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Abstract
This thesis is about the structural and the cultural characteristics of local networks in a neighbourhood. The research sets out to investigated how local initiatives and government interact with each other in local networks in a neighbourhood. There is a gap between government and citizens in the public domain (van der Lans, 2011, 2014). This gap implies that government and citizens have different ways on doing and acting. In other words, in a neighbourhood different ‘cultures’ come together (Fuchs, 2001). The study of local networks, and particularly the local interaction between government and citizens, helps to understand this gap.

In general, researches use the social network analysis to study networks. However, this study is not always affective. The field of study is criticized by different scholar for the fact that the social network analysis is inequality dealing with the questions of culture and meaning in relations. This is a scientific problem. Therefore, in this research the social network analysis is combined with the theory of ‘culture and society’ of Stephan Fuchs (2001). This is an interdisciplinary theory that studies the meaning of networks in society.

The research objective is to investigated how the combination of the social network analysis with the theory of ‘culture and society’ helps to get new insights in the structural and the cultural characteristics of local networks in a neighbourhood. First, the social network analysis is used to identify and characterize the local networks. Second, the theory of ‘culture and society’ addresses that there exist different cultures in a neighbourhood. These cultural differences help to analyse the ‘gap’ between government and citizens. This social and scientific problem lead to the research question:

‘How can a combination of social network analysis and the theory of ‘culture and society’ provide insights in the structural and cultural characteristics of local networks in a neighbourhood?’

The research studies two research objects: the local actor ‘local initiatives’ in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf and the new governmental team ‘team Leefomgeving’. The study of this two objects enables the research to get new insights in how local initiatives and government interact with each other.

The main findings of this research is that there exist three types of networks in a neighbourhood: the formal networks that exist of institutional actors, the semi-formal network that exist of citizens’ organisations and the informal network that displays the informal local initiatives in a neighbourhood that emerges from the direct needs in the society. The difference between these types of networks can be characterised by structural and cultural characteristics. This means that the networks do not only have different kind of relationships but also by the different ways of acting and practicing. First, the structural characteristics are defined by the local actors and relationships characteristics in the
network. Second, the research defines the cultural characteristics by the different languages, organisation forms and backgrounds within the networks. These structural and cultural differences affect the way the networks interact with each other. In general, the more two actors differ structural as cultural the lower the degree of external interaction. The degree of external interaction indicates the knowledge the actors and stakeholders may have from each other and the resources and information that the actors share.

The research concludes with a practical recommendation for the ‘team Leefomgeving’. The research argues that citizens and the local government have different relationships. These different relations imply that the actors have access to different information. In other words, there seems to be a knowledge ‘gap’. The ‘team Leefomgeving’ needs other sources to receive information about the needs and ideas in Presikhaaf. It provides four strategies for the ‘team Leefomgeving’ the way to observe the needs and ideas to support the social innovation and local initiatives in the neighbourhood. These four strategies can be seen as the four ‘lenses’ supporting to read the network map:

- **Strategy 1** an overview of the process and interaction patterns;
- **Strategy 2** the flow of information and resources through the neighbourhood;
- **Strategy 3** the position of the actor in the network;
- **Strategy 4** the cultural difference between the networks.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Project framework

*We live in confusing times, as is often the case in periods of historical transition between different forms of society* (Castells, 2011, p.7)

Currently, a society that develops from bottom-up, in which government and citizens work together on the same goal, a social and liveable society is seen as a political ideal. This form of society, with its political focus on the local level of governance, is not new. In modern history, there have been many political and governmental projects that promoted new solutions to change the relation between citizens and government in order to work together in the public domain (van der Lans, 2014; Wilde, Hurenkamp and Tonkens, 2014). Nevertheless, history has shown that although during different transitions government tried to develop a society bottom-up, they struggle to define its relation with citizens (van der Lans, 2014; Weijdeven, 2012). The question what government should do to redefine this relation remains unanswered (Metze, 2016). Therefore, this form of society asks for a new perspective on the position of government and citizens in society (Castells, 2011).

Since the Second World War, there have been different trends in the Netherlands of policy focussing on the local level of social intervention (van der Lans, 2014). The central philosophy was that a close relationship between government and citizens would be the solution for different problems in the social and public domain.

- In the first period 145-1970, after World War II, the philosophy was that strong and healthy communities would solve the social unrest in society.
- The second period, 1970 to 1990, was a time of urban renewal. The philosophy was that citizens and other local parties should participate in the urban-renewal programmes.
- The third period, 1990 to 2012, was a time during which the policy’s focus changed from housing to the awareness of social vulnerability in neighbourhoods. The philosophy was that social policies should encouraged citizens to have a more responsible and active role within their living environment.

(van der Lans, 2014; WRR, 2005)

These different trends show that the government struggled during every period to develop a society in which government and citizens work in close collaboration. It shows that the government constantly tried different ways to engage different local parties in the policy process (de Boer and van der Lans, 2013). What happens now in the public domain? Have policy makers learned from the lessons from history?
In the Netherlands, the most recent transition is the decentralisation: the shift in responsibilities from central to local government (Newman and Tonkens; Verhoeven and Tonkens, 2011). A range of governmental programmes, on both the local and the national level, addresses the fact that the local communities are an alternative, capable of taking over services provided by the welfare state (Wilde et al., 2014). Examples of current government programmes are:

- On a national level, the most recent transition is the new government ‘het sociale domein’ (the social domain). Since January 2015, the local government is responsible for all formal care in the neighbourhood district (Movisie, 2015). The programme includes three specific policy domains: long-term care, youth care, and income support (van Hintum, 2015).
- Another change on the national level is a new programme called the Environment and Planning’s Act (Omgevingswet). This act will be implemented in 2018. The aim is to combine and simplify the regulation for spatial projects to make it easier for citizens to start projects (Rijksoverheid, n.d.).
- On a local level, an example is the new local programme van Wijken Weten in Arnhem. The aim of the project is to restructure the public domain in the city of Arnhem by the use of a more bottom-up approach towards neighbourhood regulation. Instead of a regular policy program, it focusses the attention on the neighbourhood’s demands (Limburg, 2016).

Simultaneously, citizens increasingly take initiative to take over local services themselves (Wilde et al., 2014; van der Steen, van Twist, Chin-A-Fat, and Kwakkelstein, 2013). For instance, new trends are initiatives such as energy cooperatives, community enterprises, and urban farming (Verheije, Mittelmeijer, van Steen and Geeurickx, 2014). The society, in which citizens and local firms increasingly participate in the public sector, is defined as the ‘do-democracy’ (van der Lans, 2014; van der Steen, Hajer, Scherpenisse, van Gerwen and Kruitwagen, 2014; van de Wijdeven, 2012).

Decentralisation and the ‘do-democracy’ ask for a new perspective on the role of government and citizens. There seems to be a paradoxical relation between government and citizens in this new public environment. Firstly, the community and grassroots initiatives that developed from below appear to have merely a marginal effect on the neighbourhood (Raad voor de Maatschappelijke ontwikkeling, 2014). The initiatives are struggling with the dominant structures, such as business models and regulatory systems or the lack of public support. Secondly, the role of government is sometimes confusing in this new public environment. On the one hand, their ‘new’ role means taking a step back to open space for more ‘active citizenship’ (van der Steen et al., 2014). On the other hand, it assumes that the government participates in local social networks to facilitate and regulate local activities and
initiatives in the public domain (Berlo, 2012; van der Steen et al., 2014; van der Steen et al., 2013; Wetenschappelijke raad voor het Regeringsbeleid, 2005).

Taken together, these different policy trends showed that government constantly tried new programmes to develop a (new) relation with citizens. Nevertheless, the question remains what the preferred approach for government is to cooperate with citizens in the public domain. In addition, the recent transition towards decentralisation in this public domain poses a problem. How can this paradoxical relation between citizens and government be explained? Moreover, can this help provide answers to the question what government should do to cooperate with citizens?

Overall, ‘two worlds’ seem to come together in the new public environment in the neighbourhood. On the one hand, there is an active, positive, and innovative world of self-organisation, active citizens, and local bottom-up initiatives. This form of society is vibrant and changes fast. On the other hand, there is the bureaucratic world that tries to structure this new and active society with rules and procedures (van der Lans, 2011, 2014). These different ‘worlds’ are two different ‘cultures’ that meet in the neighbourhood. These different cultures imply that government and citizens work differently (Fuchs, 2001). In other words, there is a ‘gap’ between the government and citizens in the public domain (van der Lans, 2014, 2011; Newman and Tonkens, 2011; Verhoeven and Tonkens, 2011). This ‘gap’ calls for new knowledge on what government should do to cooperate with citizens on a local level.

1.2 Research problem
The previous section examined the social problem this research addresses. It shows that government constantly tried new programmes to develop a relation with citizens. Nonetheless, the question remains what government should do to cooperate with citizens on a local level. This asks for a study of the different interactional patterns of citizens and government on a local level or, in other words, a study of the ‘gap’ between government and citizens in the public domain. A social network analysis (SNA) might help provide answers to this question. A social network study tries to explain (social) actions in terms of their (social) relations with others in society (Marin and Wellman, 2011). Thus, the study helps to understand the action of local actors by looking at their relations with others. This mapping approach visualises the local interaction among groups, initiatives, organisations, and networks in a neighbourhood (Balfour and Alter, 2016). It shows who are connected and who are not. This SNA might help to understand the actions of citizens and government and how to bridge these two ‘worlds’ in the local public domain.

Nevertheless, this field of analysis has been criticised by different scholars because social network studies are inadequately dealing with question of culture and meaning in relations (Mische, 2011; Erikson, 2013; Emirbayer, 1997; Emirbayer and Goodwin, 1994). This is a scientific problem. A
theoretical perspective is necessary to describe the meaning of networks within society. In other words, a theoretical perspective is needed to analyse why certain interactions take place and why others do not. This research employs the theoretical perspective of the ‘culture and society’ theory (Fuchs, 2001). This is an interdisciplinary theory, which includes the issues of society, culture, meaning, and communication. The theory gives a more theoretical perspective on the study of relations than the SNA does. The perspective of Fuchs (2001) shows there are cultural differences between actors in society. Understanding these cultural differences helps the current research to analyse why certain interaction between actors in society takes place or not. More specifically, the theory of ‘culture and society’ helps to analyse the ‘gap’ between government and citizens.

This thesis is the first study that combines social network analysis (SNA) with the theory of ‘culture and society’ to answer this scientific problem. The combination of concepts of the two theories provides an important understanding of the meaning of networks in society. Furthermore, in modern history, the theory of ‘culture and society’ has only been used in theoretical debates. Therefore, this current study makes an original contribution to the scientific knowledge of networks.

1.3 The research objectives and the research questions

Two research objects are studied to answer the research problem. This helps frame how governmental parties and local actors act and work in local networks. In other words, how government and local actors interact with themselves and with each other. This research examines the following objects:

- The local actors in a neighbourhood;
- The governmental team, called ‘team Leefomgeving’, in the city of Arnhem.

First, the study of local actors in a neighbourhood is necessary to gain insight in local networks. This research studies the neighbourhood Presikhaaf in Arnhem. The argumentation for the study of this neighbourhood can be found in Chapter 4. Different local actors interact with each other in the neighbourhood. One of these local actors is local initiatives. In light of the ‘do-democracy’, the study of local initiatives is particularly interesting. As discussed, citizens increasingly take initiative in their living environment. This asks for a different perspective on the role of citizens and government in the public domain. Therefore, this research focusses on the local initiatives in the neighbourhood to gain insights in how local actors interact in local networks. Simultaneously, the study of local initiatives might help provide answers to the question how government interacts – i.e. collaborates – with the local actor local initiatives.

Second, ‘team Leefomgeving’ is a new governmental team in Arnhem. It is part of the new government programme van Wijken Weten. The team talks with different local organisations, citizens’ groups, and individual citizens to determine what special needs there are in the neighbourhood. One of the
challenges is to use the self-organising capacity of citizens and the local initiatives to promote new social values in the neighbourhood (Arnhem, 2015). One responsibility of the team is to facilitate and stimulate social innovations and local initiatives in the neighbourhood. However, the team members usually do not have contact with the more informal services and local initiatives in the neighbourhood. Studying ‘team Leefomgeving’ helps frame how government participates in local networks and how the team acts.

In short, the combination of these two study objects, the local initiatives and the governmental team ‘team Leefomgeving’, enable this research to gain insights in how local initiatives and the government interact in local networks in a neighbourhood.

1.3.1 The research objectives
These scientific and social problems lead to the following research objective.

The objective of this research is to gain insights in the structural and cultural characteristics of the local network in a neighbourhood, by combining social network analysis with the theory of ‘culture and society’. The combination of the two network studies enables the researcher to describe the meaning of networks within society. First, the SNA is used to identify and characterise the local networks in the neighbourhood. It helps to create an overview of all the different local actors and the way they interact. Second, the theory of ‘culture and society,’ written by Stephan Fuchs (2001), addresses the different ‘worlds’ of government and citizens. These differences are called ‘cultures’. The perspective of Fuchs (2001) conceptualises the relation between networks and society.

These new insights in local networks are used to formulate new strategies for the government on how to collaborate with different local parties on a local level. Furthermore, this research investigates the potential of the governmental team, ‘team Leefomgeving’, to use the SNA to stimulate and facilitate local initiatives and social innovation, by identifying and characterising the local networks in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf.

The two scientific and social objectives can be summarised as follows:

- To gain new insights in the structural and cultural characteristics of local networks in a neighbourhood, by combining social network analysis with the theory of ‘culture and society’;
- To formulate new strategies for the governmental team ‘team Leefomgeving’ on how to collaborate with different local parties and how to stimulate and facilitate social innovation in a neighbourhood.

---

1 (Tielen, personal communication, 15 January 2016)
1.3.2 The research questions
This objective leads to the main research question:

‘How can a combination of social network analysis and the theory of ‘culture and society’ provide insights in the structural and cultural characteristics of local networks in a neighbourhood?’

To facilitate the creation of a detailed answer to the research question some sub-questions have to be answered as well. Examination of the following sub-questions helps provide answers:

1. What local networks can be identified, and how can they be characterised, in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf?
2. How can the local networks be characterised structurally?
3. How can the local networks be characterised culturally?
4. How do the different identified and characterised networks interact with each other?

1.4 Relevance
The relevance of this research is twofold: scientific and social.

1.3.1 Scientific relevance
The scientific relevance lies in the combination of two network studies: the social network analysis and the theory of ‘culture and society’. The social network study is generally criticised for being a-theoretical (Emirbayer, 1997; Emirbayer and Goodwin, 1994; Erikson, 2013; Mische, 2011). Consequently, the question is whether it is a method or a theory (Mische, 2011). Different network scholars have discussed this scientific problem (Erikson, 2013; Emirbayer, 1997; Emirbayer and Goodwin, 1994; Mische, 2011; Wellmann, 1988). Nevertheless, the disagreement remains that the study inadequately deals with the questions of culture and meaning in relations (Erikson, 2013; Mische, 2011). Firstly, the present research outlines the scientific debate about whether SNA it is a method or a theory. Secondly, the research discusses the relevance of the combination of the two network studies for this research.

According to Barry Wellmann (1988), SNA is more than just a methodological approach. He argues that the study uses a different approach to study ‘social structures’ in society. The social world exists of a thick web of social relations in which we can never treat social things in isolation. In other words, society cannot be understood as a mass of individuals who act independently from each other. Instead, when studying society, the focus should be on the interactions between the individual actions. Therefore, Wellmann argues these patterns of interaction should be studied instead of individual feelings, emotions, or behaviour. A few years later, Mustafa Emirbayer and Jeff Goodwin (1994) elaborated this argument by describing the ‘anti-categorical imperative’. This imperative rejects the presumption that social behaviour or social actions can solely be explained based on the categorical
attributes of the individual. Emirbayer and Goodwin put it as ‘the priority of relations over categories’ (1994).

Although these scholars argue for a priority of relationships over ‘category’ to study forms of life in society, their work does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the relations between networks and the rest of society. Therefore, their work does not give a sufficient theoretical explanation on how to explain interactions in society (Emirbayer, 1997; Emirbayer and Goodwin, 1994; Wellmann, 1988). A new research agenda is needed for the study of the relations between networks and society. Therefore, to try to answer this scientific problem this research uses an interdisciplinary network theory: Fuchs’ theory of ‘culture and society’.

The combination of these two perspectives, the structural and the cultural, seeks to scientifically enrich the theory of relational network studies. First, this combination provides new perspectives on general network theory and, more specifically, on what networks mean exactly. Thus, it helps to give a theoretical explanation for the relationships and interactions on the network map produced by the SNA. Second, the combination of those theories helps develop a deeper understanding of why there is a ‘gap’ between governmental actors and citizens, and it seeks to provide new insights on how to overcome those cultural differences in society.

1.3.2 Social relevance

The social relevance is expressed through the development of the map of the local networks in Presikhaaf for ‘team Leefomgeving’. The local network map visualises the local interactions between citizens, citizens’ groups, and institutions in the neighbourhood. This helps the team to gain better insight in the structures and the dynamics of the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood. The study not only makes recommendations to ‘team Leefomgeving’, but it also helps other local governmental bodies within the ‘social domain’. Furthermore, the study addresses the fact that there are different ‘worlds’ in a neighbourhood. Those worlds act, speak, and think differently. The result of this thesis will be a recommendation for ‘team Leefomgeving’ on how to overcome those differences for the programme van Wijken Weten. Finally, the research makes five recommendations on how a network map can be used as a tool for local governance in the public domain.
1.5 Research design
The model (see figure 1) below gives an overview of how the research is conducted.

Figure 1, Research model

1.6 Research outline
The thesis consists of five main parts. The first part covers an introduction to the research, including the project framework, the research problems, the research objective, the research questions, and the relevance of the research. The second part consists of the literature study and the theoretical framework. The literature study briefly elaborates on the literature of governance and social innovation. It shows distinctive trends in which government focusses on the local level of social intervention. In addition, the theoretical framework combines two network studies: social network analysis and the theory of ‘culture and society’. It starts with the discussion on general network characteristics. After discussing these network characteristics in general, this research examines how ‘cultures’ can be characterised in society. In Paragraph 3.2.3, the characteristics of ‘networks’ and ‘cultures’ are combined. The last paragraph translates the theoretical framework into a conceptual model of the discussed concepts and captures the relations between them.

In the third part, the methodological strategies are outlined. First, it reviews the way data are collected. Second, it discusses the two techniques used for the analysis of the data: the social network analysis and the analytical strategy. The fourth part contains the outcomes of this research. It starts with a general introduction of the research outcomes. The rest is dived in four paragraphs including the discussion of the types of networks, the network characteristics, and the local interactions. The fifth
part ends the research with conclusions, including that of the research outcomes, a discussion of the results, and recommendations for further research. Finally, part six gives practical recommendations to ‘team Leefomgeving’.
2. Literature study: an outline of different local policies

The neighbourhood has always been one of the most important arenas in which the relation between citizens, government, and civil society has taken shape (Duyvendak and Hortulanus, 1999; De Boer, 2001; Uitermark, 2005; WRR, 2005). In the Netherlands, since the Second World War, the neighbourhood was seen as the best place to solve social problems in society (de Boer, 2001; van der Lans 2011, 2014; van der Steen et al., 2013; Verhoeven and Tonkens, 2011; de Wilde et al., 2014). This neighbourhood approach is called the ‘wijkenaanpak’. The ‘wijkenaanpak’ developed during three distinctive trends in modern history. The last decade, there has been a renewed focus on the local, in which active citizenship and social innovation are seen as new ways to solve social and liveability problems in society (Tonkens, 2008).

This literature study focusses on the recent renewed focus on the local, but how can this new focus be explained in a world of technology, globalisation, and individualisation? To give answers to this question this chapter first gives a historical background of the ‘wijkenaanpak’. It shows that different political and academic debates discuss how policy should redefine the relation between government and citizens in society. This shows that the current dilemma’s in politics are not new. Moreover, this historical perspective gives a different perspective on the struggles between government and citizens in the neighbourhood.

2.1 Three periods in the Dutch ‘Wijkenaanpak’

*The first period: 1945 – 1960*

In the period directly after the Second World War, politics saw the neighbourhood, especially in large cities such as Rotterdam, as the place to solve society’s social problems. It was a time of reconstruction and years of crisis. In this period, there was much social unrest. Citizens lost their faith in traditional democratic institutions because politics had not protected them from the harms of the war. It destroyed citizens’ sense of ‘community’ and belonging. The first neighbourhood approach, the ‘wijkenaanpak’, addressed precisely this. It stipulated something had to be done to improve the sense of community and the relation between government and citizens to improve the quality of life in Dutch society. The neighbourhood was considered the best place to develop stable and healthy social communities. The philosophy was that this ‘community thinking’ would help restore the social unrest in the Netherlands (de Boer, 2001; van der Lans, 2014; WRR, 2005).

But, how did the first period of the ‘wijkenaanpak’ change society? On the one hand, it implied a change of governance. The governmental structures were destroyed by the war, especially in the city of Rotterdam. New local community board, ‘wijkraden’, were seen as the solution for this destruction. On the other hand, it implied a sociocultural aspect, which was to protect citizens from the dangers of
modern city life. The neighbourhood was seen as a unit of human size, which could oversee the individual and due to which people could play a role in their living environment (de Boer, 2001; WRR, 2005). These fundamentals of the ‘wijkenaanpak’ were developed during the Second World War. A commissioner, director Bos of the ‘Rotterdamse Dienst Volkshuisvesting’, developed the classical report ‘De Stad der toekomst, de toekomst der stad. ‘Een stedenbouwkundige en sociale- culturele studie over de groeiende stadsgemeenschap’² (Geyl, 1946). This report was important during the first period of the Dutch ‘Wijkenaanpak’.

