

Resident participation in Local Neighbourhoods

Case study: Amsterdam Oud-West



Susanne van Gelder

Radboud University Nijmegen



Gemeente Amsterdam
Stadsdeel West

Resident participation in Local Neighbourhoods

Case study: Amsterdam Oud-West

Susanne van Gelder

S4176545

January 2013

Master Thesis Human Geography

Supervisor:

Dr. Olivier Kramsch



Gemeente Amsterdam
Stadsdeel West

Preface

In front of you lies my master thesis regarding resident participation in Amsterdam Oud-West. This thesis is part of the final stage of the Master of Science “Human Geography” at the Radboud University of Nijmegen. As I come from the Randstad and have studied there most of my academic career, I must say it was a very pleasant experience studying in Nijmegen. I would like to thank everyone in Nijmegen for their kindness and all the professors for their interesting courses.

Obviously, I would like to thank one professor in particular, my thesis supervisor Olivier Kramsch. In the beginning I switch topics a couple of times, but he always remained patient and understanding. I am very grateful for this as well as for his help and his comments which got me on the right track in the end.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the Municipality of Amsterdam and everyone I worked with during my internship. I especially would like to thank my supervisor during the internship, Frans Vlietman, for his help, his support and the good talks we had.

I would also like to thank all the participants of the research for giving me some of their time and for the inspiring conversations; I couldn't have done it without them.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for all their support from the start of my academic career. It wasn't always easy as I doubted my choices sometimes, but they supported me in every decision I made. The last couple of weeks have been very busy as I am moving to another apartment; as I am finishing this master thesis, they are putting together my new bed! I am thankful for all the energy they have put in my academic career as well.

All there is left to say is to wish you a pleasant time reading my master thesis.

Susanne van Gelder

Amsterdam, January 2013

Table of contents

Preface	3
Table of Contents	4
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Research question & research methods	8
1.2 Societal relevance	8
1.3 Scientific relevance	11
1.4 Structure of the thesis	12
2. Theoretical Framework	13
2.1 Participation	13
2.2 Neighbourhood attachment	14
2.3 Social Capital	20
2.3.1 Political participation	21
2.3.2 Civic participation	22
2.3.3 Religious Participation	23
2.3.4 Connections in the workplace	23
2.3.5 Informal social connections	23
2.3.6 Altruism, volunteering and philanthropy	24
2.3.7 Reciprocity, honesty and trust	25
2.3.8 Small groups, social movements and the net	25
2.3.9 What caused the decline of social capital?	25
2.3.10 Reflections by Putnam	28
2.3.11 Some critical notes	29
2.4 Relationship Participation - Neighborhood Attachment – Social capital	33
3. Data and Methodology	34
3.1. Research Methodology and Research Methods	34
3.1.1 Research Methods	34
3.2 Research Population	37
3.3 Basic descriptive results from the survey	39

4. Case study Amsterdam Oud-West	41
4.1 Neighbourhood attachment	41
4.1.1 Gentrification and preference of staying	41
4.1.2 Functional attachment	43
4.1.3 Cultural attachment	44
4.1.4 Economic attachment	45
4.1.5 Social attachment	45
4.1.6 Political attachment	47
4.1.7 Other factors	47
4.1.8 Partial conclusion	47
4.2 Social capital	48
4.2.1 Social networks	48
4.2.2 Trust in the local authorities	51
4.2.3 Norms and values	52
4.2.4 Partial conclusion	53
4.3. Participation	54
4.3.1 Quantitative data regarding participation	54
4.3.2 Why participate or not participate?	55
4.3.3 New policy of the local authority	61
4.3.4 Partial conclusion	64
5. Conclusion	66
5.1 Introduction	66
5.2. Summary	66
5.2.1 Conclusion research questions	68
5.3. Recommendations	73
5.4. Reflections on research	75
5.4.1 Suggestions for improvement	75
5.4.2 Suggestions for further research	75
Reference list	77
Appendix	79

1. Introduction

Two years ago District West of the Municipality of Amsterdam implemented a new policy. The implementation of the new policy went hand in hand with a reorganisation of the Municipality of Amsterdam. Before the reorganization, the municipality existed out of fourteen districts. Since 2010, there are only seven districts left. One of the districts is District West. District West is divided into four smaller districts; each district has several neighbourhoods. The smaller district Amsterdam Oud-West will be used as the case study of this thesis (Factsheets West, 26-04-2011).

Amsterdam Oud-West exists out of nine neighbourhoods (Factsheets West, 26-04-2011), though most residents, when asked where they live, will speak of Oud-West instead of mentioning the neighbourhood. Amsterdam Oud-West is considered a good part of Amsterdam next to the city centre of Amsterdam. It hasn't always been like that though. For the past ten years Amsterdam Oud-West has gone through a transformation. I remember a friend of mine, whose grandma lives in Amsterdam Oud-West for over thirty years, telling me that as a child she played among the junkies when visiting her grandma. The transformation Amsterdam Oud-West went through is the result of the new urbanites that moved into the neighbourhoods; urbanites with a higher social status than the residents who originally lived in Amsterdam Oud-West. This process is better known as gentrification (Bernt & Holm, 2005).

As Amsterdam as a city became more and more popular among the Dutch in general, it drew two income families, also known as yuppies, to the city. Given the fact that Amsterdam Oud-West is next to the city centre of Amsterdam, it became a popular spot for these new urbanites or yuppies to settle down. As a result Amsterdam Oud-West is now a quite safe, quiet and wealthy part of the city (Factsheets West, 26-04-2011).

The implementation of the new policy that is mentioned above was introduced after Amsterdam Oud-West was gentrified. The new policy regards resident participation and was implemented in 2010. The policy strives to involve the local community, existing out of residents, property owners and entrepreneurs, in the formulation of the policy as well as to involve these groups in carrying out the formulated policy; working together to improve the neighbourhood. In this way, policy should better reflect what is happening in the neighbourhoods and what is needed. The underlying idea is that by creating active citizens, these citizens should become more self-reliant or independent (Powerpoint "Buurtgericht werken", Stadsdeel West, Gemeente Amsterdam).

In "*Leren van de Stad*" Pieter van Vliet (2012) explains the three stages of resident participation in the Netherlands. In the 1970s resident participation referred to the local government formulating a plan and asking the residents for their opinion. During the 1990s, interactive policy formulation was introduced; the local government asked residents to think along. Now, residents are

not only asked to think along, but also to be involved in carrying out the policy; the role of the local government is to facilitate (van Vliet, 2012). However, this third generation of resident participation isn't going as smoothly as the local government had hoped for. Six months after the implementation of the new policy, District West had to conclude that a lot of residents are not familiar with this new policy and that residents, who were aware, believe that the overview of the neighbourhoods doesn't correspond with what was going on in these neighbourhoods (Eindrapport: Tussentijdse Evaluatie Buurtgericht Werken, 2011). In 2012 I approached the district for an internship and was asked to research resident participation in Amsterdam Oud-West as they were still struggling to get residents to become involved and to keep them involved.

During this internship I spoke with Gürbüz Yabas of District West, who is responsible for shaping resident participation in District West. Yabas explains he is working on creating a change of mentality among officials working for the district and residents living in the district. The goal is to give residents as much responsibility as possible. The role of the district should only be to facilitate the residents in their needs. How much can be done by residents themselves depends on the situation, which means that in each case the role the residents and the district take on will be considered (interview Gürbüz Yabas, 17-07-2012).

Why then this change in policy? After the Second World War, the relationship between citizens and the government changed into one where the citizen asked and the government then did, clarifies Yabas. Citizens didn't question themselves anymore and stopped asking what they could do to get a problem solved. This has become problematic for three reasons. First of all, as a result, a lot of policy was created but citizens remained unsatisfied. Second of all, policy and the carrying out of the policy turned out to be little effective. Third of all, due to the economic crisis, the government finds itself in a difficult position and is faced with high budget cuts. Yabas also emphasises that in the current era, citizens have become more assertive and the society very complex. It is the task of the government to respond to the changing society (Interview Gürbüz Yabas, 17-07-2012).

Thus residents need to become active citizens again. However, this is easier said than done. Denise Bextens (2010) wrote a master thesis about resident participation in distressed urban areas. Bextens (2010) researched four approaches to stimulate resident participation. The conclusion of the master thesis was that each approach had the same participation rate, because the same residents participated each time. Taking this into account as well as the problem of District West to get residents to participate, it raises the question why some residents in Amsterdam Oud-West are motivated to participate actively in their neighbourhoods and why others aren't.

Like the master thesis of Bextens (2010), most research on this topic is done in distressed urban areas though. In these neighbourhoods it might be easier to convince residents that they need to work together and show an active attitude in order to solve the problems in the neighbourhood.

Amsterdam Oud-West, on the other hand, as mentioned before, is going strong. This raises the question how residents can be convinced to participate in their neighbourhood, when everything is going well on first sight? Arguments for social cohesion and open public space are usually used for the improvement of safety in a neighbourhood, but when residents already feel safe, why get involved with your neighbours? Especially, considering the individualistic era we live in.

The goal of this thesis is to research the considerations of residents when it comes to participating actively in their neighbourhood or not. Research shows there is clear link between participation, neighbourhood attachment and social capital (e.g. Dekker 2007; Putnam, 2000). Therefore, the research focuses on how neighbourhood attachment and social capital affect participation. Are residents with high neighbourhood attachment and high social capital more likely to participate?

1.1 Research question & research methods

Central research question: To what extent are residents of local neighbourhoods still tied to their neighbourhood and to what extent do these ties or the lack of ties with the neighbourhood effect the degree of participation? Considering the outcome, will it be useful for the local government to continue focusing on activating residents in local neighbourhoods?

The research question thus focuses on whether there is a relationship between the degree of connection with the neighbourhood and the degree of active participation in the neighbourhood. To measure the connection residents have with their neighbourhood the following two factors will be analysed: neighbourhood attachment (fives forms of neighbourhood attachment will be discussed in the theoretical framework) and the social capital of residents.

The data will be collected through group interviews and through a survey among the participants of the group interviews to gather some background information. The interview strategy will be semi-structured. Three themes will be discussed: neighbourhood attachment, social capital and participation. In order to answer the main research question, participants are asked how they relate to their neighbourhood, how they relate to their neighbours and to what extent they are active in their neighbourhood and why. Participants are free to start a conversation between each other and share their thoughts about the three themes.

1.2 Societal relevance

Not long ago citizens were demanding to have a say in matters. Through protests, strikes and demonstrations they tried to break open hierarchical and closed structures. In the current era, it is

the other way around, the state wishes, or sometimes even demands, that its citizens participate (Uitermark & van Beek, 2010). The wish that citizens contribute to their ability can not be criticized, state Uitermark & van Beek (2010), as participation can be associated with citizenship, democracy, responsibility and social quality. Docherty, Goodlad & Paddison (2001) also emphasise that an active civil society has its relevance because it is said to support democracy and protect society from an excessive state power, which is supported by Dekker (2007, pp.356) who argues that participation “*is the key area in which the delegation of power evolves*”. Docherty et.al. (2001) further explain that participation improves the performance of the state which together results in an increase of the quality of life. However, Uitermark & van Beek (2010) argue that it is rarely questioned whether the state is the suitable actor in society to realise participation since the relevance of participation is undisputed. The idea behind the ‘participation state’ is that participation needs to be stimulated and controlled. Uitermark & van Beek (2010) question which and whose need this policy provides. Does participation come from the wish and initiative from the citizens or is it led by officials and administrators? Secondly, Uitermark & van Beek (2010) wonder how effective the policy is; do individuals and communities participate more, more intensive and better when governments and officials direct them? Their research shows that when officials appeal, encourage or support citizens, the original objective is being pushed to the background and initiatives of citizens are being repressed in the professional noise. Uitermark & van Beek (2010) thus believe that little will come of the civil society when the state interferes too much; the self-resolving power of citizens becomes undermined and participation becomes an extension of policy.

Taylor (2000) also sees some bumps on the road when it comes to the partnership between the state and citizens. According to Taylor (2000) the partnership that comes out of the ‘participation state’ is a time-consuming and complex process. More over, it is irrelevant and “*dumps the responsibility for failed services on those least equipped to cope with that responsibility and fails to involve the bulk of population*” (Taylor, 2000, pp.1029). Yet, Taylor (2000) also refers to positive sides of a partnership between the state and citizens; by working together they can make use of each other knowledge, human and social capital; e.g. the local residents knowledge of the local conditions.

Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011) on the other hand, clearly have a different opinion. Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011) state there is lots of discussion about the distrust of citizens when it comes to the government and the gap between citizens and the government. However, in the case of their research on resident initiatives, Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011) claim that the government is seen as an ally who can control other residents; one of the classic tasks of the government. Initiators want to have a say in the process because it regards their neighbourhood and their money, but officials are important because they have the skills and the knowledge. Other arguments for involving officials according to Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011) are to preserve the public interest, because officials are

more rational and less emotional and because residents can learn from them.

The above raises the question whether participation should be stimulated by the state or not? What is the use of participation if it doesn't come from within the citizens themselves? Is it really a problem if they do not wish to make use of their democratic rights, if it is a free choice not to make use of it? Let's take a basic democratic right as voting as an example. In some countries citizens don't have the right to vote, although they would like to have that right. In the Western world we have a negative judgement over these developments. However, how do we feel about citizens in the Netherlands who have the right to vote, but personally decide not to make use of this right? Is this a reason to be worried? Should the state try to get them to vote anyway? Is it really a problem that someone chooses not to make use of their rights? Having the state involved has its advantages as described by Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011). Yet, the problem faced by the local government in Amsterdam is that only few residents actually participate; it is an exception to participate not the rule. The question is how democratic this policy then really is. Those who participate decide what happens and how the money is spend. It is unknown if decisions are widely supported and whether this small group of participants represents the interest of the neighbourhood or just of their own. What do you tell residents who complain about some yellow artwork that is placed in front of their door all of a sudden? 'You should have been present at the meeting'? Local governments are democratically elected. They are expected to be more professional and objective in their decision making. Participation might add to the delegation of power, but when the local government pulls the string at least there is not an unequal division of power between residents. Some residents might not be in the position to participate; this policy focus could disadvantage these residents. In this thesis the considerations of residents to participate are being researched. By knowing why some participate and others don't, it can be determined how to stimulate participation, but also if it is really useful to have a policy focus on stimulating participation and whether the local government is really the party to be responsible. Thus, the thesis will also focus on the relationship between the local government and its residents, which is one of the indicators of social capital (see theoretical framework).

Where trust in authorities is an indicator of social capital, participation also adds to the development of social capital. It creates the formation of networks; it connects people so that they get to know each other and learn to trust one another. By working together to solve problems, participation can add to the development of public morality (Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011). On the other hand, residents with high social capital in the neighbourhood and high neighbourhood attachment are the ones who participate the most (Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011), while social capital is more important for residents with low economic capital (Uitermark & Duyvendak, 2007). Thus, there is an obvious cycle where participation creates social capital, social capital then creates more participation. Secondly, social capital can bridge the gap between citizens and the government

(Putnam, 2000). Both arguments prove the relevance of social capital in this research.

However, the partnership between state and citizens can place a strain on social capital as well. First, because of the tensions within the representative democracy, and second because of the conditions placed upon the partnership. These two factors can hurt the development of social capital and trust within the community and between the two parties, state and citizens (Taylor, 2000).

Finally, neighbourhood attachment will be considered in this thesis. According to the essay “*Mensen maken de Stad*” (Uitermark & Duyvendak, 2006) programmes to stimulate participation and social cohesion are not just about citizenship, but about street citizenship (*staatburgerschap* vs. *straatburgerschap*). The authors state that this is feasible, because in general citizens are mostly active near their house. The latter is especially true in the case of citizens with low economic, social and cultural capital (Uitermark & Duyvendak, 2006). This is an argument for a policy focus on the local neighbourhood. However, within scientific research it is still debated to what extent residents are still tied to their neighbourhood. If the government has a policy focus on neighbourhoods and concludes that it is difficult to activate people, a reason could be that residents aren't that tied to their neighbourhoods anymore; neighbourhoods could have, possibly, become solely a place to live. Are residents not very willing to participate in their neighbourhood according to the new policy of the local government because they are not interesting in participating or because they are just not interesting to participate with their neighbours in their neighbourhood? In that case, it could be questioned what use it has to have of a policy focus activating residents in local neighbourhoods.

1.3 Scientific relevance

In many cases, research questions for the master thesis are a result from literature studied by students on their topic of interest. However, in this case, the research question came from practice. It is therefore less difficult to justify the societal relevance than justifying the scientific relevance of this thesis. This doesn't mean there is now scientific relevance to this research though. As the theoretical framework will show in the case of neighbourhood attachment, there is no unanimous view on the relevance of neighbourhoods to residents and the importance of resident participation. This thesis hopes to contribute to either one of the lines of reasoning within scientific research by adding empirical examples through the case study of Amsterdam Oud-West. Second of all, I noticed that many research on participation and neighbourhood attachment is done in distressed urban areas. This thesis adds to the literature by focusing on participation and neighbourhood attachment in an urban area with a high social status. This research area is relevant because the local government is still striving to activate the residents of this area, despite the fact the area is doing well.

Dekker (2007) also emphasises there is little research on the relationship between

participation, neighbourhood attachment and social capital; most research only focuses on the relationship between participation and neighbourhood attachment or between participation and social capital. However, as the theoretical framework will show the three terms are interrelated.

Finally, as from the start of the first trial of Prime Minister Rutte and his government, active citizenship and self-reliance has been put high on the agenda again within the Netherlands. Even though the topic of participation has been researched in the past, it is interesting to see how the society is now responding to the change of relationship between the government and its citizens that is being created through this new policy. Results of the past may not be applicable anymore, due to the changing society; the assassinations of Pim Fortuyn (2002) and Theo van Gogh (2004) along with the rise of the politician Geert Wilders is said to have hardened the Dutch society over the past ten years. These events could have affected the rate of social capital among residents in their neighbourhood for example. Although this is not the research area of this thesis and won't be a topic of discussion unless participants bring it up themselves, it is relevant to reconsider neighbourhood attachment and social capital within the local urban area again given the changes in society.

1.4 Structure of the thesis

The thesis exists out of five chapters, including this introduction. The second chapter contains the theoretical framework in which the theory regarding participation, neighbourhood attachment and social capital will be discussed. The third chapter is the data and methodology chapter which describes the research method and the process. The fourth chapter discusses the data that has been collected and in the final chapter, chapter five, conclusions will be drawn and recommendations will be formulated.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Participation

According to Dekker (2007) participation is a key area when it comes to the delegation of power and its involvement. By involving the community through participation, the community is given a voice. Participation means residents who influence the social and physical space of their neighbourhood by participating actively. Two forms of participation can be distinguished: formal participation and informal participation. Residents who take part in and influence the decision-making processes which are related to issues in the neighbourhood, are participating formally in their neighbourhood. The extent to which residents have a say and can influence the decision-making process, depends on the degree of openness of the local government. It also depends on the individual capacity of the resident to influence the decisions being made. Examples of formal participation in neighbourhood are residents who actively participate in neighbourhood councils or who are involved in drawing up plans for the neighbourhood. Formal participation means mutual exchange and dialogue taking place between authorities, like the local government or housing cooperatives, and residents (Dekker, 2007). This research focuses on the relationship between the local government and the residents of Oud-West. Those residents who are involved in the policy of the local government are considered to participate formally.

Informal participation, on the other hand, refers to residents who are members of a street committee which organizes events in the neighbourhood, like a barbeque or a street parade, or a committee that keeps order in the neighbourhood by dealing with loiterers. Even though informal participation can sometimes seem like irrelevant or only for fun, it is seen as essential when it comes to neighbourhood governance, because it may enhance the possibility in which residents will participate formally (Dekker, 2007). However, Dekker (2007) point out that resident participation is a difficult issue; feeling part of a neighbourhood doesn't necessarily mean people are willing to spend time participating, whether formally or informally. When residents do not participate simply because they rather spend time on other things, there is no big problem argues Dekker (2007), but when residents do not participate because they are not able to for whatever reasons, it becomes more problematic. This raises the question what motivates some residents and what keeps others from participating?

Besides neighbourhood attachment and social capital, which are two key topics of this research and will be discussed separately from this part, there are other indicators for participation. The literature mainly refers to socioeconomic status, ethnicity, socio-demographic characteristics and housing characteristics. It is said that residents with a low socioeconomic status, relating to

income, work and education, are less likely to participate formally, because they have less developed skills, less access to institutions and a lower social capital (Dekker, 2007; Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011; Lupi, de Stigter-Speksnijder, Karsten, Musterd & Deben, 2007).

Ethnic minorities like African American and African women, on the other hand are more likely to participate. Their participation is often related to group consciousness: the interest of the group is more important than the interest of the individual (Dekker, 2007).

A fifth indicator that influences participation is socio-demographic characteristics. These characteristics indicate a resident's stake in the neighbourhood. Housewives, people with children and elderly are considered to spend more time in the neighbourhood and therefore, have more social contact. These indicators influence participation positively (Dekker, 2007; Lupi et al. 2007; Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011). Finally, owning a house has a positive influence on participation. Homeowners invest more in the locality and often made a positive choice to live there as they chose to buy a house instead of renting one which is more of a commitment (Dekker, 2007).

