motoric. This happens when it may cause important changes in the reality of city operation, sometimes without causing any positive transformations. A set of impulses may include influences which degrade the importance of city's resources, and decrease its competitive position or settlement attractiveness. The direction for impulse use is usually decided by the development leaders, but there are also impulses imposed on urban reality, such as natural phenomena, wars and political conflicts, social events (e.g. revolutions, protests, social and cultural trends) and economic events (e.g. crises, collapse of big companies, inventions and new technologies). Their impact may be very significant and not necessarily perceived negatively in the long run. In the history of cities, there have been situations when a city destroyed during an earthquake (e.g. Lisbon in 1755 or San Francisco in 1906) was rebuilt with more modern, anti-seismic development and more impressive buildings. The destructive significance of military conflicts is indisputable (e.g. Warsaw, Wrocław, Dresden), although certain cities earned a lot of money thanks to production of weapons (e.g. cities in The Ruhr Region). Social changes contributed to the collapse of many cities, or their complete transformation (e.g. the Roman Empire cities did not survive the liquidation of slavery), although they may also constitute a valuable inspiration, especially when they

² The conclusion of OECD report (2015) was that with every doubling of an urban population, the city productivity increases by 2-5%, mainly as a result of competition, better adaptation to labour market needs and exchange of knowledge.

introduce a new civilisation order, which is not necessarily enthusiastically welcomed by the citizens (e.g. Haussmann's renovation of Paris in 1852-1870). The impact of the modernist view of social housing (e.g. Le Corbusier, Athens Charter) cannot be underestimated here, as it significantly contributed to building new social relationships and improving the living conditions of the lowest social classes. The ideologically inspired Polish socialist realism in the construction of cities (Nowa Huta, Tychy) is also less criticised nowadays; particularly, its importance for introducing solutions to ensure the clarity of urban layouts is emphasized (Lipok-Bierwiazczonek 2011). Postmodernity is an impulse for cities to stress the importance of public spaces, or to develop neighbourhood communities. This proved to be useful in mitigating the effects of economic crisis in 2008 that changed the reality of the real estate market, which contributed to depopulation and depletion of income in many cities.³ The impulses resulting from application of new devices promoted in smart city concepts and used in systems for communication, safety maintenance, obtaining energy efficiency in passive buildings or forms of Internet sales, have been changing the organisation and styles of modern city management as well (Kuznik, Baron 2017).

Cities also develop based on decisions inspired by the needs reported by the inhabitants and other user groups. The demand for urban products is an important development impulse, which brings sense to the economic activities undertaken in urban areas. This allows for profitable use of both own resources and environmental factors, including the spatial vicinity of rural areas and regional reality. Cities also draw energy from the legacy of the previous generations of their own residents, who contributed to creating a positive image of the place and developing its settlement and investment attractiveness. They sometimes left valuable spatial development elements that are crucial for the current possibilities to intensify the use of urban spaces. The dynamics of changes in all urban features is favourable for the constant maintenance of desired competitive positions, frequently becoming a development impulse for larger territorial structures that they are part of.

Communities and common goods in cities

Cities are municipalities which, according to the law, constitute self-government communities formed by their inhabitants (Act on Commune Self-Government of 1990, Article 1). The existence of a community is decisive for the rules of municipality territory management and use of resources, including the creation of public goods. The duties of a municipality result from the division of competences between specific public authority levels, but do not constitute a complete range of goods and services desired by the inhabitants, who consequently supplement it with their own initiatives.

³ The Great Recession, which began in the USA in 2008, contributed to deterioration of the social and economic position of 49 out of 50 American metropolises, the only exception being Oklahoma City (Arias, Gascon, Rapach 2016).

Their activity is most frequently manifested by cooperation between people who are interested in transforming a particular area into a place regarded as a familiar space to meet individual and family needs in the best possible manner. The inhabitants make collective efforts to adapt the urban reality outside the formal actions of self-government authorities to the preferences of smaller groups, thus shaping together the actual settlement attractiveness of places in the city, which further translates into the local identity, increased interest in the local aspects of urban policy (aesthetic qualities, services) and even prices of real estates.

