



Influencing social cohesion in communities:

An exploration of activities influencing social cohesion within the community of Griffioen, Nijmegen

Radboud University



Radboud University



Radboud University Nijmegen

Master Organisational Design & Development

Business Administration

Academic Year 2022-2023

Master Thesis Research

14 August 2023, Nijmegen

Name: Guido Herbert van Mourik
Student number: s1073952
Address: Berg en Dalseweg 25, Nijmegen
Phone: 06 42 40 97 93
Email: vanmourikguido@gmail.com

Under supervision of:
Prof. Dr. P.A.M. Vermeulen

Second examiner:
Dr. L.J.G. Vermeerbergen

Institution: Radboud University
Address: Houtlaan 4, 6525 XZ, Nijmegen
Phone: 024 361 61 61

Abstract

Social cohesion within communities plays a crucial role in fostering a sense of belonging, trust, and cooperation among its members. This qualitative research paper delves into the activities that influence social cohesion within the community of Griffioen. By exploring the essential factors social relations, identification, and orientation towards a common good, this study aims to provide insights into the mechanisms that contribute to or hinder social cohesion in a specific community setting. This research employs an explorative approach, using in-depth interviews to gather data from members of the Griffioen community. Through thematic analysis, the study identifies the social cohesion and activities that have an impact on social cohesion, including the inclusion of all members in decision-making, informal meetings, daily evaluations, bridging social networks, open communication, and addressing exclusion. The findings of this study shed light on the different influence activities in relation to the outcomes within Griffioen. The research contributes to the literature by offering practical insights for communities that seek to strengthen social cohesion. Moreover, this study provides a deeper understanding of the unique factors that influence social cohesion within Griffioen, demonstrating the potential for similar investigations in other communities to create more harmonious and connected societies.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Chapter 1. Introduction	5
1.1 Problem definition.....	5
1.2 Research aim	6
1.3 Research approach.....	7
1.4 Relevance	7
1.5 Outline.....	7
Chapter 2. Theoretical background.....	8
2.1 Community.....	8
2.2 Social Cohesion.....	9
2.3 Theory Exploring Social Cohesion	10
2.4 Community Influencing Social Cohesion	13
Chapter 3. Methodology	14
3.1 Research design.....	14
3.2 Operationalization	15
3.3 Data collection.....	15
3.4 Data analysis	16
3.5 Research Ethics	16
3.6 Research Criteria	17
Chapter 4. Results	18
4.1 Social Relations.....	18
4.2 Identification	26
4.3 Orientation Towards the Common Good.....	29
4.4 Overview Activities of Influence	34
Chapter 5. Conclusion and Discussion	35
5.1 Conclusion.....	35
5.2 Theoretical Implications.....	36
5.3 Practical Implications	37
5.4 Limitations	38
5.5 Suggestions for Future Research.....	39
References.....	40

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Problem definition

In a fast-changing environment, people desire more support, collectiveness, and meaning (Kirschbaum, 2022). These needs can be found among people, groups or organizations who share common interests, which could lead to convergence. This has been done since the origin of mankind, by mutually creating a *community*, where individuals in a certain area and with the same interests converge to survive. Nowadays, both online and offline, communities emerge based on different motives, such as a fan base around a brand, movement or pop idol (Staal & Wagenaar, 2019).

The word ‘community’ is defined as “*The people living in one particular area or people who are considered as a unit because of their common interest, social group, or nationality*” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2023). In the first part of the definition, the area is viewed as the common factor that bonds individuals, groups or organizations. While in the second part, an idea or interest is the common factor of bonding. These factors could complement each other in a neighbourhood or living group, where people converge on behalf of the area they live in and have a common interest (Forrest & Kearns, 2001).

Communities could influence the well-being of, for instance, elderly residents. In 72 urban neighbourhoods in Rotterdam, where people share a common area, the well-being of older adults in the community was studied (Cramm, van Dijk, & Nieboer, 2012). Cramm et al. argue that *social cohesion* and social capital are independently important to the welfare of the elderly. Social capital refers to the relationships within a group of individuals, while social cohesion refers to the ‘glue’ holding these relations together (Cloete, 2014). Social cohesion among neighbours could lead to a higher level of welfare for elderly people, because a higher level of neighbourhood cohesion results in a higher degree of social organization, including the provision of instrumental support to neighbours (Cramm, van Dijk, & Nieboer, 2012). In line with this thought, Griffioen was set up.

Griffioen is a community located in ‘Het Waterkwartier’, the oldest neighbourhood of Nijmegen in the West part of the city. This part of Nijmegen is dealing with poverty; 22% of the citizens within this area live on a base of a low income, and 25% of the citizens are struggling to make ends meet (Gemeente Nijmegen, 2022). Putnam (1995) stated that multiple studies explain that neighbourhoods, dealing with poverty, lack the qualities of self-help, mutuality and trust. However, positive quality of public life and performance of social

institutions are more likely in civically engaging communities. Therefore, the city council views self-help, mutuality, and trust as an opportunity, along with health and participation, in improving local living, care, welfare, and local social responsibility (Gemeente Nijmegen, 2022). Within their control, Griffioen seeks to utilize these opportunities in the neighbourhood.

Griffioen emerged out of three organizations that combined their expertise to encourage the appointed opportunities for citizens in Oud-West and created a community in this neighbourhood (Jackson, Spruit, Hernandez, Huijsmans, & Sande, van de, 2022). Recently, two organizations in catering and fitness were included to provide a broad offer. Therefore, the community consists of the coalition between the organizations: BUUR (catering), Riverland Healthcentre (functional fitness), Pluryn, Sterker Sociaal Werk, and ZZG (healthcare). These organizations bundle their expertise to provide a community for the neighbourhood in Nijmegen-Oud-West, by offering long-term healthcare with an interest in elderly care. The community is located in an apartment complex, including an open meeting room for the neighbourhood. Among open registration, people with somatic care needs concerning physical disabilities live in this facility. By offering these facilities, Griffioen tries to take advantage of the given opportunities. However, Griffioen is not able to provide insight into the outcomes of their practices on, inter alia, social cohesion.

To provide viability, a community needs social cohesion (Putnam, 1995). However, it is not academically defined which steps a community should take to create or influence social cohesion. Therefore, this study will explore the possibilities to establish social cohesion in a community, which is explored within the community of Griffioen.

1.2 Research aim

This research aims to explore the different possibilities a community could take, to influence social cohesion. Therefore, different factors of social cohesion were taken into account to explore within the community, Griffioen. The following research question has been formulated:

“How can Griffioen influence social cohesion within their community?”

1.3 Research approach

This research was conducted by researching the social cohesion factors of Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017), to explore the different influences a community could have on social cohesion.

The data was collected within the organization of Griffioen, including interviews with representatives of the coalition organizations, employees, and volunteers. To provide an answer to the research question, qualitative, exploratory research was conducted, which allows a deep understanding of the interest of the research question. This research has an exploratory nature to study the influence of community on social cohesion (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Semi-structured interviews were conducted, by using operationalized concepts as dimensions and indicators (see Appendix A).

1.4 Relevance

The practical relevance of this study will be helpful to the organizations that could have equal characteristics as the organization Griffioen and face the same compliances in social cohesion. The advice could function as an example to implement within Griffioen or other organizations with similar characteristics.

This research will be conducted to provide insight into the activities a community takes to influence social cohesion. Therefore, the theory regarding social cohesion is used for exploratory research, which could provide an example for future research. Moreover, this research could create an example of new activities, compared to existing theory, to influence social cohesion in a community.

1.5 Outline

After the identification of the research problem, the theoretical background is discussed in Chapter 2, which discusses relevant literature on social cohesion and community. This chapter will be followed by the methodology of the research in Chapter 3. In this third chapter, an overview of the method that is used to provide an answer to the research question. In Chapter 4, a diagnosis of the current situation of Griffioen is conducted. In the fifth and sixth chapters, both the conclusion and discussion will be discussed, including implications. The limitations of this research and the recommendations for future research are also discussed in the last chapter.