In 1955, the ‘Wijkenaanpak’ was criticised for the first time by sociologist Jacques van Doorns. In his essay, ‘Wijk en stad: reële integratiekaders?’, he addressed the question: can the neighbourhood be considered as a separate social structure in society? His main concern was that the ‘neighbourhood community’ could not be seen apart from the rest of city life. Instead, there is a functional relationship between the neighbourhood and the city. According to van Doorn, the ‘Wijkenaanpak’ could destroy urban life (1955). Although the aim of the policy was to protect citizens from the dangers of modern city life, it actually destroyed the functional relationships between the neighbourhood and the city (de Boer, 2001).

Thus, director Bos developed the fundamentals of the ‘wijkenaanpak’ in 1946. Policy makers saw the neighbourhood community as the place to solve society’s social problems. However, van Doorn ended this glorious time of ‘wijkenaanpak’ ten years later.

The second period: 1975 – 1990

There was a renewed focus on the ‘wijkenaanpak’ in the Netherlands in the 1970s. It was a period of urban renewal, activism, and protest. Citizens were displeased with their living environment. The houses built during the time of reconstruction were of poor quality. Therefore, the government invested heavily in the improvement of the quality of houses. In Amsterdam, the action group ‘De Sterke Arm’ showed that citizens wanted to participate in the decision-making process of the plans for renewal of their neighbourhood. The goals of this group was to build small-scale housing projects. Their motto was ‘Bouwen voor de buurt’. In many cases, government responded to these needs by trying to engage citizens in this decision-making process. Therefore, the motto ‘Bouwen voor de buurt’ became the central philosophy during the second period of the ‘wijkenaanpak’.

The political ideology during that time was to have more socioeconomic equality and, therefore, the ‘wijkenaanpak’ focussed on the socioeconomic inequalities in society. During this period community

² City of the future, the future of the city. An urban and sociocultural study on the growing urban community.
work and other social-welfare services were developed. Community workers had an important role in the urban-renewal project to support the liveability of neighbourhoods. In the urban-renewal plans, the social aspects were increasingly important. The renewal project not only focussed on the physical part of urban renewal, but also on issues such as social developments and liveability. There seemed to be a need for social bonding between neighbours. The political ideology was that social bonding would help to improve the social cohesion in neighbourhoods.

In addition, it was an important topic in the academic debate as well. In sociology, the topic ‘social bonding’ was an important research object. For instance, researchers focussed on the relation between neighbours and their ‘social bonding’. It showed that people tend to have social relations with people with whom they have much in common. In general, the same types of people inhabit neighbourhoods, often characterised by a common ideology, attitude, and behaviour. Therefore, sociologists conclude that it is more plausible that people have stronger relations with their neighbours than with someone else in the city (Johnston and Pattie, 2011).

Furthermore, social-welfare policies considered the neighbourhood as the preferable area for social intervention. In 1974, the report ‘Knelpuntennota’ concluded that the local government should become responsible for the social-welfare policies. In large cities, this resulted in a neighbourhood-oriented approach. In partnership with the social-welfare institutions, the local government formulated the objectives of the social-welfare policies (WRR, 2005).

The above-discussed motto, ‘bouwen aan de buurt’, showed that the relation between citizens and government slightly changed. During this time, a new aim emerged: ‘to develop neighbourhoods for ordinary people’. Citizens were increasingly engaged in the urban-renewal programmes and project groups were formed (WRR, 2005). Housing associations, local enterprises, and citizens participated in these project groups. These parties participated together in decision-making processes. The project groups were seen as a new form of democracy that would bring government and citizens closer together. It was the first time that government collaborated with different local parties in the public domain, although politicians remained responsible for the budgets and the main topics. Citizens were able to play a role in this decision-making process (de Boer, 2001; van der Lans, 2014; WRR, 2005). The roles of the citizens and government drastically changed during this time. This period was criticised by different scholars because it seemed that these urban-renewal projects became a semi-permanent policy objective (de Boer, 2001; Duyvendaek, 1999).
The third period: 1990 – 2012

The third period of ‘wijkenaanpak’ was characterised by social renewal. It was a time of economic growth. However, people were aware of the diverse social groups that did not profit from this progress in society. Unemployment remained high, the integration of migrants was unsuccessful, and the social isolation of people grew. These developments changed the focus from housing to the awareness of the social vulnerability in the neighbourhood. In the urban policies, social issues such as integration, segregation, and liveability were increasingly important (de Boer, 2001; WRR, 2005).

In this period of social renewal, particularly relevant was the discussion of the new balance between responsible citizens and responsible government. The minister of ‘living, working, and integration’3 expressed that it was no longer about the implementation of policies to give structure to society and the participation of citizens in governmental systems. Rather, the government had to focus attention on the energy that existed in this ‘energetic society’ and see what talents there were in society (Ankeren, Verhoeven and Tonkens, 2010). One of the tools to stimulate citizens’ initiatives is to provide special budgets called ‘bewonersbudgetten’. Furthermore, decentralisation was an important topic on the political agenda and there was a discussion on how to transfer government responsibilities to the local government. One condition was that policy should focus on the neighbourhood (de Boer, 2001). It was seen as the area to encourage citizens to have a more active and responsible role within their living environment (Wijdeven, 2012). In 1998, the institution ‘Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau’ concluded that the time of social renewal had had a positive effect on the practices of local government. Government learned to collaborate with different local parties to work on the quality of life in cities. In other words, the ‘Wijkenaanpak’ was again a popular policy on the political agenda (de Boer, 2001).

In this period, there was a new focus on urban renewal. However, this period differs from the previous period in two ways. First, it used a broad definition of urban renewal. It not only focussed on the quality of housing, but also on social and economic strategies of intervention. Second, it not only focussed on the improvement of the quality of housing, but it proposed that the quality of the neighbourhood should also be improved. Some neighbourhoods had become a problem due to an unattractive image. The quality of neighbourhoods should be increased by housing differentiation. This policy was called the ‘krachtwijken’ (WRR, 2005).

---

3 ‘wonen, werken en intergratie’
2.1.1 Conclusions: three periods ‘wijkenaanpak’
These three periods show that the neighbourhood approach is seen as the remedy for bureaucratic organisations and the difficult relation between citizens and politics. It showed that the objectives of local policies increasingly focussed on the potential of collective action in neighbourhoods. This implies working together with different local parties in the neighbourhood to solve social problems. Topics such as citizens’ responsibility, citizens’ participation, and local initiative became increasingly important. Nevertheless, the question remains whether new formations between politics and citizens would solve the bureaucratic problems of the welfare state.

In particular, Duyvendak criticised the development of the ‘wijkenaanpak’ (1999). He argued that policy makers sometimes believe that the area where social problems come together, the neighbourhood, is also the place were solutions can be found. It seems they think that the place where problems, such as unemployment, poverty, low education, and social isolation, are concentrated is also the best place for community work, housing cooperation, institutions, and politics. He argued that, despite the fact that problems are concentrated there, it does not mean that its population will make an effort to solve these problems. Thus, this political ideal does not necessarily change society (Duyvendak, 1999). After half a century of ‘wijkenaanpak’, the fact remains it is more an ideal image professionals have than a real solution that works for citizens.

2.2 A new period: a period of change and new changes?
Since 2012, there has been a renewed focus on the local, in which the neighbourhood remains relevant in politics. The transition to the ‘participatory society’ seems to signal that the ‘Wijkenaanpak’ starts in a new period. There are two main developments. First, society increasingly expects citizens to become active in their own living environment. The government invests heavily to support new initiatives in (deprived) neighbourhoods. The initiatives are a new way of dealing with local issues such as a safety, liveability, and public green space (van der Steen et al., 2013; De Wilde et al., 2014). Second, the decentralisation of responsibilities, from national to local government, shows it is increasingly expected of the government to participate in local communities. This recent focus on governance is primarily orientated on the development and empowerment of the local community. In other words, government focusses on the more bottom-up, community-oriented, and grassroots initiatives (Verhoeven and Tonkens, 2011; Uitermarkt and Duyvendak, 2008; de Wilde et al., 2014). Nonetheless, the question that remains in this new period what the best approach is to redefine the relations between government and citizens. Did we learn from the lessons from history?

In general, those bottom-up, community-oriented, and grassroots initiatives are called social innovations. This concept is used in different scientific disciplines. The present research focusses
mainly on the potential of social innovations in a neighbourhood community. The concept of social innovation can be understood as:

“the satisfaction of alienated human needs through the transformation of social relations: transformations which ‘improve’ the governance systems that guide and regulate the allocation of goods and services meant to satisfy those needs, and which establish new governance structures and organizations” (MacCullum, Mouleart, Hillier and Haddock, 2009, p. 2).

In other words, social innovation implies the reconstruction of social relations and social structures that establish a direct link between the needs and the demands in the community. For instance, a group of citizens has the idea to take over the maintenance of a local garden, but the group does not have the resources. To establish a relationship between this group of citizens and the people who have access to these resources can create new structures. These new relationships are channels for the flow of information and resources. It connects the ideas, the problems, and the potentials in a neighbourhood. This new connection may create new (social) values within the community and simultaneously empower them as well (Balfour and Alter, 2016; Moulaert, Martinelli, Swyngedouw and González, 2005).

Despite the fact that society develops more from the bottom up, simultaneously there is the awareness of the paradoxical relationship between the government and the active citizens in this new public environment: there is a tension between social innovation and government.

In the first place, the large community and grassroots initiatives seem to have a marginal effect on society. The research by Moulaert et al. (2005) addresses the tension between innovation and institutionalism (referring to the state). In general, grassroots and community initiatives have problems with the dominant structures, such as business models and regulatory systems (Raad voor de Maatschappelijke ontwikkeling, 2014). The more professional initiatives generally have a wider impact on the community (Mouleart et al., 2005). The question is: how can grassroots initiatives increase their impact and become more sustainable without becoming institutionalist?

In the second place, the government sometimes has a paradoxical position. On the one hand, their new role forces them to take a step back to open space for more ‘active citizenships’. On the other hand, the government should participate in local social networks to facilitate and regulate local activities and initiatives in the public domain (Berlo, 2012; van der Steen et al., 2014; van der Steen et al., 2013; WRR, 2005). However, does the local government have enough knowledge of the local society to participate in these local networks? In other words, will the government be able to facilitate and regulate social innovation?
3. Theoretical framework: a research perspective on network studies
To answer the research problem this research combines two network theories: the social network theory and the theory of culture and society. These two theories each have a different perspective on the meaning and implication of networks in society. First, the social network theory is a well-known theory in social science. The theory explains the content of actions (social behaviour) in terms of their social relationship with other people (Johnston and Pattie, 2011; Marin and Wellman, 2011). This is used to identify and characterise the networks in Presikhaaf. Second, the theory of culture and society provides a notably different perspective on networks. The theory of culture and society is an interdisciplinary theory that incorporates the issues of society, culture, meaning, and communication. This theory is used to describe the meaning of networks within society or, in other words, to conceptualise the relation between networks and society (Fuchs, 2001).

3.1 The research perspective
The ‘research perspective’ means that the research results are the outcome of the ‘position’ in the world of science (Andersen, 2003). Society is socially constructed through different patterns of interaction. These different patterns of interaction imply that every position in society is unique: the ‘point of observation’ (Luhmann, 1995). What one can see from this position differs from other positions in society. Therefore, we live in a bounded reality. No one can see the world as such, but rather from every position in society different observations emerge. These points of observation in society are called ‘social observers’ (Fuchs, 2001). A social observer emerges from different patterns of interaction. Thus, the researcher is an observer in society that uses a scientific lens to observe the social reality in the neighbourhood. But what does the concept of ‘observing’ mean?

The act of observation is a selective process, which indicates that the information an observer receives is limited to their position and specific relations in society. Every ‘position’ in society has its own unique cultural norms and habitus. These are ‘cultures’ (Fuchs, 2001). These cultures emerge from different interactions between observers in society. It is their social reality; they are their ‘worlds’. In other words, what socially real means differs for every observer. Cultures have different implications for the act of observation. A ‘social observer’ can observe its own world, generally called ‘self-observation’, and the outside world (Andersen, 2003; Fuchs, 2001). The information that those ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ observations can provide depends on their cultural rules (Fuchs, 2001). The next section first elaborates on the meaning of the selective process of observations. It then discusses the implications of cultures on the 'inside' and 'outside' observations.

Observing means making a ‘distinction’ between what is ‘inside’ and what is ‘outside’ the world of the observer: their ‘world’. This boundary distinction, or to say guiding distinction, originates from the system theory of Niklas Luhmann (Andersen, 2003). An example of a boundary distinction is the
distinction between science and non-science. This boundary distinction is important to understand how things appear to the observer (Fuchs, 2001). Therefore, distinctions are important to analyse meaning in society. Without this distinction between science and non-science one can never analyse what scientific knowledge is and what is not (Andersen, 2003). The observer determines the distinctions. Any observer could determine different distinctions because it has had different relations in society: its culture.

These distinctions are reproduced by communication: “Communication takes place within system boundaries that defines which agents and objects belong to the system (i.e. who communicates in it with others and uses certain objects in this process) and who does not” (Fuchs, 2007, p.52). In other words, the act of communication defines what or who belongs to the network of culture. Generally, something can only obtain meaning when it is communicated to other observers in society (Aarts, Steuten and van Woerkom, 2014; Andersen, 2003).

Having discussed that observation is a selective process by using a distinction between what is inside and outside the world of the observer, the question remains what the outcomes are of the inside and outside observations in society. Inside and outside observers have access to different information and different impacts on their own cultures (Fuchs, 2001).

First, an outside observer can never do what an inside observer does, because an inside observer operates within the culture of its own network. If we are not a part of a network, we can never observe it similar to how a native observes it. Therefore, the information that this observer could collect is selective and subjective: "no observation can ever disclose the world as such, as viewing it from outside" (Fuchs, 2001, p.21).

Second, inside observations, or ‘self-observations’, influence what happens in the network. These observations are part of the daily activities of the network. Therefore, the inside observers have a stake in the network and can never be value free. Contrary to the outside observer, the inside observer has no direct interest in the network one observes, the outside network. These outside observations do not make a difference to its own network culture. Nevertheless, the outside observer can never be without value. The outside observations need to be integrated into the own network. Therefore, inside and outside observations have a different impact on the operation of a network (Fuchs, 2001).

Apart from this inside and outside observation, there are two 'levels' of observations: the first and the second level of observation (Andersen, 2003; Fuchs, 2001). The first level refers to what is under observation, such as a policy or local community. The second level refers to how this first level is being observed, for instance by looking at how a local community is observed. At the first level, the observer more or less accepts the content and meaning of the observations and takes the world for granted.
There are no optical illusions: "one sees what one sees, smells what one smells" (Fuchs, 2001, p.25). However, on the first level of observation the observer cannot see how we selectively see the world. On the second level, observations are directed to the observation on the first level of observation. This depends on the location in society, i.e. the ‘point of observation’. What one can observe only becomes visible when one knows what it can and cannot see. This refers to the ‘blind spot’ of observations, which is the things that the observer cannot see because of the point of observation. Therefore, observations are framed because the observer knows that one cannot see everything (Andersen, 2003).

3.1.1 Levels in society: four social observers
In society there are four levels of ‘social observers’: ‘encounters’, ‘groups’, ‘organisations’ and ‘networks’. These four ‘social observers’ emerge through different patterns of interaction: communication and meaning (Fuchs, 2001). The four levels of social observers in society, which Fuchs calls associations, are as follows.

1. **Encounters** emerge from the communication within encounters that are based on prior experience. In other words, these encounters are face-to-face interactions driven by a mutual consciousness. Encounters can only take place at one moment in time.

2. **Groups** emerge from encounters among similar people. Characteristics of the group members, such as age, vary among the different groups. Contrary to encounters, groups emerge from the interaction between different group members and only happen at one moment in time.

3. **Organisations** emerge from the interaction between encounters, groups, and systems. Although sometimes organisations are seen as uniform actors, these organisations exist of different sub-organisations. All these sub-organisations have their own pattern of interaction. Therefore, different observations emerge.

4. **Networks** are the master concept in society. It links all the other components and the networks themselves, through communication and interaction, into larger networks.

(Fuchs, 2001)

Therefore, through different patterns of communication different levels of ‘social observers’ emerge in society.

Those four levels are nested within each other (Fuchs, 2001, p.200). This means that the higher levels of associations are aggregated from the lower levels. For example, an organisation houses groups and encounters. At these different levels of association different communication patterns emerge. At the higher level of observation, communication becomes increasingly complex: different persons talk and communicate at the same time. At the lower level, there is only one conversation at one moment in
time. Consequently, at the higher level of observation, society appears increasingly constructed and complex for the observer. The following quote illustrates how in the higher level of society communication becomes more complex:

“At higher levels, communication becomes increasingly and massively parallel. Encounters process contribution sequentially, one at a time, so that not everyone talks and communicates at the same time. In a network, by contrast, countless encounters, groups, and organisations are “happening” at the same time, all the time” (Fuchs, 2001, p. 201).

Because of the increasing complexity at the higher level, communication produces different kinds of information. In other words, these different social observers (different social constructions) in the world make the difference between observations. For instance, in encounters communication is based on the bodily and personal experience, while in organisations communication is increasingly removed from direct experience in society. Consequently, this produces different outcomes than encounters and groups.

Generally, organisations are more chaotic and turbulent than groups or encounters. It needs to deal with different internal environments, including groups and encounters. In organisations, interactions occur between these different internal environments. All this interaction creates outcomes that need to fit in the daily operations of the organisation. For example, a meeting between the CEO and the local manager creates different goals that affect the daily work of their employees. Because of this dynamic character of organisations, an organisation generally has a turbulent environment. It produces more outcomes and events than one that consists of fewer associations. Bureaucratic systems emerge in organisations to organise these interactions. This is called the formal system of an organisation. These are devices such as laws, leadership, or procedures to gain grip on the transformation in the organisation. Part of the formal procedures is the distinction between the members and non-members: who belongs to an organisation and who does not? Furthermore, organisations partly exist of informal systems. These are the groups and encounters. For instance, these are the relations between colleagues. In general, the more outcomes an organisation produces, the more bureaucratic an organisation tends to be. As a result, at a higher level of observation, an actor is less able to influence social events or outcomes in society (Fuchs, 2001, p. 201).

Since networks link, through communication and interaction, with all the other components, encounters, groups, and organisations, into larger networks, networks are seen as the master concepts in society. Networks are ‘social observers’ in their own right. They observe their own niche and the world around it (Fuchs, 2001). Networks exist of forces that produce and reproduce their own internal social reality. Therefore, the nodes are not essential elements, but the outcome of the network
connectivity, relations, and activities (Fuchs, 2001). In society, there are many different kinds of networks. The reason for this difference is that social observers differently compose networks and that networks emerge from different kinds of interactions between 'social observers'. Consequently, the different networks behave differently within society.

None of the observers can be reduced to essential elements, which are explained in terms of agency, actions, and individual intentions. The different observers emerge from the interaction within the observer and between different observers. Therefore, the different levels of observers can never be part of society without the other parts. Moreover, it is about the difference between the parts and how these parts influence each other. In other words, the four observers are a source for observation or observers themselves (Fuchs, 2001).

The next section elaborates on the meaning and characteristics of the social observer ‘networks’. It examines the different characteristics and forces that characterise networks. It employs two network perspectives to describe these characteristics.

3.2 Two network theories:
In network studies, the relationship between the actors in society is the fundamental area of study. Although the two network perspective use similar concepts to analyse networks, they hold different perspectives on describing causations in society.

First, central to social network theory is that the unit of analysis exists of a collection of individuals and their linkages, rather than the study of an individual actor. The relevant unit can be an individual, an organisation or a group, or even a 'whole society' (Marin and Wellman, 2001). The aim of social network theory is to explain the content of actions (social behaviour) in terms of their social relationships with others (Johnston and Pattie, 2011). The social network perspective encompasses different theories, methods, and applications in which relational concepts and processes are central (Wasserman and Faust, 1994).

Second, central to the theory of culture and society are the different ‘social observers’ in society. As discussed, a network is a ‘social observer’ in its own right. The aim of the theory is to analyse the difference between these observers in culture and society and, thus, to describe the meaning of networks within society (Fuchs, 2001).

According to Fuchs, networks are sometimes ‘cultures’ or they exist partly of ‘cultures’. The cultural networks are ‘lifeworlds’ in themselves. This implies that these cultures have their own unique way of interaction. In general, network cultures have a high internal connectivity (Fuchs, 2001). This means that something belongs to a culture when its members observe it as the inside. In addition, all these
cultures are observers in their own right. The observers observe in terms of their own ‘cultural rules’. These rules emerge from the specific relations an observer has in society.

The following section starts by describing the characteristics of (social) networks in general. It combines concepts of social network theory and the theory of culture and society. The combination of these two theories helps to analyse the meaning of a specific network characteristic on interactions in society. After having discussed how networks can be characterised in general, it elaborates on the meaning of ‘cultures’ in society. The last paragraph discusses the relation between networks and cultures and their society.

3.2.1 Characteristics of (Social) Networks
A (social) network consists of a set of relevant actors or nodes and their linkages (Marin and Wellman, 2011; Wasserman and Faust, 1994). A node is anything which can become a part of a network, and which can be related to other nodes in the network (Fuchs, 2001). In network studies, these are generally individuals. However, the actor is not only an individual person but can also be an organisation, group, neighbours, initiatives, or even a city (Marin and Wellman, 2011). Furthermore, the relation between the nodes has specific content such as communication, friendship, or trade. Depending on the nature of the (social) relation, the relations can be characterised by weak or strong and by reciprocal or unilateral ties (Borgatti, Mehra, Brass and Labianca, 2009).