The existence of communities is one of the governing principles of social life and is related to the sense of unity of all their members (Millon-Delsol 1995, 7). The goals of integration may be very different, but the people who form communities are aware that belonging to a group enables them to satisfy the needs which an individual is unable to address due to the limited physical capabilities and time constraints, resulting from the lack of talents, limitations of perception, mental and manual capacities, etc. Collective action may also provide an opportunity to establish human relationships and benefit from their results. Belonging to a group has always been important for the living conditions. In the past, it enabled people to survive, mainly thanks to the cooperation between them in obtaining food, protection, care and reproductive partners (Olster 2020, 57-58). Presently, it is rather an opportunity to satisfy higher needs by creating favourable conditions for living in an area that goes beyond one's own property, ensuring the pleasure of sharing interests and opinions, or confirming the social position.

Communities provide unique possibilities to produce and consume, which are easier to notice and use in the urban reality. This is because due to the concentration of people, buildings, activities, etc., various types of human relationships are constantly established. The durability of many communities is low, or even limited to the implementation of a single goal, but for many people cooperation is beneficial in order to use the results of collective actions. M. Maffesoli writes about the modern times that "we are currently reliving, in all fields, *passion for communities*" (2008, 14), which is the result of searching for the possibility to complete the market offer obtained through individual consumption. In cities, more than in rural areas which have active local communities that enable individuals to participate in a group, people live with the sense of a lack of common everyday human relationships. Therefore, they are increasingly willing to take part in social initiatives that are aimed at cooperation. They are frequently encouraged to get involved by common neighbourhood, similar family situations, shared ideals, political views, etc. Taking part in a community is a declaration of voluntary participation in initiatives that form the activity potential oriented towards creating common good that unites all group members, in line with the group goals. Collective success, which is the production of common good, is conditioned upon the individual involvement of a single person, which must have the positive balance of strength expenditure and benefits. It is necessary to notice benefits in order to cooperate, however, such benefits do not have to be material. The important thing is that they are valuable, complementing the product range in the market; that they are one's own products and public goods.

Common goods are not a category reserved for manufacturing or using human relationships by any single group; neither are they a territorial concept. They can be developed either in the city or in the country, having regional, domestic, or even global context. They are created wherever communities are established, being “networks of interrelated human relationships, coloured with emotional elements and certain type of obligations towards the shared values, standards, meanings, history and identity” (Etzioni in: Gawkowska 2004, 567). Urban collective goods are a result of special conditions for integration, which are created by urban areas. The origins of communities that create them lie in the geographic, social and cultural reality of cities, as well as political decisions concerning development and function of a specific fragment of urban space. By creating communities, people most frequently respond to the deficiencies in the desired attractiveness of housing conditions. They want to complement the offer of municipal authorities, developers or property administrators through their initiatives. The specific nature of urban common goods results from the urban lifestyle and nature of business activities conducted in urban areas (Iaione 2016). It is not a condition of existence for city inhabitants to participate in using a common natural resource whose usage they have to agree upon and which they have to take care of for their own good (Ostrom 2013). Their needs in respect of creating common good concern the joint use of municipal resources in the conditions of competing for space. Urban communities focus on satisfying the needs of a small group, which constitutes the type of a subgroup in a larger community, i.e. city users. Everyone has the right to use urban public goods, but many city dwellers also increasingly want to participate in deciding about the detailed features of their use (Polko 2015). Common goods as results of the operation of communities, i.e. groups of people connected with an idea, goals, views, etc., are an expression of their beliefs. Urban common goods are created thanks to the collective efforts of groups who live the urban lifestyle and get involved in the changes inspired by concepts that are characteristic of them. The most frequent among them are neighbourhood communities originating around a commonly used public space, which associates a small number of people who are willing to integrate in order to improve the conditions of using such a space (Błaszczyk 2007, 156), which is a typically urban behaviour in tight spaces of housing estates.