Chapter 2. Theoretical background

The concepts ‘Community’ and ‘Social cohesion’ are complementary. One needs social cohesion to provide a successful community. The Council of Europe (2004) stated that “A cohesive society is a mutually supportive community of free individuals pursuing these common goals by democratic means”. While the Canadian Federal government defined social cohesion as “The ongoing process of developing a community of shared values, shared challenges and equal opportunity within Canada, based on a sense of trust, hope and reciprocity among all Canadians” (Jenson, 1998). These definitions entail that cohesiveness exists in communities, and communities develop with the assistance of cohesive aspects. One needs the other to act successfully.

This chapter provides the theoretical framework that will be used in this research. The concept of community will be discussed, followed by the concept of social cohesion and the theory to influence and improve social cohesion.

2.1 Community

One could argue that communities are a type of organization which is as old as the origin of humankind (Staal & Wagenaar, 2019). Since humans interact with one another and had a sense of belonging, mankind started to create small communities to survive. Therefore individuals converge because they depend on each other. However, not only individuals converge out of dependency, but also organizations converge regarding a common goal (Vermeulen & Liese-Happel, 2021). In order to create an exhaustive meaning of community, a broad definition was made by Marquis et al. (2011):

“Communities are collections of actors whose membership in the collective provides social and cultural resources that shape their action. Membership can result from a number of factors including propinquity, interest in a common goal, or common identity.” (Marquis, Lounsbury, & Greenwood, 2011)

This definition entails the importance of membership in a community. This membership relies on different social factors: (1) propinquity, which is referred to the state of being close to someone or something (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, 2023), (2) interest in a common goal, and (3) common identity. Membership could emerge when there is a certain dependency on the presence of other entities, resulting in community forming (Freeman & Audia, 2006).

Communities could be formed for two reasons: one shares a geographic territory (Marquis & Battilana, 2009, p. 286), or one shares a common interest or senses affiliation (Brint, 2001, p. 8). This could be characterized by two dimensions: functional interdependencies, or complementarity, and the degree of spatial differentiation (Freeman & Audia, 2006). In the situation where organizations address both dimensions, the community could be defined as a *residential community*. A residential community is defined as a geographically bounded social system, which refers to interactions between organizational populations and social units, sharing a geographical space. Therefore, the inter-organizational relation within the residential community is tied by functional interdependence.

In the context of this study, community is seen as a collectiveness of organizations and their employees, in order to collaborate towards a common goal, based on geographical similarities and functional interdependencies.

2.2 Social Cohesion

Social cohesion is a complex phenomenon that has a history of interest and attention within the academic world. Durkheim (1883) is seen as the founding father of modern sociology since he introduced the concept of social cohesion in his book 'The Division of Labor and Society' by describing it as "*mutual moral support, which instead of throwing the individual on his own resources, leads him to share in collective energy and support his own when exhausted*", in other words: the 'glue' of society holding individuals together. After this introduction to social cohesion by Durkheim, several authors continued studying this concept, providing different definitions and conceptions.

Based on previous studies, Chan et al. (2006) provided a review of the definition and conceptions of social cohesion. They argue that previous definitions were not satisfactory due to loose definitions or the lack of discrimination between the content and the conditions for social cohesion. After an evaluation of multiple definitions (Jenson, 1998; Beauvais and Jenson, 2002; Kearns and Forrest, 2000), Chan et al. (2006) defined social cohesion. This definition is based on multiple criteria: cohesiveness is viewed as "sticking together", if one can trust, help and cooperate, share a common identity or a sense of belonging to their society, and a subjective feeling is created towards the previous aspects in an objective behaviour. With these criteria in mind, a definition was formed:

“Social cohesion is a state of affairs concerning both the vertical and the horizontal interactions among members of society as characterized by a set of attitudes and norms that includes trust, a sense of belonging and the willingness to participate and help, as well as their behavioural manifestations” (Chan, To, & Chan, 2006).

The definition includes multiple aspects that are of interest to this study. The definition could be separated between “interactions among members of society” and the “set of attitudes and norms”. *Members of society* are not only individuals but also groups, organizations and institutions, which is referred to by “vertical and horizontal interactions”. This could include any group or community: cities, neighbourhoods, or religious groups.

It is argued that social cohesion is perceived within a group or community. However, social cohesion is not a bottom-up process (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). Therefore, social cohesion is assumed to be influential.

2.3 Theory Exploring Social Cohesion

After defining the concept of social cohesion, multiple researchers created frameworks to measure and define social cohesion in neighbourhoods, organizations or populations. Since this study is focused on community, the frameworks in the interest of macro-level measurement will not be included. Based on the *Essential Factors of Social Cohesion* of Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017), the main factors explaining social cohesion will be explained.

In the interest of the two-by-two framework of Chan et al. (2006), Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017) created a new review of the literature and only stressed the essential core factors of the concept of social cohesion. In their review, six core factors were identified: social relations, identification, orientation towards the common good, shared values, equality/inequality, and subjective/objective quality of life. Schiefer and Van der Noll argue that, in their search towards constitutive factors, the last three factors represent antecedents and consequences of social cohesion. Since this study aims to influence social cohesion in a community, the factors complementing the factors of community membership (propinquity, interest in a common goal, and common identity) are taken into account, which is described as the essential core factors of social cohesion:

Social relations. This factor refers to the interaction and relations that exist between groups and individuals, which makes the individual stay in the group or community (Friedkin, 2004). This factor consists of four components. The first component of social relations is *social networks*, which refers to the quality and quantity of social interactions within their community.

This bonding component should emphasize the group's attraction to its members in order to ensure an extended stay in the community. Another component of social relations is *trust*, which is one of the criteria of the definition of social cohesion. Trust is decreasing in the last decades (Hardin, 2006), while trust is seen as important to feel safe and comfortable. Trust is therefore related to the social network because a higher trust would result in a number of relations. This aspect should be present among people, but also towards institutions (Chan, To, & Chan, 2006). The third component on the base of cultural differences, is *mutual tolerance* between groups. Minority groups should be socially included, by bonding or bridging social networks across geographical borders. Since tolerance-related activities contribute to the implementation of cohesion goals, this component is sufficient for the study. The last component of social relations is *participation* in public life, which also reflects the sense of belonging, solidarity and readiness for cooperation in the pursuit of common goals (Chan et al, 2006; Jenson, 1998). These components create a certain attraction to the members of the community and the neighbourhood. In this study, solidarity and readiness for cooperation are seen as important aspects in order to define participation. Sense of belonging will be discussed as an aspect of identification to the community.

Identification. Concerning the component of participation, it becomes clear that there is an importance of 'feeling attached to or identify with the social entity for social cohesion' (Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). A reference is made to the definition of Chan et al. (2006) where 'sense of belonging' is listed together with social interactions, trust, and willingness to participate and help. Kearns and Forrest (2000) argued that the emotional attachment to a geographical entity, for instance, a neighbourhood, is an expression of shared values, lifestyles and socialization contexts. Jenson (1998) included the sense of belonging in the multidimensional approaches to social cohesion, where isolation is the opposite aspect of belonging. Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017) discussed that there is a conceptual overlap between identification and the dimension of social relations, but it differs in the quality of attachment to a group within social relations, and attachment to an abstract entity with a historical dimension. Considering these descriptions, 'sense of belonging' is viewed as an attachment to the social entity that is present in a shared environment.

Orientation towards the common good. In the previously explained frameworks, a shared view was included in the concept of social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; Chan et al., 2006). In the study of Schiefer and Van der Noll, this factor entails feelings of *responsibility*, the *acceptance of the social order*, and *compliance to social rules and norms*.

The first component could be described as the degree of commitment to the common good of the community and the willingness to participate and help, which is used in the definition of social cohesion in this research. This feeling of responsibility is closely related to solidarity; caring for the other, regardless of whether one knows the individual or not. The other two components refer to the institutions regulating and monitoring the social order to achieve a certain degree of legitimacy for the public (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Using social orders, a community could collectively reach a common good. Compliance to the social order is viewed as an aspect of social cohesion regarding crime statics (Green, Preston, & Janmaat, 2006), but could also be used to explore the tolerance of norm-violating behaviour (Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). However, this aspect is not without problems, assuming that social orders are necessary for social cohesion to overlook. Modern pluralistic societies see conflicting values, and question if social order is legitimate in public life (Kearns & Forrest, 2000), which should be carefully observed.

By considering the essential factors of social cohesion, presented in Table 1, a ‘slim’ and fitting approach was established. This resulted in an empirically meaningful understanding of the concept of ‘social cohesion’ by differentiating components, antecedents, and consequences (Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). These dimensions create the demarcation of the context, in order to focus this study on the essential factors to explore.