In the following section, the important characteristics of the (social) network are outlined. First, it discusses how the networks’ boundaries can be drawn. Second, this thesis discusses how the relational ties can be categorised. Third, it reviews the different network structures and the way these network structures are reproduced.

A. Network boundaries
The first network characteristic is the network boundary. Since network researchers study (social) behaviour by analysing patterns of relations, a fundamental question is: how to define the network boundary? This question refers to the definition of the rule how to select the relevant sets of actors to include in the study. This set defines the ‘identity’ of the network (Marin and Wellman, 2011). In the case of a relatively close set of actors, this question is quite straightforward to deal with. For other studies, the boundary specification of the sets of actors to include may be difficult to determine. The network boundary of sets of actors helps a researcher to describe and identify the population under study.

Networks have no fixed and stable boundaries. The nodes in the network move around the network and, as a result, change their meaning, status, and implication: “the former members of defunct groups might become members in new groups, but they are not the same members they used to be in the old
group” (Fuchs, 2001, p. 277). Therefore, because of this unstable reality, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether an actor belongs to a particular set of actors. In general, researchers define network boundaries based on the relative frequency of interaction or the strength of the ties (Wasserman and Faust, 1994).

Laumann, Marsden, and Presinky (1989) describe three theoretical approaches to address this problem to specify the network boundary. These approaches are not mutually exclusive. Network analysts usually combine different approaches to define the network boundaries.

- The first, the ‘position-based approach’, refers to the classification of members by the presence or absence of certain attributes or characteristics of a group, such as race, age, or nationality;
- The second, the ‘reputation approach’, defines the boundaries of the network by the judgement of its informants;
- The third, the ‘relational approach’, treats the nodes in the network as fully deviated from their surrounding relations.

(Laumann et al., 1989)

This research utilises a relational approach, because this research studies the relationship between different actors within in the neighbourhood.

To sum up, boundaries are important to define and understand the identity of the network. The rules that work for the inclusion or exclusion of network members are used to define the network boundaries (Fuchs, 2011).

B. Relational tie

The second network characteristic is the definition of the relational tie. One or more social ties link actors. The range and type of ties could be extensive, e.g. friendships, collaboration, or information flows. Generally, a tie is defined as a feature that establishes a linkage between a pair of actors (Wasserman and Faust, 1994). Borgatti et al. (2009) divided the dyadic relations in four broad categories:

- The ‘similarity category’ refers to the physical and temporal proximity of two nodes, co-membership in social categories, and sharing of the same attribute, belief, or behaviour. In general, social network studies, group members are treated as social relations;
- The ‘social relations category’ refers to the classical interpretation of social ties. Two types of social relations can be distinguished: role-based and cognitive/affective. The role-based type includes kinship, such as a mother, and other roles, such as a friend or neighbour. The
*cognitive/affective-based category* refers to the behavioural based ties, including perceptions and attitudes like, liking, hating, or knowing;

- The ‘interactions category’ refers to a specific event that frequently occurs or stops;
- The ‘flows category’ includes the transaction and exchange between the ties. They may transfer information, resources, or goods. The next paragraph elaborates on this topic of ‘network flows’.

In short, social network theory assumes that the relationships between two nodes in a network can have different characteristics. Those different characteristics influence the behaviour of an actor. The theory of culture and society assumes that this specific relation not only constrains and enables actors’ actions, but also simultaneously influences the meaning of an actor in society. The next section discusses the meaning of these ‘network structures’. This explains that a specific position of a node in a network structure affects its meaning, status, and implication in society (Fuchs, 2001, p. 252, p.253; Borgatti et al, 2009; Borgatti and Halgin, 2011).

C. Network structures

The third network characteristic is the ‘network structure’. Networks are not uniform but exist of different structures. The outcome of these network structures is defined by the configuration, the properties, and the mechanism of the social relations (Marin and Wellman, 2011; Diani, 2011; Wasserman and Faust, 1994). In other words, a network structure is defined by a specific pattern of relations. This network structure explains what the (social) network can do, ‘the network operations’, and it enables and constrains an actor’s actions. The current paragraph discusses the following concepts:

- **Network flow**: strength of tie and structural holes;
- **Network variables and characteristics**: density, centrality, network position, and connectivity.

The network flows models

The network flow model sees networks as systems of channels through which information and resources flow. The presence or absence of those channels (the social relationship) is essential in the study of network flows (Marin and Wellman, 2012). The two famous network theorists dealing with the question of the meaning of the flow of resource and information are Granovetter and Burt. The two approaches are reviewed in the next section.

First, the study of the American sociologist Granovetter (1973) shows that the relationship between two nodes can be weak or strong. The strength of an interpersonal tie can be defined as “a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy, and the reciprocal services which characterized the tie” (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1361). In general, a friendship relation is considered
strong, because it is commonly characterised by intense and frequent contact. Granovetter argues that there is a relationship between the performance of a network and whether a given tie is strong, weak, or absent (Granovetter, 1973). This implies that the relationship characteristics, strong or weak, affect whether innovative ideas can have success within the network. Generally, weak ties have more opportunities to diffuse new innovative ideas than stronger ties. In a research on the U.S. labour market, Granovetter proofs that information easily flows through weak ties compared to social relations defined by friendships. This finding suggests that people often find a job by advertisement rather than by close friends (Granovetter, 2001). Therefore, Granovetter argues that individuals with many weak ties are the best places to diffuse innovations.

Second, the sociologist Burt introduced the concept of ‘structural holes’. A structural hole is a gap in a network between two individuals who have complementary information (see Figure 2). According to Burt, these holes are the opportunities in a network for a new flow of information and resources. In other words, to bring the people on the opposite sides of the hole together (Burt, 2009). He argues there is a relation between a structural hole and innovations. According to Burt, society can be viewed as a market in which people exchange various goods and ideas in pursuit of their own interest. Some enjoy a higher income or interest than others. In society, the inequality that people experience is the effect of the difference among people in human and social capital. Social capital is the contextual complement to human capital and refers to the amount of social relations one has within society. The higher this social capital, the more opportunities one has. This structure of relations among people affects the flow of information and resources. In networks with closure, i.e. networks in which everyone is connected, it is likely that everyone receives the same information. On the contrary, in networks with weaker connections between actors, the structural holes, it is more likely that the information flows differently. These structural holes are sources for innovative ideas by the connection of people on opposite sides of the hole (Burt, 2000).

The two theories have a different perspective on how innovative ideas can be created. Granovetter argues that the strength of the tie determines whether it will serve as a bridge for innovation. Although Burt does not disagree with Granovetter, he sees the strength of ties more as the proximal causes. When people have strong relationships, such as friends, they are usually close together. Therefore, according to Burt, a more preferable approach is to diffuse innovative ideas between two people who are not connected.
The network variables and characteristics: density, centrality, position, and connectivity

Networks can be characterised by different variables and structural characteristics. These characteristics help to study the opportunities of a network structure or an individual actor (Diani, 2011; Fuchs, 2001). First, it reviews some general network-structural characteristics that are especially important in social network theory. Second, it discusses Fuchs’ perspectives (2001) on network structures that are considered important.

First, the two network theories discuss the following network-structural characteristics:

- **Density** can be defined as the number of ties in a network. The characteristic density gives information about the performance of the network. Different parts of the network may have different densities and different influences on the performance of the network (Granovetter, 1973).
- **Centrality** can be defined as the best-connected actor (or node) in the network (Marin and Wellmann, 2011). In general, this central actor has the best access to information and resources in the network (see Figure 3).
- The network heterogeneity has important implications for the performance of the network. In general, the performance of a highly heterogeneous network is more effective than the performance of a homogenous network (Diani, 2011, p.224).

Second, the theory of culture and society has a different perspective on ‘network structure’ than social network theory has. The theory of culture and society emphasises the meaning of a network structure in society (Fuchs, 2001). These structures are important to understand how networks or parts of networks act in society. The current section reviews the following concepts in Fuchs’ terms: connectivity and density, the network boundaries, and the bounded clusters.

In the first place, ‘the degree of internal and external connectivity’ and the ‘density’ of the networks have an influence on what matters to the network operations. In other words, how the internal or external effects affect the network structure:

- **Connectivity** refers to the connection inside or outside the network;
- **Density**, in Granovetter’s (1973) terms, can be defined as the number of ties in the network.
  In general, a dense network has a high internal connectivity.
Typically, a dense network and a high internal connectivity mean a higher chance that something will matter for that network instead of for its environment (Fuchs, 2001). This means that the network generally has internal relations. The absence of relations with the environment implies that the environment does not matter to the network operation. Furthermore, a high external connectivity means that there is a relation between the network and its environment. Because of this external relationship, when something happens in the environment it will matter to the network operation.

Secondly, ‘network boundaries’ are defined as the distinctions between the network and its environment. As discussed, those boundaries are defined by the rules for inclusion and exclusion of network members (Fuchs, 2001; Laumann, Marsden and Prensi, 1989). Depending on the type of memberships, network boundaries could be strict or fuzzy. These distinctions are important to understand how new opportunities, such as social innovation, take place in networks. Networks with fuzzy boundaries have memberships that are more ambiguous. They have an unclear identity: who belongs or does not belong to the network? Those fuzzy network boundaries have more opportunities to extend to the surrounding networks than the more restricted bounded networks have (Fuchs, 2001). An example of strict networks is cults. This is a bounded network with a strong collective identity. Contrary to a fuzzy network boundary, cults have fewer opportunities to change their internal operation.

Lastly, the ‘bounded clusters’ in a network are defined by high internal connectivity. These clusters have important implications for the identity of the network. Networks exist of multiple bounded clusters, because a network never exists of one unit and structural single outcomes. The variation of bounded clusters is defined in terms of higher internal or external connectivity or activity. Generally, a high internal connectivity means a strong identity. The members know each other because they mostly interact within their own networks. According to Fuchs (2001), cultures and subcultures appear in such clusters.

Both concepts, network boundaries and bounded clusters, are important predictors for the strength of the identity in the network. Usually, the stronger the identity in the network is the harder to make a change in the network operation.

D. Networks: a field of forces and relations
The concepts ‘nodes position’, ‘network drift’, and ‘degree of freedom’ help to understand the existence of the above-discussed network structures. Networks are fields of forces and relations (Fuchs, 2001). They are “autopoietic” systems (p.271). This implies that a network creates its own internal reality through interactions. A node in the network is the outcome of this interaction. Whether or not a node becomes part of the network operation depends on the components of the network that
are already in place. Therefore, a network structure can never be planned by a list of network members. In other words, there is no essential network structure. The next three concepts explain how a node can have different meanings within the network structure depending on the different forces and relations in the network.

- ‘Nodes’ themselves do not have ‘agency’: “the nodes become and remains what they are as long as they are hold in their positions by the surrounding relations” (Fuchs, 2001, p. 251). In other words, what a node can do depends on its position, connectivity, and temporary in the network. However, this position of a node is not stable and fixed, but rather constantly changed by different forces. Nodes are embedded in relations. These relations have, depending on the network structure and the part of the network, a dynamic character. Consequently, the node moves around in the network or even leaves the network (Fuchs, 2001). Therefore, what a node can do depends on the relationship characteristics.

- ‘Network drift’ refers to the movement of nodes in the network. Nodes that are held in their position for a longer time are defined and characterised by the place in the network. Those stable nodes normally have a clear identity. The more the node is held in position, the more it may acquire a status of essential and natural kind. In contrast, the nodes that easily move between and within the networks have difficulties with defining who and what they are. Once the node leaves the network position, the surrounding relations can no longer define it. The node will start having problems defining itself. It needs to change its meaning, status, and implication. When the node becomes a part of another network, it has to be reconstructed to fit in the operation of the other network (Fuchs, 2001, p. 251). It will lose the status of essential and natural kind.

- ‘The degree of freedom’ refers to the flexibility to change the node’s position. The loss of flexible character means less freedom and more trouble to change nodes’ positions. This is the case when a node has been in the same structural position within the network for a long time. The degree of freedom can change by creating new linkages. This means that some nodes will gain a new position because they are related to other nodes with new linkages in the network.
3.2.2. Cultural networks
As discussed, some networks are cultures or exist partly out of cultures (the subcultures). These cultures are lifeworlds in themselves, which implies that the actors in this part of the network have their own unique ways of interaction. A culture is seen as a more or less bounded and recursive network. A ‘recursive network’ implies that cultures constantly recreate their internal ‘reality’, because the actors mostly have relations within their own network. In other words, cultures have a high internal connectivity. The actors usually share the same (cultural) values and rules. For the members of a network it is clear who belongs to their network and who does not. The following quote illustrates this:

“For Art, only the art that is already there can decide what is to become part of it…. Something is ‘Art’ to the extent that it is recognized as such by the network of art “(Fuchs, 2001, p. 158).

According to Fuchs, those cultures are also observers themselves: a bounded and recursive network (2001). They observe their own niche, and those of other cultures in terms of their own cultural rules. Thus, the way the cultures observe depends on the specific values and rules actors in the network share. These values and rules are the result of the unique way of interaction in a culture. Therefore, in society the disciplines ‘art’ and ‘science’ have different observations.

Cultural and general networks have similar characteristics, as they exist of different nodes and relations and they have certain network structures. However, cultures have some specific characteristics: the characteristics of the core and the peripheral. Therefore, cultures have implications and meanings in society that differ from networks in general. The next part discusses these characteristics of cultural networks. First, it shows that the core and the peripheral have important implications on the meaning of a culture in the network. Second, it reviews the meaning of subcultures in networks.

A. The core and the peripheral
The distinction between the core and the peripheral is central to cultural networks (see Figure 4). There is a structural difference between them, which affects the behaviour of the network. The core distinguishes itself from the rest of the network. The core generally acquires a temporary stability because of the high degree of internal connectivity. Because of the stable position of the nodes and the high internal connectivity in the core, natural kinds, essence, and common sense appear. Normally, such strong stable cores generate their own identity and interest. In sociology, strong cores are called ‘institutions’, which have their own rules and habitus. Networks have multiple institutions. The number of institutions depend on the relative size and stability of the network core. Within the core, those institutions are forms of life that seem natural: “how a network does what it does” (Fuchs, 2001, p. 285). In other words, the institutions are important sources for the ‘daily’ operations in the network.
Contrary to the core, the relations in the peripheral zone are loosely coupled, fragmented, and have more possibilities for interaction. In this zone, there is more ambivalence and uncertainty. Consequently, in comparison with the core, the peripheral zone gives more opportunities for innovations and new ideas: “Outside of the core, the network’s mode of operations tends to be more experimental and innovative” (Fuchs, 2001, p. 288).

B. Subcultures
Cultures tend to have subcultures (Fuchs, 2001). Subcultures are the outcome of different patterns of relations and connections within the cultural network. There are two general rules to recognise subcultures in a network. First, the network clusters may have different internal and external connectivity. Cultures appear, for the most part, in clusters with a high internal connectivity. Second, generally, the core has a high internal connectivity and the peripheral zones have a low internal connectivity. This implies that cultures normally appear in the core of the network (Fuchs, 2001).

3.2.3 Networks and their environment
The previous part discussed the characteristics of networks and cultural networks. It has shown that these characteristics are important to understand the meaning of a network in society. The combination of the two network theories showed that a network study should not only study the interaction between the nodes in the network, but it should also focus its attention on how a network interacts with its environment or with other network structures in society. The current paragraph discusses how different network structures behave in society and how networks interact with each other.

A. The behaviour of the network
Networks rarely react unilateral to new situations. Different parts of the network can have different behaviours. All the nodes and clusters in the network are rarely linked directly and equally to the other
parts. Rather, the networks have clusters and subcultures with higher internal than external connectivity. Three (cultural) network characteristics show that networks can have different behaviours. First, the variation between the proportions of the core to peripheral matters is a characteristic. In some cultures, the core is so dominant that it accounts for most of the network operations. However, in other networks, the network generates a much smaller and weaker core with little effects. Second, the degree of internal or/and external connectivity: the higher the degree of external connectivity, the stronger the internal reaction. For instance, when something changes in the environment of the network it will have the most effect on a network that has relatively much contact with its environment compared to a network that only has relations with itself. Third, the types of relations matter for the behaviour of the network. As discussed above, especially strong relations cannot easily comply with new situations.

B. Network interaction
Network interaction refers to what networks can understand from each other. After all, when two networks do not interact they do not communicate and share meaning with each other. The ways networks interact are defined by two variables. First, it depends on how the networks are linked. In other words, do they have external connections? Second, it depends on the similarity in resonance and metabolism. In general, networks interact when they share the same metabolism.

In general, two separated networks without any link do not seem to understand their operation. The networks cannot observe one another. When two separate networks come in contact, an observer tends to model the foreign network in terms of its own understanding. Two networks can interact and communicate with each other when they share resonance and metabolism. This implies that the actors within the network usually share similar rules and values. On the contrary, when a network has internal resonance there is limited interaction, meaning to “measure something only in terms of its own mode of construction and specification” (Fuchs, 2001, p. 265).
3.3 The conceptual model
This research combines the social network theory with the theory of culture and society to give answers to the social and scientific problems. The social problem is that there seems to be a ‘gap’ between government and citizens in the social and local domain. The scientific problem is that the social network theory has been criticised for being ‘just’ a method to identify and characterise interaction, rather than giving a theoretical perspective on the meaning of this interaction.

The combination of the two network theories helps to gain a more theoretical perspective on the meaning of networks. This not only helps to understand how a network can be identified and characterised, but also what the meaning of a network is in society. First, the aim of social network theory is to explain (social) behaviour by the analysis of the relationships of actors. In particular, the theory is useful to analyse the interaction between the actors in the neighbourhood. Who interacts with whom within the neighbourhood and where do structural holes appear? Second, the theory of culture and society sees networks as the ‘master’ concept in society. Networks connect encounters, groups, and organisations in society. The theory is particularly useful to explain the causation between the network and society. Furthermore, Fuchs’ (2001) perspective helps to explain why different interactional patterns appear in society and why others do not.

The theoretical framework is translated into a conceptual model of the discussed concepts and it captures the relations between them. In Figure 5, the conceptual model is presented.

The conceptual model integrates the concepts ‘social networks’ and ‘cultural networks’ into one network. This research is particularly interested in studying specific patterns of interaction in society, such as the way government and local initiatives interact in the neighbourhood. The research studies the relation between these specific patterns of interaction and certain network characteristics. The question is: are these patterns of interaction defined by specific cultural rules or other network characteristics? In other words, which network characteristics are important to explain the different interactional patterns in a neighbourhood?
Figure 5, the conceptual model

Networks characteristics:

The research characterises networks by their type of actors, their relationships, their structures, and the cultural rules of the network. These four network characteristics are all related to each other. First, the type of actor defines the boundary of the network, i.e. who belongs to the network. This provides insight in the identity of the network. Second, the kind of relational tie, such as a friendship or colleagues, helps to understand what the actors can do, meaning the behaviour of the actor. Third, the network structures give insight in the flow of information and resources and the opportunities that a network or individual actor has. The integration of the concept ‘cultural rules’ distinguishes this conceptual model from the general social network theory. These cultural rules define the specific way in which the actors act and the way the actors observe other networks in society. Therefore, it defines how the network or part of the network structure operates. This can be, for instance, the manner in which the actors communicate.

Network forces:

Networks are not stable structures. Rather, networks face both internal and external challenges to constantly change its own operations. The concept ‘network forces’ explains that networks constantly produce and reproduce the distinction between the inside and the outside of the network. In other words, it constantly produces and reproduces different network characteristics. These network forces
are the external effects on the network. An example of such an external effect is a change in the environment of the networks, such as the introduction of a new policy.

*The degree of difference in network characteristics:*

Every network has its own unique characteristics. To analyse the differences between networks, the conceptual model integrates the concept of the ‘degree of difference in network characteristics’. This concept is defined by the difference in type of actors, type of relations, structures, and the cultural rules. The difference helps to understand the different patterns of interaction in the network and the different patterns of interaction between the networks.

*Network interactions:*

Nevertheless, the research is not only interested in the study of the interaction between the actors in the network, but it is especially interested in analysing the way networks interact with each other. The concept of the ‘degree of difference in network characteristics’ helps to understand whether two networks interact or not. The more two networks differ (a high degree of network difference), the lower the change they interact. Simultaneously, the more they share similar characteristics, the higher the chance they interact.

Network interaction is defined as ‘the degree of external connectivity’, or whether two networks have a relation or not. The concept ‘network interaction’ indicates what the networks can understand from each other. This means that something can only gain meaning when observed by and communicated to other observers in society. Two separated networks without any interaction do not communicate and share meaning with each other. These separated networks are unfamiliar with each other. Therefore, networks can only understand the other network operations when they interact. However, two networks can also have a low degree of interaction. This implies that observation takes place, but what the networks can understand from each other is limited because of their limited interaction.

*New strategies for social innovation:*

New strategies for local governance can be formulated by exploring the concepts ‘network characteristics’ and ‘network interactions’. This leads to an understanding of the local interaction between the different parties, whether formal or informal, in a neighbourhood. This may help gain insight in how social relations between actors in the neighbourhood can be reconstructed, which helps the local government stimulate and facilitate social innovation in a neighbourhood.
4. Methodological chapter

In the previous section, the theoretical framework for this thesis has been discussed. The present chapter discusses the methodological approach used to collect and analyse the data. The focus was on qualitative research. However, the research partly utilised the quantitative social network method to analyse the data. First, this chapter discusses the methodological approach used to collect the data and it reviews the case for this study. Second, it reviews the methodological approach that was used to analyse the data.