Definition of collective benefits

A lot has been written about collectiveness in recent years. There are many papers on collective actions (e.g. Olson 1971; Coaffee and Healey 2003; Simpson and Aksoy 2017), collective rights (e.g. Harvey 2012; Cities for All 2010) and collective relations (e.g. Vazquez and Gonzalez 2016; Klekotko 2018). However, the subject of collective benefits that constitute an example of economic approach to the problems of community, is not frequently covered. This term was used 11 times in the paper by E. Ostrom (1990), mainly with reference to considerations regarding the *free-rider problem*. We can also refer to the papers by S.M. Foster (2011) quoting R.H. Nelson (1999), collec-

tive benefits are mentioned by Z. Łapniewska (2015, 3) who quotes M. Olson, as well as by M. Sokołowicz (2017), who does not refer to them directly, but considers collective consumption of goods in cities with reference to G. Hardin (1968). The use of collective benefits in management processes is referred to by J. Walter, Ch. Lechner, F.W. Kellermanns (2007).

Cooperation between community members has its fundamental justification in the will of the individual to participate in consumption of a desired good or service that they cannot obtain on their own. However, cooperation may also provide unique benefits related to the existence of community and relationship between its members, i.e. collective benefits. They arise as a supplement to the main “benefits”, resulting from the goals of community establishment, but they are not a by-product of the activity of community members, because everyone (or at least the majority of members) joins the community with the aim to participate in obtaining such benefits. Collective benefits are a result of both satisfying needs through common goods and participating in the process of their production. They are the advantage of cooperation and acquired rights of cooperation under community activities. Such benefits provide the sense of belonging to a group and satisfaction from taking part in the act of production.

Collective benefits result from the existence of a community (collective) and are consumed by an individual who, in the majority of cases, is a part of this community. They are distinguished by their creation conditions rather than the consumer or pattern of consumption (except for certain special cases). They result from the existence of bonds (based both on goals and emotions), which are only established in a group and result from involving a part of individual resources (features, possibilities, potentials) in the creation of a specific good, whereby there are usually no formal means of exerting pressure on the individual to add their resources (the “free rider problem”). Collective benefits are a specific result of synergy of individual behaviours, regarded as desired from the perspective of the individual’s participation in the social life. Thus, they can be the purpose of cooperation for implementing such intentions that cannot be achieved through the efforts of a single person. At present, however, they mainly seem to be an alternative for satisfying higher needs, related to personal development, social activity or prestige.

Their occurrence is not only justified by economic aspects. They contain sociological elements to a various degree (but always), thus becoming a category that is possible to define and analyse using techniques and methods applied in many fields of social sciences. The urban context of collective benefits is additionally valuable in the reality of urban lifestyle, because there are almost no local communities in urban areas, in the traditional meaning of this form of territorial integration. Nowadays, city inhabitants associate not because of existential necessity, as described by E. Ostrom, but due to the need to participate in human relationships, which supplement the omnipresent postmodern individualism. Collective benefits are increasingly sought as a form of cohabitation. Cities, due to the fact that they are specific concentrations of people, institutions and activities, provide agglomerations with multiple benefits. Relation-

ships between entities are constantly established in city areas and become the basis for their attractiveness, both from the settlement and economic perspective. Urban development leaders desire a good position in the city market, because it provides the voters whom they represent with opportunities for dozens of everyday and occasional contacts. Participation in the exchange between city users, which is a consequence of their presence in the city, is practically invaluable in the age of increased significance of information. All types of agglomeration economies, in the classic division into scale, localisation and mainly urbanisation, result from the gathering of individuals. In turn, their cooperation favours the establishment of communities oriented towards production of common goods and the resulting collective benefits. In comparison with other territorial units, this process runs most effectively in cities.