Table 1:

Overview Social Cohesion Factors

Factor	Description	Indicators
<i>Social Relations</i>	Emphasizes a group’s attraction to its members by social network, trust, mutual tolerance and participation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social network ● Trust ● Mutual Tolerance ● Participation
<i>Identification</i>	Feeling attached to or identify with the social entity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sense of Belonging
<i>Orientation towards a common good</i>	Feelings of responsibility for the common good an the compliance of social rules and order.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Responsibility ● Acceptance social order ● Compliance social rules

2.4 Community Influencing Social Cohesion

To provide an answer to the research question, this study seeks activities to influence social cohesion in a community organization. A community, present in a neighbourhood, could both perceive and create social cohesion. By creating social cohesion, one could increase the attachment, or identity, which results in an open environment where ideas are easily discussed (Kindermann, Schmidt, Bruger, & Flatten, 2022). Van den Berg et al. (2021) argue that social cohesion in a neighbourhood could be influenced and created by simply ‘get to know each other’. This could be defined as bridge-building activities (Harris & Young, 2009). By organizing formal meetings and informal activities, social cohesion should be stimulated. However, it is argued that individual characteristics and collective characteristics explain the perceptions of neighbourhood social cohesion, and should therefore show some similarities (Berg, van den, Wielen, van der, Maussen, & Arentze, 2021). So, the characteristics of an individual should meet the collective characteristics to create social cohesion. Therefore, one should act responsive to the perceptions and preferences of the community.

Since literature, in the knowledge of the author, focuses on the influence of social capital, not on social cohesion, this study will explore new possibilities to influence social cohesion regarding the factors of Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017). However, some of the social capital domains could be explored within the community, which could be linked to the essential factors of social cohesion (Forrest & Kearns, 2001):

1. By providing support to the community members, one could feel their contribution, or participation, and have a sense of empowerment. This could be achieved by first establishing activities to participate in, and secondly, giving residents a role in the policy processes. This could be linked with the factor of *social relation*, regarding the components participation and mutual tolerance. To influence trust, one could encourage trust by connecting conflicting groups or delivering policy promises.
2. To influence the *orientation towards the common good*, different policies could be considered, including bridge-building activities, developing an ethos of cooperation between individuals and organizations which develop ideas of community support, and developing an ethos that is recognized and accepted.
3. To create, develop or support a sense of belonging, and therefore *identification*, one could boost the identity of the community using visual expressions.

Chapter 3. Methodology

In the previous chapters, the problem was formulated and the theory fitting these problems was described. An overview is conducted on the methodology of this exploratory study, to map the current state of social cohesion and the activities to influence this. In this chapter, the research strategy for this study will be discussed, followed by the operationalization of the research design, the data collection, and its analysis. Finally, the research ethics and criteria are discussed.

3.1 Research design

To investigate a contemporary phenomenon in its context, an empirical enquiry, which is referred to as a case study (Yin, 2003), is included in this study. This study consists of a single case study of the influence on social cohesion within the community. This was conducted to produce an exemplar to explore the influence a community could have on social cohesion. This is seen as a qualitative and explorative research, using theory to focus the research on a complex reality (Reiter, 2017).

A qualitative and explorative research aims to explain parts of the reality, by offering causal orders, which could not explain the whole reality since this is framed by the chosen theory and the perception or position of the researcher. Explorative research is often seen as an inductive way of conducting research (Reiter, 2017). However, this study was conducted both inductively and deductively; by the use of deductive coding, but exploring to generate a general conclusion (Bleijenbergh, 2015). To provide a case study and generate a general conclusion, qualitative research was conducted.

Qualitative research establishes a collection of linguistic data, to provide statements including a social phenomenon (Bleijenbergh, 2015). This type of research allows a more in-depth and practical exploration to provide a better understanding of the situation that is being researched. It is assumed a justified method since this study is aimed to research a social phenomenon.

To explore the social phenomenon of the influence on social cohesion by a community, this research uses the context of Griffioen to create new insights into possible influences. Therefore, the theory was operationalized to create the framework that was used to establish the indicators and interview questions. It is argued that explorative research should begin with hypotheses, while this research will not include them, but includes a-prior theory to focus the scope of the study (Reiter, 2017). In this manner, the research explored the social phenomenon.

3.2 Operationalization

During this research, qualitative and explorative research on a social phenomenon is conducted. Since the community is seen as the context of the study, this was not included in the study as the object to observe. Social cohesion is explored according to the three essential factors of Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017), which include social relation, identification, and orientation towards a common goal. An overview is presented in Appendix A.

Social relation is divided into four indicators: social network, trust, mutual tolerance, and participation. Firstly, social networks could be explored by the quantity and quality of relationships of the interview participants. The quantity could be described according to the different connections one has with other organizational members, while the quality is questioned as an open question. Secondly, the trust was divided into the trust towards other members and the trust towards the institution; the coalition. Thirdly, mutual tolerance could be described by referring to the involvement of a person in inter-organizational activities. Fourth, participation is described as the active participation of a person in activities of the community.

Identification could be described by the sense of belonging, referring to the attachment and identity a person feels towards the community.

The *orientation towards a common good* is referred to the degree of legitimacy of the public (Jenson, 1998) to measure the social order within the community. Firstly, the responsibility or solidarity of a member is described by the commitment towards the common goal, which should be clear to every member. In order to find consistency in the formulation of the goal, this was included in this study. Residents and volunteers are excluded from the responsibility since they could be seen as the receivers of the institutional rules. Secondly, the acceptance of the social order in terms of hierarchy is described. Lastly, although excluded from responsibility, the residents and volunteers are the main focus when exploring compliance with social rules and norms.

3.3 Data collection

The data concerning the case study of Griffioen and its social cohesion were collected through thirteen semi-structured interviews, operationalized according to the frameworks of Chapter 2 (see Appendix A). The interview participants were selected by the coordinators of Griffioen and based on their participation within Griffioen. The representatives of the coalition organizations, which includes BUUR, Riverland Healthcentre, Sterker Sociaal Werk, and ZZG, were questioned about the current state of the community and its social cohesion from their perspective, in order to explore what the current influence activities are on social cohesion and

its result. Besides the current state, the desired state of social cohesion was questioned, to explore new possibilities of influencing social cohesion, or if the current situation is desired. The representative of Pluryn informed the researcher that his connection with Griffioen was too short of time to explain the social cohesion of the community. Additionally, eight members of the community were questioned about their perspectives on social cohesion.

These interviews were semi-structured, to provide a guideline during the interview. However, some freedom is appropriate to leave room for extra questions to understand the perspective of the interviewee in more depth (Bleijenbergh, 2015).

3.4 Data analysis

After the collection of the data, a transcription of the interviews was made using the online platform Transkriptor. And to couple codes on certain quotes addressing the different factors of social cohesion, using Atlas.ti. These codes are based on the theoretical framework, as discussed in the operationalization, where the essential factors are characterized as dimensions, and the different components per factor are characterized as indicators. Because this study includes a single case study, no comparisons were made. The results of the data were compared to the theory, as described in Chapter 2, in order to find new possibilities for influencing social cohesion.

3.5 Research Ethics

To provide ethically correct research, several considerations were taken into account during this study. Firstly, since this is qualitative research, participants were involved in this study. These participants were informed, according to the informed consent rules (Smith, 2003). The individuals, who voluntarily participated in this study, were informed about the research subject and had the ability to withdraw from the study at any moment. To achieve this consideration, an informed consent form (Appendix D) was established to be signed by the participant and informed prior to their contribution about the study and the method used. Since this study is conducted in the Netherlands, the General Data Protection regulation (AVG) was taken into account (Rijksoverheid, 2023). As suggested by Smith (2003), during the research, one should respect the confidentiality and privacy of the participants when it is preferred. This was questioned in the informed consent form, if the participant's name and details of their contribution may be shared in this study. In order to achieve privacy, the participants were coded without including their occupations.

3.6 Research Criteria

This qualitative study was conducted to explore a social phenomenon. To provide a study with high quality, this study should comply with certain criteria. A distinction could be made between quantitative and qualitative research criteria (Golafshani, 2003). While reliability and validity are common terms used for quantitative research, other terms are used for qualitative research. Symon and Cassell (2012) proposed these terms to assess the quality of qualitative research. They follow Lincoln and Guba (1985), who established four criteria for qualitative research which could be linked with quantitative research criteria: credibility, confirmability, dependability, and transferability.