4.1. Data collection

In this thesis, a qualitative method for data collection is used. This is a broad scientific method that incorporates a combination of non-numerical data such as interviews and observations (Clifford, French and Gillespie, 2016). The approach assumes there is no objective reality. Instead, the reality is bounded. It suggests that people create and associate their own meaning in interaction with others. A qualitative method is an interpretative technique, which tries to understand a phenomenon by assessing the meaning people assign to it (Cresswell, 2013). For this research, this method is particularly useful because it focusses on the meaning of the answers of the respondents. This helps the researcher to understand what the different respondents see as important: their reality.

This current paragraph starts by introducing the case study used for this research. Subsequently, it then discusses the different methods of data collection.

4.1.1 The case study

The research uses a case study. This is a holistic and integral method, which studies an object in its natural environment. The method is characterised by small-units of research. Furthermore, the method involves a detailed and in-depth understanding of the cases, through multiple sources of information, such as observations, interviews, policy documents, and social media. The holistic approach makes a case study flexible to adapt to changes in the environment (Cresswell, 2011).

The case study method has different pros and cons. One of the pros is its adaptability to different types of research questions and contexts. In a case study design, the researcher is part of the social reality (Venix, 2011). This gives the opportunity to study a phenomenon in detail and in the natural environment. Nevertheless, being a part of the social reality is also one of the weaknesses of a case study. In some instances, it is difficult to stay objective, which can bias the research results (Venix, 2011). Therefore, the researcher constantly needs to be critical on one’s own work. The way the research tries to limit this weakness is discussed in the section ‘accounting for the observer’.
In this research, the use of a case study was particularly relevant because of the limited time to collect data. The use of a case study made it possible to have a more in-depth research than when analysing a larger research unit (Verschurne and Doorewaard, 2007).

A. The Case
The study’s case is the neighbourhood area ‘Over het Lange Water’ in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf in Arnhem (see Map 1). Presikhaaf is a post-war neighbourhood in the north of Arnhem. The neighbourhood exists of five areas. These different areas can be characterised by the different structural attributes, for instance the type of houses and the different demographics such as different nationality and age (Presikhaaf, n.d.). The neighbourhood area Over het Lange Water is situated in the east part of Presikhaaf (see Map 2). The area was built in the period 1960 – 1970. There is a mixed area of high- and low-rise buildings (Presikhaaf, n.d.). The houses are partly owned properties and partly social-rental houses of the Dutch housing corporations Vivare and Volkshuisvesting. In the middle of Over het Lange Water is the local park Kinderkamp. The centre of the park is the neighbourhood centre ‘de Oosthof’. This building is a former school, which is completely renovated by residents. It is not only a central meeting place for the residents of Presikhaaf, but there are also different local initiatives and activities located there. All those initiatives have a local function. Besides de Oosthof, there are four schools and different social and welfare organisations located in the area.

The residents in the area Over het Lange Water have different characteristics in comparison to the rest of the residents in Presikhaaf. In the 1970s, most of the residents who lived in the west of Presikhaaf moved to the east. The neighbourhood Presikhaaf-West became the area where the new migrant
workers lived (Presikhaaf, n.d.). Overall, the residents in the area Over het Lange Water are characterised by:

- A high percentage of house owners;
- A high percentage of middle-aged residents;
- A high percentage of Dutch residents;
- A relatively high percentage of long-time residents.

The preference for the neighbourhood area is partly because it the residents appear to have a high social capital. Different studies show a correlation between long-time residents and the height of social capital (de Wilde et al., 2014; Verhoeven and Tonkens, 2011). Residents with a high social capital are usually more active in their living environment. Furthermore, Over het Lange Water is an interesting case because of the different local activities and initiatives that are hosted in its neighbourhood centre de Oosthof. This centre was an interesting starting point to study local initiatives. Combining these characteristics, the area seemed an interesting place for the study of local initiatives. Nevertheless, this case is only a starting point to identify the different actors, stakeholders, and organisations in the neighbourhood. Networks do not adhere to the boundaries of this neighbourhood area. Consequently, the research also studied initiatives and organisations outside the neighbourhood district. In other words, the case Over het Lange Water was merely the premise of this study.

4.1.2 Data collection methods
A triangulation of qualitative methods was used for this research. The reason for this triangulation is that the key subject is to identify the patterns of relations and their content. Those patterns of relations are complex. It needs the collection of data of different kinds of local actors, both formal and informal. The triangulation of data often helped to establish contact with more local actors, more than the use of only one single method would have. The following qualitative methods were used:

A. Snowball method;
B. Semi-structural interviews and participatory mapping;
C. Participant observations;
D. Secondary data, such as policy documents and social media.

A. *Snowball method*
A snowball method was used to select the respondents for the interview. The research is about the study of interaction and patterns, thus networks. This meant the researcher had to speak with different actors who interact in the neighbourhood. A snowball method helped to identify the actors that interact. In every interview, the respondents were asked: with whom do I need to talk as well? Or, with whom do you have a social relationship? These questions made the networks gradually more visible.
The research used three places to start the snowball. First, team Leefomgeving was an important source to obtain information about the different activities in Presikhaaf. Second, the research talked with the community worker or participatiewerker. This actor usually has contact with different local parties, such as other social-welfare activities or citizens’ groups, and has knowledge of the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood. Third, the research started with interviews with different initiatives that are located within the neighbourhood centre de Oosthof. Specifically, the training work company Diagonaal was interested to start the snowball. They have contacted many different local parties in the neighbourhood.

B. Semi-structural interviews and participatory mapping
Face-to-face interviews were conducted with different local initiatives, groups, and organisations. In combination with the snowball method, an explorative research has been done to select respondents. The following steps have been taken:

1. A fieldtrip on the first day of the internship was used to observe the different (social) activities in the neighbourhood;
2. An internet research was done to gain an overview of the different initiatives, groups, and organisations. For example, the website gives information about the local activities in the neighbourhood;
3. The local newspaper was a valuable source. It is published once a month, which gives information about the different local activities, such as a festival in Presikhaaf.
4. Team Leefomgeving already had information on the different initiatives, groups, and organisations, which was a useful starting point for the research.

In the appendix, a list of the different respondents is attached.

For the interviews, a semi-structural interview guide was used. The research chose to use this method because of the flexible technique. The population of respondents was heterogeneous. Some of the respondents were citizens, while others were professionals, such as a social-welfare institution. The flexible method could easily adapt to these different respondents and contexts. The main topics in this interview guide were:

- The content of the activity;
- Their needs, problems, and ideas;
- The networks: with whom do you have a relationship, and why?

In Appendix 2, the interview guide is presented.
The interviews were recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were used to analyse the data. The paragraph ‘data analysis’ discusses the analysis of the data.

Furthermore, the participatory mapping method was used during the interviews. This technique is generally used to help, mostly rural, communities make decisions on, for example, land use. In this research, the method was used to gain understanding of the local interactions. The participant was asked the question: with whom do you have a relationship? The respondent drew this interaction on the topographical map (see Map 3). The same map was repeatedly reused for the other interviews. Due to the visualisation of the networks, the interaction and the networks became increasingly visible for the researcher and for the respondents. In addition, the visual-mapping technique was useful to visualise what the respondent perceives (Edwards, 2010). After all, the focus of the technique is on the respondents drawing the map themselves.

Map 3, participatory map

C. Participatory observation
Participatory observation is a technique to study an issue within its natural setting. It involves spending time with people or communities to understand them. To put it differently, it is a method based on participation and observation in which field-notes, sketches, and photographs are used to collect data. The aim of this approach is to be as close to the subject of study as possible (Clifford et al., 2016).
The observation took place in the period from the 1st of February until the 1st of July 2016. The researcher observed two areas:

1. Over het Lange Water;
2. Team Leefomgeving Presikhaaf.

In the neighbourhood area, different local activities were observed during this period. Once a week the neighbourhood area was observed while cycling. These observations were noted in the field diary. Furthermore, the researcher participated in some local events in the neighbourhood. These events were:

- The children’s art festival ‘het kinder kunst festival’ on the 25th of May 2016 (see picture 1);
- The local event ‘hou het lokaal’, organised by the training company ‘Diagonaal’ in collaboration with the national organisation LSA ‘Landelijk standpunt actieve bewoners’, on the 27th of May 2016.

Every Thursday, team Leefomgeving has a team meeting. The team was observed during these meetings. The aim of this research is to give advice to team Leefomgeving. This means it is necessary to understand their practices, their needs, and how they develop. As a result of the time spent with team Leefomgeving, it was possible to observe changes in interactions and processes. This was valuable in writing the recommendation for the team. The main points of observation were:

- With whom do they interact;
- What are the developments concerning the programme van Wijken Weten;
- What are the activities of the team;
- What are the needs of the team;
What kind of processes and developments are observed. 

All the observations were noted in the field diary, which was used for the analysis of the results.

D. Secondary data & social media
Secondary data and social media were mainly used as an addition to the other techniques. Secondary data can be defined as the data that are already collected for another purpose (Clifford et al., 2016). The research used policy documents, such as the documents concerning van Wijken Weten and documents of the local initiatives, such as the vision of the initiatives. In the research, secondary data has two main purposes. First, the data has been used to give a description of the populations in Presikhaaf and the social infrastructure. Second, the data has been used to observe the developments in the social infrastructure in Presikhaaf. Social media was mainly used to follow the different interactions and communication patterns in the neighbourhood. The researcher followed the website pages of the local initiatives and the neighbourhood Presikhaaf.

4.1.3 Accounting for the observer
The researcher is an outsider in the field of research and can never become a native. In other words, the researcher is part of the world of science. This implies that the researcher can never observe the neighbourhood as the residents of Presikhaaf do (Fuchs, 2001). This is called the problem of the point of observation. This could have affect the research results. Therefore, the current paragraph discusses this problem of the point of observation and reviews the way the research tried to limit this effect. Furthermore, it discusses some ethical questions.

A. The point of observation
The point of observation in this research is a researcher of the Radboud University of Nijmegen. This was explained to all participants in the research. Another possible point of observation could be an intern of the local government of Arnhem. However, this point of observation could affect the results. The residents might have a negative perspective on the local government of Arnhem, because it is seen as an institution from which they are depended. Therefore, it was likely that the participant would provide different answers. The choice for ‘researcher of the Radboud University’ limited the chance of the participant reacting negatively (Clifford et al., 2016; Fuchs, 2001; Luhmann, 1995).

Paragraph 4.2.2 elaborates on the implications of this point of observation.

B. Ethics
This research involves the study of people in their neighbourhood, and it encounters different series of individuals, groups, and organisations. Therefore, it was necessary to address some ethical questions: “while ethical issues may seem routine or moral questions rather than anything which is intrinsic to the design of a research project, in practice they actually underpin what we do” (Clifford et
al., 2016, p. 10). This quote illustrates that the ethical choices the researcher makes can have consequences for the research data. The research addresses the following ethical questions:

- It is important to know the position of the researcher in the field and to anticipate to the possible consequence for the fieldwork;
- The different individuals, groups, and organisations have different needs and will in consequence respond differently to the research;
- The researcher needs to be context sensitive and adapt the communication strategy according to the different circumstances;
- The researcher needs to be open and clear towards the different participants;
- The participants need to be assured that their answers remain secure.

(Phillips and Johns, 2012; Clifford et al., 2016)

4.2 Data analysis
A mixed method of social network analysis (SNA) and the analytical strategy was used to analyse the collected data. In this research, the key concern is studying the existing relationship in the neighbourhood and the influence of those relations on the content of social action. However, those relationships are not fully visible without an in-depth study. Therefore, the researcher chose to use a mixed method. The social network method was used to visualise the networks. The analytical strategy was used to analyse the meaning and the content of those relationships and the networks.

To analyse the data, the research addressed the following main questions:

- How can the local networks be identified and characterised both structurally and culturally?
- What are the structural and cultural differences between the networks?
- How do the local networks interact with each other?

This data analysis chapter starts with the outline of the SNA. This method is used to visualise the identified interaction patterns in a ‘sociogram’. The paragraph ‘analytical strategy’ discusses how those interaction patterns on this sociogram are analysed. What is the meaning of these interaction patterns? The three questions stated above guide this analysis.

4.2.1 Social network analysis
The social network study is a method to analyse the structure and patterns of (social) relations between actors and theorising the effect of those social structures on behaviour (Bond and Harrigan, 2011). The nodes in the networks are the people and the groups, and the links show the relationships between the nodes. The purpose of this research was to explain, both quantitatively and qualitatively, what the networks are and how they matter in the neighbourhood. Owing to this, the social network
analysis was used in two steps. First, it identified and characterised the relationships between the actors. Second, these relations were visualised by using the SNA computer package, ‘UCINET’, in a social network map: a sociogram.

To identify the relationships, the researcher made a sketch of personal observations. The sketch was based on the field diary, the participatory map of the participant, and the transcripts of the interviews. This visualisation technique helped to analyse what the relationships are in the research case. The transcripts of the interviews were used to characterise the relationships. These identified and characterised relationships were stored in a database. To make a ‘sociogram’ these data were converted to a binary data-matrix.

The programme ‘Ucinet 6’ produced the sociogram by visualising the data matrix (Borgatti, Everett and Freeman, 2002). A group of network analyst of the University of California produced this programme. The programme enables the measurement of certain aspects of the network structure, such as centrality and density. These kinds of measurements give information about how resources and information may flow through particular types of the network. In this research, the main purpose of the social network programme was to provide an overview of the relationships by visualising the data. This overview helped to analyse the different network structures, which helps identify the opportunities and constraints of the network operations (Edwards, 2011). In other words, the sociogram, or network map, was mainly used as a method to visualise data that helped the researcher analyse the meaning and the content of the networks. Therefore, the analytical strategy was used.

4.2.2 An analytical strategy
The research used the analytical strategy to analyse the meaning of the interactions on the network map. This is a strategy for the observation of how the research emerges in observations (Anderson, p. VI, 2003). An observation is the operation that draws the ‘distinctions’ between the system and the environment, in this research meaning the distinction between the network and the environment. The research used different theoretical concepts to analyse the meaning of the interaction of the local networks on the produced sociogram. It constantly asked what relations and interactions could be observed and what the meaning was of those interactions. These questions draw the distinction between what belongs to the network and what belongs to the environment (Anderson, 2003).

In this research, the researcher was an outside observer and used a second-order observation. The second-order observation means that something only becomes visible when one knows what it can and cannot see (Fuchs, 2001). This asks for a clear guide on how the researcher observes the network map. Therefore, the question is: how is the knowledge conducted? To answer this question, the research used different guiding distinctions, or boundary distinctions. As discussed in the theoretical
chapter of this research, these guiding distinctions are important to analyse meaning in society. Without such distinctions, one can never analyse what belongs to the network and what belongs to the environment.

In this research, the analysis of the data was guided by the following three questions:

1. How can the distinctive networks on the network map be characterised structurally and culturally?
2. What are the structural and cultural differences between those observed networks?
3. What is the implication of this observed difference on the network interaction?

These three questions were the leading guides for the analysis of the data. Every guide used different theoretical concepts. The following section describes how the research answers these questions. First, every guide describes the conditions for observations. Second, it outlines how these conditions are operationalised for the analysis of the data.

**Guide one: characterising the networks**

The starting point was to identify and characterise the networks, thus to establish the distinction between the network and environment. Different conditions were formulated to decide what belongs to the environment and what belongs to the network (Anderson, 2003). These network boundaries are defined by the rules of the inclusion and exclusion of network members. It used a relational approach, which assumes that the categorical attributes of actors should not be studied, but rather their relations (Fuchs, 2001; Laumann et al., 1989). Therefore, these types of actors are fully deviated from their surrounding relations. The networks were analysed on the following conditions:

- The type of actors;
- The kind of relations;
- The different network structures;
- The kind of cultural rules.

These different characteristics are operationalised to analyse what characterised a certain network or not.

First, the type of actors is established by the following concepts:

- Local initiatives;
- Social enterprises;
- Citizens’ organisations;
- Social organisations;
• Welfare organisations;
• Governmental organisations.

Second, the type of relation is characterised by:

• The interaction goals such as policy objects;
• The strength of the relationships. This can be strong or weak, which is characterised by the intensity of emotional contact such as kinship or another role (Borgatti et al., 2009);
• The direction of ties, unilateral or reciprocal;
• The flow of resources and information. This can be, for instance, information, money, personal, or resources (Borgatti et al., 2009).

Third, the network structures are characterised by a certain pattern of relations that can be observed by the following concepts:

• The node’s position in the network can be peripheral or central;
• Connectivity refers to the connection inside and outside the network (Fuchs, 2001);
  o The network core has a high internal connectivity;
  o The network peripheral has a high external connectivity;
• Density can be defined as the number of ties in a network (Granovetter, 1973).

Fourth, the kind of cultural rules can be characterised by:

• The language of the actors in the network;
• The objectives of the actors in the network;
• The way the actors organise their core businesses. Hierarchical or bureaucratic, or without hierarchical and bureaucratic systems.

(Fuchs, 2001)

**Guide two: the network difference**

After the characterisations of the networks, the next step was to analyse how the networks differ structurally and culturally and what the relationship between these concepts is. Thus, the conditions to analyse the meaning of the differentiation between the networks. These conditions were:

• The network structures;
• The network cultures.

The structural difference between two networks can be measured by the degree of difference in the type of actors, the type of relations, and the network characteristics. The cultural difference between
two networks can be defined by the difference in cultural rules. Therefore, the cultural difference is defined as whether the actors in networks use a different language, have different objectives, and have different ways of organising core business.

Guide three: the network interaction
The last step was to analyse how the networks interact with each other. The conditions to analyse these distinctions were:

- The degree of internal connectivity;
- The degree of external connectivity.

The degrees of internal and external connectivity are defined by the degrees of internal and external relations (Fuchs, 2001).

Thus, this research used three guiding distinctions to analyse the network map.

1. The distinction between network characteristics and non-network characteristics;
2. The distinction between structures and cultures of the network;
3. The distinction between external connectivity and non-connectivity of the networks.
5. The research outcomes
This chapter describes and discusses the results of this thesis. The chapter is divided in four main parts. These paragraphs discuss the outcomes of the study on local networks in a neighbourhood and provide answers to the question how team Leefomgeving can observe the local needs for social innovation.

5.1 introduction: will the ‘team Leefomgeving be able to facilitate and regulate social innovation in the neighbourhood’?
For the new urban governance programme van Wijken Weten, team Leefomgeving is responsible for observing what the special needs are in the neighbourhood. However, they are unfamiliar with establishing contact with the more informal services and local informal initiatives. They deal with questions such as: where are the informal initiatives located? What are their needs, problems, and ideas? How can the team support those self-organising initiatives? In other words, the question is if the team will be able to facilitate and stimulate social innovation in the neighbourhood.

This research gives answers to the question whether a map of the local networks can support the team Leefomgeving to stimulate and facilitate social innovation and local initiatives in the Presikhaaf. The local actors and their interactions are identified and characterised. The research is interested to see whether there is a relation between the different interaction patterns and organisation structures and cultures. First, it looked at the different organisation structures of the actors: are they organisations, groups, or initiatives? Second, it analysed the relations between these different types of actors: are the relationships strong or weak, unilateral or reciprocal, and how is the flow of resources and information? Furthermore, the research focussed on the cultural aspect of networks. It analysed if the identified actors communicate and act differently within the neighbourhood. Together, this creates an understanding of the relation between the situated actors and the way they work in the neighbourhood.

The picture below of the network map shows the result of this research (see network map 4). The network map is based on the relationships in the neighbourhood area Over het Lange Water in Presikhaaf, in the period from March until July 2016. It shows the observations made by the empirical observer: the researcher. Another observer could have made different distinctions. The dynamic character of networks implies that this network map is subject to constant change. A network map is attached in this research. This can be used as a tool to read the research outcomes.
However, how can team Leefomgeving use this network map? The network map shows the complex interactions that exist between the different parties in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf. This complex environment is the reality in which team Leefomgeving needs to participate to stimulate and facilitate social innovation. An overview of these different situated actors and stakeholders and their dynamic interactions may help the team establish contact with the informal initiatives and services and, subsequently, to gain insight in the local processes, such as communication and the flow of information.
and resources. The legend helps to read and analyse the network map. The map displays lines, symbols, and colours. The next section reviews the legend and explains the meaning of the different symbols.

5.1.1 The network map

A. The actors and stakeholders on the map

The network map gives an overview of the situated actors and stakeholders in Presikhaaf. On the map, the different forms of the nodes display these different types of actors. It represents the different organisation structures, such as initiatives and governmental organisation. There is a difference between the formal and bureaucratic actors who developed top-down policy objectives and the informal and innovative actors that developed bottom-up initiatives to support the needs and ideas in the neighbourhood. In other words, the actors have different legitimacy and different values and goals. These different values and goals are represented on the map by the colours of the contour of the different types of actors. For instance, the formal and bureaucrats organisation structure of team Leefomgeving represents the goal ‘liveability’. This means the team is responsible of stimulating and facilitating different activities and structures within the neighbourhood that support a liveable environment. The informal initiative, the green group Kinderkamp ‘Eetbaar en belevingspark Kinderkamp’, represents the value ‘green and nature’ (see Picture 2). The initiators have the ambition to take over the management and maintenance of the local park Kinderkamp. In other words, the network map not only gives an overview of the different situated formal and informal organisations, groups, and initiatives, but also what their values and goals are in the neighbourhood. A detailed description of the actors on the map can be found in Appendix 1.