The above mentions the indicators that positively influence participation. Evelien Tonkens and Imrat Verhoeven (2011), however, researched initiatives of residents throughout Amsterdam. Tonkens & Verhoevens' (2011) research discusses the motivation of residents to participate actively in their neighbourhoods. According to this research, initiators have social motives to do something for others and pragmatic motives to solve problems as slinging garbage and lack of contact or togetherness. Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011) do relate the social motives of initiators to help others to the architecture of the neighbourhoods; by closely living together residents are more aware of each others problems and are more confronted with the consequences.

2.2 Neighbourhood attachment

This research relates neighbourhood attachment to participation by questioning whether a strong neighbourhood attachment also means more active involvement in the neighbourhood. In other words, do residents participate more in their neighbourhood when they feel to have a strong attachment to it?

Neighbourhood attachment has been a widely researched topic over the past decades and can be related to the research of "place attachment" and "sense of place". The various terms are probably the result of the fact that the topic is researched by several disciplines as geography, sociology and psychology. Even though the three terms do not have the exact same meaning, they have in common that they all refer to bonds and feelings people have with a place or a landscape.

Due to the difference in disciplines the definitions differ in meaning by emphasizing different aspects; Low & Altman (1992) both have a background in psychology and emphasize affect, emotion and feeling in their research on place attachment, Jorgensen & Stedman (2001) mainly use the term

sense of place and emphasise affective, cognitive and conative components and have a background in psychology (Jorgensen) and sociology (Stedman) and Hay (1998), who has a background in geography, makes a distinction between place attachment and sense of place by emphasising that the latter takes the social and geographical context of place bonds into account.

Jorgensen & Stedman (2001), however, do not reject the term place attachment, but suggest that sense of place is a broader concept of which place attachment is a component. Jorgensen & Stedman (2001) argue that place attachment refers to the affective relationship between people and the landscape, while the term sense of place also contains cognitive components as perceptions and beliefs, and conative components as commitments and behavioural intentions, according to Jorgensen & Stedman (2001).

Low & Altman (1992), on the other hand, speak of place attachment. Place attachment is described by Low & Altman (1992, p.2) as *“the bonding of people to places”*. They also emphasise the many features, qualities and properties of the term. The bonding that people have to a place comes from the attachment that they have which is a result of feelings or affect. Low & Altman (1992) also elaborate on the meaning of place. According to them space becomes place when meaning is given to it through personal, group or cultural processes. An example of how this process works is given by the geographer Yi-Fu Tuan, who in his book *“Space and Place”* (1977) explains how space becomes place by referring to a man who enters a maze:

“Once he steps into the maze he will move in a certain manner; exit is his goal but its location is not yet known. By the second or third trail he will have acquired a sense of the location of the exit, and his behaviour changes as he approaches it. After a few trials, then, the subject recognizes and expresses confidence about two localities in the laboratory maze, the entrance and the exit. With further trails he learns to identify more and more “landmarks”, which represents for him stages of a journey. When the subject is able to tread the maze without error the whole maze becomes one locality with appropriate movements. Thus what begins as undifferentiated space, ends as a single object situation or place” (Tuan 1977, pp.70-72).

Besides place attachment and sense of place, a third term, neighbourhood attachment, is used to describe the bond people have with their physical surrounding. Neighbourhood attachment is a term used by geographers and sociologists as Tineke Lupi (2005) and Karien Dekker (2007). Lupi (2005) defines attachment as the specific solidarity to the local territory that is the neighbourhood or living area. Dekker (2007, pp.362) describes neighbourhood attachment as people who *“not only have ties with others, but also feel attracted to and identify with their immediate living environment”*. This point of view corresponds with researcher Bruce Nanzer (2004) definition of sense of place, also

describing it as the way people relate to or feel about their physical surrounding. Nanzer (2004, pp.363) explains that *“certain aspects of the places in which we live begin to take on meanings beyond a shared space. For example, individuals become part of their neighbourhood rather than merely residing there”*.

However, Lupi et.al. (2007) emphasise that because of the quickly changing society, social bonds have become volatile and differentiated and people more rational and individualistic; it is what sociologist Robert Putnam (2000) calls the decline of social capital, which will be discussed later on. The bond residents have with their neighbourhood also changed and it is said that attachment to the neighbourhood is something of the past and as a result researchers now speak of the social disintegration of neighbourhoods. Lupi et.al. (2007) focus in their research on the bonding ties between residents on a small scale like the neighbourhood, which is also the focus of this research.

Lupi et.al. (2007) explain how a hundred years ago the neighbourhood in the Netherlands was the spatial context in which residents spent their daily lives; within this spatial context residents lived, worked and spent their spare time if they had any. The attachment to the neighbourhood was the result of the limited mobility of the residents; residents neither had the time, nor the transport to go far from home. This did not only meant that residents felt a natural and an obvious attachment to the neighbourhood, but it also meant that the neighbourhood existed out of employers and employees, out of rich and poor and out of young and old; in others words the neighbourhood was still a heterogeneous place. The relationships between residents left little space for individual choses and preferences, yet this changed over the years as more and more opportunities for mobility arose as well as welfare.

Many other authors have elaborated on the decline in neighbourhood attachment as described by Lupi et.al. (2007). In *“Networks of a global village”*, Wellman (1999) makes a distinction between neighbourhood ties and community ties, stating it is not the same thing in the Western world anymore. Wellman (1999) refers to the traditional approach which considers community as existing in neighbourhoods and towns. However, Wellman (1999) wonders why it is assumed that the people who support us, who provide us with companionship and a sense of belonging live nearby. Wellman (1999) points to the current era were cars, planes, phones and e-mail are common to all who reside in the Western world, which makes long distance relations possible.

Wellmans' (1999) point of view can be sustained by the research of Hidalgo & Hernández (2001). In their research, Hidalgo & Hernández (2001) analysed three spatial ranges: the house, the neighbourhood and the city. According to their research, the neighbourhood has the weakest level of attachment of all three ranges. Hidalgo & Hernández (2001) ascertain the decrease in activities carried out in the neighbourhood and the possibility of moving back and forth between neighbourhoods even when one has moved out of it, as possible reasons. However, Hidalgo &

Hernández (2001) do not state that residents have no attachment to the neighbourhood; their research shows that the neighbourhood is considered less relevant than ones house or the city.

Other researchers like Wissink & Hazelzat (2012) and Friedman (2007) also stress how neighbourhoods have lost their role as the centre of the community as a result of modernisation. Friedman (2007) mainly points to the increasing spatial scale of social networks which decreases local solidarity.

Bolt, Burgers & van Kempen (1998) on the other hand discern two lines of argument in the discussion around the significance of neighbourhood. The first line supports the point of views mentioned above. However, according to Bolt, Burgers & van Kempen (1998) there is also a second line of reasoning which stresses the important role neighbourhoods and communities still play in our daily lives. This line of reasoning is prominent in the studies of human geography and in the field of urban studies.

Lupi et.al. (2007) neither reject the second line of reasons mentioned by Bolt, Burgers & van Kempen, nor completely want to stand behind the first reasoning. Lupi et.al. (2007) recognize that, nowadays, neighbourhoods are more homogeneous when it comes to social status, that a lot of people no longer live in the city where they were born, nor work in the city they currently live in. In other words, the era in which people solely spent their time in their own neighbourhood or even city has passed, as has the time that residents knew all other residents in their neighbourhood and had intensive contact with each other as well as shared the same religion and political preferences. This point of view is in line with the first reasoning of Bolt, Burgers & van Kempen (1998) and the authors discussed above. Lupi et.al. (2007) note that it seems that socio-spatial sorting processes are growing more and more. Yet, they also believe it is to early to state that attachment to the neighbourhood is something completely of the past as there are still large groups in the society who find themselves in disadvantaged position and who, therefore, still have a strong orientation on the neighbourhood like migrants, elderly and people with a low social status. Secondly, Lupi et.al. (2007) point out that there is a growing group of two-income families who appreciate proximity and accessibility out of practical reasons.

It is clear that within scientific research, it is still a point of discussion to what extent neighbourhoods still matter. Even though many state that people don't care of care less about their neighbourhood, others see or hope to see a new trend coming our way. This research will analyse the attachment of the residents in Amsterdam Oud-West and hopes to contribute to either one of the lines of reasoning about neighbourhood attachment by adding empirical examples.

When it comes to the various terms that represent the bond people have with places, this research will speak of neighbourhood attachment instead of place attachment or sense of place; since it focuses on the geographical and spatial context of the neighbourhood it makes more sense to

speak of neighbourhood attachment. Secondly, it is expected that the term 'neighbourhood attachment' will be clearer for the participants of this research.

Now that the definition of neighbourhood attachment has been discussed, the coming paragraphs will consider the various forms and indicators of neighbourhood attachment. As with neighbourhood attachment, the literature isn't unanimous about the designations of the forms and indicators of neighbourhood attachment either. Used are designations as rational-existential bonding, emotional-aesthetic bonding, group bonding, habitual bonding etc. (Lupi et.al., 2007). In this research the five forms of territorial attachment of Lupi et.al. (2007) will be used, because these five refer to all the points that are considered relevant to determine neighbourhood attachment, as seen by this research.

Thus, Lupi et.al. (2007) distinguishes five forms of territorial attachment: economic attachment, functional attachment, social attachment, political attachment and cultural attachment. Lupi et.al.(2007) emphasise that in the literature there are many designations for territorial attachment.

The first form of territorial attachment is economic attachment. Economic attachment refers to indicators as income generation and the distance between work and home. Nowadays, it is more common to work outside your neighbourhood than in your neighbourhood, as mentioned before. Women were thought to have more attachment to the neighbourhood, because most of them were housewives, but this argument is no longer sustainable now most women have a job as well, explains Lupi et.al. (2007).

The second form of attachment is functional attachment. It refers to the extent residents make use of the facilities in their neighbourhood. Examples of facilities are school, shops, care, cultural, sport and recreation facilities. Residents are no longer tied to their neighbourhood for these facilities, but in general, the neighbourhood still plays an important role when it comes to the basics like groceries (Lupi et.al., 2007).

Social attachment is the third form of attachment. It means the contact residents have with other residents of the neighbourhood. Most people have a social network that transcends the neighbourhood; family and friends often live in other neighbourhoods or cities. Though most people do have fellow residents in their social network, the contact is often limited and practical and also depends on whether or not residents have a click with each other (Lupi et.al., 2007).

Political and cultural attachments are the last two forms of attachment. Political attachment refers to the involvement of residents in their neighbourhood when it comes to taking care of it; e.g. keeping the neighbourhood nice and clean (Lupi et.al., 2007). Yet, often residents only take initiatives in case of big nuisance or extensive problems (Lupi, 2005). Cultural attachment deals with issues as to what extent residents feel at home in and identify with the neighbourhood as well as whether

they are proud of it (Lupi, et.al. 2007).

There are many indicators which influence the various forms of neighbourhood attachment. One of these indicators is age. Older people tend to have a stronger feeling of attachment to the neighbourhood than younger people. The attachment of older people is mainly the result of their attachment to other people in the neighbourhood and the level of contact they have with other residents which is higher than younger people (Low & Altman, 1992; Tuan, 1977).

A second indicator is having children. Being a parent with young children means settling down, taking your children to school, to playgrounds, sport clubs etc.. These places operate as meeting spots with other parents and therefore, influence social and functional attachment (Lupi et.al. 2007).

Another indicator that positively influences social attachment is events in the neighbourhood. According to Tuan (1977) events can build upon strong sentiment for a place in time.

Small size of population (Tuan, 1977), owning a house, the architecture of the neighbourhood (Veldboer, Bergstra & Kleinshans, 2011) and location (Lupi, 2005) are also considered as indicator for neighbourhood attachment. According to Tuan (1977) the small size of the population enhanced the city's sense of self; people knew each other. Tuan (1977, pp.175) also states that the conviction that the nation demands the supreme loyalty of man is a modern passion, *"to be a modern nation, local attachments based on direct experience and intimate knowledge have to be overcome"*.

Veldboer, Bergstra & Kleinshans (2011) explain that it is a popular assumption that owning a house increasing the attachment to the neighbourhood (e.g. Dekker, 2007). However, their research does not sustain this argument. Still, it is an interesting point to keep in mind. Veldboer, Bergstra & Kleinshans (2011) do believe that the architecture of the neighbourhood can positively influence the interaction among residents. This makes sense because; long streets or small streets and a lot of side streets can make a difference in how anonymous residents can be in their neighbourhood.

Not only architecture can influence attachment to the neighbourhood, location is also key. Lupis' (2005) research on neighbourhood attachment shows that in the Amsterdam neighbourhood 'de Banne' people feel a strong identification with their neighbourhood, because it is quite isolated from other parts of the city and a lot of residents have low mobility. Because of these two factors the life of the residents of 'de Banne' mainly takes place in their neighbourhood.

Finally, a much discussed indicator is duration of stay. Low & Altman (1992), Tuan (1977), Friedman (2007) Jorgensen & Stedman (2006), Hay (1998) and Lupi (2005), Lupi et.al. (2007) all mention this indicator as influencing neighbourhood attachment. The common thought is that the longer people stay in a place, the more familiar they become which creates a sense of place (like Tuan's (1977) example of the maze). Tuan (1977) emphasises that even more important than time

spend in a place, is the intensity and the quality of experience people have in a place. This argument corresponds with the extent to which residents make use of the facilities of a neighbourhood; a person can spend a lot of time in the neighbourhood as in staying in its home, however, that creates a strong sense of place of the home, but not necessarily of the neighbourhood. The research of Low & Altman (1992) and Hay (1998) also shows how duration of stay is linked to age. According to Hay (1998, pp.25) the development of a sense of place “*parallels the development of personal maturity (life cycle) and of mature pair bonds (marriage cycle)*” as maturing also means the ability to form a mature relationship with someone or something.

2.3 Social Capital

When it comes to the theory about social capital scholars often refer to the work of Robert Putnam (e.g. Dekker, 2007; Albarracin & Valeva, 2011; Docherty et.al. 2001; Field, 2008; Chaskin, 2001). In his book “Bowling Alone” Robert Putnam (2000), professor at Harvard University, researches the decline of civic engagement in the United States over the past century. Putnam (2000) looks at the various factors that have played a role in the process of social change that led to the slowly disappearance of thousands of community groups.

During the period between 1940 and 1960 civic engagement was on the rise as a result of voting rights for women and the rise of political activists (Putnam, 2000). When the first baby boomers approached college, the future of civic engagement looked brighter than ever before, as Putnam (2000) refers to the many researches that show that education leads to greater social involvement. So where did it go wrong?

In order to the answer the question above, Putnam (2000) refers to the theory of social capital which has a long history, but of which Putnam (2000) himself, James S. Coleman and Pierre Bourdieu are the most known for nowadays (Field, 2008) . The core idea of social capital is that social networks have value. Those networks exist out of connection between individuals which create norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness. Putnam (2000) explains that social capital is closely related to civic virtue. However, according to Putnam (2000) civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a dense network. In general, researches over the past years have focused on social capital to show how social ties made our live more productive; the individual is less helpless when engaging in the civic community. An example that Putnam (2000) gives to demonstrate the value of social capital is that job seekers often find job because of who they know instead of what they know. Who you know is social capital, while what you know refers to human capital. At the same time a society that is characterized by reciprocity is more efficient than a distrustful society; trust is the result of social capital and it is more likely you trust the person you know more than those you don't know.

Putnam (2000) explains that there are various forms of social capital; social capital that comes out of formal participation like an association or informal participation that is the result of a neighbourhood barbeque. However, the most important distinction that can be made is that between *bridging* social capital and *bonding* social capital. *Bonding* social capital means to reinforce exclusive identities and to maintain homogeneity and is good for “*undergirding specific reciprocity and mobilizing solidarity*” (Putnam, 2000, pp.22). Putnam (2000) sees bonding social capital as a kind of sociological superglue.

Bridging social capital refers to bridging people together across diverse social divisions and is good for getting ahead as it creates broader identities and broader reciprocity (Putnam, 2000). Bridging social capital is described by Putnam (2000) as a sociological WD-40. What he means exactly with the latter remains unclear for those who are unfamiliar with the term WD-40.

An important comment of Putnam (2000) is that bridging and bonding are not interchangeable. This means that a policy focus on one or another is not possible; they exist alongside each other as there is no proof that they exist separately.

In his book, Putnam (2000) explains the decline of civil society by referring to America’s bowling league. Today, Americans are less likely to play in formal teams in organized bowling leagues; they prefer to play with friends or family. The reason that Putnam (2000) uses bowling as a metaphor to demonstrate his argument is because the bowling league is an associational activity that brings strangers together on a frequent basis. Participating in a bowling league doesn’t only bring people, who are strangers to each other, together, it also helps to build and sustain a wider set of networks and values that foster reciprocity and trust, which in turn helps to facilitate mutual collaboration.

In his search to find answers for the somewhat mysterious decline of civic engagement, Putnam (2000) considers various factors that have declined. Those factors will be discussed in the following:

2.3.1 Political participation

Political participation has declined over the past decades. This is the result of various reasons. First of all, fewer Americans participate in political parties as volunteers and in political activities as the result of parties being better financed and having more professional staff. Second of all, political parties now communicate through mass marketing instead of approaching community spokespersons and going door to door. Both factors have led to a change of role for citizens; where membership used to be participating actively, it now means donating financial aid (Putnam, 2000). Political parties may not have felt the need for volunteers anymore; however, it raises the question if the changing role of citizens in political parties has led to the gap between politics and citizens nowadays.

A third factor is that despite the fact that baby boomers have enjoyed more education than their parents, it has not led to more participation on political levels. In fact, they are 10-15 per cent less likely to run for congress, 15-20 per cent less interested in politics and even 25 per cent less likely to vote, 30 per cent less likely to attend public meetings and around 40 per cent less likely to engage in either a political or civic organization. In other words, baby boomers have become well-informed *spectators* of public affairs (Putnam, 2000, pp.46).

Finally, Putnam's research (2000) shows that in the 1990s three out of four Americans didn't trust the government. They felt that the people who ran the country didn't really care what happened to the citizens. This is a concerning point since one of the conditions for creating social capital is trust, as mentioned before.

2.3.2 Civic participation

Putnam (2000) explains that American voluntary associations mainly exist out of the following three categories: community based, church based and work based. Even though the number of voluntary associations has almost tripled, the number of membership has not grown in the same speed. This means more groups of which most are much smaller than before the 1950s.

One of the groups, who were the most common association, the Parent-Teacher Association had the most members of all secular organizations in the 1960s, especially during the baby boom. Between the 1940s and the 1960s it was one of America's success stories. However, the growth came to a sudden stop in 1960 and every since 1.2 per cent of all American families have dropped out of the PTA per year. Not all members were completely lost for the civic society; some parents joined competing organizations. Yet, this counts for some parents, while civic society organisations have lost 10-20 per cent of its members during the last 30 years of the twentieth century, not to speak of the immense loss of active membership in clubs and voluntary associations (almost 50 per cent). Even though many Americans still claim to be members of some sort of organisation, they have stopped participating actively and stopped going to meetings, again despite the increase in education (Putnam, 2000).

Interestingly enough, research has shown that time allocations has not changed dramatically over the last period, despite the fact that many may think people have busier lives nowadays. This means that time is spent differently. One of the factors that play a role in this will also be discussed later on is the rise of television (Putnam, 2000).

2.3.3 Religious Participation

Churches have always been the basis for social movements in America. Even though churches are still central source of community life, churches also suffer from a decline in attendance. As in the case with political participation, generation also plays a role here; younger people attend church less and less (Putnam, 2000).

Secondly, churches have a more inward focus and therefore are less engaged with the wider community (Putnam, 2000); those who are lost or never attended are difficult to reach if an organisation has an inward focus.

2.3.4 Connections in the workplace

For the past four decades union membership has declined for several reasons. The transition from an industrial to a service economy, increase in educational level and part-time employment are seen as structural changes that have contributed to this decline. However, according to Putnam these changes only account for 50 per cent of the total decline. More likely is that people have become sceptic about the idea of membership and the factor of individualism also plays a role here (Putnam, 2000).

When it comes to informal social ties at work most employees look forward to working with their colleague and feel like they are part of sort community (Putnam, 2000). Even though, many have close personal connections at work, Putnam (2000) has found no evidence that socializing at work has increased over the past decades, nor that ties at the workplace provide intimate and deep support; connections remain rather casual.

Connections in the workplace are also disturbed as a result of reorganizations which lead to more competition between co-workers. Co-workers drift apart, instead of turning on each other. Job instability has a negative effect on friendships at work and also on engagement in the broader community (Putnam, 2000). This brings in mind yet again the factor of trust that is so important for social and civic engagement.

2.3.5 Informal social connections

In the chapter of informal social ties, Putnam (2000) refers to the terms *matchers* and *schmoozers*. Both are terms come form Yiddish. Matchers refer to people who are very active in the community and participate in formal organizations. Schmoozers on the other hand spend more time in informal conversation. According to Putnam (2000) the difference between matchers and schmoozers reflect social standing life cycle and community attachment. Informal social involvement doesn't depend on the factors mentioned. However, matchers tend to be higher educated and tend to have higher

incomes.