Credibility refers to the fit of the interpretation and the reality of the context, which could be linked with the internal validity of quantitative criteria (Symon & Cassell, 2012). In this study, credibility could be

When achieving *confirmability*, which could also be described as objectivity (Symon & Cassell, 2012), the data, interpretations and outcomes are not a description of the imagination of the researcher, but are collected in the context and from persons other than the researcher. In order to achieve confirmability, one reports the steps that were conducted extensively.

Dependability is referred to the explanation of the methodological choices in a way that when a separate researcher would do the same research, using the same methodology and research design, the outcome should be the same. This is also referred to as reliability (Symon & Cassell, 2012). To be reliable, this study should be conducted in a “transparent, honest, and self-reflexive way” (Reiter, 2017).

Lastly, in quantitative research, one seeks to generalize the results and outcome of the study. In qualitative research, this is referred to as *Transferability*. To generalize to other contexts, details should be provided about the single case study, so the reader can judge whether it could be generalized (Symon & Cassell, 2012).

Chapter 4. Results

This chapter includes the results of the exploratory study, containing the current situation of social cohesion within the community of Griffioen, followed by an overview of the current activities Griffioen established, to influence social cohesion.

Three levels of participation will be discussed, where the macro level is represented by the coalition and their representatives, which expresses the current situation and influence activities per aspect of social cohesion. The meso level is represented by the employees of the different organizations, which established an overview of the current situation and their experiences. Lastly, the volunteers, residents, and guests of Griffioen are viewed as the micro level.

The results are based on thirteen interviews that were conducted among the employees and representatives of the coalition organizations, and one volunteer. Appendix B contains the quotes per indicator, in Dutch. To provide anonymity, the participants are coded, where P1 to P8 are volunteers and employees of Griffioen, and P9 to P13 are the representatives of the coalition organizations. In Appendix B, an overview of quotes per indicator is presented as expressed in this chapter.

4.1 Social Relations

The relationship between groups and individuals is seen as a prominent aspect of social cohesion. It is argued that this aspect explains the group's attraction to its members, which makes people stay. Multiple components are linked to this aspect and are included in this study: social network, trust, mutual tolerance, and participation.

4.1.1 Social Network

The first indicator of social relations is social network, regarding the quality and quantity of social interactions with other members of the community. In this study, the focus was laid on the relationship between and among the different levels, within Griffioen.

Five organisations are included in the coalition: ZZG, Sociaal Sterker, BUUR, Riverland, and Pluryn. The latter has no physical presence within Griffioen, which was confirmed by multiple participants. The parties that are present seem to collaborate and are trying to bond the community (see 4.1.3 Mutual Tolerance). Some participants expressed a close bond between the employees of the organizations (Appendix B); between the different coordinators, employees and the different groups. Despite the differences in the organizations, they view each other as one group of colleagues. But when discussing the trust (see 4.1.2),

multiple participants expressed some abrasion between the different organizations and their members, regarding the flexibility of the employees, due to the multiple changes within the organization of Griffioen. These changes also affected the residents of Griffioen, which will be explained in the following sub-paragraph. The residents of Griffioen are commonly familiar with each other, due to the connection they have regarding the spatial similarities. Both the residents and the employees are known with the neighbourhood, which enables fast bonding.

Table 2:

Overview of interview quotes referring to 'Social Network'

Level	Quote
Coalition	<p><i>"I noticed that parties and people who are there a lot regularly, that it is very easy to build a good relationship with them. And then I do see a good relationship, I really feel commitment to the concept. And it is also felt and expressed. That someone or a party also feels: "Hey. We own this, we want to be here. We want to be here. We are also willing to put hours / euros into this, we see the great greater good, so to speak, very much in front of us." And the parties and the people who are less able to be that, or want to be less, or whatever reason. With those, it is more complicated to build the relationship. So physical presence, appearing at meetings, that kind of tomfoolery, makes a lot of difference" (P9.)</i></p> <p><i>"I experience it as a nice relationship, but also that it is very much a search for everyone, because of course it is something new that you are doing and everyone has different interests, so it can be difficult. And that changes a lot, so it's difficult and at the same time it's also very joyful what we're doing. I think we have a very nice club of people at the table with whom there can also be a nice and relaxed atmosphere, right? So, there could be abrasion for a while, but then afterwards it can also be fun again and we can move on." (P13.)</i></p>

Employees	<p><i>“They feel like my colleagues, but from other teams. And of course, there are times when I do feel that they are working from their own organisation and they have different collective agreements, or different rules, or different working hours, paid breaks or no breaks. But yes, when I think about social relationship, they just actually all feel like my colleagues.” (P11.)</i></p> <p><i>“It’s like you just end up a very big family here. Also with staff from the ZZG. It’s all. How to put it? They’re basically all there for you. If something doesn’t work out, or whatever. It’s not like, “Oh yeah, you guys are BUUR, we are ZZG. Figure it out.”” (P6.)</i></p>
Residents and volunteers	<p><i>“Waterkwartier is really an old working-class neighbourhood and the old people who are here [...] are real Nijmegen people. Grew up here, so they also know lines of each other and families. Yes, it is a culture of directness and heart on the sleeve. That is really fun, but sometimes also quite blunt.” (P7.)</i></p> <p><i>“What I always do, when there is something to do. I put everything on my Facebook page, because I have a lot of people from the neighbourhood” (P6.)</i></p>

4.1.2 Trust

Without a degree of trust, one could not achieve social cohesion within their group. Trust could both exist between individuals and towards institutions. Therefore, the interviewees were asked about their trust towards the participants of Griffioen, their colleagues, and the coalition. Between the organization and their representatives, the term ‘transparency’ was often used, referring to open communication about their mutual goals and how both parties could participate to achieve this goal. Also, there is trust in the autonomy of the employees, where they are allowed to bring in their thoughts and act if they feel the need to act. However, not all members are aware of this trust and seem to be afraid of making decisions. It is argued that they need guidance in their decisions, while the representatives expressed their trust in self-sufficiency. The employees of Griffioen express their trust towards their colleagues and participants of Griffioen. However, there is a low degree of trust towards the coalition organizations. This is due to the frequent changes of policy within the organization, which also impacts the residents and volunteers. This was not known to the representative who expressed

the benefits of quickly taking action of the coalition. Between the participants from the neighbourhood, the interviewees stress the general mistrust that is common in Het Waterkwartier. To prevent this mistrust, Griffioen attempted to involve the neighbourhood in their decision- and policy-making. Therefore, more participant involvement is needed to achieve this goal. Also, this mistrust seems to influence the confidence of other residents and volunteers, since the way of communicating by the residents, referred to as ‘speaking up’, could harm the confidence of another person. The coalition attempts to take its role in addressing and guiding this inconvenience on this level.

On all levels, trust towards each other within their group seems present. The trust towards the institution, the coalition behind Griffioen, could be described as low. This is based on the frequent changes in the organization and the old cultural habit of the neighbourhood.