The lines on the map

The lines between the different actors represent the interaction patterns: the relationships and the flow of resources and information. This can be reciprocal or unilateral. The line between the training work company Diagonaal and the initiative of the natural playground Speelbos represent a reciprocal relation (see Map 5). This means that both actors share resources and information with each other. Diagonaal helps the initiative Speelbos with the construction of the playground, while Speelbos...
supports Diagonaal in organising local activities. On the other hand, the line between the cultural initiative Cultuurgroep Presikhaaf and the citizens’ organisation Wijkplatform represent a unilateral relation (see Map 6). This means that only one actor shares resources and information. In this instance, the Wijkplatform subsidises the activities of the initiative Cultuurgroep Presikhaaf. The absence of a line means that the two actors do not share information or resources with each other. For instance, the training work company Diagonaal and the cultural initiative Kunstroute do not have contact with each other.

The different colours on the map

The different colours, blue, red, and yellow, display the different types of networks in Presikhaaf. It can be observed from the map that these networks exist of different organisation structures. First, the formal networks exist of social, welfare, and governmental organisations. Second, the semi-formal network exists of citizens’ organisations and social organisations. Third, the informal network exists of local initiatives and social enterprises.

5.1.2. A story on a map

As discussed, the network map displays a range of different organisation forms that exist in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf. The current paragraph gives an introduction to important actors that are represented on the network map. This introduction is an outline for the rest of the research. In other words, it puts the network map in context. This enables the reader to read the network map. It starts with an introduction of the important informal actors in Presikhaaf, the local initiatives. Subsequently, it introduces the important formal actors identified in the research case.

A. The informal actors: the local initiatives

The neighbourhood Presikhaaf is a deprived area in Arnhem. In the past, the local government invested heavily in social and welfare organisations to stimulate the participation and social welfare of the community. Besides these different formal organisations there is a range of different local initiatives that support the social welfare of the community. Volunteers and citizens manage these initiatives. The two maps below display these important actors (see map 7 and 8).
The training work company has an important local function within the neighbourhood Presikhaaf (see Picture 3). It hosts Diagonaal in the neighbourhood centre De Oosthof, located in the local park Kinderkamp. The last years, the initiative has transformed to a community enterprise (a social enterprise). Their main activity is to combine education with work experience and support the self-organisation of citizens and community activities. This is done, for example, by helping to write a business plan or by giving space to these activities in De Oosthof⁴. Among others, the training company facilitates the local organisation for teenage mothers, Stichting JAM, and the initiative of the natural playground, het Speelbos.

Next to De Oosthof is the local activity group Stichting initiatief groep Kinderkamp (SIK), located in the De Willem Dreesschool. This is the oldest initiative in Presikhaaf. Their primary goal is to stimulate the

⁴ (Cornelissen, personal communication, 24 March 2016).
liveability in Over het Lange Water, with a special attention for children. They organise different activities for children and adults. The main activity of the year is ‘Queensday’.

In Presikhaaf, the sport-welfare company Budosport has an important social role (see picture 4). It is not only gym, but also an important meeting place in Presikhaaf. The aim of the sport-welfare concept is to support and facilitate sport facilities in multicultural neighbourhoods. Therefore, according to Wensink, Budosport is different from the trendier gyms: “I want to have a gym where everybody feels at home”.

In the shopping centre of Presikhaaf, the cultural initiative Locatie Spatie is located (see picture 5). This cultural facility practices on both a local and an international level. They not only provide art education but also support young artists in Arnhem. The activities of Locatie Spatie are based on a certain philosophy. The main issues that they address are empty buildings, unaffordable rent, social segregation, and the lack of space for creative people in Arnhem (Schouten, 2014, p.5).

B. The formal and semi-formal actors
The research made the distinction between actors that belong to the formal network and actors that belong to the semi-formal network. In other words, there are formal actors such as social and welfare organisations and semi-formal actors such as the citizens’ organisations. These citizens’ organisations

---

5 (Hagen, personal communication, 12 April 2016).
6 (Een sportschool waar iedereen zich thuis voelt) Wensink, personal communication 19 May 2016).
differ from the local initiatives and from bureaucratic actors such as ‘team Leefomgeving’. They are managed by citizens but not developed bottom-up. The map below gives an overview of the important formal and semi-formal actors in Presikhaaf.

Map 8, the important formal and semi-formal actors (Google My Maps, 2016)

In Presikhaaf, there are three citizens’ organisations/groups: Wijkplatform, het Buurtoverleg over het Lange Water, and the Wijkkrant. In Arnhem, every neighbourhood has their own citizens’ organisation, called the Wijkplatform. This organisation emerged from the policy objectives of the programme the Arnhemse Wijkenaanpak7 (Arnhem, 2014). Every year, the local government provides a neighbourhood budget. It is the responsibility of the members of the Wijkplatform to monitor this budget8. Since a couple of years, every neighbourhood district has its own Bewonersoverleg. This is a local citizens’ consultative group. In the neighbourhood area Over het Lange Water, this is called ‘het Buurtoverleg over het Lange water’. This organisation gives advice to the neighbourhood citizens’ organisation the Wijkplatform.

---

7 In English: the neighbourhood approach
8 (Vonk, personal communication, 17 March 2016)
Because of the policies of the local government, there are many social-and welfare organisations situated in Presikhaaf. The main social and welfare organisations are the welfare organisation Rijnstad, the elderly organisation ‘stichting welzijn ouderen Arnhem’ (SWOA), and the specialisation organisation for physical help RIBW. Those organisations have different sub-organisations or workers situated in the neighbourhood. Rijstad facilitates and regulates the local social-welfare group Kwartiertafel, the community work Opbouwwerk, and child work kinderwerk. Firstly, the Kwartiertafel is a local platform for supply and demand in local welfare and care. Secondly, the community work Opbouwwerk is responsible for issues such as self-organisation and participation in Presikhaaf. Thirdly, child work has the responsibility to facilitate educative activities for children in the neighbourhood.

In Arnhem, the local government exists of different sub-organisations. In accordance with the decentralisation, especially the social welfare teams, Sociale wijkteams, and the governmental team, team Leefomgeving, have an important role. First, the Sociale wijkteam is responsible for care, social welfare, and activation of citizens in the neighbourhood. Second, team Leefomgeving is responsible for all the activities that facilitate or stimulate the liveability in the neighbourhood.

The next paragraphs elaborate on describing the meaning of the network map. It gives answers to the questions: which networks can we see? What is the meaning of the interactions on the network map? What are the implications of the networks for the role of team Leefomgeving? To begin with, the research discusses the different networks that are identified. After defining the different types of networks, it reviews the different characteristics of networks: the structural and cultural characteristics. First, it discusses the different organisation structures and relations that characterise the different network types. Second, it discusses three cultural values that are identified in the
network. These different characteristics give insight in the local interaction in Presikhaaf. The implications of the structural and cultural characteristics of networks are discussed in Paragraph 4.3.

5.2. There are three networks in a neighbourhood
Three networks are identified in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf. This can be read from the different colours on the network map (see the network map). The distinction is made between the following networks:

- The formal network (red);
- The semi-formal network (blue);
- The informal network (yellow).

However, why does this research distinguish three networks? The combination of the social network method with the theory of culture and society gives new evidence that networks are not only characterised by relationships and actors, but by their cultural characteristics as well. In other words, networks can be identified based on structural and cultural characteristics. These network characteristics show that the three networks are not only visualisations of local interaction, but it also helps to understand why certain actors do not interact within the neighbourhood. The different actors in the three networks have different cultural values. In society, actors that have notable different cultures usually do not interact. More precisely, cultures are important predictors for the relationship between two people in society. Taking these together, the structural and cultural characteristics have important implications for the meaning of networks within a neighbourhood.

First, in general, the formal network can be characterised by bureaucratic structural and cultural characteristics (see the network map). This implies that network structures are from a high level of complexity. In other words, this network is, according to van der Lans, the bureaucratic world in society. This world tries structure society by providing rules and systems (2014, 2011).

Second, the semi-formal network is partly characterised by bureaucratic and partly by community characteristics (see the network map). This community characteristic implies that it belongs to the lifeworlds in the neighbourhood. Although the network, for the most part, did not develop bottom-up, it has more relationships with the community in Presikhaaf.

Thirdly, the informal network develops bottom-up and displays the active, positive, and innovative world in society (see the network map) (van der Lans, 2014, 2011). The network structures are characterised by community relationships and by a grassroots and community-oriented culture.
The next paragraph elaborates on the structural and cultural characteristics that characterise the three networks. It illustrates that these characteristics have important implications for the meaning of networks in the neighbourhood.

5.3. The structural characteristics of networks
The different actors and the different relationships define the structural characteristics. First, the different local actors that are identified are discussed. Second, the different relationships the actors have are reviewed.

5.3.1 Who plays a role within the three networks?
The three networks exist of different kinds of actors or, more precisely, the different networks exist of institutional organisations, citizens’ organisations, and informal initiatives (see the network map). These actors and stakeholders have different values and legitimacy and different relationships to the lifeworlds in the neighbourhood. This implies that the different actors are having different organisation structures. Consequently, different interaction patterns appear. Therefore, the actors belong to different networks. To analyse these different interaction patterns, the network map differentiates between the different actors’ categories. The following differentiation is made:

- Local initiatives part of the informal network;
- Social enterprises part of the informal network;
- Citizens’ organisation part of the semi-formal network;
- Social organisation part of the semi-formal network or formal network;
- Welfare organisation part of the formal network;
- Governmental organisation part of the formal network.

The actors partly belong to different networks (see the network map). Whether an actor belongs to the formal, the semi-formal, or the informal network depends on their organisation structure. First, the informal network exists of local initiatives and social enterprises. These organisation structures are flexible, which is necessary to participate in this ‘innovative world’. Second, the semi-formal network exists of citizens’ organisations and, partly, of social organisations and social enterprises. Those actors are more used to routine and structures. Third, the formal network exists of social and welfare organisations and governmental organisations. These organisations are bureaucratic. In Presikhaaf, these organisations try to give structure to the community with their different systems and rules.

Furthermore, these actors have their own position within the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood. Some actors have a more central position within the network, while others are peripheral. This position implies that the information the local actors receive is limited by their position in the social infrastructure. The central actors have more access to information than the peripheral
actors do, because these central actors have many relations. According to social network theory, relationships are channels for information and resources (Marin and Wellman, 2011). However, even the central actor receives limited information. In other words, there is no such thing as ‘to know everything’. Rather, the information that the actors can receive is generally limited to the relationships one can have. In other words, we live in a bounded reality and no citizen, local organisation, or local government can receive all the information about the needs in a neighbourhood.

The next section reviews these different actors in the three networks. On the network map, these different actors can be recognised by the different forms. What form presents which actors can be read from the legend.

**The formal network**
The formal network consists of the governmental and the social and welfare organisations (see the network map). Examples of this type of actors are the local sports company het sportbedrijf, the social welfare team het Sociale wijkteam, and the liveability team, called team Leefomgeving. These bureaucratic organisations emerged from the policy objectives of the local government of the city of Arnhem. These bureaucratic organisations have a complex organisation structure: they are lifeworlds themselves. The organisations have their own formal and informal systems, such as a bureaucratic procedure to organise the daily activities and their relations with their colleagues.

Those bureaucratic organisation structures have implications on the position of these actors in the neighbourhood. In general, a covenant defines the activities of those organisations. Therefore, these activities are sometimes established for a couple of years. This implies that these bureaucratic organisations usually cannot easily adapt to new situations in a neighbourhood. For instance, it took more than a year to introduce the new government programme van Wijken Weten. The entire hierarchical organisation structure needs to adapt to a different way of working: bottom-up. In Presikhaar, the social-welfare organisations and the governmental organisations have a structural position in the social infrastructure. In general, they are multiform and complex organisations, which exist of different kinds of sub-organisms and groups and their relationships. Because of this complex organisation structure, they face resistance to change. In other words, the position of the bureaucratic organisations cannot easily change their position within the neighbourhood.
The social and welfare organisations have an important position in the neighbourhood. Especially, the Kwartiertafel and the community worker Opbouwwerk hold a central function within the social-welfare network in Presikhaaf (see the network map 9). They are facilitated and regulated by the social-welfare organisation Rijnstad in Arnhem. The Kwartiertafel is a local platform for supply and demand in local welfare and care, and the community worker Opbouwwerk is responsible for activating citizens in their living environment. These workers have a great deal of knowledge about the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood. They know the neighbourhood, the problems, and the activities.

---

9 Vonk, personal communication, 17 March 2016; Smits, personal communication, 14 June 2016
This differs from the other actors within the formal networks, because they have contact that is more direct with citizens. Therefore, in the formal network these actors are important sources to receive information from the neighbourhood.

The position of the governmental organisations

The locations of the local government and team Leefomgeving are ambivalent (see the network map 10). As pointed out in the introduction of this thesis, the aim of the government programme van Wijken Weten is to be better informed about the needs in the neighbourhood by changing the position and the role of the local government. Therefore, the new sub-organisation of the local government, team Leefomgeving, is formed. The network map illustrates that despite this objective, team Leefomgeving has not yet gained a structural position in Presikhaaf. They still need to adapt to the new circumstances in the neighbourhood. Currently, the team focusses on searching the best position in the network and defining what the best practices are for the team\textsuperscript{10}. Therefore, the team did not establish many new contacts in the neighbourhood. Therefore, the information that team Leefomgeving received about the needs and the wants in the neighbourhood is limited. On the one hand, this is a result of the limited time spend since its installation. On the other hand, this is the effect of the internal culture of the local government. The implications of this observation are examined in detail in Paragraph 4.3.

The semi-formal network:

The category of the semi-formal network consists of the citizens’ and social organisations (see the network map). Examples of the types of actors are the citizens’ organisation het Wijkplatform, the local foundation Stichting the Dullert, and the primary school De Willem Dreessschool (see the network map). The semi-formal organisations generally did not emerge bottom-up, but they were initiated by

\textsuperscript{10} team Leefomgeving Presikhaaf, personal communication, 31 June 2016
the local government or emerged from a national movement. Although they operate independently, the local government still has an influential voice in these organisations. The local government partly defines some general rules that structure their actions. This is particularly true for the citizens’ organisations, such as the Wijkplatform. For instance, they follow certain rules, *de spelregels*, which are based on a dialogue between the citizens’ organisation and the local government. Furthermore, these local organisations have, compared to the bureaucratic organisations, more direct contact with the community in the neighbourhood. In general, their activities are organised for the community in Presikhaaf. For instance, the social organisation Resto van Harte organises food events for the elderly people in the neighbourhood.

According to the objectives of the local government, the Wijkplatform should have an active and central role in the neighbourhood. However, the network map shows the contrary as it does not have a central position in Presikhaaf (see network map 11). The actors only have an important position for the other two citizens’ organisations, Buurtoverleg over het Lange Water and the Wijkkrant. According to the majority of the respondents, the members of the platform are not a proper reflection of the residents of Presikhaaf. Some respondents reported that the members are unable of making proper decisions about the needs of the neighbourhood. It seems that they do not really have an active role in facilitating the local activities. As the community worker, the *Participatiewerker*, puts it: “they are members of ‘the Wijkplatform’ for self-satisfaction”.

There seems to be a paradox in the semi-formal network. Although, most of the organisations organise activities for the local community in Presikhaaf they do not have strong relationships with the

---

11 (Vonk, personal communication, 17 March 2016)
12 (Vonk, personal communication, 17 March 2016)
community. How can this be explained? Is this because government initiates them? Paragraph 4.4 answers this paradox.

The informal network

The category of informal networks consists of local initiatives and social enterprises (see the network map). Examples of this type of actors are the training company Diagonaal and the cultural meeting place Locatie Spatie. These initiatives are more community and grassroots oriented. They emerged from the direct needs, wants, and experiences in the neighbourhood.

In contrast with the formal and semi-formal networks, the informal network is based on the self-organising capacity of residents. An example of an initiative that emerged from the direct experience of citizens is the initiative for teenage mothers, called stichting JAM (see the network map 12). The respondent Lovaijh Veldt was a teenage mother herself and had trouble with combining motherhood with school and work. Teenage mothers are not unusual in Presikhaaf. Therefore, Veldt started stichting JAM to help other teenage mothers in Presikhaaf with these struggles.

In comprising to the other actor categorisation, these informal initiatives have a relative simple organisation structure. Therefore, when the initiatives experience new needs in the neighbourhood they can easily adapt their organisation structure. In general, this implies that when a citizen or initiative has a new idea they will be supported by other local initiatives. The initiatives with a central position normally have an important local function to support and stimulate other initiatives in Presikhaaf. These central initiatives have access to more resources and information than the more peripheral ones.
In particular, the training work company Diagonaal has an important local function within the informal network in the neighbourhood (see the network map 13). They play an important role in supporting the development of new initiatives. They work together with other different initiatives and organisations. For this reason, they have access to different resources and information. They support citizens who have an idea but do not have the self-organising capacity to execute it themselves\(^{13}\). One of those residents is Edwin van der Molen of the green group Kinderkamp, called Eetbaar en belevings park Kinderkamp. He had the idea to develop a vibrant neighbourhood park for and by residents. However, he did not have the capacity to organise it himself. The training company Diagonaal helped make a plan and to gain the contacts.

**Concluding: the different types of actors have a different position in Presikhaaf**

To conclude, the categorisation of the local actors says something about the position of those actors within the neighbourhood society. The meaning of the actors’ position, peripheral or central, differs for each actor’s categorisation and says something about the information an actor is able to receive. The more complex the organisation structure, the more difficult it is to receive information of the local community in the neighbourhood and to adapt the daily operations to the local circumstances. First, the position of the institutional organisations is the result of the bureaucratic systems in the organisations. This means that the position of these actors is usually the result of procedures, rules, or policy objectives. Second, although the citizens’ organisations emerge from policy objectives, their position is the result of their own practices. This implies that although they have more relations with the community they do not successfully support their local activities. Lastly, the position of the informal initiatives in the neighbourhood is the result of the interaction with other initiatives or citizens in the neighbourhood. Generally, the more people support a certain idea, the more they will have a central position.

Having defined and discussed that the three networks consist of different actors, the next section will discuss the different characteristics of the relationships.

\(^{13}\) (Cornelissen, personal communication, 24 March 2016)
5.3.2 The different relationships
The above-discussed actors have different relationships with each other in the neighbourhood. These relationships can be characterised by:

- The interaction goals;
- The strength of relationship;
- The direction of the ties;
- The flow of resources and information.

The reason for these different relationship characteristics is that local actors have different goals to come together in the neighbourhood. The governmental organisations come together to discuss policy objectives. On the contrary, the informal initiatives drink a cup of coffee while discussing a new project for elderly people in Presikhaaf\textsuperscript{14}. Those different relationship goals affect what local actors share in the neighbourhood. In general, the relationships based on living conditions are stronger and more flexible than the relationships based on work and bureaucratic systems. Therefore, in the informal network they share more and different kind of resources, information, and services than in the formal and semi-formal network. Furthermore, the direction of a tie depends on the role of the actor: a customer or an executive. For example, the local government has an executive role. It assigns team Leefomgeving to investigate what the special local needs are in the neighbourhood.

The next part presents these characteristics within the three networks.

**Formal relationships**
The relationships in the formal network are characterised by working relations. The goal of those interactions is to share resources and information: a flow of information, instruction, and funding. Because of the lack of emotional contact between two professionals in the overall network, the relationships can be characterised as weak.

\textsuperscript{14} (Wensink, personal communication, 19 May 2016)
The network map demonstrates that especially the actors Kwartiertafel, Opbouwwerk, team Leefomgeving, and sociale wijkteams have strong relationships with each other (see the network map 14). Kwartiertafel and Opbouwwerk are executive workers of the social welfare organisation Rijnstad, whereas team Leefomgeving and the social wijkteams are executive teams of the local government. Because of the decentralisation of the government, those actors need to work in close cooperation. They share information about their observations in the neighbourhood. In particular, this is the case for team Leefomgeving and the Social wijkteams. In accordance with the policy van Wijken Weten, the teams should become partners in the neighbourhood. Their job is to be informed of the problems, the needs, and the wants in the neighbourhood and, subsequently, to inform the local government of this. Nevertheless, they are struggling to define what these relationships should mean. In particular, they have difficulty in defining what their role is. What relationships are important for whom? What is their job?

**Semi-formal relationships**

The relationships in the semi-formal network are characterised by neighbours and working relations. The goal of the relationships in the semi-formal network is to transfer information and funding. The majority of the relationships in the network are weak. However, compared to the formal network some of the relationships display a higher emotional intensity. These are the citizens’ organisations: de Wijkplatform, de Wijkkrant and Buurtoverleg over het Lange Water.

The networks map above, map 15, displays the clustering of these citizens’ organisations. The rest of the network mainly exists of fragmented relationships. This cluster has its own kind of system and rules. As discussed, the local government provides the Wijkplatform every year with a neighbourhood
budget. The Wijkplatform partly financially supports the other two organisations with this budget. The role of the Buurtoverleg over het Lange Water is to inform the Wijkplatform about their ideas, presented in the form of a report. The relationship with the Wijkkrant is less formal. The Wijkkrant is only interested in information for new articles in the newspaper.

The rest of the relationships in the semi-formal network are relatively fragmented. This means that they do not have many relationships with each other. The reason for this fragmentation is the difference in goals that actors have within the network. For instance, the goal of the local foundation Stichting Dullert is to support social initiatives in Arnhem, while the goal of the primary schools is only to give education. Because of these different goals, the actors do not have the need to have a relationship with each other.

**Informal relationships**

Within the informal network, the relationships are often strong and based on friendship and trust. This is noticeably different from the other two networks. The relationships are strong because of the high emotional intensity, the reciprocity of services, and the frequency of contact. The initiatives all share similar status, meaning, and philosophy: “just do it with the resources you have”\(^{15}\). Compared to the other networks, the relationships within the informal network are not complex. Therefore, the initiatives can easily establish new contacts within this network.