The difference between formal and informal participation is also reflected by age. Formal participation is lowest at a young age and near retirement and high in late middle age. In the case of informal participation it is exactly the other way around as people participate informal the most as young adults, while it declines when people start a family and rises again when they retire. Thus having children means more formal participation in the community, but less informal participation (Putnam, 2000).

Some other characteristics found by Putnam (2000) is the density of social connections which is lower in cities than in villages. Second, contemporary America has more citizens who participate as schmoozers than as machers, which means that people are more engaged with each other as friends than as citizens; people get together twice as much with friends as attending organized meetings. Yet, even friends are visited less. Putnam (2000) explains that a survey of the DDB Needham Life Style shows that in the 1970s the average American had friends over at home about fourteen to fifteen times a year. In the late 1990s this number had dropped to eight times a year. Neighbourhood ties also declined and were in the 1990s almost half as strong than in the mid 1950s; spending an evening with neighbours dropped from thirty times a year to about twenty times a year among married people and from about fifty times a year to about thirty-five times a year among single people. A nice example Putnam (2000) refers to is neighbourhood watch groups against crimes. According to Putnam (2000) people invest more in guns, dogs and locks than in social capital, like neighbourhood watch groups, for crime defence.

Finally, Putnam's (2000) research shows how people have replaced playing a sport for watching a sport, and listening to music instead of playing music together; in 1960 the bowling league had over 125.0000 members while in the late 1990s this figure had fallen to about 40.000 members. Americans know their neighbours less well and spend less time with their friends.

2.3.6 Altruism, volunteering and philanthropy

Social capital is important for volunteering, altruism and philanthropy as it provides the connections to recruit people and call attention to people in need. Education is an important predictor for altruism, while time spent on work is a predictor for volunteering; part-time workers volunteer the most. Volunteers are also positive towards political engagement; they do not reject or are cynical about politics. Social capital is a powerful predictor for philanthropy, even more powerful than finances. Even after natural disasters for example, the social ties people have depends on the rate of involvement. Also, people who have received help from others are more likely to give back. This means that helping people creates a ripple effect and can change behaviour. Yet, despite factors as wealth, education, age, family status etc. community involvement is the most consistent factor for

giving time and money (Putnam, 2000).

In all three cases the baby boomers have turned out to be less involved. However, according to Putnam (2000) there are signs that the generations after the baby boom generation will be more active.

2.3.7 Reciprocity, honesty and trust

All three factors, reciprocity, honesty and trust, are key for social capital. Helping someone can result in reciprocity, which in the end thus means that by helping someone else, you help yourself in the end. Reciprocity also results in a more efficient society, while honesty and trust result in less friction. Yet, people over sixty-five are more trusting and socially inclined than people under forty-five, which is a negative sign for the future of social capital and a peaceful society. Very important is that people, who see that others are doing their share, will make them do their share. While people are discouraged to participate or to care about the neighbourhood when they see nobody else cares (Putnam, 2000).

Putnam (2000), furthermore, explains that as a result of less honesty, trust and reciprocity, people depend more and more on formal institutions for the things they used to get out of informal networks and generalized reciprocity, thus social capital. This is concerning given the fact that formal institutions like the government are drawing back more and more, trying to leave it to the people to fix it themselves.

2.3.8 Small groups, social movements and the net

Fortunately, not all organizations have lost members. Exceptions are support groups and social movements which also create social capital. The most hopeful factor for reinforcing social capital is telecommunications. However, the latter, even though it had had the effect of reinforcing contact, as it is easier to keep in touch, it doesn't necessarily lead to meeting new people and therefore, it doesn't create more social capital. Telecommunications facilitates schmoozing and easy contact that takes less time, but it is not clear whether it will offset the decline of social capital (Putnam, 2000).

2.3.9 What caused the decline of social capital?

The above is an overview of the various engagements and factors that have declined over the past decades and show the decline in social capital. The question is why people are less engaged with their surroundings than before; what has happened?

According to Putnam (2000) pressures of time and money, mobility and sprawl, technology and mass media and the transition of generation play a role.

In the case of pressure of time, it is true that the well-educated middle class parents of the 1990s have less free time on their hands than they had in the 1960s. On the other hand, there is a strange contradiction in the case of time management. Research also shows that people who say to have to the heaviest time pressure are more likely to participate in community projects. Some research also shows that people have more free time than before (referring to the 1990s) and that the amount of free time people have doesn't determine whether they will participate or not (Putnam, 2000). More important is how people classify their time or as Putnam (2000, pp.192) puts it "*ER before the Red Cross and Friends before friends*".

Financial pressure plays only a small role according to Putnam (2000). It may account for 5-10 per cent of the decline of social capital as it is not low income that is a determinant, but more financial worry that keeps people away from community involvement and activities.

There is, however, one factor that has had an impact on society in more ways and that is women who compared to the 1950s and 1960s have started to participate in working life for the past decades. Off course, it wasn't if this woman before just sat at home doing nothing, but research has shown that people who work outside the house participate less in community life. Also important is that women who work by choice are more involved than those who work out of necessity. Still, most important is how people decide to classify their time. It has not been proven that people really do not have the time to be involved in community life (Putnam, 2000).

Mobility and sprawl also play a role in the decline of social capital. In high mobility communities, crime rates are higher, school performance is lower and long time residents have fewer ties with their neighbours. A more important factor, though, is life in metropolitan area; it weakens civic engagement and social capital as suburbanites keep more to themselves. Work is often far away and Americans therefore spend an average of seventy-two minutes a day, which is an increase of 26 per cent compared to 1969. People also spend 29 per cent more time on the average shopping trip while the average amount of shopping trip also doubled (Putnam, 2000). Even though, Putnam (2000) states that the difference in mobility and sprawl only account for a small fraction of the decline of social capital, it does show how people have come to spend their time differently, as mentioned before.

Technology and mass media is the third factor that had an effect on the decline of social capital (Putnam, 2000). According to Putnam (2000), news and entertainment has become very individualized; people can listen or watch what they want, wherever they want it after the Walkman was introduced and other technology that allow people to be entertained when they want it. This also means people can do it by themselves. Especially in these times of welfare were everybody has some kind of mp3 player or a mobile phone with lots of options and each house has several televisions.

Newspaper readers on the other hand turn out to be quite social and are both machers and schmoozers (Putnam, 2000). Putnam's (2000) research shows that three out of four Americans who were born in the first third of the twentieth century still read the newspaper, while of their baby boom children less than half read the newspaper and only one in four of their grandchildren sit down with a newspaper. These generations tend to watch the news more, although this is even declining. Why is reading a newspaper or watching the news important? Because it shows some interest in your surroundings and other people lives. Yet, most Americans prefer to watch entertaining programs and spend an average of four hours a day watching TV. This is worrying as watching TV doesn't require much interactions; American husbands and wives spend three to four times as much watching TV as they talk to each other and six to seven times as much as they spend on activities in the community. Watching TV is the single most consistent factor Putnam (2000) has discovered in his search for the decline of social capital. Besides the fact that watching TV takes up much time, it also provides a sort of "*pseudoperonal connection*" (Putnam, 2000, pp.242) that creates ties and associations with the characters and person that people see on TV which compete with the 'real' people in your life.

Finally, the factor "from generation to generation" plays a huge role as already came out of the factors discussed above (Putnam, 2000). Putnam (2000) posed several questions to three generations: generation baby boom, generation X and generation Y. The questions he asked were whether some had voted during the last elections, how often people read the newspaper, if people volunteer or attend club meetings, are interested in politics etc.. The result? According to Putnam's (2000) research, the generation born in the 1920s belongs to twice as much civic associations as the generation of their grandchildren born in the 1960s, they are more than twice as likely to trust other people, they vote at double the rate, are almost twice as much interested in politics and more likely to attend church. They are also almost three times as much likely to follow the news and 35% spent time on community projects the past year, only 15-20 per cent of the younger generation did so. What the above numbers and conclusion show is that the fact that so many of the older generation participate compared to the younger generation reflects the freedom of choice the younger generation has when it comes to spending their time, concludes Putnam (2000), who calls it a form of self-disenfranchisement of the younger groups. Putnam (2000), furthermore, concludes that the younger generation is more concerned about material goods, as a second TV or nice clothes, than contributing to the society. 38 per cent of the adults in 1975 would describe "lots of money" as an element of "the good life" and 38 per cent said it would be "a job that contributes to the welfare of society". In 1996 these numbers had changed to 32 per cent who aspired a job that would contribute to society, while 63% was striving to earn lots of money.

2.3.10 Reflections by Putnam

The research of Putnam (2000) clearly shows that social capital has declined, but why is it so important, why should we care about social capital? According to Putnam (2000), social capital contributes to education and children's welfare, safe and productive neighbourhoods, can lead to economic prosperity as more trust saves money on surveillance for example or you find a job through your network, health and happiness and social capital contributes to a more democratic society as people are more involved in their communities, because again what counts for improving your life is who you know, not what you know.

Does this mean there are only positive points to social capital? According to Putnam (2000) the dark side of social capital is that people might consider solidarity as a loss of freedom and therefore are not interested. A second point is that bonding social capital compared to bridging social capital can have illiberal effects; associations are not always open to liberal democracy and can be intolerant. In some cases bonding social capital could discourage bridging social capital and the other way around. Yet, Putnam (2000) continues to emphasize that by helping others and that through building social capital, you will help yourself.

Whether policy should focus on bonding or bridging social capital depends on the situation. Putnam (2000) gives the example of stimulating small children and making sure they get the structure they need. Bonding social capital will be useful, while for improving public schools bridging social capital at community level should be the answer. Putnam (2000) explains that for the biggest collective problems the kind of bridging social capital is needed, that is the toughest to create and here lies the challenge; how do you create social capital when less and less people are interested?

Putnam (2000) gives some suggestion to the question above, although he also admits he doesn't have all the answer. First of all, it is important to acknowledge the problem, so awareness can be raised. Second, the supply and demand for opportunities for civic engagement must be addressed and new structures and politics need to be created to facilitate the new civic engagement. Important to remember is that even though actions by individuals aren't enough to restore community involvement, but they are necessary; it is not enough because a meeting is not a meeting when only one person attends. Thus communities should be restored through collective and individual initiatives. In order to arouse these initiatives, people need to be made aware of the collective significance of connecting socially. Policy should focus on civics education in school, community service programs as part of the school curriculum as it has been proven that volunteering at a young age is a predictor of adult volunteering. Finally, extracurricular activities also improve civic and social involvement later on in life.

In order to breath new life into social capital and civic engagement, local governments need

to provide living areas for residents that exist out of “*more integrated and pedestrian-friendly areas, and that the design of our communities and the availability of public space will encourage more casual socializing with friends and neighbours*” (Putnam, 2000, pp.408). Putnam (2000) also emphasizes that policy should focus on using new forms of electronic entertainment and communication to reinforce civic engagement. When he wrote this book in 2000, Facebook wasn’t as big as it is today, but it could now be a platform he is referring to. Obviously, Putnam (2000) isn’t suggesting that these platforms or other electronic entertainment should be used to replace face-to-face contact, but it should facilitate making face-to-face contact.

Putnam (2000) also suggests to use art as a way to bind diverse groups. He refers to a successful project, Liz Lerman’s Dance Exchange, which built unlikely community togetherness by bringing together unemployed shipyard workers and white-collar professionals for community-based modern dance.

Finally, the political side of local governments should also play a role by using their campaign to address the importance of social capital. Decision making should be brought down to smaller, local jurisdictions. False debates should be avoided while creating awareness of the importance of social capital. Examples of false debates are “top-down versus bottom-up” as the role of national and local institutions should be complementary; the problems can only be solved while working together. A second false debate is whether the government is the problem or the solution (Putnam, 2000). Putnam (2000) refers to historical records that it can be both. The final false debate would be whether trust and community bonds should be restored by individual change or institutional change. In this case, the answer is also both. To conclude, Putnam (2000) states that it is good to keep in mind that if people don’t really want more community, they won’t get it.

2.3.11 Some critical notes

“*Bowling Alone*” is an extensive book about the decline of social capital. Putnam (2000) tried to research every angle he could find. The book therefore gives a lot of information, figures and facts which are useful to draw one’s own conclusions and can be used as a guideline for research in other countries regarding the topic of social capital. However, the final conclusion is that the mystery of social capital hasn’t been solved. Even Putnam (2000) himself recognizes that the main factors that have come out of his research, as the rise of television and a transition of generation, aren’t sufficient to explain the entire decline. Putnam (2000) doesn’t always have strong argumentation because of this. An example is the argument of telecommunications as a way to facilitate schmoozing, while it was yet to be seen if this would be the case. A second example is the argument that there are signs that the younger generation will be more involved and active. Even though he gives some proof for it, the proof remains thin as Putnam (2000) talks about signs which

are yet to be proven; it gives a sense of guesswork. Thus what Putnam (2000) proves with his book is the decline of social capital, but who expected to find a clear answer of why will be disappointed after finishing reading Putnam's (2000) theory.

A second criterion on Putnam's (2000) work would be the attention he pays on some topics that seem important, but how important would be the question giving the few words he spent on the topics. The distinction he makes between bridging and bonding social capital is an example. Putnam (2000) only spends a page and a half on this topic and leaves in the middle how to achieve bridging and bonding. At the end of the book he does give an example, but it is very little if organisations would like to base a policy on Putnam (2000) philosophy. Yet, maybe the latter is the problem; *Bowling Alone* gives a lot of information, but lacks a strong philosophy one could work with to turn the decline around.

When it comes to bridging and bonding social capital, Putnam (2000) makes an interesting statement by concluding that a policy focus on either one would not be possible as there is no prove that it exist separately. Therefore, bridging and bonding social capital are not interchangeable. However, just because there isn't prove that it exist separately, does this means it is not possible? That policymakers can not strive for one or the other? Doesn't it depend on the goal you would like to achieve? I can imagine that in the Dutch multicultural society, the Dutch government would like to see a little less bonding and a little more bridging social capital as the different cultural groups do not seem to mingle much. Would it then not be possible to have a policy focus only on bridging social capital?

A second example is the use of machers and schmoozers. Putnam (2000) explains both terms in the beginning of the book, but it aren't constant factors; both terms are mentioned and then for a few capitals Putnam (2000) doesn't refer to it until all of a sudden it appears again. Also, Putnam (2000) doesn't give much to work with when it comes to answering the question how to make machers out of schmoozers or whether that would be important. It will be interesting to see whether machers and schmoozers are also present in the Dutch society and whether the machers are also those who are higher educated and tend to have higher incomes.

Putnam (2000) doesn't only refer to less known terms as machers and schmoozers, and bridging and building social capital, but also to the famous phrase "who you know, not what you know". Social capital gains its value through social networks; at the end of the day we all need people around us, from finding a job to unexpected incidents which require help. Besides, knowledge only has value when it can be shared. Yet, somehow people have forgotten the usefulness of having a social network outside our friends, colleagues and family. What happened to knocking on your neighbours' door for a cup of sugar? Giving a key in case you have locked yourself out or working together on improving our living environment? Getting milk for your downstairs neighbour, who you

call nana or auntie, because you are running to the supermarket anyway like people used to do in neighbourhoods as the Amsterdam Jordaan? To the social control? Why aren't we interested anymore in the people we don't know? Or in extending our social network to benefit even more? Putnam (2000) has tried to answer these questions in the case of America, but apparently it is a complicated case study. Maybe the answer is right before us, maybe we just don't care or are fine with the way things are. Would that really be a problem? Could it be that scientists are desperately looking for a better answer simply because it is difficult to accept that there are easy answers? Hopefully this research will give some more insight into the loss of interest in social capital.

However, let us consider the problem of the decline of social capital for just a second longer. On paper social capital is a useful tool, but the question is how visible are the results? Is the message of social capital enough to trigger the generations who have left it behind? Aren't they the generations who are looking for visible and instant result? One of Putnam's (2000) recommendations is to have politics pay more attention to address the importance of social capital. However, that is just talk. Maybe policymakers should focus on creating visible results. A good example is The People's Supermarket¹ in London: for four hours voluntary work a month you get 20% discount on the groceries. You build a network but not through having to chit chat with your neighbours about their kids, but through working together. You also create a common good, you create the feeling of being part of something together and you are bridging the age difference; the feeling of not having anything in common with the person of a different generation; a reason you might not have attended the neighbourhood barbeque.

This also brings us to the questions how people see their neighbourhood nowadays. Should policymakers maybe start presenting the neighbourhood in a different light; more as a business you can gain profits from of which The People's Supermarket is a good example?

Finally, the research has to show to what extent Putnam's (2000) conclusions, figures and facts are also applicable in the case of the neighbourhood Oud-West in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Two points that at first sight seem to be the case is the rise of welfare that has resulted in multiple TVs in each house and several hours of watching television a day. Second, is the point that Putnam (2000) makes about socializing at work and the connections there that remain casual. The perception seems to be that Dutch people do not really come to work to make friends, but more to work and then close the door behind them afterwards with the exception of the '*vrijdagmiddagborrel*', a drink now and then after work with your colleagues.

This, however, may only be perceptions. How is the Dutch social capital doing in comparison with the United States? Is there a similar decline? The Dutch case lacks unanimity; researches do not

¹ The People's Supermarket: <http://www.thepeoplesupermarket.org/home/full-width/becoming-a-member/>, accessed on 10-07-2012

agree on the topic. Looking at the figures some conclude the Dutch have nothing to worry about. Figures of 2002 show that they still have as much contact with friends, family and neighbours as in 1975, while the percentage of citizens who volunteer hasn't declined either (Bekkers & de Graaf, 2002).

New sources do show a decline in the percentage of Dutch citizens who have contact with their neighbours for at least once a week; in 2004 47% had contact with their neighbours at least once a week, in 2010 it fell to 40% (Cnossen, 2009).

On the other hand, seven out of ten Dutch are members of a club or an association and in 2009 87% of the households gave an average of 241,- euro to charity. One out of three Dutch citizens declared to volunteer (Cnossen, 2009).

Even though four out of ten Dutch stated to have been politically active in the past five years, as well as in 2002 and in 2010, physical presence declined from 10% to 5 % and political participation on the internet rose from 10% to 21% (Cnossen, 2009). The latter could imply a decline of social capital, because internet creates a more distant contact and can also mean filling in a form, which doesn't create any contact at all.

Like in the United States, Dutch citizens who attend church, volunteer more often and they help friends, family members and neighbours without asking money more often as well (Cnossen, 2009).

When it comes to trust, less than 50% of the Dutch believe he or she can trust their neighbours and they score really low when it comes to trusting authorities (Cnossen, 2009). This is a concerning point for the new policy of the local government of Amsterdam since trust is also one of the indicators for participation. The gap between the local government and the residents could be a reason why residents aren't very likely to participate in their new policy.

Despite the fact that the above numbers might not be really concerning, the debate about social capital remains in The Netherlands. The Balkenende government was the first to start the public debate about norms and values and the hardening of the society in 2002 and this debate is still going strong. Figures might show a different picture, but the feeling remains that there is less solidarity, a lack of norms and values and a hardening of the society. 9/11, the assassinations of politician Pim Fortyun (2002) and film director Theo van Gogh (2004) has changed the Dutch society. With the rise of Geert Wilders, a politician who is very pro Dutch and anti migration, relations within the Dutch society were put on edge. Ten years later it will be interesting to see what the participants of this research have to say about their social capital. Are politics and the media keeping the debate and the perception alive or are the Dutch really faced with a decline in social capital and turning inwards?

2.4 Relationship Participation - Neighbourhood Attachment – Social capital

Looking at the literature about participation, neighbourhood attachment and social capital, it clearly shows that the three topics are related to each other. Indicators as age and level of education influence all three topics. Both having children and owning a house influence participation and neighbourhood attachment, while distance between work and home and free time influence neighbourhood attachment and social capital. In addition, social ties that build social capital reflect the interaction within communities (Dekker, 2007). The interaction makes people more productive as mentioned by Putnam (2000) and is therefore considered to influence the level of participation. Dekker (2007) refers to research done in Wisconsin and New York which shows how participation increased alongside the increase of social ties; as the social ties expanded, participation in the community increased.

Research on neighbourhood attachment has shown that residents who can identify with and feel part of a neighbourhood are more likely to participate. The group identity that is created with neighbourhood attachment also creates feeling of security and builds one's self-esteem. However, neighbourhood attachment is not only about ties between people, it is also about the bond people have with their living environment. It is said that people who feel attached to something, want to protect it and take care of it; it thus enhances participation. The neighbourhood attachment that comes from social attachment, as in identifying with those around us, should not be mistaken for social networks; residents can feel socially attached to a neighbourhood without really having social contact with other residents (Dekker, 2007). Dekker (2007) states that it is residents' positive attitude towards the neighbourhood, that will encourage them to participate in order to improve their living situation.

The main focus of this research is the influence neighbourhood attachment has on participation. However, given the close relation social capital has with both topics, it can not be neglected and therefore, social capital in relation with the neighbourhood will also be discussed with the participants of the research. Research shows that residents with a high level of neighbourhood attachment and a high level of social capital should be more inclined to participate in their neighbourhood (Dekker, 2007). Does this mean that only a few residents participate actively in Amsterdam Oud-West, because these residents lack neighbourhood attachments and social capital within the neighbourhood?