Table 3:

Overview of interview quotes referring to 'Trust'

Level	Quote
Coalition	<p><i>"So based on that, I do see, we see that the, that, that works better instead of just saying "We're going to do this and we're going to do it in 8 weeks. We're going to do it in 3 months" and that People are thinking "yeah, when will, when will, when will she pass that much time again?" And that hasn't happened, so that they. They see what is happening, so that is. Yes that action, action is taken immediately. That does make for better confidence and also less resistance I think."(P9.)</i></p> <p><i>"Desirably, I would say that confidence does score a 7 or an 8. And I mean particularly in the sense of, dare to do it. Therefore, I would like the confidence is felt so high, that people themselves think: "Hey, I think this is fun or necessary to do and I'm just going to do it. And I feel backing from my mother organisation, or from the coordinators, or the directors here, to just enjoy pioneering. And then I bump my nose once, but I'm still supported and..." So that, trust-wise, I would really like that even more, wouldn't I?" (P11.)</i></p>

Employees	<p><i>“You notice that they have no trust, or less trust, I should say, because it's not always no trust, but you notice, for example, that they, that my team members - I'll call it that for a moment - don't dare hand over certain things to these other staff members. Because they think, well, then it [the task] won't go well. And that has to do with trust, of course. And we are working on that, so it is growing. And they do support the vision. But of course, they also think very practically from the work floor, and you do notice that they have a lot of questions about what is being asked here: "Is it really possible? Can we really live up to all these demands?" (P13.)</i></p> <p><i>“The trust between me and my colleagues is there, but due to all constant changes... So in the past 4 years, there really has been so much shifting every time, and the plans still change, in my experience, monthly, weekly, daily. That does put pressure on that trust... So, that constant switching, takes a bit of confidence as well.” (P7.)</i></p>
Residents and volunteers	<p><i>“Because also in this neighbourhood, but I think it is in several places, you see that people are very suspicious of everything that is set up in the neighbourhood or in the area. And that I hope there we do have some more residents at the table who think along instead of just criticising and just telling people what hasn't gone right all these years.” (P9.)</i></p> <p><i>“You have people who live in Griffioen, you have people from the neighbourhood who walks in, people who have lived in Het Waterkwartier for years, who really speak up. And if you are incipiently demented, and you enter Griffioen, I can tell you that your confidence[or trust] is gone the moment someone addresses you in a certain way on his 'Waterkwartiers'. Look, and then we can all think together: "Yes, that lady has lived here all her life, and this is just her veritable way of doing things". But that all hooks into trust and tolerating each other. And I think all of us then have a role in facilitating that and guiding as best as we can. But I think you have less influence on that than on the other layers”</i></p>

4.1.3 Mutual Tolerance

Related to trust and relations between individuals, is the mutual tolerance between groups within a society. Inclusion of the minority within a group, by bonding the social network and putting effort into bridging the social networks across the group boundaries. Griffioen actively tries to bridge across the communities' boundaries. A community liaison officer was hired to connect with the neighbourhood. Fifty new participants or visitors, from the neighbourhood, came to Griffioen in the time that the community liaison officer was active. This resulted in a larger social network, which should bond to the community to achieve repeated participation.

The 'bonding' inclusion of all members could be achieved by involving members in the community. The representatives of the organizations explained that they involve the employees in decision-making by inviting and including them in meetings. However, one interview participant argued that this was not always the case. The participant argued that the employees of the Healthcare department are involved in a late stadium of the process of decision-making. The participant implicated that the lack of early involvement results in the lack of ambassadorship within this department. Since other employee interview participants expressed their feeling of involvement, it is difficult to argue the lack of involvement. This could refer to the different layers of involvement, for instance, involvement in the daily tasks, or involvement in decision-making are involvement on different levels. While it is discussed that the employees' involvement in decision-making could be done earlier in the process, involvement in daily practice is common.

The coalition implemented two moments a day for employees to express their feelings. One at the beginning of the day, where the participation is discussed, and one at the end of the day, to share their emotions and experiences of that day. During this last evaluation meeting, every employee has a chance to share their obstruction of that day and discuss certain solutions. Multiple participants feel the need for these meetings, to share their feelings and reflect on the day to improve the process. Although there is a moment to reflect and provide feedback to each other, there is still abrasion among the members of the community.

The representatives and employees of Griffioen are going through a phase referred to as 'storming'. This is expressed in the frustration in the absence of one coalition party and employees leaving the organization. The cause of these frustrations, according to the interview participants, are unclear task descriptions, and different cultures and sizes of organizations. Some organizations are more flexible and self-managing than others, due to the size of the parent company and their culture, for instance, more entrepreneurial. It could be argued that this is a result of contrasting cultures in one community, which is not the same as the

neighbourhood culture. As previously explained, the neighbourhood culture is characterised as suspicious. This could explain the mutual tolerance towards each other, which could be described as low.

Currently, the mutual tolerance could be described as low. The participants of this research are recognizing each other as colleagues, working together towards a common goal. However, the employees act in their roles and function within the organization. Due to the outflow of employees, a lot of tasks lie on fewer employees. Therefore, the focus lies on their function within the community. It is expressed that the frequent changes in the organization provided a certain mistrust (see 4.1.2 Trust), and some participants stated that tolerance is not yet achieved.

Table 4:

Overview of interview quotes referring to 'Mutual Tolerance'

Level	Quote
Coalition	<p><i>“And they said. You just have to, go the do... If I just work with you now not fine, say, gee is not that fine. But giving that feedback right away? Oh dear, that's really exciting. So they don't do that, they don't do that, so then things go up. So that's why at the end of the day, just to say to each other, okay, let's put the irritations on the table, that they have to. Yes, that really is still necessary, so indeed you want them to gradually give this feedback on the working floor, but that is still quite exciting, yes.” (P10.)</i></p> <p><i>“And then it turned out that, in that year that Linde [community liaison officer] has been there, 50 people from the neighbourhood have come in anyway... But you did get those people in.” (P4.)</i></p> <p><i>“... I do feel that the [department] Healthcare, so the people, my colleagues. The IG's [Individual Healthcare] who walk around here, who walk the routes, who provide care here. Are the least involved [party] in the plans.” (P5.)</i></p>

Employees	<p><i>“And you can see the abrasion on the floor with the teams too, can't you? 'Where do I belong? Where do you belong? Shouldn't you be doing this? You're behind the laptop and I'm active, why?' Yes, and that's very healthy.” (P10.)</i></p> <p><i>“There was a period when I felt that I sat or could sit at all consultations and from that very fact we also said as the team: "That's not doable, That's just not doable", because then you are constantly in consultations wearing all kinds of different hats.” (P7.)</i></p>
Residents and volunteers	<p><i>“...With the residents, that they can't always come to us, but they just also start asking each other of "Can you walk my dog? Can you look after my plants when I'm away in the summer?" And also teaching people to ask for things. I don't do it easily myself and most people don't do it easily but yes. Why not? Because people also really enjoy offering help.” (P3.)</i></p>

4.1.4 Participation

In this study, participation represents the readiness for cooperation in the pursuit of common goals. The interview participants were questioned about their participation within the community, to draw an organization outline. The representatives and coordinators provide policy, vision and coordination to the organization. Some of the representatives directly participate among the employees. The absence of Pluryn is recognizable within their lack of participation in meetings. It was explained that at first, one person from Pluryn actively participated in forming Griffioen, but withdraw from the project since this person switched jobs. Since this person withdrew from the project, Pluryn does not actively participate in decision and policy-making.

For the employees, an overview of different activities per parent company is presented.

Table 5:

Overview of employee activities per company

Company	Activities
BUUR	Hospitality, catering, and room management
Pluryn	Nursery special treatments, for instance TBI (Traumatic Brain Injury)
Riverland	Exercise lessons
Sociaal Sterker	Day-care
ZZG	Nursery, Living assistance and bridging social network

The residents and volunteers of Griffioen are expected to ‘look after each other’. However, the participants of this interview stressed that this does not comply. Some volunteers are serving drinks, walk together, gardening, and other activities. Volunteering seems at a low level among the residents of Griffioen and the neighbourhood ‘Het Waterkwartier’. The current members of Griffioen are employees of the coalition organizations. However, higher participation on all levels is desired, which is one of the components of the organizational goal.

Table 6:

Overview of interview quotes referring to 'Participation'

Level	Quote
Residents and volunteers	<p><i>“For example, if they say ‘It is not like it used to be. Those activities are gone.’ And I say ‘Yes, but you can do something yourself, for instance organise an activity yourself. Rr what would you want yourself to do?’ Then, they argue ‘ Well, I don't know. I don't do that.’ So, there's abrasion in there. They complain, but do not take the other side [in organising an activity].” (P7.)</i></p> <p><i>“I think some people who live here quite a long time and they are somewhat hospitalised, I think. When you take into account that they actually live independently, [but they] expect us to come exactly at that time. That is what they desire.” (P3.)</i></p>

4.2 Identification

In relation to participation in the community, one should feel attached to or identify with the community. These aspects are captivated by the sense of belonging, which was questioned to the interviewees, in order to prove their identification with Griffioen.

4.2.1 Sense of Belonging

The sense of belonging is seen as the attachment to a social entity in a mutual environment. To map this sense of belonging within Griffioen, the participants were asked if they feel attached to and identify with the community.