As discussed, the central actor in the informal network is the training work company Diagonaal. It has strong relationships with the cultural meeting place Locatie Spatie and with the sport-welfare centre Budosport. The relationships between these actors are characterised by friendship and reciprocal services. The respondents reported that they not only share resources and information with each other but also different services.

First, the relationship between Diagonaal and Locatie Spatie is based on trust and reciprocity (see the map 16). For instance, “When Diagonaal organises a local event, we will help them with painting and preparing ‘bitterballen’ for them. We are a short of partner organisation.

\(^{15}\) (van der Molen, personal communication, 27 May 2016)
We support each other in advice, resources and working hours.”

Second, the relationship between Diagonaal and Budosport is similar (see the map 17). “Diagonaal can make use of our van. As a reciprocal service the interns of Diagonaal maintain our yoga garden and support Budosport with the cycling classes for multicultural woman”.

Map 17, the relationships within the informal network.

5.3.3 Concluding: the relationships in the three networks
The above-mentioned results demonstrate that the relationships within the three networks have different characteristics. These characteristics are related to the goals the local actors have in the neighbourhood. Therefore, the institutional organisations have different relationships than the informal initiatives. Furthermore, these relation characteristics give insight into the information and resources the actors share. For instance, the friendship relations within in the informal network are characterised by a high intensity of flow of resources, information, and services.

Taking the structural characteristics together, these characteristics say something about the paradoxical relationships of the government. They are bureaucratic organisations that are connected by working relations, although the decentralisation suggests that the activities of the local government should change. The results suggest that this organisation structure cannot easily adapt to new situations. The next paragraph further supports this argument.

5.4. The cultural characteristics of networks
In general, social network theories define networks as a set of actors and their relationships (Marin and Wellman, 2011; Wasserman and Faust, 1994). This research agrees that their members and relationships can identify the networks. However, this research gives new evidence that those (structural) networks are also cultures. In other words, networks can be characterised by both structural and cultural characteristics.

16 (Als hij een dagje heeft dan komen wij daar schilderen en komen we bitterballen maken. Als wij hier een dag hebben, komen ze een koffiezet apparaat brengen. We zijn eigenlijk partner organisaties. We ondersteunen in advies, middelen en uren met elkaar) (Schouten, personal communication, 12 April 2016)

17 (De bus die hier vaak stil staat mogen zij gebruiken en zij onderhouden weer onze yoga tuin. En de staigers van diagonaal helpen ons met de fietslessen) (Wensink, personal communication, 19 May 2016)
These cultures are a way of acting and practising for the actors and stakeholders who operate in those networks: their objectives, their languages, and their forms of organisation. It needs to be noted that the network structures and the cultures are strongly related. This means that the local actors and the relationship characteristics are in relation with the cultural values within the networks. When the position of an organisation, group, or initiative changes in a network, new relations are created and new cultural rules will appear. As discussed, when the group has a structural or central position within the neighbourhood network, it matters more to the network operation than a group in the peripheral zone. These observed effects depend on the point of observation of the empirical observer. To put it differently, this means that the professionals in the neighbourhood can have different observations than the researcher has.

The cultures can be defined by:

- The different language;
- The different objectives;
- The different way of organising their core business;

Although the network-structural characteristics are important to identify and characterise the local interaction, the cultural differences are important to understand who interacts with whom in the neighbourhood. The structural differences are only an outcome of these cultural differences. Normally, if people do not have the same cultural values they have difficulties to relate to each other. So, what are those cultural differences? How do these cultural differences explain the structural difference? In the section that follows, the three cultural elements mentioned above are outlined. Paragraph 4.4 discusses how these cultural and structural differences affect the interaction between the networks.

5.4.1 The language and attitude

The local actors within the three networks speak a different ‘language’ and have a different attitude: a way of communication. Consequently, there sometimes occurs miscommunication between different local parties in the neighbourhood. Without being a part of these local networks, it is challenging to understand their way of communication.

- The **formal network** communicates in the language of policies, mandates, or procedures. In other words, the formal network communicates in a bureaucratic language. This creates their own institutions and cultural rules;
- The **semi-formal network** communicates in the language of reports and through letters and emails. For example, a report is made after every formal meeting of the citizens’ organisation. This report is a way to communicate with the other citizens’ organisation within the network
and to communicate with the institutional organisations in the formal network. The report is checked by the welfare worker (Lies Vonk)\textsuperscript{18};

- The \textit{informal network} communicates mostly face-to-face. Normally, the initiatives do not have a formal structure or procedures for communication. They follow their instinct: ‘just do it’. In other words, in the informal network they speak the language of ‘trial and error’. Social media are only used to reach people outside the own network, for example a neighbourhood activity.

In particular, there is miscommunication between the informal network and the other two networks. The initiatives in the informal network have the attitude ‘just do it’. For instance, according to Edwin van der Molen, “If you have the ambition to do something, you just do it and do not worry about the money. This will come”\textsuperscript{19}. Furthermore, the initiatives are managed by the ambitions and motivation of the initiators. The core of their motivation is real ‘passion’. This conflicts with the more institutional and structural way of communication in the formal and informal networks. The next section outlines these miscommunications.

\textbf{A new language: communication between the informal and the formal network}

Miscommunication between the initiatives and the more formal organisations, such as team Leefomgeving, is mutual. As discussed in the introduction of this research, the team is not familiar with establishing contact with the local informal initiatives. Therefore, team Leefomgeving sometimes finds it hard to communicate with the local initiatives in Presikhaaf. The ‘just do it’ attitude of the initiatives collides with the bureaucratic systems of the government. This refers to the different ways of communication and organisation within the formal and the informal network: the bureaucratic versus the ‘just do it’.

The new urban governance programme asks for a dialogue with citizens and team Leefomgeving. However, the team faces different dilemmas to establish contact with these citizens and to define their role when approaching the initiatives. They are not used to communicate with the community. The last couple of years, they used to communicate with the community with letters, emails, or procedures. These different dilemmas can be summarised as:

- Firstly, the team has problems to contact them. Because the initiatives do not have a strict structure, they do not check their email on a daily basis;
- Secondly, the team has problems to understand their core business. The initiatives organise more different activities rather than only focussing on one core business;

\footnote{\textsuperscript{18} (Vonk, personal communication 17 March, 2016; van Duuren, personal communication, 30 March 2016)} \footnote{\textsuperscript{19} (als je iets wil doen, moet je het gewoon doen, en niet aan geld denken. Geld komt vanzelf wel) (Personal communication, 27 June 2016).}
Thirdly, the team believes that conversation with the initiatives is complex. Sometimes they call it being on a ‘roller coaster’.

On the other side, the active citizens have trouble to communicate with the bureaucratic world of the local government and the social-welfare organisations. The actors within the formal network communicate in procedures and systems. The actors within the informal network are unfamiliar with those systems and rules. The subsidy system is an example of the communication between those worlds: the initiative and the local government. The application systems are complex, filled with many terms and conditions. The initiatives do not have the desire to fill out an application form or even do not have the knowledge to do so. There are several dilemmas:

- There are at least fifteen kinds of subsidies. It is unclear whether subsidies are suitable for a particular case;
- Citizens have trouble filling out the application form. Some citizens are even unable to fill out this form themselves;
- The approval procedures are based on the observations of the local government. It decides what the rules are for application and the subsidies systems. This is based on procedures and structures. This observation differs from the way the initiatives act and organise.

Because of this complex application system, some initiatives need to hire an expert. This expert can help bridge the gap between the bureaucratic language of the government and the ‘try and error’ language of the informal initiatives. For instance, the social-welfare organisation Budosport needed to hire an expert to apply for the sport subsidy.

The implication of these different languages in the formal and informal network is that they need other sources to understand each other. Paragraph 4.4 gives some recommendations on which strategies team Leefomgeving can use.

**Two languages: communication between informal and semi-formal network**

The citizens’ organisations and the local initiatives are both motivated to do something for the neighbourhood. However, they do not understand their different ways of acting and working.

On the one hand, as follows from the previous results, the Wijkplatform and the Buurtoverleg over het Lange Water should support the local initiatives. However, mostly they do not understand the business of the informal and innovative initiatives and find their activities unprofessional. Van Dulkenraad, manager of the local newspaper de Wijkkrant and former member of the Wijkplatform, experiences a

---

20 (Tielen, personal communication, 31 May 2016).
21 (Wensink, personal communication, 19 May 2016)
difference between the communication with the grassroots and innovative informal initiatives, such as Diagonaal, and the organised oldest informal initiative SIK (initiatief groep Kinderkamp):

“the communication with Diagonaal is hard. They are not good to pass on information to the ‘Wijkkrant’ ….. Then we have SIK…They can login to one website to receive information about their activities”  

This quote supports the above-mentioned argument. It shows that the members of the semi-formal network prefer to communicate with structures.

On the other hand, the informal initiatives think that the Wijkplatform is out-dated and not a proper reflection of the current population in Presikhaaf. Most of the members have a Dutch background and are above 50 years old. However, in Presikhaaf a high proportion of the population is multicultural. Therefore, the respondents in the informal network believe the members of the Wijkplatform do not represent the needs in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, some initiatives have bad experiences with the citizens’ organisation. To obtain subsidies they need to gain permission of the citizens’ organisation. Therefore, they need to present their idea during a formal meeting. However, according to some of the respondents, this meeting is sometimes more a court where you need to defend your work instead of a place of stimulation to do something for your neighbourhood. For example, Wensink of the welfare-sport company ‘Budosport’ had a bad experience when she applied for a subsidy for the cycle classes for multicultural woman. According to Wensink, “the members of the ‘Wijkplatform’ think that their function is really important. Their reaction was: we all learned to ride a bicycle by ourselves. If they need a bicycle they better steal it”.  

The meaning of the difference between these actors is that the local actors that emerge from policy objectives and the local actors that emerge from the direct needs in the neighbourhood communicate in a different way. These two languages implicate that if professionals are working in the neighbourhood, they need to have knowledge of the different ways in which local actors communicate. In other words, it implies that team Leefomgeving needs to be aware of the different ways of

22 (Nou Diagonaal is zelf een beetje moeilijk. Die geven heel slecht informatie door…. Je hebt ook SIK bijvoorbeeld…. Ja SIK die kan gewoon op onze webiste zelf inloggen) (personal communication, 30 March, 2016).

23 (Ik heb slecht ervaring mee. Toen wij met fietslessen startten, zitten veel mensen bij die denken dat hun functie heel belangrijk is…. “Wij hebben ook zelf moeten leren fietsen en als ze een fiets nodig hebben dan jatten ze die maar”). (Wensink, personal communication 19 May 2016).
approaching them. Chapter 6 gives recommendations on the strategies that team Leefomgeving could use to overcome this language problem.

5.4.2 Backgrounds and objectives
The three networks each have different backgrounds and objectives. This implies that the three networks emerge from different developments: from more general and national trends or out of local needs. Consequently, the network activities have different goals and objectives. The backgrounds and objectives of the three networks are discussed below.

Formal networks
The formal network emerges from top-down developments in society. This means that their objectives are not based on direct experiences in the neighbourhood, but rather on an observed trend, such as poverty or elderly care. Normally, these objectives are formulated in a policy. This influences the practice and action within the network. For instance, the government programme van Wijken Weten influences the way the professionals need to work with each other in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, the organisation within the network does not focus on one social issue, but rather on a range of social issues such as social welfare, economics, and the environment.

The goal of the new programme van Wijken Weten is to change the way the policy objectives are formulated: from a more top-down approach towards a more bottom-up approach (Arnhem, 2015). Team Leefomgeving is responsible for observing what the special needs of the neighbourhood are. However, the role of team Leefomgeving appears paradoxical. The neighbourhood district Presikhaaf is a deprived area in Arnhem. This neighbourhood has the need for a different range of social activities than a more prosperous area. Nevertheless, a remarkable observation is that in less than six months the team was forced to give advice to the local councils on which (social-welfare) activities they could economise. They needed to have an overview of the important and less important social activities in Presikhaaf. However, this period was far too short to observe and analyse the whole social infrastructure. In other words, to really examine the lifeworlds in the neighbourhood. This case illustrates that it is debatable if the team can even have a bottom-up approach when they are forced from the top down.

This result suggests that, although actors within the formal network have the objective to work bottom-up, there always are top-down forces that limit their actions. For instance, the objectives of the local government are always partly the result of the objectives of the national government and political systems.
The Semi-formal network
The semi-formal network falls between the bottom-up and the top-down approach. In general, their core business emerges from top-down developments. However, they are more flexible than the formal network, an example of which is the national foundation Resto van Harte. Their objectives are to support social meetings and to prevent loneliness in a neighbourhood. These objectives are national but their practices are local. This implies that they can adapt their objectives to the local circumstances.

The informal network
The informal network emerges from a bottom-up movement. This means that its objectives are based on the direct experiences or needs within the neighbourhood. Therefore, the objectives within the networks are mostly based on one specific issue, such as a natural playground or an art route. For instance, the need for a natural playground, het Speelbos, emerged from a group of mothers in Presikhaaf. Together with other mothers, van Dam manages and develops the initiative. Because of the flexible organisation structures, the initiatives can easily adapt their objectives to the current needs in the neighbourhood. Therefore, those objectives are direct and flexible to the living environment.

5.4.3 Their organisation forms
The networks have different ways to organise their core business. Especially, the organisations within the formal and the informal networks have highly different forms of organisations:

1. The formal institutional organisations within the formal networks are hierarchical and bureaucratic and exist out of different bureaucratic subsystems;
2. The informal initiatives within the informal network, or better to say the groups and encounters, do not really know a hierarchical system.

In the next section, these organisational forms of the three networks are briefly discussed.

Formal network: organisation form
As revealed above, the formal networks are composed of organisations and these organisations have bureaucratic systems. These are the devices, the laws, and the rules in an organisation. The actors and stakeholders in the organisations act according to this bureaucratic system. Therefore, the individual actors and stakeholders cannot act according to free will, but rather their actions are institutionalised. In other words, the organisation form of an institutional organisation says something about the behaviour of the actors in the network. In Arnhem, the local government has the largest influence on the rest of the actions within the network. They form the core of all the formal procedures in Arnhem. It hosts different systems and activities related to different activities such as social, welfare, juridical,

24 (van Dam, personal communication, 27 May 2016)
or economic. Therefore, the local government influences the operations of other institutional organisations in Presikhaaf.

Because of this bureaucratic system, change in the network activities is difficult, but also to make a change in the individual actions. Many actors gain a structural position in the neighbourhood. The following empirical example will reveal that in a bureaucratic organisation transitions take time and are not without problems:

The observations of team Leefomgeving demonstrated that the internal organisation of the local government has trouble adapting to the new situations of the programme van Wijken Weten. The local government is a multiform organisation that hosts many systems and activities. In this new situation, the local government needs to redefine its status and position. However, this takes time. An interesting observation was the struggles team Leefomgeving experienced when they wanted to organise an activity within the neighbourhood. For a Turkish event in April, the team wanted to borrow a bus and some other equipment. However, according to a member of the team (Emerenciana), it was impossible to organise this in a short time. He needed to fill in different papers and needed to obtain permission of his manager\textsuperscript{25}. This observation shows that the internal organisation is not yet ready for the flexibility that is needed to work in the neighbourhood.

**Semi-formal network: organisation forms**

As discussed in Paragraph 4.3., there is a paradox in the semi-formal network. Why is there a paradox? The way the citizens’ organisation is organised answers this question. The citizens’ organisations emerged from the policy objectives called the Arnhemse wijkenaanpak. The objective was to support citizens to participate in their living environment. In other words, the aim was to support citizens to become responsible for the policy decisions made for their neighbourhood. Therefore, the government created a local platform, the citizens’ organisation Wijkplatform (Arnhem, 2014). The members of the organisation have the responsibility to decide what the important topics and needs are in the neighbourhood. Nevertheless, as the previous result suggests, to take decisions they need to follow certain rules and systems that are made in collaboration with the local government. In other words, the government shapes their core businesses. Consequently, the actors seem to act in a bureaucratic way. Therefore, despite the fact that citizens manage Wijkplatform it became one more bureaucratic organisation.

\textsuperscript{25} (personal communication, May 2016)
Informal network: organisation forms
The informal network does not have a hierarchical and a bureaucratic system. Their core business is to organise based on the instinct of the initiators: ‘just do it’ and ‘what feels good’

Furthermore, the daily activities of the initiatives are driven by the motivation and ambition of the initiators. Normally, volunteers manage the initiatives. It takes much time to be successful in longer terms. Even for some of the volunteers it is really a job next to their paid job. This has been observed by the initiatives the cultural meeting place Locatie Spatie, the work training company Diagonaal, and the local foundation JAM. For these initiatives, their core business is about real ‘passion’. Because of this flexible organisation structure, they can easily adapt to new needs in the neighbourhood.

5.4.4 Conclusion: networks and cultures
This paragraph concludes that cultures have important implications for the relationships in the neighbourhood. In this research, these cultures are analysed in the following way:

- **Languages**: the actors in the network have different ways of communication. In particular, the informal networks communicate differently from the other networks. Therefore, it seems that there is sometimes miscommunication or even no communication. In case of no communication, actors have separate cultures which indicates that there is no relation between the actors.

- **Background and objectives**: the three networks emerge from different developments, which imply different objectives. While the formal network emerged from top-down developments, the informal network emerged from bottom-up developments;

- **Organisation forms**: the networks organise their core business differently. Whereas the formal network is more hierarchical, the informal network does not need bureaucratic structures to organise their activities, but rather just follow their instincts.

These cultural values influence how the different local actors act and practice in the three different networks. This helps to understand why certain local actors have a relationship and why others have not. In other words, these different cultures affect the way local actors interact with each other in the neighbourhood. The next paragraph elaborates on this argumentation.

---

26 (van der Molen, personal communication, 27 May 2016)
5.5 How do the networks interact in Presikhaaf?
As described in the previous sections, the three identified networks can be characterised by the structural and cultural network characteristics (see the network map). These characteristics affect how the formal, semi-formal, and the informal networks interact with each other in Presikhaaf. This degree of external interaction informs how much the actors and stakeholders can know from each other and the information and resources that the actors share. In general, the more the networks differ structurally and culturally, the lower the degree of external interaction. For instance, the formal network that is characterised by working relations and institutional cultural values has a low degree of external connectivity with the informal network with notable different structures and cultures.

The degree of external interaction helps to understand what the local actors, such as the local initiatives and the local government, can know and understand from each other. It needs to be clear that there is a difference between the position of an actor and the degree of external interaction. The position of an actor helps to understand the information one can receive within the networks, while the degree of external interaction gives insight into the information an actor can receive from another network. Generally, the information that the actors can receive is limited to the relationships one can have. In other words, in general the practices are not visible to actors that are not part of those networks or, to put it differently, ‘worlds’. For the new government programme van Wijken Weten, this knowledge ‘gap’ is problematic if the local government wants to facilitate and stimulate social innovation in a neighbourhood.

This current section analyses how the formal, informal, and the semi-formal networks interact in the neighbourhood Presikhaaf. First, the interaction between the formal and the informal networks. Secondly, the interaction between the formal and the semi-formal networks. Thirdly, the interaction between the informal and semi-formal networks are visualised. The research focusses on some special cases. These cases are an illustration of the effects of the structural and the cultural differences on the external interaction.
5.5.1 The interaction between the formal and informal network:

The formal and the informal network have partly a low degree of external interaction. The network map 18 above demonstrates this. However, in the formal network a difference is observed between the governmental and the social-welfare organisations (see map 19).

Especially the governmental organisations have a low degree of external interaction with the local initiatives in the informal network. Therefore, the local government finds it hard to observe the local needs, because they are not part of these local networks in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, the results show that usually the governmental organisations and the informal initiatives do not share information and resources with each other. This is not only the result of the different cultures that these local actors have but there is some other specific
explanation for this interaction pattern. The explanation is the existence of the Wijkplatform. The aim of this citizens’ organisation is to support the local initiatives with governmental financial resources. In other words, to be a bridge between the local government and local initiatives. However, as the previous results demonstrated, rather than support the initiatives it seems that the practices of these actors collide. Consequently, the government organisations and the local informal initiatives do not have many relationships with each other.

This network map 20 shows the relatively low interaction between team Leefomgeving and the local initiatives in Presikhaaf. According to the team, it is not easy to understand where all the initiatives are located and what its practices are. In other words, they do not have a real perception of what the needs are in the informal networks. The reason for this knowledge gap is the low degree of interaction. They are both members of different cultures and have different relationship goals.

Although the informal initiatives have a central function within the social infrastructure, most of them are without governmental support. They are mainly financially self-supporting and managed by volunteers. Nevertheless, the initiatives are struggling to be fully financially self-supporting. This can be seen in the case of Locatie Spatie. According to Schouten, it is hard to organise a social project in Presikhaaf voluntary and without financial resources. The following quote illustrates the effect of the cultural difference that exists between the informal initiatives and the governmental organisations. It shows the challenge to become a more professional service in the neighbourhood if the local government does not see the value of these local activities:

27 (personal communication, 12 July 2016)
‘It would be nice if we would receive some support. For education and participation. Our concept is just unique. We connect the local practices with international ones. Maybe we are too innovative. I do not know. Although, if people come visit this place they are always enthusiastic’ 28

As revealed above, social-welfare actors have more external connections with the informal network. These are the local functions, like the opbouwwerker and the Kwartiertafel. The network map 21 visualises this external interaction. In general, they have a longer history to work with residents in the neighbourhood. As discussed in Paragraph 4.1. The social welfare actors and the actors within the informal network both speak a different language. However, they are more experienced how to communicate with this informal network than the governmental organisation because of the long history working in the neighbourhood. This means that those actors normally have more knowledge about the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood. They know where the initiatives are located and what they do. In other words, the social welfare organisations know better how to observe the needs of the informal initiatives. For team Leefomgeving this actor is an important source to receive information of the informal network.