3. Data and Methodology

In the previous part the theoretical framework has been discussed. In this chapter I will elaborate on the methodological approach that has been used to collect the data. The main focus of the research was on qualitative research methods, however, all participants completed a survey, which means there is also some quantitative data. The survey was used to collect some background information about the participants. In my opinion, quantitative data are facts and figures. The information that it provides can be useful, but is limited as it only tells 'what is' and not 'why that is'. Comparing quantitative data with the literature would mean that if a participant fills in he or she has a high level of education and limited time, the conclusion would be that these two reasons indicate why this person doesn't participate. However, as mentioned by Putnam (2000) people do not have less spare time that a couple of decades ago; they qualify their time differently. By using qualitative data you can find out how people qualify their time.

In the next section (section 3.1), the methodological approach will be discussed. This section will also give information about the research population. In section 3.2, the statistical data from the surveys will be discussed.

3.1 Research Methodology and Research Methods

Even though research methodology and research methods may often be used interchangeably, it is not exactly the same thing. Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009, pp.3) are more precise in their use of the terms and explain that research methods refer to "*techniques and procedures used to obtain and analyse data. This, therefore, includes questionnaires, observation and interviews as well as both quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (non-statistical) analysis techniques*".

Research methodology, on the other hand, refers to "*the theory of how research should be undertaken*" (Saunders et.al., 2009, pp.3).

3.1.1 Research Methods

The research for this thesis was done between April and September 2012. During the same period of time I also worked as an intern at the Municipality of Amsterdam-West. The research question is based upon a question of one of the sub-department of the department of districts of the municipality (district Amsterdam-West). As explained before, they have been working with a new policy regarding active citizenship since 2010, but have difficulty keeping residents involved and finding more residents willing to participate beside the hard core. Working as an intern at the municipality gave me the opportunity to get a good insight in how the municipality carries out the policy as well as how they deal with obstacles in the neighbourhood and within the organisation. To

give an example, it became clear to me that the department of districts has a difficult task as they have to translate the wishes of the residents to other departments within the municipality. These departments are not used to working together with residents when it comes to the formation of policies and carrying out the policy. Most residents, on the other hand, are not used to anything required of them. The department of district is stuck in the middle, trying to regulate everything. Without the internship, I wouldn't have gotten an insight in the complexity of the case.

Yet, carrying out a research, not only for yourself and the university, but also for a third party makes it more difficult to come to an understanding regarding the research area. It therefore, took up quite some time to find the right problem statement and research question.

In general, a problem statement comes from the literature. In this case the problem statement came out of practice. The first month and a half, I therefore, searched for books and scientific articles about the topic to get more insight in the problem statement. I also went through the various policy notes of the municipality to get a better picture of the policy they work with.

As an intern at the municipality I was able to go to events, as consultation evening with participants for example. This way I got to know various people who participated actively in the neighbourhood. This helped not only so I could hear for myself what issues they dealt with, but also helped me in finding participants for my research. In addition, it was easier to talk to various people who work at the municipality about the policy. I interviewed two people of a different department within the municipality, but who also work on the same policy, only at a different level. I wanted to interview a third person, but unfortunately, she didn't have time to talk to me because of personal circumstances.

As mentioned before, the research strategy for this thesis focuses mainly on qualitative research. Qualitative research brings some reliability and validity issues about. Reliability of the data collected has to do with the questions as whether the measures would have the same results on other occasions or if a different observer would make the same observations. The first error mentioned has to do with a subject or a participant error (Saunders et.al., 2009). Half of the interviews were done during the evening and the other half was planned during the day. Due to the diversity of the backgrounds of participants (difference in age, living situation and work career) it was not possible to do all interviews at the same time of the week. Participants were asked to pass the time that was most convenient for them, after which I tried to make groups and set a date that was convenient for everyone in that group. I do not believe that the outcome of the research would have been different had all interviews been conducted at the same time. What could have influenced participants are current events; participants who recently went to a consultation evening and had a negative experience might have had a different opinion before that evening. However, these things are inevitable; opinions are always subject to change.

The second error is a subject of participant bias. This means that participants might have giving a desirable answer instead of their true opinion. When analysing data this should be taken into account (Saunders et.al., 2009). To limit the influence of the bias, participants were giving the option to complete the survey without filling in their names. However, of the 20 participants only 6 didn't fill in their name and some even said they wanted the municipality to know how they felt. Saunders et.al. (2009) give an example of interviewing employees of a company. Obviously, there could be negative consequences if employees speak out their dissatisfaction. In this case, it regards the relationship between residents and the municipality, which is more at distance. Besides, in the Netherlands citizens can speak freely about politics and often aren't afraid to give their opinion. This doesn't mean subject or participant bias shouldn't be taken into account when analysing data.

Finally, there could be an observer error and an observer bias. The observer error refers to the way question were asked which could influence the response of the participant. This could be prevented by using a structured interview schedule (Saunders et.al., 2009). However, I chose do to semi-structured interviews on a focus group, which means there are certain topics participation are asked to give their views on. I did write down some questions to start the interview with, but the same questions were used during each interview. On the other hand, during the interviews I did respond to some participants' point of views to get more insight into what they wanted to say. The strategy of the interviews was to create a conversation/discussion between all the people sitting at the table without structuring it too much in order to get more to the core of what the participants thought were regarding the topic.

The observer bias that was mentioned in the paragraph above refers to the different ways data could be interpreted by other people (Saunders et.al, 2009). Even though, the goal of research is to be objective, it is impossible to have 100% objectivity. Every person has it own background and takes this background with them in every interview they do including analysis. Therefore, it is not sufficient to research a topic only once; a topic should be researched several times and then, when the same conclusion are drawn, we can say that it is probably right.

Besides reliability, validity should be taken into account. According to Saunders et.al. (2009) validity questions whether findings are about what they appear to be about. Validity is threatened by factors as history, testing, instrumentation, mortality and maturation. Like I already mentioned before, the answers participants give, might be influenced by current event.

A second point to consider is the generalizability of the research, which is seen as an external validity. Generalizability is concerned with whether the research is also applicable to other research setting (Saunders et.al., 2009). Considering this research, it can be questioned how applicable it is to other research settings. First of all, it is a qualitative research with a small group of participants which makes it more difficult to generalise. Second of all, it has been done in a particular geographical and

spatial setting. External factors as the demography of the neighbourhood play a role. This means that the research is not applicable to neighbourhoods in particular, but could be applicable to similar neighbourhoods when it comes to factors as history and demography for example.

3.2 Research Population

The research focuses on participation of residents in Amsterdam Oud-West. Amsterdam Oud-West is a relative good neighbourhood and exists out of eight smaller neighbourhoods. In general the neighbourhoods are known for having high house prices, low unemployment rates, and few people who live of social security. Only a few children have a disadvantaged position and therefore, most have a high level of education. The population exist out of quite a high rate of new urbanites, but the Borgerbuurt and the Vondelparkbuurt are also known for having a high length of residency. Amsterdam Oud-West has some really good neighbourhoods with high income families like in the Voldelparkbuurt, but also average neighbourhoods who are doing well, but not excellent. None of the neighbourhoods score below average (Factsheets West, 26-04-2011).

In order to do my research I had to find participants in these neighbourhoods who were willing to collaborate. It turned out to be quite difficult and took up quite some time. On the one hand, this shouldn't be so surprising since this thesis stemmed from the problem that only a few residents were enthusiastic to participate in their neighbourhood. On the other hand, I thought it at least wouldn't be so hard to find residents willing to participate with the research who were already active in their neighbourhood. I first emailed all the residents in Oud-West of which the municipality had an e-mail address. In this e-mail I asked them if they wanted to participate and if they might know other residents who wanted to participate. I got some response to this, but the problem was that these residents didn't want to bother other residents with this question; they wanted to participate, but found it difficult to approach other residents. Since I decided that I wanted to interview residents who participate in their neighbourhood and residents who don't participate in their neighbourhood, I had to find another way to reach the residents who don't participate. I approached people who worked for several organisations in Oud-West to ask if they could inform among their networks if residents wanted to participate. In the end I just emailed everyone I met during the internship. In this way the internship really contributed. I worked on several projects, also independently, and created a network of my own as well. Through one of the people I had met during a consultation evening, I found an entire focus group for example. I sent an e-mail and an attachment with information about the research to give to residents that might be interested to all the people I approached. Through this way, I mainly found residents who participate though. It became clear to me that the only way to find residents who didn't participate was to just approach residents in meeting places as the park, the library and playgrounds. The playground and the library

were good places to approach residents; they had the time to listen to your story. In the end, I found twenty-nine residents who wanted to participate. Unfortunately, only twenty really did participate. My aim was to find thirty-six to forty-five residents, because I wanted to form groups of four-five people. I also wanted to divide the groups in generation. My aim was to compare three generations and then three groups per generations. I didn't reach my aim as it was already hard to find twenty-nine residents and I lost nine other residents along the way. I was happy with twenty-nine and in the end I am glad twenty residents participated; at a certain point I was afraid I wasn't even going to get five residents. Arguments of residents who I approach and didn't want to participate were: interview too long, doesn't live in the neighbourhood, too busy, not enough time, unsuitable and just didn't want to.

As I mentioned before I decided to group interviews. I interviewed both residents who participate and residents who don't participate. The reason I wanted to interview both groups was because I wanted to compare what their motives and thoughts were and because I was interested in the discussion between the two groups. The latter is also why I chose to do semi-structured interviews; to leave space for an open conversation.

At first I wanted to interview residents between age twenty-seven and seventy-seven, because I was asked to include generation theory by the municipality. The municipality focuses on generation theory and I used their information about the different generation. Interviewing residents between twenty-seven and seventy-seven would mean I would interview generation Baby boom, generation X and generation Y according to the information I received from the municipality. After some more research, I discovered the literature is not unanimous when it comes to where generation X ends and generation Y starts. In addition, one of the people I approached to help me find participants arranged a group of residents who were all above age seventy-seven. I, therefore, decided to let go of the strict division of ages as I my group of participants did vary quite in age. In the end, I am happy I did so. If I hadn't let go of the strict division of age, I couldn't have interviewed the group of residents above the age of seventy-seven, the parents of generation baby boom, while they provided me with very interesting stories and information.

I did divide the groups by age which means some groups were only residents who participate, while others existed only out of residents who don't participate. Looking back, the interviews I did which included residents who participate and residents who don't participate didn't brought me what I hoped for. The residents who participate were much more present during the interviews and this made it difficult for the others to intervene; I saw a difference in character between residents who participate and those who don't.

In total, I interviewed nineteen participants divided among six groups and one resident separately. The groups existed out of two to four people; this was due to some people not showing

up. The reason I did one interview that wasn't a group interviews, was because two participants who didn't show up during the interviews, later contacted me to tell me why they couldn't make it. They told me they still wanted to participate, but in the end one of them didn't come through.

3.3 Basic descriptive results from the survey

Of the twenty participants, ten were men and ten were women. The twenty participants were born between 1928 and 1976. The men were born between 1928 and 1974, the women between 1936 and 1976. The participants live in their neighbourhood for between three and seventy-seven years. The shortest period is three years for both men and women, while the participant who has been living in its neighbourhood the longest period is a woman, seventy-seven years. In case of the men the longest period was fifty-two years. Nineteen out of the twenty participants have the Dutch nationality; one person didn't answer this question. Of the twenty household, only five still share their household with children. Thirteen out of the twenty participants followed a higher education like an Hbo² or University; the women were higher educated than the men.

Thirteen participants are tenants and seven own their house. All neighbourhoods in Amsterdam Oud-West were presented. Ten of the participants have a job; the other ten didn't work anymore. When it comes to income division, six have an income of less than an average income, and nine a bit more than average. Only six participants have family living in their neighbourhood and eleven have friends in their neighbourhood, but these friends count for less than half of their friends.

Considering the contact the participants have with their neighbours, there was only one who doesn't have contact with their neighbours at all. Nine have small talk, four visit their neighbours and six have neighbours who are also their friends. The trust in neighbours is quite good, most give their keys in case of emergency, but some do claim that they trust some neighbours and others not. When it comes to the trust in authorities the answer are very diverse. Two don't trust the authorities and four don't feel that they are taken seriously by the authorities. One has no experience with authorities and three gave a different answer.

When it comes to norms and values thirteen participants claim to correct those who show deviant behaviour, six state they won't and one only sometimes.

All participants claim to feel connected to their neighbourhood and to feel at home. Ten participant lives take place mainly in their neighbourhood, five mainly outside and five answered both. Seventeen claim to feel proud of their neighbourhood, one isn't proud of it and one didn't answer.

Only one participant stated not to participate at all in his neighbourhood and that is a man.

² An Hbo is an higher vocational education

One participant was very active but is going to quit. Eight do attend consultancy evenings or activities in their neighbourhood. The other ten are active or have become active recently.

4. Case study Amsterdam Oud-West

In the following the results of the qualitative research will be analysed and discussed. I will start by discussing the results regarding neighbourhood attachment and social capital. By starting with these two themes, I can determine to what extent residents in Amsterdam Oud-West are still tied to their neighbourhood, after which it can be analysed whether it affects the participation rate of the residents.

4.1 Neighbourhood attachment

In the theoretical framework neighbourhood attachment is described as the meaning that is given to the space that is the immediate living environment by residents of this environment. Residents who feel attracted to, who show solidarity to and can identify with the living environment that is their neighbourhood have a strong neighbourhood attachment. Scholars like Lupi et.al (2007) and Putnam (2000) suggest that because of the quickly changing modern society, social bonds are now volatile and differentiated and people individualistic which resulted in the social disintegration of neighbourhoods; neighbourhoods aren't relevant anymore. Is that the case in Amsterdam Oud-West? To what extent is the neighbourhood the spatial context in which residents spend their daily lives? Has mobility and welfare opened the eyes to places further away and made the residents care less about their immediate living environment? Does Amsterdam Oud-West lack a community? Or are there still groups in the society, like migrants, elderly or two income families who are tied to the neighbourhood as suggested by Lupi et.al. (2007)?

4.1.1 Gentrification and preference of staying

Looking at the research data that was collected among the participants it becomes clear that all participants find their neighbourhood a pleasant one to live in. Amsterdam Oud-West is described as peaceful yet a true Amsterdam neighbourhood and close to the city centre of Amsterdam. One of the participants, Anjo, tells she prefers going to a bar in her neighbourhood than in the city centre of Amsterdam, because the atmosphere is more homely and there are less tourists. The participants thus confirm the information provided by the local government about Amsterdam Oud-West being safe and quiet. However, in case of some residents there are clearly some mixed feelings about their neighbourhood. Some of the residents have been living in Amsterdam Oud-West for years and, as mentioned before Amsterdam Oud-West went through some big changes over the past 10 years. Even though they find their neighbourhood very pleasant to live in and they recognize the improvements, they aren't very enthusiastic about the new population that moved into their neighbourhoods. Diederik, Jose, Piet, Frits, Ko and Maria have been living in Amsterdam Oud-West

between eighteen and seventy-seven years and conclude that it has changed a lot. Diederik calls it the '*concertgebouwicering*' of Amsterdam Oud-West. Diederik was born in Amsterdam Zuid near the city's famous concert hall. The area around the concert hall is a wealthy part of the city where the upper class lived and still lives. Now, explains Diederik, these people have also crossed the Vondel Park that separates Amsterdam Zuid from Amsterdam Oud-West and have settled down in Amsterdam Oud-West. The composition of the population has changed as Amsterdam Oud-West used to be a neighbourhood for the working class. Dierderik explains that as for now there is still a good mix between the original residents and the new urbanites, who he calls yuppies, but if the process of gentrification continues and more yuppies come to live in Amsterdam Oud-West he will move to a different neighbourhood, "*these people are intolerant and antisocial. They block the entire pavement, but have a big mouth when you address them. A lot of people think that original Amsterdam people are rude, but they ain't. They might be straight forward, but they are not unreasonable or aggressive. These yuppies start cursing when you go through red, while, Amsterdam people would never do that. These people stick around after college and start to act as what they believe is "amsterdam" behaviour, but it has nothing to do with that*". Jose also regrets that so many yuppies have come to live in Amsterdam Oud-West, but it is not a reason for her to move out of the neighbourhood, because she prefers living in the city centre between the yuppies than in far away neighbourhoods as Sloterveer or Geuzenveld.

The changes in the neighbourhood hurt, explain Piet, Maria and Frits as "*normal people can not live here anymore*" (frits). "*The neighbourhood is no longer ours, but of the yuppies. They get to have barbeques of our money and then they call it neighbourhood oriented*" tells Piet who also refers to rented houses who are being split for sale and then rented again for high amounts of money because the houses weren't sold, "*those parents from Bussum, Naarden en Laren³ then pay for it so their children can live in it, it really pisses me off*". Ko emphasises the dichotomy that is now present in the neighbourhood between the original residents and the yuppies. Ko explains there is no communication between the two groups. When the yuppies have a barbeque they don't warn the other neighbours and when confronted with this, the yuppies answer "*oh your right*", but nothing changes. Frits also regrets this because he fears a lot of yuppies will move after a couple of years and don't have ties to the neighbourhood.

Despite the mixed feeling, none of the participants who have been living in Amsterdam Oud-West for many years wishes to move to another neighbourhood. Except for Diederik, the participants mentioned above all state they will never leave the neighbourhood. Jose ones did, but says she didn't know how fast she had to return. Duration of stay definitely plays a role in the attachment to the

³ Bussum, Naarden and Laren are villages known for their very wealthy population.

neighbourhood, as well as age. One of the participants, Marjo, states that she bought her house so she doesn't want to move anymore, but twenty years ago she wouldn't have found it a problem. Other participants do not wish to move to another neighbourhood as they find their neighbourhood very pleasant to live in, but do not feel tied to the neighbourhood to the extent that they would find it problematic to move. In other words, the younger participants are less tied to the neighbourhood. This could be because of a shorter duration of stay and also, like Marjos' statement suggest, when people are younger they adapt easier and moving is also less of an effort. Participants as Maria, Ko, Piet, Frits and Jose who are of a certain age and have been living in the neighbourhood for between eighteen and seventy-seven years clearly stated that they didn't want to move out of the neighbourhood.

4.1.2 Functional attachment

The data shows that the functional attachment to the neighbourhood among the participants is high. Functional attachment refers to the extent that residents make use of the facilities in their neighbourhood (Lupi et. al, 2007). Even though functional attachment is high there are two groups that can be distinguished; the participants who live in the area of the Frederik Hendrikbuurt and in Marcanti-eiland and the participants who live on the other side of Amsterdam Oud-West. This is due to the location of Frederik Hendrikbuurt and Marcanti-eiland next to the Jordaan⁴ and the number of facilities which is much lower than in the other part of Amsterdam Oud-West which is full of shopping streets for example. Dirk who lives in the Frederik Hendrikbuurt states that he considers the Jordaan to be his neighbourhood too, "*my neighbourhood doesn't end at the end of the street*". Marjo who lives in Marcanti-eiland says that everything is so close by; within ten minutes she can find herself in the part of Amsterdam where all the museum and theatres are. Pieter-Jan, also a resident from the Frederik Hendrickbuurt, confirms that the city is very close by and that the Frederik Henkrikbuurt doesn't have a lot of facilities.

For a participant like Geertje who moved to Amsterdam Oud-West a couple of years ago and who lives in the southern part of Amsterdam Oud-West where all the shopping streets are, the facilities of the neighbourhood were a reason to move there. Before, Geertje lived in the Jordaan, but she moved to Amsterdam Oud-West because of the better public transport as she is becoming older and more dependent on this kind of transport. Maria, who has been living in Amsterdam Oud-West for seventy-seven years, also refers to the good transport to the city centre and all the facilities that are just around the corner in Amsterdam Oud-West. For those who are older and are becoming less mobile, these facilities are very important. The facilities also create attachment to the

⁴ The Jordaan is one of the popular old neighborhoods of the city center of Amsterdam.

neighbourhood.

Facilities do not only create attachment to the neighbourhood for older people. Anjo who is in her thirties explains she feels attached to the neighbourhood. Even though she could also see herself living in another neighbourhood, she refers to the many playgrounds and shops Amsterdam Oud-West has, as well as the Vondel Park and the fact that it is next to the city centre. Her family lives outside of Amsterdam and her friends mostly in other parts of the city, she therefore believes her attachment to the neighbourhood comes from the facilities it has to offer.

Diederik doesn't only live in Amsterdam Oud-West, but has his business in the neighbourhood as well. He makes use of all facilities in the neighbourhood; from the market, to the library, to the optician and the shoemaker, to going to a restaurant. He says it is easy, because everything is close by. As a result most of his life takes place in Amsterdam Oud-West, *"actually I only go to other parts of the city, if I have to be somewhere, like for an appointment"*. Diederik likes to spend his money in his own neighbourhood and wonders why someone would go somewhere else when it is good here. Being an entrepreneur might play a role in this as you are more aware of the support that is needed to maintain the business. However, Diederik also emphasises that laziness may play a role as well and the fact that he doesn't own a car, *"people who own a car go to a lumberyard where they have a lot of stuff, I just go to the nearest one"*. Thus low mobility, like with the older people, causes attachment as mentioned in the literature.