Elements of collective benefits

The term “collective benefits” requires a detailed analysis in order to be unambiguously defined. However, it is not possible to determine precisely its elements due to the presence of subjective components, which express the recipient’s satisfaction level. This is due to the fact that all types of benefits are, by definition, referred to the quality assessment of the processes of satisfying needs, which are expressed by consumers who ultimately evaluate the entire process of addressing the identified deficiencies. There are many types of needs distinguished, and consequently, hundreds of benefit groups arising when such needs are satisfied. The never-ending sequence of necessities, requirements, demands, preferences and appetites justifies all operations, including commercial and social activities. Even volunteering brings benefits which are not financial, but for many activists more valuable, because they satisfy the needs which are not properly addressed in the market relations. This is also the case of collective benefits.

Their main elements, obtained by a community member, refer both to the way in which collective benefits produced thanks to the community activity are generated, and to the consumption of common goods, which contain an element of collectiveness within their range. These include:

1. **Individual benefits**, which are positive effects of satisfying needs, i.e. the result of delivering individual consumption, which is a subjective category measured with individually experienced state of deficiency. Their existence results from the summary of attributes of good (its constituent resources, raw materials, types and amounts of work, ways of obtaining, manufacturing, etc.) with the desired effects of its use. They are partly inspired by the existential needs and, as such, they are suitable for objectification as part of segmentation determined by criteria such as gender, age, health condition, type of work, place of residence, etc. In the field of satisfying higher needs, we cannot precisely classify them into groups, but only suggest classifications of benefits resulting from satisfying similar needs, e.g. regarding education, leisure activities, culinary tastes, artistic preferences, etc. They are always desired, to the greatest extent as egoistic aspiration to derive pleasure from consumption.

2. **Private benefits** resulting from participation of the individual in a community, mainly non-material, constitute a type of individual satisfaction from belonging to a group. Not so much do they result from the use of common goods, as from having the right to being the part of a community. They are private, which refers to the type of ownership, but not necessarily to the individual (separate) use. Their occurrence is, to a significant extent, a result of the existence of primarily biological motivation to being associated in social groups. It is also closely related to the reality of human coexistence and, as such, it has its psychological justification. We want to live among people and each of us needs them (as a group, without individual references). Reclusive lifestyle is regarded as a kind of exception from standard human relationships which involve everyday cooperation in carrying out necessary actions, as well as the pleasure of exchanging information and direct physical contact. In large communities, private benefits contribute to winning recognition, privilege and honour of being included in a group, or reinforcing one's social position, which is of great significance in the political reality of a city. Under operating conditions of smaller and less spontaneous neighbourhood communities, such benefits are perceived as individual pleasure of taking part in creating and controlling the use of a specific area.

3. **Benefits which are transmitted to other community members who are not involved in creating goods that deliver collective benefits**, are a kind of investment made by a community member for future individual benefits derived from community activities, which require:

- involvement of particular individuals associated in a community, who have certain unique specific resources (knowledge, skills, education, etc.), and who were not interested in participating in the work on creation of an individually desired common good;
- acquisition of individuals who are not associated in the community yet, but are required to carry out certain planned activities, including production of common goods. They must be encouraged, so it may be considered to offer them something “towards” their future involvement.

This category of benefits, in the account calculated for a particular community member, is a cost that they incur to create in the future a good which is beneficial to them by agreeing to take part in creating a good desired by another community member. In the urban reality, this category is to the greatest extent threatened with the risk of losing the effects of personal involvement to the benefit of anonymous city users, who are interested in the “free rider” role, i.e. in obtaining benefits from the consumption of good for which they neither paid, nor compensated the obtained profits in any other way.

4. A part of **benefits produced by other community members, which are transferred to the benefit of the entire community**, as a form of participation in benefiting from the entire community's activity and all its common goods. It is acquired by each community member, even if they were not involved in the activities intended to produce a specific good which they use. The share of particular individuals (coefficient “a”) does

not have to be identical. It results from the position in the community, which reflects the fact that an individual adopted the rules of its existence. There may be various criteria of access to specific goods, whereby the rules of using the community offer in the long run always to an extent take into consideration the degree of involvement in activities undertaken for the whole group.