Overall, the interviewees express their sense of belonging to the community. They are attracted to the concept of Griffioen, regarding self-sufficiency. Unfortunately, this commitment takes its toll on some of the employees. As mentioned in 4.1.3 Mutual Tolerance,

P4 and P7 explained that, in their time within Griffioen, they feel to slow down and show less commitment than before, in order to strengthen their mental health. They argue that this is due to the many changes that have occurred within the organization. Employees that did not experience these changes and have a short commitment to the community, show a less sense of belonging to the community. Two short-involved employees explained that they could identify with the concept, but do not feel a necessary attachment to the community. As discussed in 4.1.3 Mutual Tolerance, this could be linked to the culture and participation nature of the parent company.

While short-involved employees lack a sense of belonging, coalition representatives expressed their frustration of their lack of active time to contribute in community activities. They argue that they feel a commitment to the concept of Griffioen. However, some parent companies provide a given time amount per week that could be invested in Griffioen. Some frustration was sensed because the lack of time relates to having a say in decision-making. Besides the lack of time, and therefore involvement that is wanted, some parent companies could act bureaucratically by expressing their feeling, while the collective feeling is desired. In Table 7, a quote stresses the importance of the 'We' feeling.

For the residents of Griffioen, it is argued that there is a sense of belonging, only not to Griffioen. While asking about their sense of belonging, they refer to the neighbourhood as 'West' or 'Het Waterkwartier'. While this should be more focussed on Griffioen, it was not expressed what the activities are to influence this aspect. In other answers, one said that there are multiple informal meetings to stress the vision of the community

Table 7:

Overview of interview quotes referring to 'Sense of Belonging'

Level	Quote
Coalition	<p><i>"Inge has for instance, who is self-employed, actually running the project from the <u>Nonna</u> network [Network of elderly care in Nijmegen]. She also has more hours for that and that's really her core business, which she does all week. For me, for example, it's something I do on top of that and that's something that can really get in the way, because I understand Inge. She has, she wants to continue. Which I want too, but I also have to deal with the fact that I only have an x number of hours per week for Griffin, so those are things that can be difficult to do and that are of course also searching for the other partners. Of course, it also depends on how many hours you have to be present and involved, so that is looking for a solution." (P13.)</i></p> <p><i>"So there I did discuss it all, but then I really have to do this (slams fist on table) "No, we are not going to do this. I don't accept that you are responsible for that, because we are 'We' here." And yes, then I have to get over it. And finally get it, totally fine is. It is neatly watered everywhere now, but then, then you think you have the expectation sharp, don't you? Of "Yes, in this concept do 'We', and you come.... Nobody comes here for their own parish. Nobody has their own room, nobody has their own piece, we try as much as possible, like that." And then you think you've been very clear... And then still... Yes... So it's a continuous repeating also and checking, of "Have we understood each other correctly? Is that still your expectation, my expectation? Are you still doing what we agreed?" Yes, there, there is continuous reiteration needed. Yes." (P10.)</i></p>

Employees	<p><i>"I feel that the Griffioen team, so the daytime team/hospitality team, that those relationships are also very good. And also that they really feel part of Griffioen. Maybe even more than of BUUR. Well, I think much more than of BUUR. While the new team, which is the evening team, I sense it differently. I feel that they really feel "I work for BUUR" and not "I work for Griffioen". "</i></p> <p><i>(P11.)</i></p> <p><i>"Yes, for example, we have a 'neighbourhood day' in September, I get included. They will include me for the whole neighbourhood, but also for Griffioen residents. I will definitely be included there. But I also think it's for activities like cycling, so that kind of thing, that. That is, well... I don't have to be there, so to speak. Because, for example, this is kind of a side project, so to speak, of what we do at Riverland. So I could do it. Only that takes quite a lot of time, secretly." (P1.)</i></p>
Residents and volunteers	<p><i>"I'm in West, I feel. Yes, it's all so accessible. You got involved in the neighbourhood... They are having sales day from the garden now. I think, the neighbourhood is also accessible. I do feel a bit involved." (P8.)</i></p>

4.3 Orientation Towards the Common Good

The third essential factor of social cohesion is the orientation towards the common good. Working towards a common goal provides certain motivation and a feeling of responsibility. To achieve this goal, institutions provide regulations and social order, which should be accepted and followed by the members of the institution. These aspects, linked to the goal of Griffioen, were questioned.

4.3.1 Responsibility

The feeling of responsibility for the common good is expressed by the degree of commitment and the willingness to act in the interest of the community's needs. These aspects are closely related to the term 'solidarity'. Firstly, the interviewees were asked if they could explain what the goal of Griffioen is. Appendix C includes the 'Praat Plaat' of Griffioen, which contains some key elements of the goal and is therefore taken as the original goal. In Table 3, an overview is presented of the elements of the 'Praat Plaat', and the frequency per element as responses during the interviews.

Table 8:

Frequency of the use of key elements Griffioen in interviews (N=13)

Element	Frequency
Eye for each other	6
Living, welfare & care	8
Working together	5
Approachable	2
Meeting or connecting	11
Straightforward	0
Broad and vibrant offer	5

From the thirteen interviews, the element of meeting or connecting was mentioned frequently. Although no interview participant mentioned ‘Straightforward’ as an element of the goals, it is mentioned as an element of the culture of Het Waterkwartier. A phrase that was commonly used was ‘Hart op de tong’ (Heart on the sleeves), which means that a person expresses his or her feelings, instead of hiding these (Cambridge University Press, 2023). An element that is not included in the ‘Praat Plaat’, is self-sufficiency. It is generally included in the goals that are expressed by the participants as ‘Extended stay at home’. This was also included in the goal that was explained by the project manager of Griffioen, see Table 9. Since it does overlap, one could argue that the goal of Griffioen is somewhat clear, but there is a lack of unambiguousness.

To achieve the formulated goal, one should show commitment towards this common good. The representatives of the coalition explain that they feel commitment, but desire a higher commitment from the parent companies and residents. This could be expressed in the time a representative is given to invest in Griffioen and the lack of presence of Pluryn.

In the current situation, it is stressed that each organization is responsible for its part in the whole community, as addressed in Table 5. However, it is desired to feel more responsibility for Griffioen as a whole organization. It is suggested by one participant to divide portfolios of activities within Griffioen, for example, the responsibility of space allocation.

Table 9:

Overview of interview quotes referring to 'Responsibility'

Level	Quote
Coalition	<p><i>"With collaborating parties to build a network. And also with citizens from the neighbourhood to build network, that we do in and around Griffioen what is necessary to engage people, less loneliness, longer stay at home. Well, and real doing what the neighbourhood needs for a need. Especially for, well, not just for the elderly, but elderly in the primacy has been and we're now shifting to basically everybody. So young people as well. So the ambition is, yes. We are actually a gathering building to do what is needed to serve neighbourhood." (P10.)</i></p> <p><i>"Because actually, I want to move to portfolio sharing then, among the organisations. Now everyone is responsible for his own team. Responsible for his own bringing to get piece what is agreed. And responsible to put a piece in collectively. Not so much financially, but mainly in working hours. That's how it is now." (P10.)</i></p>
Employees	<p><i>"My responsibility? At least I do my job well, so that's then in care as a nurse. So with the care demand that the clients have that I can meet that together with my colleagues. I still feel responsible for that. But also that connection indeed, so of with Wellbeing and with Stronger that, that it is also clear to me. And then can engage people." (P3.)</i></p> <p><i>"You know, the shift from, from the day job as I started to the bigger picture, so, so. Yeah, that's also a different interpretation of the job than when I had it. And there are definitely nice and positive things in it, but also there is also loss in it you understand, so they are also things that I thought, "oh, I really liked that". And "so how do I get that now In the new concept? What's possible then?" So no, that one doesn't lapse, but is, is a, is a somewhat different one. See, otherwise it was really focused on a group of 10 people coming there. And now I divide my attention between here and there and there, right? And, I do very much like giving someone real attention, focus, attention and that's harder. Because then I'm everywhere" (P7.)</i></p>

4.3.2 Acceptation of Social Order

Social order is necessary in the pursuit towards the common good, but must be legit following the theory of community, and accepted by the members of the community. The research participants stated that the organization feels like a flat organization without status, which initiates that the roles should be even. However, the organization is built in multiple layers (see 4.1.4 participation). Nevertheless, the employees accept the social order that is needed in the pursuit of the common goal. As stated before, only one complained could be found about the coalition, regarding the scope and frequency of the organizational changes.