Sander, on the other hand, makes use of a lot of facilities in the neighbourhood like, the swimming pool, shops and schools, but states he doesn't feel committed to go to a restaurant in the neighbourhood as well. He works in the city centre and therefore already spends less time in the neighbourhood.

4.1.3 Cultural attachment

Besides functional attachment, the participants also have a high cultural attachment. Cultural attachment refers to the extent residents feel at home in, identify with and are proud of the neighbourhood (Lupi et.al., 2007). One of the questions of the survey was whether the participants felt at home in their neighbourhood and another whether they were proud of the neighbourhood. All the participants answered yes to whether they felt at home in the neighbourhood, although one wrote a comment saying most of the time. Seventeen participants stated to be proud of the neighbourhood, one isn't proud of it, one stated sometimes and one didn't answer the question. These are rather convincing numbers.

4.1.4 Economic attachment

When it comes to economic attachment those who work in the neighbourhood seem to have a stronger attachment to it than those who work outside the neighbourhood. Mirjam works at home and explains how she feels about her neighbourhood: *“I’m always in the neighbourhood, I live close to the market and work from home. I feel wedded to the neighbourhood. I wouldn’t move very quickly. As I have been living here for over fifteen years, everything is known to me and pleasant; I ran into people on the street and great them. If I would move to another neighbourhood, I might as well move to another city”*. Diederik who has a business in the neighbourhood is also very found of the neighbourhood. As mentioned before most of life takes place here and he would only move if the process of gentrification continues. A lot of his clients are from the neighbourhood as well, which creates attachment through a social network. Another participant who works in the neighbourhood is Jan. Besides the fact that he loves the neighbourhood and feels very at home, his work is a reason to continue living in the neighbourhood, *“I’m not going to travel two hours to get to my job”*.

Those who work outside the neighbourhood like Pieter Jan, Willemeke en Sander seem to have less attachment. Sander works in the city centre and feels attached to the neighbourhood, but also emphasises that during the day he is already there and just as easily goes to another neighbourhood to do things. Pieter Jan works outside of Amsterdam and is only at home during the night or during weekends. Because of his work he doesn’t do much in the neighbourhood; mainly groceries.

Interesting enough, Willemeke works outside of Amsterdam as well, but was forced to work less hours. She has been living in Amsterdam Oud-West for many years as well, but because she always worked outside of the city, her attachment to the neighbourhood got less. Now that she is working less, she is also spending more time in the neighbourhood and the feelings of attachment are returning.

4.1.5 Social attachment

A fourth form of attachment is social attachment. Social attachment refers to the contact residents have with other residents of the neighbourhood (Lupi et.al., 2007). There is a difference of in social attachment among the participants. The strength of social attachment seems to depend on the neighbourhood and the time spend in the neighbourhood. The participants from the Cremerbuurt, Anjo, Sander and Ko have the feeling other resident aren’t really interested in having contact, *“in the street there are clearly residents who don’t feel the need to have any contact”* claims Sander. Anjo also emphasises that her neighbours seem quite individualistic. When she wanted to contact the local government about a complaint regarding the amount of bicycle wrecks in the neighbourhood,

she told her neighbour about it. She was hoping her neighbour would call as well because when more people complain, the complaint will be taken more seriously. However, her neighbour reacted as in *"oh sure you call"*, but wasn't willing to put any effort into it herself. Anjo regrets that other residents aren't willing to work together. Anjo lives in the same neighbourhood as Ko who already referred to the dichotomy in this part of Amsterdam Oud-West.

Pieter Jan doesn't have a lot of contact with his neighbours either. He lives in the Frederik Hendrikbuurt. He feels the neighbours around him keep to themselves. A lot of yuppies live in the neighbourhood who work a lot like himself, he explains. Bianca, who moved to Amsterdam three years ago, also emphasises that it is difficult to make contact with the yuppies in comparison to the original residents.

In other parts of Amsterdam Oud-West, where Diederik and Mirjam live for example, the participants have a higher social attachment. Diederik explains that when he first moved into the neighbourhood, the residents didn't really accept him. This changed when he and his wife had children. He then realised there was an entire network of residents in the neighbourhood. Now he has a lot of social contacts in the neighbourhood, also because of his business; *"people keep an eye on each other and each others belongings. I once sent my children to buy a lottery ticket at the kiosk. We know the owner as we come there a lot. However, it is not allowed to sell lottery tickets to children. The next Saturday the owner told me my kids stopped by, but that he didn't sell it to them. These things happen a lot in the neighbour as residents know each other. There is still social cohesion. This adds to the neighbourhood. A lot of merchants of the market live in the neighbourhood, so when I walk through the neighbourhood people greet me and I greet them"*. The same goes for Mirjam as mentioned before, who lives in the same part as Diederik. Although the contact remains to greeting and helping each other out from time to time; drinking tea or having a barbeque together isn't sometimes she strives for.

The participants who live in Marcanti-eiland also have high social attachment. Marjo explains Marcanti-eiland has a nice atmosphere. For Marjo, atmosphere is greeting each other, the fact that people may be, are respected and help each other where needed. She tells of the children who always greet her, *"these children who then say 'what do you carry in your bag Marjo', they asked me everything, I think it is great. They sometimes ring my door bell to ask if I have pencils. There was this one girl, Moroccan, who then said 'I have never been in your house'. Very straight forward and whether it is a Moroccan girl or whatever, it doesn't matter, they just know you are an accessible person. Sometimes I give them a notebook and a pencil"*⁵. Bianca has a high social attachment as well and also lives in Marcanti-eiland.

⁵ Marjo is a teacher and as the children know this, they know that she sometimes has these things, as a notebook of pencils.

Social attachment will be discussed more extensively in the next part of this chapter regarding social capital.

4.1.6 Political attachment

Finally, the fifth form of attachment is political attachment. Political attachment refers to the involvement of residents in their neighbourhood (Lupi, et.al., 2007). This will be extensively analysed when the data regarding participation will be discussed. However, even though this research is testing how neighbourhood attachment affects participation, the collected data also shows two examples of how participation caused attachment to the neighbourhood. After living in his house for a year, Dirk was invited for a meeting regarding neighbourhood management. He met a lot of other residents there, some who did a lot of work for the neighbourhood and others who just came for some company. He really liked this so decided to join. Through participating he met a lot of people and became attachment to the neighbourhood.

The same happened to Bianca. She used to work out a lot, but after an accident with her scooter she couldn't anymore. She became bored after a while and decided to get involved with the neighbourhood, *"consequently I now have more attachment to the neighbourhood than I could ever imagine. Like my neighbour, a couple of weeks ago I went on vacation, he came to pick us up from the airport. It is all a joint project and I have met a lot of people who stopped by to see what I was doing. I have a garden and next to it are two pieces of public land"*.

4.1.7 Other factors

Other factors that have come out of the data, that play a role in neighbourhood attachment is small scale neighbourhoods and having children. Marjo believes that the small scale of Marcanti-eiland contributes to the atmosphere and the social cohesion as it is less anonymous. Sander and Anjo, two young parents, noticed that now that they have children they have more social and functional attachment to the neighbourhood. *"I now know people in the neighbourhood, while before I just lived there"* explains Anjo who like Sander explain how the playground is a meeting place as well as school, *"because of school you meet a lot of parents who also live in the neighbourhood. A playground as Cremersplein creates connections"*.

4.1.8 Partial conclusion

In general, the participants of this research seem to feel quite attached to the neighbourhood. None of the participants stated not to feel attached to the neighbourhood at first instant. The participants have a high score when it comes to functional and cultural attachment; all participants make use of

at least the basic facilities in the neighbourhood and stated to feel at home.

Factors that influence the degree of attachment are age, duration of stay, low mobility, living as well as working in the neighbourhood versus only living in the neighbourhood and location within the neighbourhood. This means that the participants with the highest neighbourhood attachment are the ones who are from an older generation, have been living in the neighbourhood for a long period of time and also work in the neighbourhood.

Location and architecture also play a role as the participants who come from Marcanti-eiland and the Borgerbuurt seem to have a higher neighbourhood attachment than the participants of the other parts of Amsterdam Oud-West. Age and duration of stay are less relevant in these neighbourhoods due to the architecture that creates a less individualistic atmosphere. While the residents of the Cremerbuurt (Sander, Anjo and Ko) mentioned they feel their neighbours aren't interested in social contact or working together.

A final point that returned in the discussion various times is the role of the yuppies. It seems that this group is more on their own and therefore, affects the social cohesion in the neighbourhood and also the creation of neighbourhood attachment. Ko referred to the dichotomy they create as they are only involved with their own group. Bianca stated it is difficult to make contact with them and other participants also mentioned how the neighbourhood changed over the years as this group moved into the neighbourhood.

4.2 Social capital

Social capital is said to have value gained through social networks. As a result of social contacts norms of reciprocity and trust are created which can add to safety and cohesion in the neighbourhood (Putnam, (2000); Dekker, (2007); Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011)). Do the residents have low social capital in their neighbourhood and mainly keep to themselves? Or are things not so bad? Are the residents of Amsterdam Oud-West mainly makers of schmoozers? Which factors influence the social capital among residents? Does social capital create bonding or bridging? Moreover, Putnam (2000) spoke of a gap between politics and citizens that negatively contributed to the decline of social capital in the United States as for technology and high mobility, is this the case in Amsterdam Oud-West as well?

4.2.1 Social networks

The quantitative data regarding the relationship between residents in Amsterdam Oud-West shows that among the participants only one resident has no contact with the neighbours. Nine out of twenty participants socialize with their neighbours as in small talk, four visit their neighbours from

time to time and six has neighbours who are also their friends. These numbers seem quite positive at first sight. Let's consider the qualitative data. How do the participants describe their contact with their neighbours?

Diederik explains he only socializes with his neighbours. He doesn't have much contact with them. Last summer he watered their plants, because they went on vacation for six months. He knows about their whereabouts, but not necessarily through personal contact. When his neighbour got cancer, the man kept a blog. Diederik's wife reads the blog and so they knew how the neighbour was doing. The same goes for his children. They are Facebook friends with the children who live next door, even though they never hang out, *"but at least they stay up to date this way"*. Even though Diederik doesn't have much contact with his neighbours, he explains they do help each other out, like watering the plants for example or when Diederik wants to clean the gutter, he needs to enter the garden of his neighbour who lives below them. This is a simple example, but it does show how people sometimes simply need each other. Diederik works in the same neighbourhood as he lives. His high degree of social capital in the neighbourhood is also due to his work.

Anjos' contact with her neighbours is mainly through the owners association of her building. Their contact is related to the common cause (the building) they have, but other than having a cup of tea while discussing what needs to be done they don't have much contact. She says that being part of an owners association doesn't stimulate more contact.

Anjo does have the key of her neighbours and takes care of the cats when they are gone. The same goes for Sander, *"a beer once in a while with those who are interested, but other than that no. I know most of them quite well, but to go and have a barbeque with them for example, no, no I don't find that necessary"*. He also emphasises that some are just not interested in any contact, while others do, like the ones who have children like him or who live above him.

Mirjam helps her neighbours out as well, but doesn't consider her neighbours to be her friends either. She explains she has cats and sometimes the neighbours take care of them and the other way around. In case of emergency she also watches the children of her neighbours, *"the neighbours who live across from me have kids and in case of emergency they sometimes drop them at my house. I don't always think that's cool, but I can imagine that it is needed sometimes"*. On the other hand, she wouldn't want to participate in informal activities with her neighbours like a barbeque, *"fortunately not, I don't feel the need to participate informally with my neighbours"*.

Annie also has only contact with some neighbours. One who lives a bit further and one who lives downstairs in her building, but that is it. She used to help one of her neighbour who was sick, but the woman passed away recently. She wouldn't describe the contact she has with her neighbours as friendship, but a cup of coffee now and then she does like. *"You can call on someone. When you go on vacation, you water the plants, we do that. But a lot of people live there, so you can't hang out"*

with all of them. Besides, you don't see everyone".

Paul and Willemeke are the two participants who hardly have contact with their neighbours. Paul sees his neighbours on the stairs sometimes. Willemeke lives in a commune. She, therefore, has contact with the other people of the commune, but not with the neighbours. *"I do a lot of stuff with the people at home. I am not interested. When a movie night was organised, with a beamer on the square next to us, nobody showed, but I didn't go either. I don't feel any need for it. I am not lonely or anything. It may sound strange, but I used to have a really nice neighbour, who lived in an elderly home, with whom I also went swimming in the Marnixbad, but since she moved, I only have my last neighbours and family members. I try to keep neighbours off, in some way I keep attempt approaches off. It will cost you a lot of energy, you see".*

Dirk and Marjo on the other hand do have a lot of contact with their neighbours. Dirk lives in a flat and started a garden committee. He explains that more and more people of the flat join. They have a lot contact with each other. Residents also keep an eye out for each other, *"if we haven't seen someone for two days, we go and check if everything is alright. The flat is seven stories high and has thirty-two apartments. Everybody watches each other. I think it is nice. We have each others keys. When I go on vacation, someone takes out the mail and things like that. We also have barbeques and do fun things together. I live next to the entrance of the building. So often when I'm in the kitchen it's like tiktak and someone is waving, but most of the time I open the door and someone then comes in for a cup of coffee".*

Marjo rented a house for twenty-three years in the Marcantilaan and then bought a house in a different street in Marcanti-eiland. She explains she now lives between a school and a newly build houses, which she finds really different than when she was living between flats, *"I know look over the water, it is a very social environment. I now water the plants and feet the cats. Other residents just stop by. There is a lot of cohesion, we don't have parties or anything, but the people in the other block do invite me".*

The contact residents have depends on whether there is click between them and their neighbours, *"it is like, if you have a click with your neighbours you become friends, if there is no click, it is oké as well"* argues Sander. Diederik who moved with his neighbourhood, tells that when living in his former street he watched football with his neighbours when the Dutch team played, they had barbeques and during New Years Eve residents gathered on the street. In his current street he doesn't have that kind of interaction with his neighbours, *"it was a different street, people were hanging out of their windows to smoke because they didn't want their curtains to become dirty of the smoke, that kind of people, all like us. We got along very well, now we have bought a house. Next to us live yuppies. And the residents next to us, the men who had cancer, they are churchgoers, not our kind of people".*

Dirk also emphasizes that it depends on whether there is a click. However, he also claims that it depends on the position you take up. He moved into a flat with forty-two apartments, *“what do you want? Do you want to know how it works, then you start talking to people”*. I asked him whether he finds it important to have contact with his neighbours and then argues, *“yes, because otherwise you are an individual, a loner and why should you stay alone? I don’t understand that. It is so easy to hide, while much more fun to try to be a part of something”*. In his experience people like to have contact with the ones around them, but often don’t dare to approach others.

When it comes to trusting their neighbours, most participants answered positively; sixteen commented to have given their keys to their neighbours, which was also shown by the qualitative data. However, they did mention they trust some and others not.

4.2.2 Trust in the local authorities

The trust the participants have in authorities depends on their experience. The survey shows only two participants answered not to trust the local authorities. Four also answered to feel that the local authorities don’t take them serious. On the other hand five stated to trust the local authorities to make the right decision and six participants also stated to feel that the local authorities take them serious. Three filled in a different answer (no experience and, not everything is going well) and one didn’t have an opinion. Diederik stated to trust the local authorities. He has very positive experience with the local authorities and therefore is very satisfied, *“I’ve met so many benevolent, nice, helpful, smart people at the local authorities. I have many positive experiences, only things go very slow, but ok that’s the way it is. I’ve got everything I asked for. I called because I wanted a front yard, three or four hours later they were knocking on the door. This summer we needed a permit for a festival, they tried to help us as much as they could. If it is not possible within regulations they try to come up with an alternative. They followed up on everything they said they would. I’m very satisfied”*.

Anjo feels to be taken serious by the local authorities as well. She does feel they have a capacity problem, which isn’t optimal, but she does feel that when she calls they take action, *“I don’t feel they don’t listen, but you do sometimes notice that because of procedures they are not hands on, but that doesn’t mean they aren’t committed”*.

Malene on the other hand has a very different experience. The plans she made with the local authorities didn’t turn out the way it was supposed to, which she regrets. She says it really depends on which official you speak and states she thinks that the local authorities keep themselves at a distant and keeps away from the citizens. She also sat in a commission as a volunteer and invested a lot in time in this commission. She said she is very disappointed because she didn’t even receive a thank you, *“how they dealt with it, I don’t think highly of it”*.

4.2.3 Norms and values

A final point of discussion was norms and values in society. How do residents feel about residents who deviate from the norms and values? Do they feel safe in their neighbourhood? Most participants state it depends on the situation, but in simple cases as dog poo or people throwing stuff on the pavement they don't restrain themselves from addressing this person. Diederik states it is not worth getting a black eye for, but in general he feels safe in his neighbourhood. Sander and Anjo agree. Sander argues *"it depends, but when people let their dogs do their business on the pavement, I approach them. But most of the time they make sure that it doesn't happen when you are around"*.

Mirjam and Jose are more reluctant. Not because they are scared, but because they don't feel like it anymore. Mirjam says *"I used to address people when they throw something on the pavement, but now I am more zen. I don't interfere anymore. I feel it is time for others to care"*. Jose shares the same opinion, *"At the moment I don't feel much attached to the neighbourhood. When something happens, I think pff I keep on addressing people. I used to address people, but now I think it never ends. I do feel emotionally attached, but I don't do anything physical about it. I'm busy with my own stuff"*.

Marjo on the other hand believes it is important because you can set an example and when you do people will give back. That is also why she helps others out. She explains that some people are afraid to address others, but she isn't *"it all depends on the way you address people, they are never angry with me. I ask them in a way that they are free to do whatever they wish with the critique and then the next time I will see what happened"*.

Frits feel it doesn't always help, *"I say something about it, but then they just say 'old men who are you to interfere in my business'"*. Frits is from the generation who has experienced the Second World War. He feels that the society has hardened a lot, *"luckily I am a very happy and positive person, but what I do see is that the society has become very hard and I regret that. People are all very self-centred, not all of them thank god, but many are. I have two daughters and grandchildren who go to college. When they come to visit they are only playing with their phones. My daughter tells them to put it away, it is a different world. You see, actually they are already pissed they had to come visit their grandparents"*. Ko experiences the same thing with his grandchildren, *"my daughter is also beginning to have the tendency"*.

The self-centred behaviour of people and the way they prefer to keep to themselves is something that seems to be more present in the larger city. Willemeke who works in a small city says she was surprised that people started to greet her when she passed, *"in Amsterdam you says hallo to someone on the street and they look at you like 'do I know you?', but now that I work in de Bilt, people greet me on the way to the bus stop, while nobody knows me. Once a car even stopped and I*

thought 'oh that is a bit creepy', but the car just stopped to ask if I needed a ride. It is a different environment and then you come in your own familiar environment and you don't say hello to people".

Bianca had the same experience when she went of vacation to Bonaire not long a go. She was so surprised by the friendly attitude of people on the island, *"people are waving at you, everybody says hi. If you try that here, they ask you if they know you. I don't think you have to say hi to people in Amsterdam Oud-Zuid, but I do think you should in your own neighbourhood"*. She explains that it is important to her because you get to know people and that creates safety in the neighbourhood; you start to keep an eye on each other, a bike all of a sudden is connected to a face.

4.2.4 Partial conclusion

The results of the discussion regarding social capital are less convincing than results of neighbourhood attachment. The discussion regarding social networks, shows that the participants do have contact with their neighbours, but that the contact mainly remains super visual and practical; most participants help their neighbours out by watering their plants or feeding cats during vacations, but informal activities like a barbeque are not preferred. Factors that affect the degree of contact are having children, living as well as working in the neighbourhood versus only living in the neighbourhood and location. What is noticed is that participants also indicate that the contact they have with their neighbours depends on whether there is a click or not. Usually, people have a click with those with whom they have things in common, like lifestyle or background. This thus could mean that the degree of social networks among the residents in Amsterdam Oud-West might have been influenced by the entrance of new residents, the yuppies, in the neighbourhood as this is a different group than the original residents who are mainly working class.

As mentioned, trust in authorities really depends on the experience the participants have had with the local authorities. This means that some are positive and others are not. The quantitative does show that more participants trust the authorities than don't trust the authorities, but the quantitative data nor the qualitative is very convincing.

The discussion regarding norms and values show the same result; it depends on the situation whether the participants will address people who deviate from the norms and values. Some also feel that it doesn't help to address people or wonder who are they to address others.

Overall, it can be concluded that the degree of social capital of the participants in Amsterdam Oud-West is lower than the degree of neighbourhood attachment.

4.3 Participation

Participation has proven to be relevant because it adds to citizenship, democracy and the delegation of power. Some scholars question whether the state is the right party to stimulate participation (e.g. Uitermark & van Beek, 2010), while others see a clear role for the state within the process of participation (e.g. Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011). How do the residents of Amsterdam Oud-West feel about the new policy of the local government? Who participates and what do they think about participating in their neighbourhood?

4.3.1 Quantitative data regarding participation

The survey shows that four participants stated not to participate actively, but do attend festivities that are being organised by others. These participants are all female. The age differ; two are from 1943, one from 1956 and one from 1976. Three don't have a household with children; the one from 1976 does. Two have a University degree, one an Hbo and one only high school. Furthermore, three are renting their house, while the youngest participant owns a house. Two have an income a bit more than average, one about average and one below average.