In the process of producing common goods, when unit collective benefits appear at the same time, this category arises in the following relationship between its elements:

$$KKj = KI + KP - KPIN + aKCW$$

where:

KKj – collective benefits achieved by an individual (community member),

KI – customised benefits of an individual resulting from personal consumption of collective goods,

KP – private benefits resulting from participation of an individual in a community,

KPIN – benefits that are transferred to other community members who are not involved in creating goods that provide collective benefits,

KCW – benefits produced by other community members and transferred to the benefit of the whole community, a part of which (a) can be used by an individual.

The above operation illustrates the general approach to the term “collective benefits”. The defined elements can also be clarified further by being divided into more detailed elements. However, this task seems to go beyond the scientific orientation of economy and falls within the competence of sociologists, or even psychologists, who are significantly better at defining motivations behind various human activities. In the context of urban economy, we are left with the analysis of elements of collective benefits, recognised as a source of profits from the manufacturing activity of a community intended to create a common good, and consequently, to increase the attractiveness of a particular area, which results in a decision either to stay in the city, or to join the users of a different city.

Collective benefits and city development

Defined collective benefits, similarly to common goods, which are their carriers, are a non-spatial category from the theoretical perspective. They may originate wherever communities are established, regardless of the nature of territorial units. If they are produced in the city, their urban character is associated with the existence of a specific lifestyle and special conditions for conducting business activity in urban areas. Economic units are less frequently members of communities, but as active city users, they are very often interested in participating in the creation of desired conditions for activity (Czornik 2017). Urban communities are formed mainly by city inhabitants. By establishing such communities, they complement the municipal offer of public and market goods and services on the one hand, and satisfy the individual needs for co-

operation and people-to-people contacts, on the other hand. The produced collective benefits are the desired effect of each form of involvement.

As a notion that might have a significant impact on the city attractiveness, collective benefits are thus a category that belongs to the set of elements forming the urban reality, shaped in development processes. It is assumed that changes of urban features are designed to provide a better response to the needs of all of its user groups. A city is a unit of settlement, so inhabitants are most important and all urban features should be adapted to their needs, including decisions on granting the consent for the activity of economic units, supra-cultural institutions, as well as the presence of tourists, students and other external user groups. Urban communities are also an important part of the city reality, because they express the will to take active part in creating the city. They offer their members the opportunity to get involved and the related sense of being a driving force behind urban transformations. The awareness of a lack of influence on the changes of urban features that are important for living in the city discourages many inhabitants from taking active part in local politics. Their frustration with inactivity is overcome by forming groups that may become pressure groups which successfully enforce the desired changes in the city. A community connected with an idea, views or achievement of a specific goal may even pose a threat to the existing political order, e.g. by initiating and holding a referendum on removing the mayor, president or city council.

The economic effects of the existence of urban communities are usually underestimated. Self-government and state authorities regard such communities as entities involved in the local areas for solving social problems, which only generate costs and constitute an inevitable element of the existence of human settlements, sometimes being a type of social pressure forces. It is rarely assumed that they can earn income or generate profit.⁴ The few examples of actions with measurable financial effects include the community initiatives to organise fund-raising or events (e.g. book fairs, artistic performances) intended to implement charity goals (treatment, care, holidays, reduction of social exclusion, etc.).⁵ Urban communities seek funding for their activities in many places and frequently operate only based on member contributions. Despite this, the non-financial collective benefits obtained by their members may have a significant impact on their spatial behaviours, including the decisions to settle in the city or use public goods and services.

Participation in obtaining collective benefits, as a result of activities of urban social groups, is an argument in favour of getting involved in them. At the same time, communities co-participate in the processes of effective urban management, thus supporting

⁴ Katowice intended to provide an amount not lower than PLN 14.5 million under the multi-annual programme for cooperation between the city of Katowice and non-governmental organisations (Multi-annual programme for cooperation between the city of Katowice and non-governmental organisations in 2016-2020, p. 9).