28 (Maar het zou leuk zijn als er een keer middelen naar ons toe komen. Educatie en Participatie. Je hebt hier gewoon goud in handen. We maken verbinden lokaal met internationaal. Ik denk dat wij toch te innovatief zijn. Ik weet het niet. Als mensen hier komen zijn ze altijd enthousiast (Schouten, personal communication 12 April 2016).
5.5.2 The interaction the formal and the semi-formal network

Map 22, the formal and semi-formal networks in Presikhaaf

The network map 22, shown above, visualises the fragmented interaction between the formal and the semi-formal networks. This means that some parts of the networks have a higher interaction than in other parts. To say it differently, they have higher external interaction. With respect to this fragmented network interactions, the organisation within the formal network seems to have most contact within their own network.
In Presikhaaf (see network map 23), team Leefomgeving mainly has formal contact with the institutions such as the social-welfare organisation Rijnstad and the elderly organisation SWOA. The observed interaction between the formal and the semi-formal network is the interaction between team Leefomgeving and the citizens’ organisations in the semi-formal network (see network map). As discussed, these organisations are initiated by the local government. The team joins the meeting of the Wijkplatform to observe what the important subjects are and how the members make decisions.

Team Leefomgeving and other governmental organisations have a low degree of interaction with the rest of the network. The previous section has discussed the consequences of the low interaction between the formal and the informal network. It has been argued that it can be a challenge for local initiatives to become more professional if the government does not support them. However, the implication of the low interaction between the formal and the semi-formal network differs. It seems that the actors, such as the stichting Volkstuinencomplex or local foundation stichting Dullert, do not have the need to receive governmental support. In particular, an interesting observation is the low interactions with the schools and the governmental organisations. Although it seems that primary schools have formal and bureaucratic systems, it is hard to get in contact with them. According to the community worker, “the management of the schools are too busy to manage the internal school programs”. This result suggests that it seems that the schools are not interested in getting extra support.

29 (‘team Leefomgeving, personal communication, 31 May 2016)
30 (Hier komt dat doordat ze heel erg druk zijn met interne verhaal) (Personal communication, 17 March 2016).
5.5.3 The interaction between the informal and the semi-formal network

In general, as the network map 24 above shows, the interaction between the informal and the semi-formal network is low. This means that the actors within the semi-formal network do not have many relationships with the actors within the informal network. With respect to this low interaction, the actors mostly share resources and information within their own network. This can be explained by the cultural difference between the two networks. As discussed in Paragraph 4.4, the actors within the semi-formal and informal network have different background and objectives and speak a different language. However, the network map demonstrates that some actors within the semi-formal network only have one or two relations with the informal. Nevertheless, the reasons for these relations are that these actors partly share similar objectives of languages. To explain the argument, the research elaborates on two cases.
The network map above shows the low interaction between the citizens’ organisation and the local informal initiatives (see the network map 25). Although the citizens’ organisation should support all the bottom-up activities in the neighbourhood, they have the most relationships with the other semi-formal citizens’ organisations like the Buurtoverleg over het Lange water and do not have many relations with the informal initiatives in Presikhaaf. In particular, the network map shows the low interaction with the innovative initiatives like the training working company Diagonaal and the cultural meeting place Locatie Spatie. The reason for the absence of relations is that the citizens’ organisations have difficulties to understand the different languages and objective of the more innovative initiatives in Presikhaaf. This argument is explained in paragraph 4.3.A.

Nevertheless, the network map above shows that the Wijkplatform has interaction with the initiatives SIK and the cultural initiatives the Kunstroute and the Cultuurgroep. Especially the interaction with the initiative SIK needs some special attention. The SIK is the oldest initiative in Presikhaaf and their members are generally over sixty. Over the years, the initiative became more professional. For instance, they have a schedule when activities take place and every month they have a meeting with the board. Furthermore, some members of SIK are formal members of the Wijkplatform. Taking this together, it seems that the initiative SIK is better adopted to the culture of the Wijkplatform.

5.5.4 Conclusion: the external interaction
This paragraph has reviewed the interaction patterns between the three networks in Presikhaaf. The research calls this the degree of external interaction. It has been argued that the structural and cultural characteristics affect this degree of external interaction. In general, the more two actors differ structurally and culturally the lower the degree of external interaction. The different network map shows that particularly the formal and the informal network have a low degree of external interaction. This result from the notable different cultures the actors have.

This degree of interaction gives information about the information and the resources the different networks share with each other. The low degree between the formal and the informal network support
the argument that there is a gap between the institutional organisations and the local initiatives in a neighbourhood. As a consequence of this low interaction, the government has a little perception of the need the local initiatives has.
6. Conclusion
This research began with the discussion on the changing relationships between the government and the citizens in the public domain. The government increasingly participates on a local level whereas it needs to facilitate and regulate the active citizens and citizens increasingly take initiative in their living environment (van der Steen, Peeter and van Twist, 2010). Nevertheless, the relationships between government and active citizens are paradoxical. Both parties have different goals and practices in local governance. On the one hand, citizens have troubles with the bureaucratic governmental structures (RMO, 2014). On the other hand, local government has trouble to speak the language of people in the neighbourhood. They often do not have the flexible attitude that is needed to participate in this context. It seems that the bureaucratic system of the government collides with the ‘lifeworlds’ of citizens. Without a good understanding of those ‘two worlds’, policy objectives have difficulty to meet the needs of local initiatives and to reach the aim to stimulate and facilitate social innovation and local initiatives in the neighbourhood. Different researchers are dealing with the above-discussed problem in local governance.

From a scientific perspective, social network analysis (SNA) can help give answers to this problem. This method visualises the relationships and local interactions in the neighbourhood. However, this SNA has been criticised for the fact that it is only a visualisation of interaction between people and that it does not analyse the meaning of networks in society (Mische, 2011). A more theoretical perspective is needed to analyse the meaning of local interaction. Therefore, the current research combines a social network perspective with the theory of culture and society. In this literature, networks are considered as the master social structures in society, which connects individuals, groups, and organisations (Fuchs, 2001). This helps to analyse the meaning of the ambivalent relationships between government and active citizens in local governance.

In view of these social and scientific problems, the research question of the current thesis was:

‘How can a combination of social network analysis and the theory of ‘culture and society’ provide insights in the structural and cultural characteristics of local networks in a neighbourhood?’
6.1 There is not one, but there are three different types of local networks in a neighbourhood

In general, the governmental actors like team Leefomgeving look at the neighbourhood as one single project. However, the findings of this research suggest that the neighbourhood exists of different types of networks. According to the current research results, there exist three types of networks in a neighbourhood:

- The network of government and institutions: the formal network;
- The network of citizens’ and social organisation: the semi-formal network;
- The network of the local initiatives: the informal network.

The question is: how were these three local networks identified? The research findings show that these three networks are defined by their structural characteristics, their cultural characteristics, and the different interaction patterns. First, the structural characteristics are defined by a set of actors and their relationships. Second, the cultural characteristics are the different ways government, the citizens’ organisations, and local initiatives communicate and act in the neighbourhood. The different network structures and cultures affect how the networks interact with each other. The more the networks differ, structurally and culturally, the lower the degree of external interaction. For team Leefomgeving this implies that the team needs different strategies to observe the way to support social innovation in the neighbourhood. This research concludes that the network map (see the network map) provides four new strategies which help to ‘bridge the gap’ between the local government and the local initiatives.

This concluding chapter starts to review the structural and cultural characteristics of these three networks. It then shows how these different characteristic affect local interaction. The last section discusses what the implications are of these three networks for the role of team Leefomgeving in local governance.

6.1.1 The network structural characteristics

The type of local actors and the relationship characteristics can define the network structural characteristics. This not only give insights into the interaction in the neighbourhood: who interacts with whom, but also what the meaning and content is of relations. These identified characteristics give new evidence why there exist a paradoxical relationship between government and active citizens.

First, the three networks consist of different types of local actors: the initiatives, the citizens’ groups, and the institutional organisations. The actors have different organisation structures. This has an impact on their daily operations in the neighbourhood. For instance, while an institutional organisation has a bureaucratic system to organise the interaction with other local actors in the neighbourhood,
the informal actors, such as the initiatives, usually do not use bureaucratic systems to organise themselves. Furthermore, the actors have their own position within the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood. This can be a peripheral or central position. This gives insight into the information an actor receives from other local actors. The meaning of an actor’s position differs from each kind of organisation structure. In general, it seems that the more complex an organisation structure is, such as an institution, the harder it is to receive information from the local community in a neighbourhood.

Second, the relationships characteristics can be defined by the different relationship goals such as the type of work, strengths, direction, and flow of information and resources. The different types of local actors have different relationship characteristics. The reason for this difference is that the actors come together with different goals and values in the neighbourhood. Some actors may have relationships on work, where others have a relationship on living conditions. This not only implies that the relationships between the institutional organisations differ from the relationship between the local informal initiatives, but these different goals and values also have implications on the relationships between institutional actors and informal actors. In other words, there is a link between the sort of local actors and the relationship characteristics.

Those different relationship goals have influence on the way the actors share information and resources with each other. In the informal network, the relationships between the initiatives are often strong and based on friendship. This personal contact is the reason that they share more resources and information than the other networks. In the formal network, the relationships between the governmental and the social- and welfare organisation are characterised as typical working relations. The way those actors can share information and resources is defined by a bureaucratic system. In other words, these working relations are based on contracts and procedures. This different relationship characteristic implies that what the local initiatives share with each other can never be the same as between two bureaucratic actors.

Together these structural characteristics help to understand the existence of the paradoxical relationship between government and active citizens. The local government has only a few relationships with the local community. This is the result of the different organisation structure and the relationship goals: bureaucratic versus non-bureaucratic and work versus living. Because of this different relationships characteristics, it is hard for the local government to receive the right information to support social innovation in the neighbourhood.

6.1.2 The network cultural characteristics
In the neighbourhood, the three networks also have different cultural characteristics. In this research, the term culture is defined as the way the local actors act and practice in the network. Three main
cultural values are identified. Firstly, the different language the actors speak and the attitude the actors have in the network: the bureaucratic or the ‘trial-and-error’ language. Secondly, the different backgrounds and objectives: developed top-down or bottom-up. Thirdly, the different ways of organising their core businesses: hierarchical or flexible. These cultures have important implications for how initiatives, citizens’ groups, and organisations interact in the neighbourhood.

Especially the different language the actors use and the different attitude the actors have has impact on local interactions. These different languages affect how the government and the informal local initiatives can understand each other. In Presikhaaf, miscommunication can often be observed between the informal local initiatives and the formal organisations. It is typical for the local initiatives to communicate face-to-face without formal structures or procedures for communication. They act flexible and have a ‘just do it’ attitude. Furthermore, the core of their business is real ‘passion’. This obstructs with the more institutional and structural way of communication of the formal organisations and the citizens’ organisations. Their ‘language’ of communication goes via emails, reports, procedures, and policies. Therefore, governmental actors and the local initiatives do not always understand the ‘words’ of the other because of these different acts of communication.

In the new public environment, the awareness of the different ways of communications is essential for the increasingly important local role of the government. The system of the local government often does not correspond with the structures and rules of a dynamic neighbourhood environment. This implies that team Leefomgeving would do good to get more close to the rules of the neighbourhood: a flexible working method without many procedures. Nevertheless, for the bureaucratic organisations it is not easy to comply to this culture. A civil servant cannot act following free-will, rather his actions are institutionalised. To adapt to the local situation implies that hierarchical and bureaucratic systems should have to change. However, these are complex systems that exist of different bureaucratic subsystems which takes time to reform. To sum up, an understanding of this local culture, is vital for the team to observe what the real needs are in the neighbourhood.

6.1.3 The network interactions patterns
The mapping of the local networks visualises the interaction patterns in the neighbourhood: which local actors are connected with whom. For example, it brings up the actors that are not well connected in the neighbourhood. The above-mentioned structural and cultural difference affects the way the networks interact with each other. In general, the networks with notable different relations and cultures have a low degree of external interaction. This degree of external interaction indicates the knowledge the actors and stakeholders may have of each other and about the resources and information that the actors share.
In Presikhaaf, there is a low degree of external interaction between the formal and the informal network. Especially the governmental organisations lack knowledge about the informal local initiatives: what are their objectives? And do they need support? Therefore, the local government sometimes fails to facilitate and support the local initiatives. Actors, which are better connected to the informal network, have more knowledge about the needs of the initiatives. Those (central) actors can be used as informants for team Leefomgeving. For instance, team Leefomgeving could make use of the community worker, the *opbouwwerker*, from the social-welfare organisation as an informant.

Furthermore, the interaction between the actors within the networks gives information about the way actors are connected. The different relationships characteristics and the flow of information and resources provide insights on how the social relations can be transformed in order to create new social values in a neighbourhood. The initiatives and/or organisations with certain needs or innovative ideas can be connected to similar actors. This reconstruction of social relations brings the needs and the wants in the neighbourhood together, which can create new social values. For example, a group of citizens have the idea to take over the maintenance of a local park but do not have the resources, such as a rake and a wheelbarrow, to organise this. The community garden may lend out their equipment’s to the initiative. This example shows that these ‘new’ relations bring the needs and opportunities together in a neighbourhood, which can strengthen the social infrastructure.

6.1.4 What do the three networks imply for the role of the local government?
The existence of three networks has several implications for the role of the government in the neighbourhood. The above results demonstrate that neither citizens, groups, nor local government get all the information about the needs in a neighbourhood. They have different relationships within the neighbourhood. The information the local actors receive is limited by their relationship with others and their position in the social infrastructure. This knowledge ‘gap’ can be problematic if team Leefomgeving wants to facilitate and stimulate social innovation in the neighbourhood. Therefore, the team needs to use other sources to receive information about the needs and the ideas of the initiatives in Presikhaaf.

Four new strategies for the stimulation and facilitation of social innovation are identified. These strategies can help team Leefomgeving to overcome this knowledge ‘gap’ between different parties in the neighbourhood. The starting point for the use of these strategies is the network map (see the network map). The analysis of the network map brings the following four strategies for social innovation:

- An overview of the relationships and interactions;
- The flow of resources and information;
• The (central) position of the actors;
• The cultural differences.

The four strategies can be seen as four ‘lenses’ to help read the network map. These strategies are not mutually exclusive; they may be used in combination.

First, “the overview of relationships and interactions and the flow of resources” together give insights on how social relations can be transformed. Second, the strategy “the position of the actors” helps to understand what an actor can do and the information this actor can receive. Three examples can show the benefit of this strategy:

• A central position: this central actor has access to many sources of information and resources in the neighbourhood. Therefore, those actors are valuable to use as local informants.
• A peripheral position: this peripheral actor is not well connected in the network structures. Therefore, this actor normally has limited access to information and resources. This confines his actions.
• An actor position in relation to others: do they belong to the same network or do their networks have different structures and cultures? This position gives information about what the actors can know and understand from each other.

In relation to the other two strategies, “the overview of relationships and interactions and the flow of resources”, this strategy helps to identify the new possibilities for social innovation. The last strategy, “the cultural difference”, reveals the misunderstanding between the different parties in the neighbourhood. Different actors may use a different language and/or act differently in the neighbourhood. An improved understanding of these different cultural values helps to anticipate to the local situations in the neighbourhood. For team Leefomgeving this implies that it would do good to get more close to the rules of the neighbourhood: a flexible working method without many procedures.

The visualisation of local networks not only give insights into to complex social infrastructure that exist in the neighbourhood. It also shows that there is a cultural difference between local actors. The four strategies that this research provides help to overcome this difference. In other words, to ‘bridge the gap’ in dynamic neighbourhoods.
6.2. Discussion

The current thesis about local networks in neighbourhoods gives a different perspective on the topics of networks, social innovation and governance. The combination of the two network theories, the social network analysis (SNA) and the theory of ‘culture and society’, helped to analyse what the meaning is of networks in relation to local governance. It explores how the mapping of the local network can support the local government to observe the needs and ideas in a neighbourhood in order to stimulate and facilitate social innovation. The research argues that there are three different networks in a neighbourhood which can characterise structurally and culturally. These results give a nuanced understanding of the complex environment in which local governance takes place. It provides new evidence that governmental actors sometimes fail to support social innovation and local initiatives in the neighbourhood.

This discussion chapter gives a broader reflection on the meaning of these results on the literature on local governance; with its implication for the relation between the government and citizens in local governance. First, it begins with a validation of the research. It will then go on discussing the meaning of the redefinition of relationships in local governance. This section ends with a discussion of the limitation of this research.

Several previous studies concluded how the local government sometimes fails to facilitate and stimulate new local initiatives (de Wilde et al., 2014; Bakker et al., 2012). These discussed, that although citizens increasingly take the lead to work on the quality and liveability of their neighbourhood, the fact remains that government and local institutions sometimes reproduce the inequality among community groups rather that facilitate them. The current research addresses these social and scientific problems. It has shown that mapping the existing interactions can help to overcome those barriers to increase social innovation. The critical actors that have weak relationships in the neighbourhood can be identified by the SNA. The flow of resources and information can be increased by bridging those local actors to other actors or groups in the neighbourhood. These results support the previous work of Balfour and Alter (2016) on the study of the potential to facilitate community innovation and development in a research park in California. The findings of the current research give the evidence that the mapping approach cannot only be used in a restricted environment, such as a research park, but it also has potential in a neighbourhood. This implies that the social network method can has potential as an urban governance tool to increase social innovations in the neighbourhood.

Trends like self-organisation, local initiatives and active citizenship ask for a different perspective on the role of government and citizens in the public domain. Several studies suggest that this local
governance asks for a redefinition of the relationships between the government, citizens and local institutions in order to open space for new innovations (Bakker et al., 2012; Verhoeven and Tonkens, 2011; Kruiter and Blokker, 2015; van der Steen et al., 2013; de Wilde et al., 2014). Although the relations between the government and citizens changed in this new public environment, the local government can never become part of the local communities in a neighbourhood. In light of the result of this research, it is debatable what the redefinition of relationships mean.

In governance, different local parties, such as the local government, citizens and social organisations, come together. These local actors are all part of different types of networks in the neighbourhood. The concepts ‘networks structure’ and ‘network culture’ helps to understand that these types of networks can be seen as cultures in themselves. This cultural difference has implications on the interaction of the actors within governance. In general, government and citizens have notable different cultures. For instance, the actors have different objectives to come together in governance. This implies that the bureaucratic actors and the community actors can never have equal relationships in governance. In other words, they have different goals in governance. But what does this imply for the redefinition of relationships between citizens and government?

The next section elaborates on the meaning of the redefinition of this relation. It first discusses the paradox that exist between government and citizens. It then concludes with a discussion of the implication of the research findings on the redefinition of relations.

A. The paradox: the relations between government and active citizens
The neighbourhood has always been one of the important places in which the relation between citizens and government has taken shape (Duyvendak and Hortulanus, 1999; De Boer, 2001; Uitermakt, 2005 and WRR, 2005). In modern history, there are distinctive policy trends in which government tries to redefine the relations with citizens (de Boer, 2001; Duyvendak, 1999). In general, these policies imply that new (bureaucratic) structures emerge such as new platforms, organisations or institutions.

In Arnhem, for more than twenty years, the local government have had the policy programme ‘Arnhemse Wijkenaanpak’ (Arnhem, 2014). The objectives were to increase local democracy and to motivate citizens to become active within their living environment. The citizens’ organisation ‘Wijkplatform’ was introduced to give the residents of Arnhem more power over their living environment. The aim was to restore the relations between citizens and the bureaucratic systems in the neighbourhood. Nevertheless, the findings of the current research show that this citizens’ organisation became another bureaucratic system. The citizens’ organisation is part of the semi-formal network in Presikhaaf. The relations in this network are generally based on policy objectives. This imply that the way the ‘Wijkplatform’ and other actors interact in the semi-formal network are based on
certain rules and procedures. In other words, this network has its own culture: their own objectives and langue. This culture constantly re-events itself because it only has similar relationships with itself. As a consequence, it constantly recreates its own ‘semi-bureaucratic’ reality. This collide with the local informal initiatives within the informal network.

The current government programme van Wijken Weten is another policy that tries to redefine the relations with citizens. Team Leefomgeving needs to encourage citizens to play an active role in their neighbourhood. In other words, the teams are responsible to redefine the relation between citizens and the local government. They partly take over the responsibility of the community worker (Limburg, 2016). Although the team has the ambition and positive energy to take-over this responsibility, according to Visser, manager of the social-welfare organisation Rijnstad, this transformation is not without problems: “How can we have knowledge of the local community if we at the same time decrease the knowledge we have”31. The findings of this research show that the social-welfare actors have an important position within the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood. These workers have knowledge about the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood: they know the ideas and the problems in the neighbourhood. In other words, although the aim of van Wijken Weten is to restore the relation with the local community, it seems that the policy first partly destroys the existent social infrastructure to make room for new actors and relations. But, why does the local government take such decisions? How can this behaviour be explained?

It needs to be clear that team Leefomgeving is nothing to blame. They just do their job in the best way they can. The team is enthusiast and have ambition to work together with citizens on a better living environment in Presikhaaf. Nevertheless, their actions are limited. This implies that although team Leefomgeving is enthusiast, they are still part of the bureaucratic world in society. This system has their own rules of acting and doing. Therefore, the actions of team Leefomgeving are institutionalised. This implies that the team can never act following free will. Whether the new ideas and plans of team Leefomgeving can be implemented depends on this bureaucratic system.