Three participants also stated to visit consultation evenings. These participants are all born before 1944. Two of them are male, one is a female. They all have a household without children. One has a University degree, one an Hbo and one went to high school. All three are renting their house. Two have an income below average, one about average.

Three participants organize informal events in their neighbourhood. Two of them are male, one is female. One is born 1943, the other two in 1962 and 1963. One has a household with children, two don't. Two also have an Hbo degree, while one only went to high school. Two are renting their house, while one bought it. Two have an income a bit above average and the other one below average.

Five participants are a part of the *regiegroep*⁶ of the local government and one recently started an initiative for more green in the neighbourhood. Of these six participants three are male and three are female. They are of all ages; the oldest from 1936, the youngest from 1970. Two have households with children and four without children. Two have an Mbo⁷ degree and the three an Hbo degree and one a university degree. Three rent their house and three own their house. When it comes to the income division, one didn't answer, one has an income below average, one has about average and three have a bit more than average.

⁶ The local government has a budget for the public space in the neighbourhood. The residents of the neighbourhood can decide what is done of this budget. The residents who participate in the formal group together form the *regiegroep*.

⁷ An Mbo is an intermediate vocational education

Finally of the four participants left, there are two who are active in their neighbourhood, but in a different way as mentioned above. One takes care of the green areas in the street. This participant is female, from 1962, has no children, an Hbo degree, owns her house and has an income of a bit above average. The other participant is male, from 1956, has no children, a high school diploma, rents his house and earns below average. This participant is chair man of the residents committee.

Of the last two participants, one stated not to participate in anyway. He is male, from 1974, has children, a university degree, owns his house and has an income that is two times the amount of average. The other participant is very active, but won't be from 2013 because of a disagreement with the local government. He is male, from 1941, has no children, an Mbo degree, rents his house and an income a bit above average.

4.3.2 Why participate or not participate?

Now that all the facts and figures about the participants have been gathered, the qualitative data regarding participation will be analysed. What are the considerations of residents when it comes to participating in their neighbourhood?

When asked whether he considered himself as an active resident in his neighbourhood, Diederik answered he believes he is. He reads the local newspaper and goes to consultation evenings. Diederik also takes part in an art project in Amsterdam Oud-West. Recently, they organized an event in the neighbourhood, *"I just enjoy doing it. It is mainly out of interest, I think it is interesting. For some part, it is also out of entrepreneurship. That is also one of the reasons to stay informed about the Hallen⁸. I think I might benefit from it, at least by expanding my network, which could be useful. In other words, it is also something selfish. There is nothing idealistic about it, like I am going to improve the neighbourhood for my neighbours. I find the public space an interesting topic, so I would like to talk about what we can do with it. It is also in my own interest. I like to do it, but I also prefer to look at some green across the street instead of an ugly building"*. Diederik then refers to the theory of Satre he learned at high school. Satre says *"freedom and responsibility"*, Diederik didn't understand what was meant with it back then, but now he thinks he does. He says he thinks it refers to the responsibility you have for yourself and your living environment. He hasn't become liberal because of this insight, but he does believe people themselves have to make it better; if they don't, they shouldn't point the finger to the person next to them. In other words, he started to do things in the neighbourhood, because he believes he is responsible too. This doesn't mean that Diederik believes the local government isn't responsible; they are as well. *"It is the responsibility of*

⁸ The Hallen is real estate project that also regards the expansion of culture and entertainment in the neighbourhood.

the local government to pick up the trash, of the residents and the local government together. The residents can be held responsible, in general, like I sweep the pavement in front of my house, nowadays that is a negative expression, but if everyone would sweep his own piece, it would all be clean". Diederik thus believes that it is oke to expect people to do the things they can do themselves, but that there are still things you can't, like collecting the trash. In these cases the local government is responsible.

Anjo also has a strong tendency to become active in her neighbourhood, so she is going to sign up for an advisory board of the neighbourhood. She wanted to do something next to her job, something with content and decided to see if that was possible in the neighbourhood. Anjo does want to become active in a formal committee, she wouldn't want to organize an informal activity like a barbeque, *"I don't know. I think organising a barbeque is something you organise yourself, for a group of friends which might possible expands, but this (the board) is something you join, something that crosses your path, you see an advertisement in the local newspaper for example and then you don't have to take initiative. So maybe it is also out of laziness."*

Sander says he once considered going to a consultation evening, but it must be convenient time wise. He receives the local newspaper each moment and assumes that consultation evenings and other activities are announced here, but he never reads it. Whether he is interested to go depends on how well it is being communicated what will be discussed, *"if i have the feeling that what is discussed isn't relevant, that would be a reason not to go. Furthermore, if I already have an appointment, I can't go. On the other hand, if it is really important, I would make time"*.

Anjo also confirms that it depends on whether it matters to someone, *"bicycle wrecks annoy me, so I would definitely become active to do something about it or like the Cremersplein where my son plays. I feel connected to these things, but when it comes to a parking lot, well I have a car, but that as much say everything, I don't like that subject, so it also depends on the content."* She also thinks that it depends on the living situation whether residents will participate. She explain there is also a large group of starters who bought their first house in the neighbourhood who will be less likely to go to a consultation evening, *"when someone is settled down or when someone has kids or more attachment to the street, I think it is more likely that this person will go to such an evening"*.

Paul isn't participating at the moment either, other than visiting a consultation evening a couple moments ago. Shortly after he moved to Amsterdam Oud-West nineteen years ago, he received he letter that his building was going to be renovated, which meant he needed to move out. Unhappy about this decision, he and his neighbours tried to stop it successfully as he still lives in the same house. Paul explains he invested time in stopping the project only out of self-interest; at the moment he is not active, *"I think it is going well in the neighbourhood. I have no idea what I could do. I think, these people have their own lives, they are not waiting for me"*.

As mentioned above, he did visit a consultation evening a couple of months ago, but it remained unclear what the meeting was about, *“it was very detailed, people were talking about pavements and things in front of their door. So I thought this isn’t interesting, this is only for a couple of residents. I thought it would be about big plans, like traffic or something, so I left. I didn’t find it interesting, too many details. A couple of residents wanted to talk about lights and wanted to plant some bushes. You shouldn’t discuss this with the entire neighbourhood, you can solve that locally, I think.”*

Marjo on the other hand has always been active. When she moved into the neighbourhood something bad and shocking happened, *“when something like that happens, you so that unrest is created in the neighbourhood en then you just start taking thing up. Marjo comes from a family with eleven children and she has always taken things up when necessary. She says it is because she is socially engaged, “it is who you are”. Besides she teaches education, art, culture and society at an Hbo in Amsterdam and says that it is not credible to teach young adults about society, while not engaging yourself, “it has to be something you believe in and find important”.*

Dirk agrees that it is a part of who you are. When he started to work, he joined the trade union and helped employees when the company he worked at, when it went bankrupt. On the other hand, he also believes you can set an example, *“in our neighbourhood residents see what Hennie and I are doing and some are already saying they are going to organise something too. I asked them what and they said a flat barbeque. I told them that was nice and that I would be waiting for the invitation. They start to see things are possible. The neighbours never did anything together when I just moved there. So when I started to invite people, they thought it was weird at first. They said, but no you don’t do that, but I said yes I do, because you pass my door every day and every time you do I see a stranger passing by, I don’t like that”.* What Dirk is saying that it is not only about helping each other, but also about safety.

Dirk isn’t the only one who refers to this argument. Bianca also explains that she tries to participate socially in the neighbourhood, because through this way you know who live there, *“and you know when new people move in, and a lot of different types do, I want them to know that certain behaviour is expected. If everybody stays inside, you know, people start to act differently in their own world”.*

Annie on the other hand is more to herself. She says she is interested and reads the local newspaper, but afraid she would take too much on, *“I would say I would never do something, but it just hasn’t happened yet. I am interested in the neighbourhood and visited a consultation evening. But I am not in the same circuit as Marjo and dirk, so I am not invited much. Also I am not also aware of meetings”.*

Pieter-Jan hasn’t been active either. However, recently he started an initiative for more

green in the neighbourhood. He feels responsible for his neighbourhood and thinks it is important to go to consultation evenings because it is a way to have some influence. Yet, the problem is that he works outside the city and goes abroad because of his work a lot as well. Time is therefore an important factor in his consideration of participating, but he also states that it depends to what extent you as a resident have a say in matters, *“if it turns out that residents don’t have a lot of influence, I wouldn’t go again, but I have never been to such an evening. Time and work stay important, on the other hand the neighbourhood is also important, so I would make time for it”*.

The group of Ton, Geertje and Jose is divided about the topic. They all live in the same apartment building in Amsterdam Oud-West. Ton is really active in the building and also the chairman of the commission. He organises barbeques and drinks. He finds it important because it connects people. Geertje on the other hand doesn’t care much for it. She doesn’t go to the drinks of the barbeques.

When it comes to formal participation, none go to consultation evenings. As was mentioned by other participants like Anjo, Geertje would only go if the topic would be interesting for her like green in the neighbourhood and if it would be convenient time wise. She is not willing to give other things up for it, which she states might sound selfish, but she just doesn’t feel called upon to do something. Jose is also reluctant, because she doesn’t believe residents have much to say in matters, *“in the end they (local government) do what they want to do and already planned to do, residents can express their opinion but that is it”*. She is also afraid that such an evening turns out to be a disappointment because the conversation will remain superficial as all residents have their own interests., *“more people means more opinions and leads to nothing, a lot of chatting only”*. Ton agrees and refers to the bureaucracy that arises in these circumstances, but he also states that you can learn a lot from it, which is also the reason why he finds participating interesting, *“you learn from people and their ideas”*.

Willemeke is yet another participant who emphasises that her decision to participate in the neighbourhood would really depend on the topics and whether these topics interest her. She likes topics as green in the neighbourhood and finds the library very important, *“like the library for example, they are still considering to remove it from the neighbourhood. If that would happen, I would definitely start something to try to prevent it from happening, because it is a core importance of mine”*.

Malene and Jan refer to their living environment. Malene explains she can’t move, *“I must live there and if I don’t do anything, well we are the once who are facing the trash everyday. A lot of drunken people pass by, something just needed to happen*. She also believes you can set an example referring to the fact that when things are clean and look nice people treat it differently. However, a reason that Malene is participating actively in her neighbourhood is also stimulated because she is a

socially engaged person, which is reflected through her work and her political point of view. This is another example of how some people can not, not participate, because of who they are.

Jan also states that his neighbourhood is his living environment, the place he lives and he likes it to be nice and likes to enjoy it, *“if I can add to a better neighbourhood, I like to do so, maybe you have to take initiative and yes there are always people who disagree, but so what.”* Jan also claims it depends on how passionate people are. He is passionate about what he does and so are the other people who participate, but he recognizes not everyone feels the same way. He also emphasises that clear communication is needed; the time it takes is a consideration of him and before he starts something he wants to know how much time it will cost, *“people like clarity”*.

Besides carrying for your living environment, the architecture of the living environment plays a role too. Both Anjo and Willemeke argue that the architecture of their streets contributes to the low degree of involvement in the street. Willemeke states that despite the central position of her street in the neighbourhood, it is quite individualistic. Anjo argues her street isn't very inviting either; she lives on the Overtoom, a wide passage street leading to the city centre.

Finally, the generation that went through the Second World War gives some very interesting insides. Ko has always been active in society. He was a member of a political party for a very long time. It started when he was eighteen years old and joined the Dutch Communist Party. Ko explains how growing up in the neighbourhood Spaarndammerbuurt meant traditions of activities and actions like going to the swimming pool, *“always doing things together”*. Later he got involved projects regarding the renewal of the city and participated actively in the district the Baarsjes, *“and then it just goes on and on. Via via I ended up in social work. I didn't have any training or degree, but my political belief helped me and also stimulated me in my work. I come from a family who has always voted left. My brother was also active in the Communistic Party. There were always strange people at our house. It was fun, but they were refugees from Germany. I was raised with the idea of helping each other and doing things together. That is how it happened. You just stay involved. It is not like I'm bored or anything”*. Ko explains that it is his philosophy that comes out of his communistic line of reasoning.

Maria tells us that during the war his mother had five persons in hiding in the attic, who were gluing calendars. Her uncle was also part of the team. Someone else got send to the concentration camp in Vught, after they got arrested. She was also raised with the idea of helping other people. It is something that comes from within she claims, *“you want to carry out what you feel inside. It is what you feel inside and what you hope to do. I know that I am a warm person. I am good with the elderly, I always tell them something nice, but not every one is capable of that, but you do hope to touch someone with your feelings. You want to carry it out”*.

When I ask her how she feels about the current society, she claims it is a different world and

they should live their life's as they wish. It is as result of their upbringing and it is how they are, *"you can't get involved. You teach them your beliefs of sharing and helping each other out, but often they just ignore it. They have to figure out how they are going take care of things in the future"*. She say that as a mother you always want your child to have better life than you did. So she sent her children to university, while she went to fashion school and other women of her generation did domestic science, which has changed society, *"in my time women weren't allowed to work, because her man took care of her. Everything changed; women are now working just as hard as men. It wasn't like that back then and therefore there is less social contact than before"*. Maria calls it a change of mentality which caused the society to go backwards socially. Maria also refers to the poverty that people had back then. Because of the poverty, people came to each other. Now there are eight people living in a building, they say hi to each other, but never ask someone to come in, *"people used to help each other a lot more because of the poverty. You had to help each other"*.

Like Maria, Frits also claims that society has changed, not only because of welfare, but also through modern technology. He participates in society, because it keeps him young and also because he is a social person, *"it is in your head"*. Frits tells us that the War has shaped him. His father was Jewish and walked around with a star. His mother, a Christen, was active in the DSP⁹ and chairwoman of the Red Women¹⁰. His father went into hiding during the war. As a result the family hardly had any income. At the age of fifteen Frits started to work. He got a job at a factory which made medicine. After he went to work there, something happened. He lived in Amsterdam Noord, which was more of village. Next door lived communistic members of the resistance and every week a group of members of the resistance came together. The family had a son which was a friend of Frits. Because the members of the resistance knew Frits had a Jewish father they trusted him and ask him to deliver their newspaper the *Illegale Waarheid* (Illegal truth) at some addresses. When they found out Frits was also working at a factory which produced medicine, they told him they were in a great need of vitamins. Frits started to smuggle vitamins out of the factory, but after a while he was caught. He was taken to a German officer who said he actually had to extradite him to the *gestapo*, but when the officer discovered Frits was only fifteen (he lied, he was sixteen actually), he told him to get his jacket and better leave, *"my life was saved. Otherwise I wouldn't be sitting here today. That is what I recall from the war"*. After the war Frits joined the Pacifist Social Party and fought for the recognition of the DDR. Now he is the chairman of the councils of elders in Amsterdam Oud-West. As in the case of Ko and Maria, Frits grew up in a different society and in family who were socially engaged and had certain political belief which shaped them and resulted in them becoming socially engaged as well.

⁹ DSP probably a political organization.

¹⁰ *Rode Vrouwen* was a political organisation of women.

4.3.3 New policy of the local authority

Besides the participation in general, the new policy of the local government was also discussed among participants. Diederik says he hears the local government talking about their new policy for years, but never really understood what it is really about, *“you think you know what it is about, I have walked through the neighbourhood once with representatives of the local government, but I don’t know why they asked me. Many times I associate the new policy with a dog poo committee, that is how it makes me feel. It just sounds very snug and corny”*. He says that it is fine, but the problem is that because of this the local government loses the support of people who have a vision for the neighbourhood. A project as the Hallen draws two kind of people, those of the dog poo who are only concerned with small things as nuisance and people with a vision. However, the people with a vision soon leave when they discover how things are being handled and what is being discussed.

Anjo on the other hand is worried that the responsibility of the neighbourhood is in the hands of a small group, because others are selfish and don’t want to spend their time participating; this small group thus carries a big load. She does think it is ok that the local government aspects more involvement of the residents and is annoyed by neighbours who complain but who don’t do anything to solve the problem, *“people don’t take the step to figure out how things can be solved. I regret that. They just complain, while some things can be solved. I do believe people can have more responsibility”*. Yet, as was mentioned by Diederik, residents are not able to do everything themselves. The local government of Amsterdam North recently decided to remove garbage bins if residents didn’t empty them themselves. Anjo thinks this goes too far, *“asking residents to look after garbage bins is one thing, but removing the basis, is something else”*. Sander agrees and thinks garbage is one of these topics that is really something of the local government to solve, *“you can try to involve them and in return give them something extra, but these kinds of tasks can’t be put in the shoes of the residents”*.

Other participants even question if it is the responsibility of residents to take care of a garbage bin at all. Paul, Willemeke and Marjo ask if they aren’t already paying taxes for it and Dirk thinks everybody should be responsible, *“if you see someone leaving trash at the wrong time, you walk up to them to say something. It is not the responsibility of one person, and worse, these people who joined this initiative even got a dustpan and brush. That just makes it really bad. You can also say that someone is responsible for the street and you give them a stool and a hammer to do it themselves, but that can’t be the intention right?”*.

Sander feels that within the local government it isn’t always clear who is responsible for what. Recently he called them because of construction waste, but nobody seemed to know who had the authority to do something about it. Anjo says she never sees people from the local government,

neither officials nor politicians, which she thinks is a disadvantage.

Dirk explains a lot went lost two years ago when the districts changed. He tells us that neighbourhood management used to do a lot, while the local government now expects a lot from the residents. A lot of residents who were active before, quit because they can't handle it as they are older, *"we used to say we couldn't meet somewhere far away because the group also existed out of elder people. Now we have to go to the office of the district which is too far away. If you want to keep people involved, you have to go to them instead of continuing to distance yourself from them"*. Marjo agrees. She thinks it should be kept close to home and suggests that the local government makes some changes in this area.

Secondly, Dirk emphasises that due to the current policy, residents have to take initiatives themselves and also approach the local government themselves. He believes that the local government should support the residents better, because not everyone has experience in organising events for example. In some cases they give residents too much responsibility. Dirk refers to how easily money is put on residents' bank accounts for the organisation of events, *"some of these people live of social security. They could really get into trouble and besides as local government you don't have any control over the money anymore once you have given it away. During the organisation of a recent event I told them I didn't want to have anything to do with the money. I just sent the bills to them"*. Dirk doubts how well everyone is working together as a result of the new policy (local government and residents). He refers to another bottleneck; besides the local government, two other parties are active in the neighbourhood: social work and the housing associations. Dirk claims that all three parties have a different way of working when it comes to facilitating the neighbourhood, *"first of all, there is no similar way of working so they don't complement each other and second of all, the support that is needed differs per person"*. Secondly, Dirk believes that the way the local government is working in the neighbourhood, through *regiegroepen* and *inspiratiegroepen*¹¹, is really confusing, *"are we going to talk about budgets or about the neighbourhood? That is the difference. We don't know where we are at anymore. Some people quit, because they didn't understand. It is too confusing for people"*.

Mirjam also says it used to be better. Before there was a neighbourhood group called the Bellamy team. The district mayor attended this group along with officials who were responsible for the issues that would be discussed, *"you discussed the problems with them and they could take action right away"*. Mirjam regrets that a structure that was working well has disappeared. She says a *regiegroep* isn't the same as the Bellamy team. The Bellamy team acted as a sounding board and existed out of entrepreneurs and residents; a reflection of the neighbourhood that came together

¹¹ An *inspiratiegroep* is like a *regiegroep*, but then controls the budgets for informal participation.

every two months to discuss bottlenecks. The next meeting the participants could check what had been done about the issues discussed that were discussed and if it wasn't solved yet, it could be explained. Mirjam explains that it was about looking at your neighbourhood, the whole package, not just about dropping complaints, *"you knew what was happening and what wasn't and why. An example is the market that wasn't cleaned properly after the market day. What happened was that the manager of the market came to the meeting and explained what was going wrong. Otherwise, the only thing the manager hears is that he isn't cleaning properly which creates irritation. Through this way you are starting conversations with people in the neighbourhood. Now they work with budgets"*.

Mirjam refers to another problem as well, which was also discussed by other participants like Dirk. Mirjam concludes that the distance between the local government and the residents has grown, *"officials used to be all around the neighbourhood, which was perfect, because you could address them easily. We had Nico, an official, who was talking to the residents all day and tried to stimulate them to come to a meeting. For weeks he was busy trying to get residents up to date, it must have been very intensive. A certain group then stays involved, because they feel heard. Because of the community work, it was possible to go door to door, but that is over now"*. Jan has the same argument. He emphasises the importance of personal contact to get residents involved as well, *"a form is so impersonal; people aren't going to do that"*. He does question who will take this upon himself.

Piet acknowledges the same problem of distance since the new policy and the new division of districts, *"it is too far away and things that have been build for years are taken down. I am active in an organisation that helps residents, but from 2013 we don't receive any subsidy anymore. I have to join another organisation, ABC, and then feel like I have to do what they want"*. Ko agrees that the collaboration with the ABC team isn't working. He says that the collaboration with the local government always went very well, but now budgets are being disapproved and he was told to approach funds, *"I thought never mind, we are not going to do that. So now we have decided to quite, no more festivals"*.