⁵ The charity foundation called "Siepomaga" declares on their website that over 4.2 mln people have already been involved in their activities (www.siepomaga.pl, access: 11 January 2020).

the creation of urban advantages. Their areas of involvement should include not only social initiatives undertaken by authorities, occasional events or use of cultural sites and sports and leisure facilities. The most valuable thing is to gather the authors of urban goods and services, including people who enrich the entire local offer with their work and talents. Even if what motivates them is their individual or private elements of collective benefits, creation of favourable conditions to gather them is still in the interest of the city. Urban development accomplished in this manner will be expressed by increased satisfaction of inhabitants with the quality of living in the city. This measure of development is not economically precise, but when we translate it to the behaviours of inhabitants, we get an opportunity to examine the migration balance, involvement of people who are interested in building detached houses, renovating flats, planting trees, improving the aesthetic qualities of their city, sponsoring the operation of municipal institutions, as well as voter turnout and distribution of political preferences. Development inspired by collective participation of inhabitants in adapting the city to their needs is a dream of many self-government authorities.

Summary

Common goods are produced by communities, i.e. special social groups formed by individuals who are connected with an idea, goals, views, etc. Collective benefits originate in the process of creating common good. They are a result of cooperation between group members and as such, they are included in the offer of urban common goods. Cities develop in the desired directions if they take into consideration the needs of their users, and particularly their inhabitants, in the first place. Their preferences express well the goals of communities, which are established in order to increase the settlement attractiveness of places in the city, created for them by the local authorities and commercial development authors. Collective benefits obtained from the activity of communities motivate particular individuals to get involved in the changes of urban features which they desire. Although such benefits refer to satisfying individual needs, they result from the existence of communities and are consequently obtained by all their members, thus offering an advantage of being a city user.

References

- Arias, Maria and Charles Gascon and David Rapach. 2016. Metro Business Cycle. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 94, 90-108. DOI: 10.1016/j.jue.2016.05.005.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. *Płynna nowoczesność*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2004. Ponowoczesność. In: *Słownik społeczny*. Edited by Bogdan Szlachta, 903-904. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Błaszczczyk, Mateusz. 2007. O więzi sąsiedzkiej w środowisku wielkomiejskim. In: *Współczesna socjologia miasta. Wielość ogłędów i kierunków badawczych dyscypliny*. Edited by Iwona Borowik and Krzysztof Szałt, 101-119. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo UWr.
- Cities for All. Proposals and Experiences towards the Right to the City*. 2010. Edited by Ana Sugranyes and Charlotte Mathivet. Santiago: Habitat International Coalition.