Although the different roles are accepted, the participants express that these roles are acceptable for the beginning of this community. Both the representatives and the employees desire a situation where these roles are less needed. Therefore, the leading person stepped back out of the role, in order to create less hierarchy.

4.3.3 Compliance Social Rules and Norms

Related to the acceptance of social order, compliance of social rules and norms could describe the communities ratio towards standards. Common standards and norms within Griffioen is equality or inclusivity, expressed in approachable participation, transparent communication, and showing respect to each other. This was discussed with the interview participants, and they recognise them as the social rules. Between the organizations, one could argue that there is a certain degree of equality. In decision-making, all organizations are involved and committed, if present. Although the organizations differ in size, finance, and culture, all representatives sense equality between each other. This is also sensed among the employees, who expressed open communication and involvement between their colleagues and the organizations.

Since equality is a common norm of the organization, and therefore the community, it is desired to convey equality towards the residents and members of Griffioen. However, there is a certain misfit. The interview participants provided examples of situations where the exclusion of the community was sensed. Without the surveillance of the employees, inclusion is not guaranteed among the residents and members of Griffioen. One participant stated that this was caused by the many changes in the organization, which resulted in insecurity. Another participant expressed concern about the residents that do not participate in the activities and desired more 'eye for each other'. Thus currently, surveillance is needed to achieve equality, while self-sufficiency is desired.

Table 10:

Overview of interview quotes referring to 'Compliance social rules and norms'

Level	Quote
Coalition	<i>"That's just the regular group that benefits from that [activities]. I would, and then I say this with all my care-heart, the 'grey mice' that are upstairs, I would pay attention to that." (P5.)</i>
Employees	<i>"'If I arrive and I want you to sit with me.' Then, I am going to say to someone who comes 'No, you can't sit here, because someone else sits here'... I think, people are afraid of not being seen enough or no longer being seen enough or losing their place because of the change" (P4.)</i>
Residents and volunteers	<i>"There are some nasty comments here too.... There is a resident of colour, and then someone said, 'Are we in the jungle?' Yeah, you know? You can't do that anymore... So we have to be really tight on that as well. 'We don't want to hear this here. There is the door.'"</i> (P10.)

4.4 Overview Activities of Influence

In addition to providing an answer to the research question, an overview is presented of which different activities of influence on social cohesion are established by the community.

Table 11:

Overview of influence activities in Griffioen

Factor	Activity of influence
<i>Social Relations</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Involvement of every member in decision making. However, it is argued that this is not always the case since the community is expanding, it takes its toll in the amount of consultations, and it is argued that the residents have a low participation in the community. 2. Bridging social networks through a community liaison officer. 3. Two meetings a day to discuss the daily activities and evaluation of the day to express the feelings and find solutions to do better.
<i>Identification</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creating a sense of belonging by addressing this to new partnerships, in the sense of talking about 'We'. 2. Informal meetings to share the vision and create a sense of belonging. Examples: Barbeque, get together with drinks.
<i>Orientation towards common good</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interact when social rules or norms are not complied. In case of exclusion, the employees react referring to own norms. 2. Social order is accepted, but is now being phased out by creating less layers. 3. Open communication towards each other to express the goal of the separate organizations and the common good. 4. Informal meetings to share the vision and create a sense of belonging. Examples: Barbeque, get together with drinks.

Chapter 5. Conclusion and Discussion

In this chapter, the results of this study will be discussed concerning the theory. Furthermore, both the theoretical and practical implications, the limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research will be discussed.

5.1 Conclusion

The aim of this study is the exploration of a community influencing social cohesion. This was based on the literature in Chapter 2, which included the essential factors of social cohesion as dimensions; social relations, identification, and orientation towards a common good (Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). The factors of equality, quality of life and shared values were excluded from this study since these are characterized as consequences. These dimensions exist as indicators that were questioned among thirteen members of the community.

To actively influence the aspects of social relations, Griffioen tries to bridge social networks in order to expand their network. To include new organizations sharing the same vision, one coalition representative tries to bridge and seeks new organizations, while a community liaison officer was hired to bridge the social network with the neighbourhood to include more members, which is currently successful. Furthermore, Griffioen involves every member of the community in their practices and decision-making, although this differs per layer of the organization. This is in line with the suggestion of empowerment by Forrest and Kearns (2001). Still, some members feel excluded or are involved in a late stadium of the decision-making process. The coalition organizations and employees are included through formal meetings. However, there is a certain desire to increase the empowerment of the residents and volunteers of Griffioen. Although the meetings are seen as activities to ensure empowerment, it is expressed that these meetings are too frequently planned, which caused the absence of members to focus on the daily practices.

Voluntary participation is described as low existed. While Griffioen offers multiple tasks or activities to participate in or is open to new inspiration, the members of the community lack voluntary participation. This could be related to the cultural mistrust in the neighbourhood and the frequent organizational changes. When considering the influence activities of Forrest and Kearns (2001), Griffioen could encourage trust by delivering on policy promises or connecting the conflicting groups.

The identification to the community is influenced by constantly addressing the feeling of 'we'. Moreover, to create a sense of belonging in terms of attachment, Griffioen organizes different informal activities to 'get to know each other', as suggested by Van den Berg et al. (2021). Although these activities are organized by Griffioen, one could argue that belonging in terms of identification is not sensed by every member. Short-involved employees expressed their identification with the common good, but not the community. One resident only expressed a sense of belonging to the neighbourhood. It could be argued that this needs more time, but it is suggested to boost the identity of the place through visual expressions (Forrest & Kearns, 2001), although this is established in moral expressions of 'We'.

To create a mutual orientation towards the common good, Griffioen tries to inform the different layers of the community by organizing formal and informal activities, where the vision is discussed, which could be described as developing collective norms and values (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). Although it was argued that everyone was involved in creating the vision, the goal of Griffioen is still not clear to all members of the community. While the common goal is not clear, the separate goals of the different organisations are discussed among each other to assist. One of the common good/norms is equality, which is currently difficult to achieve. Between the different organizations and their employees, equality is achieved by open communication and a low hierarchy in layers. The social order is accepted, although it is being flattened in order to create a non-hierarchical community. However, surveillance is needed to create equality between the residents of Griffioen. The feeling exists that if there is no surveillance, the exclusion will occur.

5.2 Theoretical Implications

This study was conducted to explore the social cohesion of the community of Griffioen and the activities to influence social cohesion. To provide an addition to the academic knowledge, some theoretical implications could be discussed. This study provides an example of the activities that could influence social cohesion in a community. Although it is an exploratory research in a single case study, this study is arguably transferable. The results, as presented in the conclusion, could be generalized and could therefore add value to the academic world. This study explored the outcomes of the different influential activities, which could be compared to the suggested activities by Forrest and Kearns (2001) For example, a community liaison officer provided an example of bridging social networks activity to create more mutual tolerance in a neighbourhood following the theory of Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017). Also, this study used

the theory of Schiefer and Van der Noll as a framework to explore social cohesion within a community. This study could therefore provide an example of the use of this framework in future research.

Secondly, three factors of the original six factors of Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017) were excluded since these are viewed as consequences of social cohesion; shared values, equality/inequality, and subjective/objective quality of life. However, equality was defined as one of the social rules/norms, which gives rise to the question if it should have been included in this study. It could be argued that all factors described by Schiefer and Van der Noll should have been taken into account to explore properly. However, due the limitation of time, this was not feasible.

5.3 Practical Implications

The findings of this study suggest a need for activities to influence social cohesion within the community of Griffioen. In the exploration of social cohesion, this study emphasizes the state of the different factors within the community. Some implications could be made about the participation of the members, trust towards the institution, the common goal, and identification of the members with the community.

Firstly, the community could provide a clear common goal that is expressed in a way that every member is aware of what the common goal is. This study stressed the inconsistency of expressing the common goal among the interview participants. Considering the inconsistency, one could conduct research in providing an exhaustive goal, which should be adopted easily.

Secondly, the community struggles with the trust among the members towards the organizations, also viewed as the institution. It is argued that trust could be strengthened by connecting conflicting groups or delivering policy promises. In this case, the missing policy promises could be linked to frequent organizational changes.