As a result of budgets cuts it becomes clear that a lot of organisation are disappearing in the neighbourhood. When I ask Piet and Ko what this will mean for the neighbourhood, Ko explains that this will be a problem, *"it contradicts the idea of participating and the fact that participation should be bottom-up. If it is being stopped from above, we are faced with problems. There are so many organisations, one says a, the other b. You notice that from the local government as well. You know, we are spoiled by the old district. You just walked in and had contact. Now it is big and distant"*.

Like Mirjam and Ko, Frits also sees this as a problem and refers the officials who used to walk through the neighbourhood which made it easy to approach them. The participants also emphasise

that something needs to be done about the many organisations in the district and the districts councils, *“there are too many layers”* explains Frits, *“which cost a lot of money and create bureaucracy”*.

Ko isn't the only one who highlights the contradiction in the new policy and method the organisation of ABC needs to work with. Malene argues that the employees of ABC should be approaching the residents to get an overview what residents want instead of sitting in their office waiting for residents to take initiatives. Jan calls this the new policy of the local government, *“they don't take on action until the residents come to them”*, which is a problem according to Malene. She explains she has the possibility to approach the local government, but there are others who don't, *“it is the government who is looking for what people have and can do. We active citizens know what is going on with who in the neighbourhood, but the ABC team isn't even going out to look for it”*. She says there are also residents who are wondering why they should do something for the local government if they aren't doing anything for them. Diederik and Dirk also feel that you need persistence when you work with the local government, which makes it difficult to keep some involved as not everybody is persistent.

4.3.4 Partial conclusion

Considering the quantitative data, it can not be said that there is a clear profile regarding the participants who are active in their neighbourhood and the participants who aren't. The only thing that can be noticed is that most of the active participants don't have a household with children. Yet, that might also be the result of the fact that most participants of the research don't have a household with children. Factors as level of education, owning a house or renting a house, age and income vary a lot per group.

Since the quantitative data is not giving any clear insights, let us consider the considerations of the participants regarding the topic. The qualitative data shows that, in general, participants participate actively in their neighbourhood because of interest and self-interest, because of safety, because they feel responsible for their living environment and argue that it is important as it is the environment you move around in every day. Probably the most important factors are background and being a socially engaged person which partiality has to do with character. Of the older generation, all participants are active citizens in their neighbourhood, which is influenced by the political background they grew up in (communistic and left wing politics) and the fact that they grew up in a society that needed each other to survive not only during the war, but also afterwards because of poverty. Maria and Frits referred to how the society changed; welfare, women working and modern technology. These three factors play a key role when it comes to a socially engaged society. Furthermore, the participants argued that it also depends on who you are; some people care

more than others. It is the difference between why some decide to do social studies and others economics, the urge to do something, *"it comes from within"*.

The participants who aren't participating or hardly participate, explained that it is due factors to laziness and time. More important some doubt how much influence they would have if they did participate in the new policy of the local government. Many also argued that it depends on the topic of the meeting and whether the topic would interest them. Some visited a consultation evening once, but were disappointed because it was very detailed or didn't go to a consultation evening because it was unclear what it was about.

In general, the participants think the new policy which puts more responsibility in the hands of the residents is reasonable, but only if responsibility is divided equally. Problems with the new policy that were mentioned by the participants is the fact that they hardly see people of the local government in the neighbourhood, thus low visibility, the collaboration with the ABC team and the fact that budget cuts are resulting in the disappearance of many organisation in the neighbourhood which contradicts the idea of participating and how participation should be bottom-up.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters the theory and research data have been discussed in order to answer the research question of this thesis. In the following and final part of this thesis the final results towards answering the research question will be discussed. First an overview will be given of the previous chapters, after which the research question will be answered and recommendations will be suggested. Finally, I will reflect on the research.

5.2 Summary

As explained in the introduction of this thesis, the local government of Amsterdam District West introduced a new policy in 2010 which is about stimulating resident participation and strives to involve the local residents in the formulation and carrying out of new policy of the district. So far, the new policy has not led to a desirable level of resident participation in the neighbourhood Amsterdam Oud-West, which is one of the four neighbourhoods of District West. The challenge is to achieve a change in mentality of residents as this level of resident participation hasn't been required for decades (see introduction). Yet, how to create a change of mentality in a neighbourhood that is developing well and where the need to become active might not be so urgent for residents? However, as the literature has shown, participation is not only important for improving the conditions in the neighbourhood, but also for increasing democracy and protecting citizens from excessive state power. Some researcher question whether the state is the right party to stimulate participation, while others see a clear role for the state in this matter. This raises the question who is right in the case of Amsterdam Oud-West.

The literature distinguishes two forms of participation; formal participation and informal participation. Formal participation is relevant because it allows residents to influence the decision making process. Informal participation on the other hand enhances the possibility that residents will participate formally (Dekker, 2007). Indicators for participation are socio-economic status (Dekker, 2007; Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011; Lupi, de Stigter-Speksnijder, Karsten, Musterd & Deben, 2007), ethnicity (Dekker, 2007), socio-demographic characteristics (Dekker, 2007; Lupi et.al. 2007; Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011) and housing characteristics (Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011). Researches Tonkens & Verhoeven (2011) also refer to social motives for participation.

Besides the fact that the role of the local government in stimulating participation can be questioned, it is also questionable whether it is useful to stimulate participation in local neighbourhoods. Do neighbourhoods still matter or have they lost the role as the centre of

community? Are residents still attached to the neighbourhood or has it become solely a place where their home is? Again, the literature doesn't show an unanimous point of view and the case study must show how it is in Amsterdam Oud-West. Secondly, literature shows that when people feel attached to something, they want to take care of it (e.g. Dekker, 2007). Turning this around, it would say that when people aren't attached to something, they won't be willing to take care of it. In this case, it could thus be questioned whether it would be useful to have a policy focus on local neighbourhoods.

Neighbourhood attachment is described as the meaning that is given to the neighbourhood by residents. Those residents who feel attracted to, who show solidarity to and who can identify with their neighbourhood are said to have a high neighbourhood attachment (e.g. Dekker, 2007; Lupi, 2005; Nanzer, 2004). In order to answer the question above five forms of neighbourhood attachment have been used to measure the degree of neighbourhood attachment among the participants of this research: economic, functional, social, political and cultural attachment. Two of the five forms of neighbourhood attachment show the interrelation between the neighbourhood attachment, social capital and participation as social and political attachment within neighbourhood attachment refer to the social network of the resident and the extent to which resident are participating in their neighbourhood (Lupi et.al., 2007). Indicators of neighbourhood attachment are age (Low & Altman, 1992; Tuan, 1977), having children (Lupi et.al., 2007), size of population (Tuan, 1977), owning a house (Veldboer, Bergstra & Kleinhaus, 2011), events (Tuan, 1977), location (Lupi, 2005) and duration of stay (Low & Altman, 1992; Tuan, 1977; Friedman; 2007; Jorgensen & Stedman, 2006; Hay, 1998; Lupi, 2005; Lupi et.al., 2007).

The final theme that was discussed is social capital. Social capital refers to networks and trust. Networks of social contacts are said to have values and are said to create norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness. More over social capital creates public morality. These factors are important to this research, because networks, norms and values, trust and public morality can have a positive influence on participation, while the lack of it can have a negative influence (Putnam, 2000; Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011). Indicators for Social capital are contact with, helping and trusting neighbours, trust in authorities, education, age, classification of time, location of work and participation (Putnam, 2000).

In this research I have used the theory of Robert Putnam (2000). In 2000 Putnam wrote a book about the decline of social capital in the United States of America. He emphasises how social capital can be the result of participation and distinguishes bonding and bridging social capital. His theory is very interesting, but not necessarily applicable in the Netherlands. Therefore, the Dutch social capital has been analysed. It shows that in the Netherlands there is also a decline in social capital, though this decline is not as concerning a described by Putnam (2000). However, there is still

an on going debate about norms, trust and solidarity in the Netherlands and many feel that the society has hardened. Considering that the new policy, not only of the local government of Amsterdam, but also mentioned many times in the past years by the Dutch government of prime minister Rutte as in the Dutch need to become more self-reliant, it is interesting to see how the Dutch are really doing in terms of social capital, neighbourhood attachment and participation; how self-reliant are they willing to become?

In order to answer these questions twenty residents of Amsterdam Oud-West were interviewed. The interviews were done in groups and the strategy was semi-structured. All participants filled in a survey as well.

The data shows that over all the participants have a high score when it comes to neighbourhood attachment, while their level of social capital is clearly lower in comparison to neighbourhood attachment. The latter is due to the fact that the data regarding trust and norms and values aren't very convincing and contact between residents is mainly superficial. In the case of neighbourhood attachment, the participants score very high in case of functional and cultural attachment; almost a hundred per cent score.

Looking at the data collected regarding participation, the quantitative data is not giving a clear profile regarding the once who participate and who don't participate. It does show that only four out of the twenty participants do not participate in their neighbourhood, however do visit activities which are being organised; which is also part of informal participation. Ten out of twenty participants participate actively in their neighbourhood; take on action instead of only visiting festivities or consultation evenings. The qualitative data shows that participation is the result of upbringing, self-interest, safety and feeling responsible for the living environment. Considerations of not participating in the neighbourhood are time, doubting the influence they could have and the topics being discussed.

The above gives an overview of the theory that has been discussed in this thesis. In the following the results will be further analysed to answer the research question.

5.2.2 Conclusion research questions

Before the results will be further analysed, we shall take another look at the research question:

“To what extent are residents of local neighbourhoods still tied to their neighbourhood and to what extent do these ties or the lack of ties with the neighbourhood effect the degree of participation? Considering the outcome, will it be useful for the local government to continue focusing on activating residents in local neighbourhoods?”

The first question is whether residents are still tied to their neighbourhood. Researchers in the field of place attachment, including neighbourhood attachment, are questioning the role of the neighbourhood in our daily lives. Some even dare to state that the neighbourhood has lost its role as the centre of the community (Wissink & Hazelzat, 2012; Friedman, 2007), while other researchers believe it is too early to draw this conclusion. Lupi et.al (2007) pointed out that a century ago the neighbourhood represented the spatial context in which residents spent their daily lives. Even though Lupi et.al (2007) questions the role of the neighbourhood, they recognize that some groups still depend on the neighbourhood. In the case of Amsterdam Oud-West, are residents still tied to their neighbourhood?

Considering the high functional and cultural attachment to the neighbourhood of all participants it can be concluded that the participants are still tied to their neighbourhood; although some state that they could live somewhere else, none wishes to move and almost all participants make use of the facilities in the neighbourhood. This does not mean that all participants have the same degree of neighbourhood attachment, but not one showed signs of lack of interest. The neighbourhood attachment of residents a hundred years ago is not comparable to the attachment residents have nowadays as there is easy access to other places. Yet, Lupi et.al. (2007) suggested that some groups in society still depended on the neighbourhood which can be confirmed by the data of the research. The older generation has a higher degree of neighbourhood attachment and stated clearly not to want to move. This can be explained by the fact that they often have been living in the neighbourhood for many years, but also because they have a lower mobility; Geertje for example hasn't been living in Amsterdam Oud-West for that long, but moved to the neighbourhood because of the facilities and the fact that it has become more relevant to her that everything is close by.

Other participants, like Pieter-Jan, who doesn't spend much time in the neighbourhood due to his work, might find it less difficult to move to another neighbourhood, but does feel responsible. The research data thus doesn't show that residents are not attached to their neighbourhood. I was even surprised about the responses of the participants as the literature inclined me to think that the majority would answer otherwise.

As it turned out, social capital and participation are two forms that express neighbourhood attachment as well. Looking at these two forms, the difference in neighbourhood attachment among the participants becomes larger. When it comes to social capital, this research can't say anything about a decline or a degree, because unlike the research of Robert Putnam (2000), this research does not compare data taken from other periods of time. Thus, the research can only draw conclusions on the data collected, which is a random indication.

The collected data shows that the social capital differs more among the various participants. It mostly differs in the way participants have contact with their neighbours. In general, the contact is

quite superficial, but there is also a group that undertakes activities with their neighbours. The same goes for trust in authorities. Yet, considering whether social capital has an effect on participation, I would conclude that the data collected among these participants rather shows that participation had an effect on the social capital of the participants as participants as Bianca, Dirk and Marjo for example, first became active which resulted in comprehensive social network as well as that they realized how fun it is to know the people around you.

The data concerning social capital shows that among the participants there are some who are clearly machers. However, according to Putnam (2000) machers are highly educated and have a high income, which is not sustained by this research. Schmoozers are residents who prefer informal conversation. The other participants would then be schmoozers. Yet, what I have noticed is that most participants don't feel much for informal participation like attending a neighbourhood barbeque, which can be linked to the schmoozers. Social capital is used by the participants as a functional tool and they also prefer it that way. In chapter 2 I wondered whether the gain of social capital is visible enough to trigger the generations who have left it behind. I gave an example of The People's Supermarket as a way to show visible results. As the data shows that residents prefer functional interaction, I believe that the message should be brought in a practical and functional way rather than having politician address the importance of social capital.

A final point regarding social capital is the fact that various times during the interviews, participants referred to the yuppies in the neighbourhood and not in a positive way. My conclusion would be that there is more bonding social capital, than bridging social capital in Amsterdam Oud-West.

The second question is to what extent neighbourhood attachment affects the degree of participation. Considering the data, those participants who have a high neighbourhood attachment and high social capital in the neighbourhood, also participate more actively in the neighbourhood. However, even though the participants with a high neighbourhood attachment and social capital, also participate more actively, the data among the other participants doesn't shows a degree of neighbourhood attachment and social capital that is low to the extent that can be concluded that there is a clear link between the degree of neighbourhood attachment and social capital on one hand and the degree of participation on the other hand. The data shows that participation comes mainly from social motives and upbringing/someone's background.

The above conclusions show a paradox within this thesis when considering the literature. Puntams' (2000) theory states that social capital is key when it comes to participation; a high level of social capital will lead to a high level of participation. The decline of participation in the United States is the result of a decline of social capital according to Putnam (2000). Considering this theory it would mean that policy makers should focus on increasing social capital in the neighbourhood in order to

increase the level of participation among residents. However, the results of this thesis show the contrary; the participants have a higher degree of neighbourhood attachment than a degree of social capital. The spatial component of neighbourhood attachment and how residents relate to sense of place turn out to be more valid for participation in Amsterdam Oud-West, unlike the theory of Putnam (2000) suggests. This means that in the case of Amsterdam Oud-West policy makers should not focus on increasing informal participation so much, but on improving the spatial setting of the neighbourhood together with the residents; residents value the space around them.

The advantage of this theory for policy makers is that residents do not necessarily need to spend a lot of time in the neighbourhood for them to decide to participate. Residents who work 40 hours a week, are therefore still likely to participate as the reason to participate is to keep the space around them in a good state; as mentioned, they value the space around them. For reaching a high level of social capital, residents need to be in the neighbourhood a lot, because it is the result of the contact residents have with each other. For residents who have little time or who are not interested in social contact with their neighbours, it would mean that they would not participate. On the other hand, social capital makes it easier to start an initiative together and to come up with ideas; during some small talk with a neighbour, residents can come to realise that they share the same issues or ideas for the neighbourhood and can then decide to do something about it together. However, this research shows that policy makers should start thinking spatially and work from there to get residents involved.

The conclusions drawn so far mean that there is no reason for the local government to stop focusing on local neighbourhoods and start looking for activating, in that case it would be, citizens. A lack of neighbourhood attachment turned out not to be the reason why there is a low involvement in the policy of the local government. It makes sense to try to activate citizens within the geographical context of the neighbourhood as the participants do care about their neighbourhood and the fact that the neighbourhood is “close” to home. At the same time, this means there are other reasons why residents aren’t participating as much as the local government would wish they would. It also brings us to the question whether the government is the right party to do the job as is questioned by researchers as Uitermark & van Beek (2010).

After talking to the participants, considering their answer it would be my conclusion that residents do not, not participate because of lack of neighbourhood attachment or a lack of interest, but due to how the policy is now being carried out in practical terms. First of all, it became clear that not everyone is aware of the policy and the possibilities. Second of all, participants mentioned considerations as doubting to what extent they could influence the decision making process, how it depends on the topic of the meeting and whether the topic would interest them as well as that it is often unclear what a consultation evening is about and that consultation evenings are very detailed.

As mentioned before, what matters to the participants is whether there is a functional side to the story, a gain. The participants, who are not participating at the moment, stated formal participation had their preference over informal participation, meaning they are not looking for new friends, but are interested in working on their living environment. It also became clear that the participants, as some only have little time, want to talk about things that have an impact and a clear result.

The new policy could need some revision, not only because of the arguments made above, but also because the data of this research shows that the gap between the local government and the residents has grown. Taylor (2000) emphasised that the partnership between state and citizens, in this case the local government and its residents, can place a strain on the social capital, because of the tensions and the conditions placed upon the partnership. The data shows that the changing relationship since the new policy indeed has a negative impact on the relationship between the local government and the residents, which causes a loss of social capital through a decline of trust in the local government. The participants who have been participating in the neighbourhood for many years spoke out their concerns and are clearly disappointed about the way things are handled at the moment. They pointed out how many around them already stopped participating. Furthermore, the fact that neighbourhood commissions are threatened in their existence because they will not receive any subsidies anymore, also means that social networks which have been build for years are being threatened while they have an important role through involving residents in the neighbourhood. As mentioned before, it contradicts the idea of participation and bottom-up participation. The same organisation who created a policy that strives for more resident participation in the local neighbourhood, is threatening existing frameworks of resident participation in the neighbourhood, while they could also try to achieve resident participation through extending the existing frameworks/networks. However, it is clear that residents in general do need support and this support can be given by the local government. In general, the participants of this research agreed with the idea of residents taking on more responsibility. Even though the degree of trust in the local government isn't really high, none of the participants suggested that the local government isn't the right party. Rather they pointed to the responsibility the local government has and how in the past the local government was a good ally. Also, one of the participants who got the advice of the local government to summon funds, said he decided to not organise the event as a result. I didn't have the feeling he wasn't willing to put the effort in. However, not everyone knows how to take on something like that and I can imagine that the barrier is also higher when approaching other parties; in our thoughts the government is the organisation in our lives of which we feel they are there to help us and look after us.

Summing up, I do not agree that the local government isn't the right party to stimulate resident participation. It takes skills and knowledge to initiate a project. The local government has

these skills and knowledge, while not all residents have the rights skill and knowledge to do so, but that doesn't mean they are not willing to carry it out.

5.3. Recommendations

Considering the literature, the data and the conclusions that have been drawn, the following part of this thesis will contain some recommendations for improvement.

As mentioned in the previous part, residents prefer formal participation over informal participation; residents want visible results. Many people have their group of friends and have little time and therefore, see less use in participating informally. What did become clear is that formal participation can lead to informal participation, unlike the literature suggested earlier in this thesis (the relevance of informal participation is that it can lead to formal participation (Dekker, 2007)). The focus should be on getting residents together and getting them to interact through formal participation; I remember one of the participants stating that at first he is only interested in participating formally, and then maybe at a later stage, after you get to know each other, informal participation.

It also became clear that there is dichotomy in the neighbourhood between the original residents and the yuppies. This means there is a task for the local government to create bridging social capital. As not everybody is looking to make new friends, these two groups can be brought into contact through a common cause which is more likely through formal participation.

However, to get the residents involved who aren't involved at the moment, the structure of consultation evenings needs to change. Residents' considerations to attend a consultation evening depend on the topic and whether that topic interests them. Officials need to go into the neighbourhood and talk to the residents to find out what is going on in the neighbourhood and what moves residents. Very important in this is to remember that details as dog poo and a tile that is skewed discourages residents to come again; big issues which leads to clear results should be giving attention over daily businesses and never ending stories as dog poo. Obviously there are residents, who do care about that skewed tile and it would not be right to leave them unheard as that could lead to losing their involvement. However, the local government already has a programme on the internet, called More, where residents can leave their complaints. Resident with small problems should be referred to this programme and at the same time residents should be made more aware of this programme which will save time answering phone calls referring residents to the website.

Furthermore, communication should be strong as some participants stated that often it is not clear what will be discussed; clarity is key; what/when/where/how much time.

A second issue which causes indistinctness is the various organisations that are active in the neighbourhood; the local government, social work (the ABC team) and housing associations. All three

organisations work in a different way and it is unclear for residents which organisation is responsible for what. The housing associations work independent from the local government, but social work isn't. Various participants complained about the collaboration with social work. It would thus be wise to reconsider the way responsibility is now divided between the local government and social work. Social work is responsible for informal participation. Having a part of your policy carried out by a different party requires good communication between the two parties. It also makes it confusing for residents as they are not aware who is part of what.

It is important to consider that there are different target groups in the neighbourhood as well. This should be taken into account not only when considering the structure of meetings, but also in how to make residents aware. Not everyone has internet, so it should also be possible to drop a complaint elsewhere, besides the internet. Not everyone reads the local newspaper, so announcement should be made through various forms of media. Finally, not everyone has time to attend an evening, but this doesn't mean they don't want to have influence. Regarding the latter, one of the participants suggested to thinking of other platforms where residents can speak out rather than solely a consultation evening. His suggestion was through the internet, but this should be given some good thought as it might mean less time for the residents, but more paperwork for the officials and at the same time it doesn't have the advantage of bringing people together.