- Coaffee, Jon and Patsy Healey. 2003. 'My Voice: My Place': Tracking Transformations in Urban Governance. *Urban Studies*, 40, 1979-1999.
- Czornik, Małgorzata. 2012. *Konsumpcja miejska. Ekonomiczne refleksje nad ewoluowaniem funkcji miejskich*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo UE.
- Czornik, Małgorzata. 2017. Twórcy miejskich dóbr wspólnych. *Studia Miejskie*, 28, 43-58. DOI: 10.25167/sm2017.028.03.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1996. *The New Golden Rule. Community and Morality in Democratic Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Foster, Sheila. 2011. Collective Action and the Urban Commons. *Notre Dame Law Review*, 87(1), 57-133.
- Gawkowska, Aneta. 2004. Komunitaryzm. In: *Słownik społeczny*. Edited by Bogdan Szlachta, Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Gorzelał, Grzegorz. 2000. Zewnętrzna interwencja jako czynnik rozwoju lokalnego (na przykładzie Programu Inicjatyw Lokalnych). *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, 3(3), 99-120.
- Hardin, Garrett. 1968. The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science*, 162, 1243-1248. DOI: 10.1126/science.162.3859.1243.
- Harvey, David. 2012. *Rebel Cities. From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London, New York: Verso.
- Hryniewicz, Janusz. 2000. Endo- i egzogeniczne czynniki rozwoju gospodarczego miast i regionów. *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, 2(2), 53-77.
- Iaione, Christian. 2016. The CO-City: Sharing, Collaborating, Cooperating, and Commoning in the City. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 75(2), 415-455. DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12145.
- Kleotko, Marta. 2018. Między lokalnością a wspólnotowością, czyli o wspólnototwórczych właściwościach scen miejskich. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Folia Sociologica*, 64, 5-19. DOI: 10.18778/0208-600X.64.01.
- Kulawiak, Anita. 2016. Czynniki endogenne w rozwoju gospodarczym małego miasta – studium porównawcze. Przykład Uniejowa i Dąbia nad Nerem. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Folia Geographica Socio-oconomica*, 23, 171-185. DOI: 10.18778/1508-1117.23.10.
- Kuźnik, Florian and Marcin Baron. 2017. Economic Basis for Functioning of a Smart City. *Studia Regionalia*, 51, 83-103. DOI: 10.12657/studreg-51-06.
- Lipok-Bierwiaczonek, Maria. 2011. *Od socrealizmu do postmodernizmu. Unikatowe Nowe Tychy. Przewodnik po szlaku miejskim*, Tychy: Urząd Miasta Tychy.
- Łapniewska, Zofia. 2015. (Re)claiming Space by Urban Commons. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 49(1), 54-66. DOI: 10.1177/0486613415616217.
- Maffesoli, Michel. 2008. *Czas plemon. Schyłek indywidualizmu w społeczeństwach ponowoczesnych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Millon-Delsol, Chantal. 1995. *Zasada pomocniczości*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Nelson, Robert. 1999. Privatizing the Neighborhood: A Proposal to Replace Zoning with Private Collective Property Rights to Existing Neighborhoods. *George Mason Law Review*, 7(4), 827-880.
- OECD. 2015. *The Metropolitan Century: Understanding Urbanisation and Its Consequences*. Paris: OECD. Publishing <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264228733-en>.
- Olson, Mancur. 1971. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Olster, Carol. 2002. *Grupy*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 2013. *Dysponowanie wspólnymi zasobami*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wolters Kluwer Business.
- Polko, Adam. 2015. Strategie kolektywnego działania w miejskich przestrzeniach publicznych. *Studia KPZK*, 161, 172-179.
- Simpson, Brent and Ozan Aksoy. 2017. Cumulative Advantage in Collective Action Groups: How Competition for Group Members alters the Provision of Public Goods. *Social Science Research*, 66, 1-21. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.03.001.
- Sokolowicz, Mariusz. 2017. Miejskie dobra wspólne (commons) z perspektywy ekonomii miejskiej. *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, 4 (70), 23-40. DOI: 10.7366/1509499547002.

- Stöhr, Walter and D.R. Fraser Taylor. 1981. Development from Above or Below? The Dialectics of Regional Planning in Developing Countries. In: *Regional Development Alternatives: International Perspectives, United Nations Centre for Regional Development, Regional Development Series*, Vol. 2. Edited by Akin Mabogunje and Rameshwar Misra, 9-26. Nagoya: Maruzen Asia.
- Tuziak, Bożena. 2016. Autorytet władz gminnych jako element kapitału społecznego a nierówności w rozwoju na poziomie lokalnym. *Nierówności Społeczne a Wzrost Gospodarczy*, 48(4), 347-359. DOI: 10.15584/nsawg.2016.4.26.
- Ustawa z dnia 8 marca 1990 roku o samorządzie gminnym*. „Dziennik Ustaw” 1990, 16, poz. 95.
- Vazquez Alfredo and Pablo Gonzalez. 2016. Knowledge Economy and the Commons: A Theoretical and Political Approach to Postneoliberal Common Governance. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 48(1), 140-157. DOI: 10.1177/0486613415586991.
- Walter, Jorge and Christoph Lechner and Franz Kellermanns. 2007. Knowledge Transfer between and within Alliance Partners: Private versus Collective Benefits of Social Capital. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(7), 698-710. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.01.026.
- Wieloletni program współpracy miasta Katowice z organizacjami pozarządowymi na lata 2016-2020*. 2015. Urząd Miasta Katowice.