These two example shows the paradox that sometimes exists when the government tries to recover the relationship with citizens. It seems that government usually creates new (bureaucratic) structures and procedures in order to redefine the relation with the local community rather than just have a direct ‘dialogue’ with citizens. The explanation for this reaction is their culture: a bureaucratic culture. This culture implies that the ways the actors act within this culture are affected by rules, procedures, and policy objectives. This culture collides with the culture in the informal network in the neighbourhood. Government and citizens have different goals and values and different ways of

31 ‘Maar hoe kan je van Wijken weten als je die kennis bij voorbaat afbouwt’ (Clön, 2016)
communicating and acting. These cultural differences imply that the relationships between government and citizens can never be the same as the relationships between the actors within the formal and informal network. In other words, the relations within the informal network will always be based on living conditions and the relations within the formal network on work. Therefore, it is hard to redefine the relations between the ‘bureaucratic’ and the ‘informal’ culture.

Taking these together, the current research argues that, rather than the redefinition of the relations, the different local actors in governance need to be aware of the different cultures that exist in the neighbourhood. This cultural difference implies that the professionals need to be aware of the different ways in which citizens organise and communicate to understand their needs and ideas. In other words, government needs to be aware that their bureaucratic language differs from the ‘trial-and-error’ language of the innovative world in the neighbourhood.

This above implication supports the idea of ‘social heating’ (in Dutch: sociale opwarming) as mentioned in the study of Verhoeven and Tonkens (2011). There should be a partnership between professionals and initiatives. The initiatives are satisfied with the role of the professionals if they avoid bureaucratic procedures and rules, holding a flexible attitude, and listening to their needs. In other words, as discussed, the professional should be aware of the cultural differences. This asks for a flexible method and attitude from professionals when working in the neighbourhood. This implies that professionals need to be aware of the different ways citizens and institutions organise and communicate. For example, with some active citizen they had better drink a cup of coffee than invite them to a formal meeting. Therefore, the knowledge of the cultural difference rather than the redefinition can help improve the relationship between professionals and initiatives in the public domain.

6.2.1 Limitations of the research
The results and the way the results are conducted are subject to certain limitations. The results of this thesis are limited to the case of the neighbourhood Presikhaaf in the city of Arnhem and to my own point of observation. I am part of the world of science and I have my own background. For example, my observations depend on the way I am raised and what my norms and values are. Another observer could have made different observations from the network map. This asks for some discussion on how the research has handled these limitations.

The network map is subject to certain limitations as well. Since, the study focussed on Presikhaaf, the results will not be fully generalisable to other neighbourhoods. Certainly, in another neighbourhood in Arnhem other networks and cultures would be identified. Furthermore, since the limited amount of time limit it was not possible to speak with all the actors and stakeholders on the network map. The choice has been made to map the actors that the respondents mentioned during the interviews. Those
actors that are not interviewed are especially seen at the edge of the network map such as ‘de Twins’. Another point of discussion is the actors that one sees on the network map. In general, the network visualises only those actors that have an active role in the neighbourhood. What does this imply for the citizens that do not have an active role? Does the mapping of only the more active citizens give enough information about the social infrastructure in a neighbourhood? In other words, it is the question whether the research has reached the actors and groups that have a less central or visible position in the neighbourhood, for instance a youth or migrant group.

To overcome these limitations, the research has used different methodological techniques. First, the research used the triangulation of secondary data, such as policy documents, social media, and semi-structured interviews. This helped to gain the first information about the social infrastructure in Presikhaaf. Second, a participatory mapping method has been used during the interviews. I asked participants the question: with whom do you have a relationship? The respondent could draw the relationships on the topographical map. This technique has helped to reach the groups and initiatives that have a less visible position within the neighbourhood. For instance, the actors that were not identified during the internet research. Lastly, the findings of this research were presented to the different Leefomgeving teams in Arnhem. They were asked to describe what they saw on the network map, what they thought about the categorisation of the three networks, and how they would be able to use this. This has helped to obtain critical feedback on the results.

The way the study has collected data was sometimes challenging. I spoke with many different people from different organisations and initiatives. On the one hand, this was one of the grateful parts of my research. On the other hand, it was also one of the largest challenges. These different kind of respondents gave reason constantly to change the interview techniques. Next to the interview techniques, it was sometimes difficult to stay objective. I personally experienced the different ‘worlds’ that exist in the neighbourhoods. The different respondents did have different opinions about the neighbourhood, about the local government and about the local initiatives. Although it has been hard sometimes, it was also interesting. I learned much about how to communicate and to behave in all those different ‘worlds’.

6.3 Future research
This research has given rise to many questions in need of further investigation. To begin with, the research results argued that the social network method has potential use for governance. However, the practical use of the networks map as a tool asks for further research.

First, for further research it is recommended to use a different social context. The result of this research are only limited to the context of the neighbourhood area Over het Lange Water. In accordance with
the length of residence, the residents in this area mainly have a high social capital. In an area with a population characterised by a low social capital, other interaction patterns would appear. Furthermore, in other cities different social-welfare systems exist. Consequently, other interactions would appear.

Second, despite the promising result of the use of the network map for local governance, the question remains how to overcome the dynamic in the networks. Obviously, neighbourhoods are dynamic. The populations constantly change which asks for other kind of activities. Besides the population, there are other factors such as policies that makes networks dynamic. A recommendation for further research is what the implications of this dynamic character are for the use of the network map.

Thirdly, further research should be undertaken to investigate the practical use of the network map for different professionals that work in the public domain. This implies to investigate the way network map can be designed to make it look less complex. Although this is the reality, the visualisation of the complex network interactions is not workable for the local government. Maybe an online function could help make the local map useful as a tool for urban governance. Furthermore, this research focussed only on the potential of the SNA for team Leefomgeving. However, SNA can also be valuable for the work of the civil servants in the sociale Domein or a district nurse.

The results of this research suggest that there seems to be two forms of active citizenship: the distinction between the local initiatives and the citizens’ organisations like the Wijkplatform and the Buurtoverleg. They are not only members of different networks with different cultures but as well, they differ in the way they became active. The citizens’ organisations emerged from the policy objectives and the local initiatives mostly from the direct needs in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, they have notable different ways of doing and practicing in the neighbourhood. The questions are, can we say that there are two forms of active citizenships? Perhaps, there are multiple cultures of active citizenships in a neighbourhood. To give answers to this question further research needed. The theoretical perspective of ‘social justice’ and ‘deep participation’ of Roark (2014) can be used as a theoretical framework for this further research. The theoretical concept deep participations can help to get a better understanding of the dynamics of the world. The concept describes that there exist different forms of participatory dynamics. This theoretical perspective can help to further analyse the different dynamics that exist in the neighbourhood.
7. Practical recommendations: four new strategies for social innovation

The results have demonstrated the meaning of the network map and argued that there are three networks with structural and cultural characteristics. This raises questions about what the implications are of these identified networks on the research question: *how can team Leefomgeving observe the needs and ideas of the local initiatives in order to facilitate and stimulate social innovation and local initiatives.* The next part of this chapter will discuss the implication of the previous result for the use of the network map. First, it discusses the implications of the research results for the role of team Leefomgeving in Presikhaaf. Second, it will then discuss the potentials of the network map for team Leefomgeving. Lastly, this chapter concludes with four strategies which team Leefomgeving can use to observe the local needs for social innovation. These strategies have a two important of practical implications: how the team can use the network map, the role, and the position of the team in the neighbourhood.

In the introduction of this research, it was discussed that the government has a paradoxical role. The three identified networks acknowledge this statement. The way the government can observe the needs in a neighbourhood are affected by the structural and cultural network characteristics. This has important implications for the role of team Leefomgeving in Presikhaaf. In general, team Leefomgeving finds it hard to observe the local needs in the neighbourhood. As discussed in the previous result, this is the result of the relationships and the position of the governmental organisations in Presikhaaf. The team is part of the formal network: the bureaucratic world in the neighbourhood. In this network, they communicate in bureaucratic languages and organise their core business by policy objectives. This contradicts with the semi-formal and the informal network: the lifeworld’s in the neighbourhood. Although the local government needs to work with the local networks, they can never become a part of the local community in Presikhaaf. Rather, they need to be consciousness of the difference that exist in the neighbourhood and need to understand what those differences are. This asks for a flexible working method to adapt work in this dynamic environment.

The results of this research suggest that the network map can be used to bridge the gap between the bureaucratic world and the local community in the neighbourhood. Team Leefomgeving can use this network map to observe new possibilities for social innovation in Presikhaaf. The network map visualises the relationships between the local actors in Presikhaaf. Resources and information are shared through this channels of relationships. Therefore, the map of the local interaction can be seen as the current social values in the neighbourhood. Particularly, the actors that are not well connected in the neighbourhood are interesting to know. These peripheral actors do not have access to the
different local resources and information. New social values arise when new relations are created between actors that are not well connected: a new channel of information and resources.

Taking this result together, the research gives evidence that team Leefomgeving can use the network map to identify new possibilities for social innovation in the neighbourhood, by the use of the following strategies:

- To get an overview of the relationships and interactions;
- To get insight into the flow of resources and information;
- To get an overview of the (central) position of the actors in the social infrastructure;
- To get insight into the cultural difference.

These four strategies are the four ‘lenses’ supporting to look at the network map. The strategies are not mutually exclusive but are in relationships with each other. Together these four lenses can help team Leefomgeving to gain new insights in the social infrastructure in the neighbourhood from their own position. This can help to get the information about the needs in the neighbourhood that is needed to stimulate and facilitate social innovation.

**Strategy 1: An overview of the relationships and interactions**

An overview of the relationships and interactions visualises the way actors connected in the neighbourhood. Especially, the information about the actors that are not well connected within the social infrastructure is relevant. These actors may need extra support. In theoretical terms, this disconnected actors are ‘structural holes’.

**Strategy 2: The flow of resources and information**

The flow of resources and information refers to what the actors in the neighbourhood share with each other. This flow of information and resources can be seen as the value stream that exists in the neighbourhood.

Combining strategy 1 and 2, these different relationship characteristics and network flows give information on how the social relations can be transformed in order to create new social values in a neighbourhood.

Team Leefomgeving can use strategy 1 and 2 to initiate social innovation in the neighbourhood. These strategies give insight in how the social relations can be transformed in order to create new social values. The initiatives and/or organisations with certain needs or innovative ideas can be connected to similar disconnected actors. This reconstruction of social relations brings the needs and the wants in the neighbourhood together, which can create new social values. Fundamental questions are:

- Which initiatives/organisations need support?
- What are the problems, the needs, and the potentials (for example a new idea of an initiative)?
- Where are the initiative/organisations located where new connections can be created?
- What is the social value of the innovation? What are the potentials of the initiative/idea for the neighbourhood?

The SNA can help to give answers to this question. This can help team Leefomgeving to make a well-considered decision how to regulate and facilitate local process in this area. Initiatives that needs extra support or initiatives with an innovative idea can be connected to similar initiatives. Consequently, those initiatives get access to new resources and information in the neighbourhood. For example, a group of citizens have the idea to take over the maintenance of the local park but do not have the garden tools. Therefore, the overview of the networks can help to see what other actors could help this group of citizens. For instance, the community garden ‘De Volkstuinenvereniging’. Furthermore, the result of this research helps to have a different approach to look at values in the neighbourhood. By the connection of problems, ideas and potentials new values are created. It is not directly about economic values but especially social values are considered as important. In detail, an important message of this research is that governance should look at new potential how to strengthen the social infrastructure in a neighbourhood instead of financially support.

**Strategy 3: The position of the actors**

The position of the actors in the social infrastructure gives information about the information and resources an actor can get. This position can be central, peripheral, or the position in relation to other local actors. As discussed, generally, the information that an actor can get is limited to the relations one has. This implies that the position an actor has within the social infrastructure help to understand the information an actor gets. This position has three implications:

First, an actor can have a central position. Those actors have many relationships in the neighbourhood. This implies that they have access to many information and resources. Those actors are valuable to use as a local informant. As discussed, the social-welfare organisations can be informants for team Leefomgeving. These organisations have more relationships with the local networks in the neighbourhood and they know this local language.

Second, an actor can have peripheral position. Those peripheral actors are not well connected in to the networks. Therefore, they have limited access to information and resources. This can have limited their actions. Those actors can be seen as new possibilities for social innovation.

Thirdly, the position of the actor in relation to others gives information about what the actors can know from each other, for instance, the local government in relation to the informal initiatives. They
are both part of a different network. This implies that the local government can never get the same information like the informal initiatives gets from each other.

It is recommended that the Leefomgeving teams make use of the central actor within the neighbourhood. Because of the bureaucratic status of team Leefomgeving, they can never gain the same information about the local news as the residents of Presikhaaf do. In other words, as discussed, if you are not part of those worlds you can never get the same information as the local ones. Those central actors normally have better access to information and resources in the more informal network than team Leefomgeving can have. Therefore, the team can use them as an informant within the local community.

**Strategy 4: The cultural difference**

This cultural difference asks for a flexible working method and attitude of professionals to work in the neighbourhood. This implies that professionals need to be aware of the different ways citizens and institutional organisations organise and communicate. For example, with some active citizen they had better drink a cup of coffee than invite them to a formal meeting. In other words, to use the network map for social innovation, team Leefomgeving needs to learn the ‘language’ of the informal network. This knowledge of the cultural difference can help to improve the relationship between professional and active citizens.

All those different cultures have different needs and act differently. Team Leefomgeving can never become part of these local informal cultures in the neighbourhood. Otherwise, the team can lose their status as civil servants. Although without an understanding of the cultural differences, team Leefomgeving can never observe the right needs and wants for social innovation. Therefore, it is recommended that the team adapt to the local cultural rules that exist in those local network: a flexible working method without many procedures. In general, this implies that the team should create new relationships with local actors and earning trust of the informal networks. There are five practical implications for the role of team Leefomgeving to get to learn these local cultures:

1. **To make an appointment:** the best way to get in contact with the informal network is to call or just walk by. The initiatives do not have a strict day structure. Therefore, they do not check their email every day. If team Leefomgeving wants to get in contact with the formal network, they just need to go there.

2. **A conversation:** to listen is essential. For the initiatives, it is mostly about real ‘passion’. Try not to use the words ‘yes but’, in Dutch ‘ja-maar’. When you stop their motivation, it is possible that they lose faith.
3. **Organisation forms:** the local initiatives and the active citizens work organically and without much formal procedures. It is recommended for team Leefomgeving to try to avoid the formal procedures if possible. If not, communicate in the right way about the procedures and rules, so to prevent confusion. Furthermore, another practical implication is that team Leefomgeving needs to be consciousness of the different kind of citizens they communicate with. For example, the ‘doeners’ (someone how wants to act rather than talk) do not want to be invited for a meeting in the neighbourhood centre ‘het MFC’ (multicultural centrum). This centre is too institutional for them. A better approach is to drink a cup of coffee together.

4. **Communication in two worlds:** if team Leefomgeving has a conversation with a local initiative or active citizens, it is important to communicate about the goal of these conversations. Is it just an introductory meeting or is about for example a new plan. If further action will follow, it is important to reflect after the conversation. Nevertheless, the citizens cannot see what the daily activities are of team Leefomgeving.

5. **Volunteers:** for team Leefomgeving it is important to be consciousness that volunteers manage most of the initiatives. Some of the local initiatives are asked to give a tour or presentation to the council member. Although, it is their ‘passion’ and they like to talk about it, such activities take them much time and energy.
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## Appendix I: the list of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal network</th>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De meidenclub</td>
<td>Bianca van der Mark (vrijwilliger)</td>
<td>Activities for young girls in the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stichting Jam (stichting voor alleenstaande moeders)</td>
<td>Lovijah Veldt</td>
<td>A local organisation for teenage mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeu-de-Boules-club &quot;de Oosthof&quot;</td>
<td>Six elderly man</td>
<td>A group of elderly people who plays every Wednesday Jeu-de-boules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leerbedrijf Stichting Diagonaal</td>
<td>Spekschoor and Corneliussen</td>
<td>The training work company main activity is to combine education with work experience, as well as matching interns to activities of the residents in Presikhaaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eetbaar en belevenispark Kinderkamp</td>
<td>Edwin van der Molen</td>
<td>A group of residents who have the ambition to take over the management of the local park ‘de Kinderkamp’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goede buur</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>An initiatives of a mother who develops a natural playground for the children in the neighborhood;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stichting initiatief groep kinderkamp (SIK)</td>
<td>Martin Hagen</td>
<td>A local initiative that organises different local events with a special attention to the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgegroep</td>
<td>Joop Rozenkrans</td>
<td>A citizens group that plays bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biljartgroep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A citizens group that plays biljart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunstroute Presikhaaf</td>
<td>Mies Frieling</td>
<td>A local initiative that organise every year the art route in Presikhaaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultuurgroep Presikhaaf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A citizens groups that organise different cultural shows in Presikhaaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locatie Spatie</td>
<td>Claudia Schouten</td>
<td>A cultural breeding place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burenhulp voor elkaar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>An initiatives that facilitate and stimulate neighbourliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budosport</td>
<td>Marian Wensink</td>
<td>A gym that combines sport with social-welfare activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair Café</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A local repair centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereniging van eigenaren Middachtsingel</td>
<td>Marjan Appelhof</td>
<td>An association of house owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle-ele</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A music-and danceschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het Speelbos</td>
<td></td>
<td>An initiatives of a mother who develops a natural playground for the children in the neighborhood;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi- formal netwerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het wijkplatform Presikhaar                                                       -</td>
<td>A citizens’ organisation that is initiated by the local governement as a local consultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het buurtoverleg Over het Lange Water                                              Henk van Duuren</td>
<td>A citizens’ organisation that is initiated by the local governement as a local consultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De wijkkrant Presikhaar                                                            Hans van Dulkenraad</td>
<td>The local newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkstuinenvereniging Presikhaar                                                   Reinder de Boer</td>
<td>The allotment garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Willem Dreesschool (primary school)                                            -</td>
<td>A primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunstportaal                                                                       -</td>
<td>A meeting place for artist and art lovers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie MG Schmidt School (primary school)                                          -</td>
<td>A primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stichting Dullert                                                                  -</td>
<td>A local foundation that supports citizens or local initiatives to actively participate in society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultatie bureau                                                                 -</td>
<td>A child consultation clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Twins                                                                           -</td>
<td>A crèche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resto van Harte                                                                    Allon Cheng</td>
<td>The Resto van Harte table is a meeting place to bring people in the neighbourhood together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Weldam SWOA                                                                     Leonieke Jansen</td>
<td>A home for elderly people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinderwerk Rijnstad                                                                 Michelle van Dijk</td>
<td>A social-welfare activity with a special attention to childrenen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opbouwwerk Rijnstad                                                                Lies Vonk</td>
<td>The community worker is responsible to active citizens in their living environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Bibiliotheek mfs                                                                -</td>
<td>The local library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sociale wijkteams                                                               Lian Oomen</td>
<td>The social welfare team is responsible for care, support and activation in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Team Leefomgeving                                                               The seven team members</td>
<td>The team is responsible for all the activities that facilitate or stimulate the liveability in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Kwartiertafel                                                                   Alex Smits</td>
<td>A local platform for supply and demand in local welfare and care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De gemeente                                                                        -</td>
<td>The local governement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rijnstad                                                                           -</td>
<td>The social- and welfare organisation in Arnhem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leefstijlcoaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>A local consultative that gives advice to citizens about their social-welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presikhaaf bedrijven</td>
<td></td>
<td>A platform for jobs for people with a distance to the labor market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Hall Larenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>A college with special attention to technology and life science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkshuisvesting Arnhem</td>
<td>Yvonnen Bierings</td>
<td>A local housing association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunstbedrijf Arnhem</td>
<td></td>
<td>The creative institution that facilitates and stimulates creative and artistic initiatives in the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportbedrijf Arnhem</td>
<td></td>
<td>The local sport company in Arnhem that stimulates sport activities in the neighbourhoods in Arnhem;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBW</td>
<td></td>
<td>A psychiatric and psychological institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: the interview guide

1. **Voorstellen en doel**
   a. Wat doe het team Leefomgeving
   b. Doel gesprek

2. **Voorstellen respondent:**
   a. Organisatie
      i. Hoe zit de organisatie van X in elkaar? Hebben jullie bestuur?
      ii. Doen jullie dit vrijwillig?
   b. Wat is het doel?
   c. Hoe is het ontstaan?

3. **Initiatief (Deze vragen gaan over de organisatie of initiatief zelf)**
   a. Kunt u beschrijven vanuit welke behoefte X is ontstaan?
      i. Wie deelde deze behoefte?
   b. Kunt u de visie van X beschrijven?
   c. Welke activiteiten organiseren jullie?
      i. Locatie en schaal
      ii. Wie is hierbij betrokken?
      iii. Hoe vaak wordt deze activiteit georganiseerd?
      iv. Welke bronnen en middelen hebben jullie nodig voor het organiseren van activiteit?

4. **Sociale netwerk**
   a. Met wie werkt X samen?
   b. Hoe belangrijk is deze samenwerking?
      i. Welke informatie, bronnen en middlen delen jullie?
   c. Hoe communiceer u met?
      i. Met de buurt/wijk?
      ii. Met andere betrokken organisaties?
   d. Hebben jullie contact met, waarom wel of waarom niet? Kunt u dit beschrijven?
      *(Deze lijst wordt steeds groter)*