The paperwork brings me to another issue, the visibility of officials in the neighbourhood. Some residents stated never to see officials in the neighbourhood and others who have been living in the neighbourhood for a longer period of time stated that things used to be better because of the high visibility of officials. However, as I also worked with the local government for five months as part of an internship, I know that the low visibility isn't due to officials being comfortable behind their desk. Many times I heard them complain how they should be on the street, but were stuck behind their desk doing paperwork; in other words due to bureaucracy. As has become clear earlier in this thesis there is a contradiction in the policy of the local government. On the one hand the policy makers formulated a policy that strives to activate residents, but on the other hand it doesn't seem as they want to invest in it. On the long term it could be done in a different way, but first awareness must be raised, and awareness isn't raised by having an attitude that says "*we are not doing anything anymore until residents take initiative*". Second, residents also need to learn how to stand on their own feet which requires good guidance of professionals in the starting phase.

The people responsible for this policy need to take a step back and ask themselves why they formulated this policy; is the main goal saving money or is it creating active residents? I don't think one necessarily excludes the other, but I do believe it does so on the short term; you need to sow, before you can harvest.

5.4. Reflections on research

Looking back on the research, there are some things I would have done differently; obviously looking back is always easier than looking forward. However, I would like to point out some things for others to learn from.

5.4.1 Suggestions of improvement

First of all, during the interviews I realised that the discussion between residents who stated to participate in their neighbourhood and residents who state not to participate wasn't going as I hoped as the residents who stated to participate had more input than the other residents; it felt as if the others had difficulty intervening. One of the interviews existed out of residents who stated not to participate and I noticed that it was easier to get to the core of why they didn't participate with this group. Next time I would divide the groups in residents who participate on the one hand and residents who don't participate on the other hand.

Second, when I approached residents for the interviews in the neighbourhood a certain group stated not to consider themselves as active residents. However, during the interview I discovered more resident were active in some way than they had stated. It could thus be questioned whether this says something of this groups of residents in particular of whether the degree of participation isn't as low as was thought of.

In addition, I approached residents in certain places as the library, play grounds and the park. This might have caused a bias as this might attract certain residents. Next time I would visit more diverse places. I question this, because non of the participants have a nationality other than the Dutch nationality (one didn't answer this question). This might say something about the residents who are willing to participate in research. However, now it seems as Amsterdam Oud-West is a neighbourhood of Dutch nationality only, which can not be the case.

5.4.2 Suggestions for further research

When it comes to neighbourhood attachment indicators are duration of stay, age, having children etc.. The older generation often has a higher degree of neighbourhood attachment. One of the reasons for their high degree of neighbourhood attachment is duration of stay. Yet, I also started to wonder if dependency is a indicator that plays a role and whether this dependency has an effect on participation as some of the older participants who participated in their neighbourhood also seemed to argue that it had to do with the fact that they couldn't move or were depended as a result of low mobility. I would suggest further research in this area.

Second, I noticed that Amsterdam Oud-West is a very interesting neighbourhood for those

researchers interested in gentrification. There are frictions between the original residents and the yuppies, at least seen from the point of view of the original residents. I believe Amsterdam Oud-West is an interesting case to research how these feelings develop.

Third, more related to this research, I interviewed only twenty residents. Further research in the neighbourhood will give more insight in the larger population. Second, District West has three other neighbourhoods with a different demography. I believe it would be interesting to do research on the topic in the other neighbourhoods as well as they all deal with the same policy. It would be interesting to see if the residents in other neighbourhoods have the same considerations and which factors play a role.

Finally, I would suggest an internal research in case of the local government. During my internship, I wondered if all departments share the same vision. A more efficient collaboration between the departments, a shared vision and a main goal will make it easier to carry out the policy and it would also save money; a 'minor' detail in times of crisis.

Reference list

- Albarracin, J. & Anna Valeva (2011), Political participation and social capital among Mexicans and Mexicans Americans in Central Illinois, *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 33:4, pp. 507-523.
- Bekkers, R. & N.D. de Graaf (2002), Verschuivende achtergronden van verenigingsparticipatie in Nederland, *Mens & Maatschappij*, vol.77:4, pp. 338-360.
- Bernt, M. & A. Holm (2005), *Exploring the substance and style of gentrification: Berlin's 'Prenzlberg'*. In: Atkinson, R. & G. Bridge (eds)(2005) *Gentrification in a global context: The new urban colonialism*, London/New York: Routledge, P. 106-120.
- Bextens, D. (2010), *Bewonersparticipatie bij fysieke projecten in krachtwijken*, Delft: Delft University of Technology.
- Bolt, G. Burgers, J. & R. Van Kempen (1998), On the social significance of spatial location: spatial segregation and social inclusion, *Netherlands Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, vol.13:1, pp.83-95.
- Chaskin, R.J. (2001), Building community capacity: A definitional framework and case study from a comprehensive community initiative, *Urban Affairs Review*, vol.36:3, pp. 291-323.
- Crossen, S. (2009), *Hoe beschaafd is Nederland? Een fiscale kosten-batenanalyse* (Report no.83), Den Haag: Centraal Planbureau.
- Dekker, K. (2007), Social capital, neighbourhood attachment and participation in distressed urban areas. A case study in The Hague and Utrecht, The Netherlands, *Housing Studies*, vol.22:3, pp. 355-379.
- Docherty, I. Goodlad, R. & R. Paddison (2001), Civic culture, community and citizen participation in contrasting neighbourhoods, *Urban Studies*, vol.38:12, pp. 2225-2250.
- Field, J. (2008), *Social Capital*, Oxon/New York: Routledge.
- Friedman, J. (2007), Reflections on place and place-making in the cities of China, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol.31:2, pp.257-279.
- Hay, R. (1998), Sense of place in development context, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol.18, pp.5-29.
- Hidalgo, M.C. & B. Hernández (2001). Place attachment: conceptual and empirical questions, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol. 21, pp.273-281
- Jorgensen, B.S. & R.C. Stedman (2001), Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore owners attitude toward their properties, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol.21, pp.233-248.
- Jorgensen, B.S. & R.C. Stedman (2006), A comparative analysis of predictors of sense of place dimensions: attachment to, dependence on, and identification with lakeshore properties, *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol.79, pp.316-327
- Low, S.M & I. Altman (1992), *Place attachment*, London/New York: Plenum Press.

- Lupi, T. (2005), *Buurtbinding: van veenkolonie tot vinex-wijk*, Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Lupi, T., de Stigter-Speksnijder, M., Karsten, L., Musterd, S. & L. Deben (2007), *Leven in de buurt*, Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Nanzer, B. (2004), Measuring sense of place: a scale for Michigan, *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, vol.26:3, pp.362-382.
- Putnam, R. (2000), *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Saunders, M.N.K., Lewis, P. & A. Thornhill (2009), *Research methods for business students*, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Gemeente Amsterdam (2011) *Factsheets West*. Stadsdeel West: Government Printing Office.
- Gemeente Amsterdam (2011) *Eindrapport: Tussentijdse Evaluatie Buurtgericht Werken*. Stadsdeel West: Government Printing Office.
- Gemeente Amsterdam (n.a.) *Powerpoint "Buurtgericht werken"*. Stadsdeel West: Government Printing Office.
- Taylor, M (2000), Communities in the lead: power, organisational capacity and social capital, *Urban Studies*, vol.37:5-6, pp.1019-1035.
- Tonkens, E. & I. Verhoeven (2011), *Bewonersinitiatieven; proeftuinen voor partnerschap tussen burgers en overheid*, Amsterdam: Pallas Publications.
- Tuan, Y.F. (1977), *Space and Place*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Uitermark, J. & J.W. Duyvendak (2006), Ruimte maken voor straatburgerschap. Mensen maken de stad als assertief sociaal beleid, Rotterdam: Projectgroep Sociale Integratie, Gemeente Rotterdam.
- Uitermark, J. & J.W. Duyvendak (2007), De kloof dichten met straatburgerschap, *Agora*, vol.24:5, pp.31-34.
- Uitermark, J. & K. van Beek (2010), Gesmoorde participatie. Over de schaduwkanten van 'meedoen' als staatsproject, pp. 227-240. In: Verhoeven, I. & M. Ham (red) (2010), *Brave burgers gezocht. De grenzen van de activerende overheid*, Amsterdam: Van Genneep.
- Van Vliet, P. (2012), *Leren van de stad*, Amsterdam: KennisNetwerk Amsterdam.
- Veldboer, L., Bergstra, M. & Kleinhaus, R. (2011), *Meer inkomensdiversiteit, meer buurtvertrouwen? Sociale tectoniek of vreedzame co-existentie in Amsterdamse gentrification-wijken*, Amsterdam/Delft: Universiteit van Amsterdam/Onderzoeks-instituut OTB.
- Wellman, B. (1999), *Networks in the global village: life in contemporary communities*, Boulder: Westview Press
- Wissink, B. & A. Hazelzat (2012), Social networks in 'neighborhood Tokyo', *Urban Studies*, vol.49:7, pp.1527-1548.

Appendix

Enquêteformulier onderzoek “Buurtparticipatie in Oud-West”

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen



Naam (niet verplicht):

1. Wat is uw geslacht?
 - Man
 - Vrouw

2. Wat is uw geboortjaar? 19.....

3. Wat is uw nationaliteit?
 - Nederlands
 - Surinaams
 - Turks
 - Marrokaans
 - Anders, namelijk.....

4. Hoe is uw huishouden samengesteld?
 - Huishouden met kinderen
 - Huishouden zonder kinderen

5. Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding?
 - Geen opleiding voltooid
 - Basisonderwijs
 - Middelbaaronderwijs
 - MBO
 - HBO
 - Wetenschappelijk Onderwijs
 - Anders, namelijk.....

6. Heeft u uw huis gekocht of gehuurd?
 - Huur
 - Koop

7. In welke buurt woont u?

- Bellamybuurt
- Da Costabuurt
- Borgerbuurt
- Vondelparkbuurt
- Helmersbuurt
- Cremerbuurt
- Hugo de Grootbuurt
- Frederik Hendrikbuurt
- Marcanti-eiland
- Ik weet niet welke buurt het precies is, maar ik woon in de volgende straat:.....

8. Uw dagelijkse activiteiten bestaan uit:

- School
- Werk
- Anders,
namelijk.....
-

9. Wat is de hoogte van uw inkomen per maand?

(Een modaal inkomen bedraagt tussen de €2.250-€2.750)

- Beneden modaal
- Ongeveer modaal
- Iets meer dan modaal
- 2 keer modaal of meer

10. Woont er familie van u in de buurt?

- Ja
- Nee

11. Wonen uw vrienden in dezelfde buurt als u?

- Ja
- Nee

12. Woont meer dan de helft van uw vrienden in dezelfde buurt als u?

(U kunt deze vragen overslaan wanneer uw vrienden niet in dezelfde buurt wonen)

- Minder dan de helft
- Meer dan de helft

13. In hoeverre heeft u contact met uw burens?

- Ik heb geen contact met mijn burens
- Ik maak een praatje met mijn burens
- Ik kom bij mijn burens over de vloer (denk aan: koffie drinken)
- Mijn burens zijn inmiddels vrienden geworden; wij doen regelmatig dingen samen

14. In hoeverre vertrouwt u uw buurtbewoners?
- Ik vertrouw mijn buurtbewoners niet
 - Ik heb er vertrouwen in dat de buurtbewoners mijn fiets en/of andere dingen in de openbare ruimte niet vernielen of stelen
 - Ik geef mijn naaste buurtbewoners de sleutel van mijn huis in het geval van calamiteiten
15. In hoeverre vertrouwt u het Stadsdeel?
(Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)
- Ik heb geen vertrouwen in het Stadsdeel
 - Ik voel mij niet serieus genomen door het Stadsdeel
 - Ik heb er vertrouwen in dat het Stadsdeel de juiste keuzes maakt
 - Ik voel mij serieus genomen door het Stadsdeel
 - Het Stadsdeel komt de gemaakte afspraken na
16. Wanneer ik zie dat iemand afwijkend gedrag vertoont (tegen de algemene normen en waarden in), corrigeer ik deze persoon en ga ik eventueel opzoek naar een oplossing:
- Ja
 - Nee
17. Hoe lang woont u al in uw buurt? jaar
18. Voelt u zich verbonden met de buurt?
- Ja
 - Nee
19. Speelt uw leven zich vooral af in de buurt?
- Vooral in de buurt
 - Vooral buiten de buurt
20. Bent u trots op uw buurt?
- Ja
 - Nee
21. Voelt u zich thuis in uw buurt?
- Ja
 - Nee

22. In hoeverre bent u actief in uw buurt?

- Ik ben niet actief in de buurt en ik doe ook niet mee met activiteiten die georganiseerd worden in de buurt (denk aan: een feest of een barbecue)
- Ik organiseer zelf geen activiteiten in de buurt, maar ik doe wel mee met activiteiten die door anderen georganiseerd worden
- Ik organiseer activiteiten in de buurt als straatfeesten en barbecues (informele participatie) en ik doe ook mee aan de activiteiten
- Ik maak geen deel uit van een regiegroep, inspiratiegroep of een co-productie van een project met het Stadsdeel (denk aan: een plantsoen herinrichten samen met het Stadsdeel), maar ik ga wel naar inspraakavonden of buurt-aan-zet avonden die het Stadsdeel organiseert
- Ik maak deel uit van een regiegroep, inspiratiegroep of een co-productiegroep en ik ga naar inspraakavonden of buurt-aan-zet avonden die het Stadsdeel organiseert (formele participatie)
- Anders,
namelijk.....
.....
.....
.....

Dank u wel!

Results survey

Enquêteformulier onderzoek “Buurtparticipatie in Oud-West”

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen



Naam (niet verplicht):

1. Wat is uw geslacht?
 - Man
 - Vrouw

Men: 10

Woman: 10

2. Wat is uw geboortjaar? 19.....

Participants born between 1928 and 1976

Men born between 1928 and 1974

Women born between 1936 and 1976

3. Wat is uw nationaliteit?
 - Nederlands
 - Surinaams
 - Turks
 - Marrokaans
 - Anders, namelijk.....

Participants nationality: 19 carry the Dutch nationality, 1 doesn't want to answer the question (man)

4. Hoe is uw huishouden samengesteld?
 - Huishouden met kinderen
 - Huishouden zonder kinderen

Household with children: 5 (men: 3, women: 2)

Household without children: 15

5. Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding?
 - Geen opleiding voltooid
 - Basisonderwijs
 - Middelbaaronderwijs

- MBO
- HBO
- Wetenschappelijk Onderwijs
- Anders, namelijk.....

Highschool: 5 (men:3, women:2)

Mbo: 2 (men:2, women: 0)

Hbo: 8 (men: 2, women:6)

University: 5 (men:3, women: 2)

6. Heeft u uw huis gekocht of gehuurd?

- Huur
- Koop

Tenant: 13 (men: 6, women: 7)

Owner: 7 (men: 4, women: 3)

7. In welke buurt woont u?

- Bellamybuurt
- Da Costabuurt
- Borgerbuurt
- Vondelparkbuurt
- Helmersbuurt
- Cremerbuurt
- Hugo de Grootbuurt
- Frederik Hendrikbuurt
- Marcanti-eiland
- Ik weet niet welke buurt het precies is, maar ik woon in de volgende straat:.....

Cremerbuurt: 3

Bellamybuurt: 4

Marcanti-eiland: 2

Vondelparkbuurt: 1

Helmersbuurt: 3

Borgerbuurt: 3

Frederik Hendrikbuurt: 1

Da Costabuurt: 1

Hugo de grootbuurt: 2

8. Uw dagelijkse activiteiten bestaan uit:

School

Werk

Anders,

namelijk.....

.....

School: 0

Work: 10 (men:4, women: 6)

Different: 10 (men: 6, women: 4)

9. Wat is de hoogte van uw inkomen per maand?

(Een modaal inkomen bedraagt tussen de €2.250-€2.750)

Beneden modaal

Ongeveer modaal

Iets meer dan modaal

2 keer modaal of meer

Less than average: 6 (men: 3, women:3)

About average: 3 (men: 1, women: 2)

A bit more than average: 9 (men: 5, women: 4)

Twice average: 1 (men:1, women:0)

Didn't answer: 1

10. Woont er familie van u in de buurt?

Ja

Nee

Family: 6 (men: 3, women:3)

No family: 14 (men:7, women:3)

11. Wonen uw vrienden in dezelfde buurt als u?

Ja

Nee

Friends: 11(men: 6, women:5)

No friends: 8 (men:4, women:4)

Filled in both: 1 (women)

12. Woont meer dan de helft van uw vrienden in dezelfde buurt als u?

(U kunt deze vragen overslaan wanneer uw vrienden niet in dezelfde buurt wonen)

- Minder dan de helft
- Meer dan de helft

Less than half: 8(men:4 , women: 4)

More than half: 2 men:1, women: 1)

13. In hoeverre heeft u contact met uw burenen?

- Ik heb geen contact met mijn burenen
- Ik maak een praatje met mijn burenen
- Ik kom bij mijn burenen over de vloer (denk aan: koffie drinken)
- Mijn burenen zijn inmiddels vrienden geworden; wij doen regelmatig dingen samen

No contact: 1 (men:0, women:1)

A conversation: 9 (men:4, women: 5)

I visited my neighbours: 4 (men:2, women: 2)

My neighbours are friends: 6 (men: 4, women: 2)

14. In hoeverre vertrouwt u uw buurtbewoners?

- Ik vertrouw mijn buurtbewoners niet
- Ik heb er vertrouwen in dat de buurtbewoners mijn fiets en/of andere dingen in de openbare ruimte niet vernielen of stelen
- Ik geef mijn naaste buurtbewoners de sleutel van mijn huis in het geval van calamiteiten

No trust: (men: 0, women: 1)

I trust them to leave my stuff in the public space alone: (men: 0, women: 2)

They have my keys: (men: 9, women: 7)

Didn't filled it in: 1 (say to trust some, and others not)

Some say they trust some and others not

15. In hoeverre vertrouwt u het Stadsdeel?

(Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

- Ik heb geen vertrouwen in het Stadsdeel
- Ik voel mij niet serieus genomen door het Stadsdeel
- Ik heb er vertrouwen in dat het Stadsdeel de juiste keuzes maakt
- Ik voel mij serieus genomen door het Stadsdeel
- Het Stadsdeel komt de gemaakte afspraken na

Don't trust local authorities: (men:1, women:1)

Don't feel local authorities takes me serious: (men:1, women:3)

I trust them to make the right decision: (men:3, women:3)

I feel like they take me serious: (men:1, women:4)

Local authority follows up on what they say they will do: 2

No experience: 1

Other answer: 3

16. Wanneer ik zie dat iemand afwijkend gedrag vertoont (tegen de algemene normen en waarden in), corrigeer ik deze persoon en ga ik eventueel opzoek naar een oplossing:

- Ja
- Nee

Yes: 13 (men:6, women:7)

No: 6 (men: 3, women: 3)

Sometimes: 1 (men)

17. Hoe lang woont u al in uw buurt? jaar

Men between: 3 and 52 years

Women between: 3 and 77 years

18. Voelt u zich verbonden met de buurt?

- Ja
- Nee

Yes: 20 (men:10, women:10)

No: 0

19. Speelt uw leven zich vooral af in de buurt?

- Vooral in de buurt
- Vooral buiten de buurt

Mainly in the neighborhood: 10 (men: 5, women:5)

Mainly outside the neighborhood: 5 (men:3, women:2)

Answered both: 5 (men:2, women:3)

20. Bent u trots op uw buurt?

- Ja
- Nee

Yes: 17 (men:9, women:8)

No: 1 (men:1, women:0)

Sometimes: 1 (women)

No answer: 1 (women)

21. Voelt u zich thuis in uw buurt?

- Ja
- Nee

Yes: 20 (men:10, women: 10; 1 most of the time)

No: 0

22. In hoeverre bent u actief in uw buurt?

- Ik ben niet actief in de buurt en ik doe ook niet mee met activiteiten die georganiseerd worden in de buurt (denk aan: een feest of een barbecue)
- Ik organiseer zelf geen activiteiten in de buurt, maar ik doe wel mee met activiteiten die door anderen georganiseerd worden
- Ik organiseer activiteiten in de buurt als straatfeesten en barbecues (informele participatie) en ik doe ook mee aan de activiteiten
- Ik maak geen deel uit van een regiegroep, inspiratiegroep of een co-productie van een project met het Stadsdeel (denk aan: een plantsoen herinrichten samen met het Stadsdeel), maar ik ga wel naar inspraakavonden of buurt-aan-zet avonden die het Stadsdeel organiseert
- Ik maak deel uit van een regiegroep, inspiratiegroep of een co-productiegroep en ik ga naar inspraakavonden of buurt-aan-zet avonden die het Stadsdeel organiseert (formele participatie)
- Anders,
namelijk.....
.....
.....
.....

Not active: 1 (men)

Don't organise but do attend: 6 (men:2, women:4)

Organize informal events: 5 (men:2, women: 3)

Not part of 'regiegroep', but do attend consultation evenings: 5 (men:3, women: 2)

'Regiegroep': 5 (men: 2, women: 3)

Different: 1 (men)

Dank u wel!