Third, the results implicate a misfit of the identification to the community. Although the suggested influence activities are present within Griffioen, the employees and residents identify themselves with the neighbourhood or only the goal of the concept. Further research should establish a new theory of influencing the sense of belonging.

5.4 Limitations

The first limitation could be found in choosing the factors of social cohesion by Schiefer and Van der Noll (2017). This provided a certain overview of how social cohesion could be described. Many theories of social cohesion could be chosen to research the community's social cohesion. However, these dimensions were considered the best fit for conducting this research, as these dimensions were complementing the definition of community. Also, this theory was not initially a measurement instrument, which resulted in interviews with non-academic qualified questions. These questions were conducted in Dutch, which could affect the credibility of the construct. Moreover, the interview participants volunteered to participate in the study, which could imply that members with a positive perception of Griffioen are included in this study.

Secondly, the context of the research is arguably a community. One interview participant expressed the considerations in identifying the organization as a community or as a network. Therefore, it became difficult to identify the organization to the researcher, in order to find a fitting theory. Also, the participation of the representatives was not sufficient, since one of the leading characters of this organization was unavailable, and one representative rejected participation in an interview due to a lack of knowledge about Griffioen concerning social cohesion. Later, it was explained that this representative was only briefly involved in the coalition.

The third limitation was the setup of this thesis. Due to obstacles during the prophase of this research, concerning the development of theoretical background, the data collection period was shortened. This resulted in a reduction of the research, which was intended to do a diagnosis of the community, including a redesign. However, this was changed to exploratory research in order to provide a better answer to the research question. This was implemented in a late state of the thesis, which resulted in a short period to change, while the interviews were already conducted. It is the understanding of the researcher that this could have been done differently. For example, the activities to influence social cohesion could be identified properly by questioning this directly. In this study, it was questioned through the exploration of the current and desired state per indicator.

5.5 Suggestions for Future Research

Concerning the outcome of this research, there are three recommendations for future research. As explained in the limitations, a theory concerning the measurement of social cohesion within an organization could be not present. Future research could develop a new measurement scale, which could be grounded academically. Therefore, these theories could be taken as an example of measurement.

In order to improve the orientation towards the common good, Griffioen could do research on their approach towards this goal. This could include multiple subjects concerning strategy management in communicating their vision or change in behaviour, or a combination of these subjects.

During this study, safety was not included as a social cohesion factor. However, this example of inequality could lead to a feeling of insecurity and therefore a lack of safety. This could be included in future research on the influence on social cohesion and how to influence safety within a community.

References

- Beauvais, C., & Jenson, J. (2002). *Social cohesion: updating the state of the research*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Berg, van den, P., Wielen, van der, K., Maussen, S., & Arentze, T. (2021). A path analysis of factors influencing social cohesion and neighbor support in collective self-build housing. The importance of getting to know future neighbors. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 36, 965-989.
- Bleijenbergh, I. L. (2015). *Kwalitatief onderzoek in organisaties*. Den Haag: Boom Lemma uitgevers.
- Brint, S. (2001). Gemeinschaft revisited: A critique and reconstruction of the community concept. *Sociological theory*, 19(1), 1-23.
- Cambridge Dictionary. (2023). *Community*. Consulté le April 19, 2023, sur Cambridge Dictionary: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/community>
- Cambridge University Press. (2023). *Wear your heart on your sleeve*. Consulté le July 7, 2023, sur Cambridge Dictionary: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/wear-heart-on-sleeve>
- Chan, J., To, H.-P., & Chan, E. (2006). Reconsidering social cohesion: developing a definition and analytical framework for empirical research. *Social Indicators Research*, 75, 273-302. doi:10.1007/s11205-005-2118-1
- Cloete, A. (2014). Social cohesion and social capital: Possible implications for the common good. *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 35(3), 1-6.
- Council of Europe. (2004). *A new strategy for Social Cohesion*. European Committee for Social Cohesion.
- Cramm, J. M., van Dijk, H. M., & Nieboer, A. P. (2012). The Importance of Neighborhood Social Cohesion and Social Capital for the Well Being of Older Adults in the Community. *The Gerontologist*, 53(1), 142-150.
- Durkheim, E. (2018). The Division of Labor and Society. Dans D. B. Grusky, *Social Stratification* (pp. 217-222). Routledge.
- Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2125-2145.
- Freeman, J. H., & Audia, P. G. (2006). Community Ecology and the Sociology of Organizations. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 32, 145-169.

- Friedkin, N. E. (2004). Social Cohesion. *Annu. Rev. Socio.*, 30, 409-425.
- Gemeente Nijmegen. (2022). *Bindkracht 10 en Sterker Sociaal Werk*. Nijmegen: Gemeente Nijmegen.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597-697.
- Green, A., Preston, J., & Janmaat, J. G. (2006). *Education, equality and social cohesion. A comparative analysis*. New York: Palgrave.
- Hardin, R. (2006). *Trust* (Vol. 10). Polity.
- Harris, M., & Young, P. (2009). Developing Community and Social Cohesion through Grassroots Bridge Building: An Exploration. *Policy and Politics*, 37(4), 517-534.
- Jackson, D., Spruit, M., Hernandez, H., Huijsmans, M., & Sande, van de, I. (2022). *Griffioen, de bloeiende community in het Waterkwartier Nijmegen*. Nijmegen: Griffioen.
- Jenson, J. (1998). *Mapping social cohesion: the state of canadian research*. Ottawa: Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate, Department of Canadian Heritage.
- Kearns, A., & Forrest, R. (2000). Social Cohesion and Multilevel Urban Governance. *Urban Studies*, 37(5-6), 995-1017. doi:0.1080/00420980050011208
- Kindermann, B., Schmidt, C. V., Bruger, O., & Flatten, T. C. (2022). Why teams matter in customer involvement – The moderating effects of team social cohesion and team autonomy. *Journal of Business Research*, 70-83.
- Kirschbaum, M. (2022, Februari 4). *Waarom zijn communities tegenwoordig steeds meer in trek?* Consulté le April 19, 2023, sur Bedrock: <https://www.bedrock.nl/communities-populair/>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Marquis, C., & Battilana, J. (2009). Acting globally but thinking locally? The enduring influence of local communities on organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*, 29, 283-302.
- Marquis, C., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (2011). Introduction: Community as an institutional order and a type of organizing. Dans *Communities and organizations* (pp. ix-xxvii). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. (2023). *Propinquity*. Consulté le August 14, 2023, sur Oxford Learner's Dictionaries: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/propinquity#:~:text=%2Fpr%C9%99%CB%88p%C9%AA%C5%8Bkw%C9%99ti%2F->

,%2Fpr%C9%99%CB%88p%C9%AA%C5%8Bkw%C9%99ti%2F,space%20or%20ti
me%20synonym%20proximity

- Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.
- Reiter, B. (2017). Theory and methodology of exploratory social science research. *International Journal of Science & Research Methodology*, 5(4), 129-150.
- Rijksoverheid. (2023). *Privacyregels beschermen persoonsgegevens*. Consulté le April 18, 2023, sur Rijksoverheid: [https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/privacy-en-persoonsgegevens/privacyregels-beschermen-persoonsgegevens#:~:text=De%20Algemene%20Verordening%20Gegevensbescherming%20\(AVG,u%20daarover%20goed%20te%20informereren](https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/privacy-en-persoonsgegevens/privacyregels-beschermen-persoonsgegevens#:~:text=De%20Algemene%20Verordening%20Gegevensbescherming%20(AVG,u%20daarover%20goed%20te%20informereren).
- Schiefer, D., & van der Noll, J. (2017). The Essentials of Social Cohesion: A Literature Review. *Soc Indic Res*, 132, 579-603. doi:10.1007/s11205-016-1314-5
- Smith, D. (2003). Five principles for research ethics. *Monitor on Psychology*, 34(1), 56.
- Staal, P., & Wagenaar, K. (2019). *Organiseren van communities*. Schiedam: Scriptum.
- Symon, G., & Cassell, C. (2012). Assessing qualitative research. *Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges*, 204-223.
- Vermeulen, P. A., & Liese-Happel, H. M. (2021). De community als organisatievorm. *M&O: Tijdschrift voor Management en Organisatie*, 75, 61-76.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). Designing case studies. Dans R. K. Yin, *Qualitative research methods* (Vol. 5, pp. 359-386).

